

January 2006
Volume 121 Number 1

PMLA

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

*Rethinking the Print Object:
Goethe and the
Book of Everything*

Andrew Piper

Rethinking the Print Object: Goethe and the Book of Everything

ANDREW PIPER

Indeed, I wanted to write that my work consists of two parts: that which lies here before me and that which I have not written. And it is precisely this second part that is the more important.

—Ludwig Wittgenstein

Fortresses of the Spirit

ON SUNDAY, 28 JUNE 1896, A CEREMONY WAS HELD TO MARK the completion of a new building for the recently established Goethe and Schiller Archive in Weimar. It was a day of extreme optimism: reverent speeches were delivered, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony was played, and newspapers around the world made grand pronouncements, comparing the archive to the library of Alexandria, calling Weimar the Athens on the Ilm, and anointing the new structure a "fortress of the spirit [*Geistesburg*]," a "temple," "hall of honor," "palace," and "citadel" (Golz 37).¹ Even the *Chicago Times Herald* reported the story, remarking, "The whole may well be named the Pantheon of German Literature—the most unique and valuable in the whole history of literature" (Golz 35). Standing imperiously on a hill overlooking, indeed dwarfing, the small town below it, the imposing new structure visually articulated the cultural hierarchy it was intended to bring about. At the core of this architectural and institutional edifice was the emerging textual monument to be known as the Weimar edition.

The edition was initiated nine years earlier, only two years after the death of Goethe's last living relative, Walter Wolfgang von Goethe, who in 1885 bequeathed Goethe's entire *Nachlaß* or posthumous papers to the Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen-Weimar. The

ANDREW PIPER is an assistant professor in the Department of German Studies at McGill University. His essay on the problem of the sharedness of writing in the nineteenth century is forthcoming in a special issue of *Genre* on new histories of writing. He is completing a book on print culture around 1800, entitled *Bibliocosmos: Literature and the Nineteenth-Century Media Imaginary*, and has recently published a translation of Goethe's *The Man of Fifty* (Hesperus, 2004).

transference of Goethe's manuscripts from private to public hands was a sensation in philological circles, and the duchess quickly assembled a team of six editors and over seventy assistants to begin producing a new critical edition. Thirty-two years and 143 volumes later, the project reached its conclusion.

The edition not only functioned as a kind of "Parallelaktion," in Dieter Borchmeyer's words (230), to the founding of the German nation—the spiritual edifice on which rested the new *Kulturnation*—it also represented the culmination of the twin nineteenth-century literary ideals of personality and totality. In his foreword to the first volume of the Weimar edition, the editor Hermann Grimm wrote, "One knew the poet, but now one wanted to know more about *the writer* and *the man*. *Everything about everything* of the man who was so dear to every German's heart" (xi; emphasis added). And Bernhard Suphan, the director of the project, wrote in his preface, "This edition shall represent in its *purity* and *completeness* the *entirety* of Goethe's literary activity along with *everything* that has been left behind of his *personal essence*, a project that has for the first time become achievable now that his posthumous papers have become accessible to scholarly treatment" (xvii–xix; emphasis added). As this proliferating vocabulary of material completeness and personal essences indicated, the exhaustive empirical recovery of the author's life along with its complete and conclusive representation in print was to provide the foundation for all future interpretation. One wanted "everything about everything" of the individual life, and the textual production was to represent the "purity" and "completeness" of this biographical data.

The Weimar edition, then, not only captured a theory of literature—that its meaning depended on knowledge of its author—but also a theory of print: that it was capable of producing timeless and unchanging objects, objects that were totemically capable of or-

ganizing or holding together the social form of the nation. In the hands of the editors of the Weimar edition, Goethe would no longer be a fluctuating network of publications and interpretations but would become something bound and complete, like the stone walls of the new archive that housed his literary remains. The Goethe of the Weimar edition—and indeed the format of the collected edition itself—was to provide the spiritual edifice that strengthened the walls of the national *Burg*.

Rethinking the Print Object

The Weimar edition marked the culmination of an ideal of literature that emerged as part of a larger cultural and material reorientation beginning around the turn of the nineteenth century. By making the author and his life the central organizing principle of literary works—and by extension literary history—the Weimar edition was concluding a process that arguably began with C. M. Wieland's landmark collected works edition of the 1790s and achieved its most formidable expression in Goethe's *Ausgabe letzter Hand* or Walter Scott's *Magnum Opus* edition of the late 1820s.² In response to the overwhelming proliferation of printed books in the early nineteenth century, the "collected works" had become one of the most—if not the most—effective vehicles for regulating, institutionalizing, and stabilizing the category of literature in the nineteenth century. Like the popular nineteenth-century format of the miscellany, the collected works had the capacity to group extraordinary textual diversity under a single heading. Yet unlike the miscellanies with their accompanying ethos of sharing and shared literary property, the collected works established the boundaries of an author's work as inviolable. The collected works thus not only responded to, and in part repaired, the spatial disorganization of the literary system in the nineteenth century, it also addressed the crisis of *traditio*, the problem

of literature's temporal durability in an age of mass-reproduced objects. In its capacity to stabilize and pass on a literary canon over time, the collected works seemed to embody the arguments of pioneering book historians like Elizabeth Eisenstein and Alvin Kernan that print contributed to the standardization and the stability of cultural knowledge. And in its cultlike value to nineteenth-century projects of nation building, the collected edition offered a vivid example of Benedict Anderson's theory of print nationalism, as the operations to the textual body were intended to be symbolically performed on the national body as well.

The Weimar editors were thus largely continuing, or completing, a material practice that was launched in the age of Goethe and that Goethe himself, not uncharacteristically, played a substantial role in initiating. With the *Ausgabe letzter Hand* as the textual basis of their edition, the Weimar editors were re-collecting Goethe, who, toward the end of his life, had been hard at work collecting himself. After overseeing the creation of a personal archive for his lifetime of writing—a move of self-administration that must mark a first in literary history—Goethe used this personalized institution as the basis of his last edition of his works. In a real sense, Goethe's archivization preceded the architectural foundation of the Goethe Archive several decades later. At the same time that Goethe was contributing to his own private institutionalization, he was also working toward the public institutionalization of his works by applying to the Bundesversammlung, the parliamentary body of the German states, for a "Privileg" for his edition (Fröbe). It was an anachronistic gesture that pointed back in time to the early modern system of the royal privilege—to the origins of print literature, in other words³—as well as forward to a time when a national system of copyright might exist to protect against the vigorous industry of piracy that beset the German book market.

Most of all, it was intended to declare the sovereignty and the nationality of this final publication, that the boundaries of the book fixed the boundaries of the author's property as well as the cultural boundaries of the German nation that did not yet exist.⁴ The privilege, like the archive, like the collected edition, was intended to institutionalize and nationalize the individual writer. It is easy to understand how the Weimar edition could imagine itself as the legitimate heir, indeed the apotheosis, of these dual authorial and national projects.

And yet this is only part of the story of publishing Goethe and Goethe publishing. If we look more closely at Goethe's late publishing practices that concluded in his final collected edition, we can see that, far from affirming these author- and nation-building projects, they yield a different set of literary ideals. I do not wish to imply that the Weimar edition was somehow a misguided practice or that it has not proved to be a tremendously valuable resource for Goethe scholarship. But I do want to suggest that its production rested on a set of assumptions about literature, about the function that the printed book had in maintaining these literary ideals, and ultimately about Goethe's privileged place in the continuation of this literary system.⁵ Its production rested, in other words, on a way of reading Goethe that had become institutionalized in the nineteenth century, a perspective that depended on an understanding of what literary work was and thus where it could take place.

Thus in the same way that a particular mode of reading Goethe was used to underwrite a larger disciplinary program in the nineteenth century (and indeed for long after), close attention to his publishing practices can, I argue, underwrite the disciplinary convergence of book history and literary history that we are seeing today. Under what one could call an ideology of the hand—in their exclusive focus on Goethe's final col-

lected edition, the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*, or their tireless attention to the unpublished manuscripts—the Weimar editors understood publication as a form of degradation, as a disruption to the economy of consolidation on which authorial identity and literary culture came to depend in the nineteenth century. Goethe's relation to print, however—the process of his actual publishing practices—necessarily remained overlooked. Yet as recent book historians, publishers, and bibliographers such as Siegfried Unseld, Waltraud Hagen, Dorothea Kuhn, and Wolfgang Bunzel have shown, few writers exhibited a greater concern for the intersections of literature and publication than Goethe did during his late period. We now have a much clearer idea of how varied, extensive, and calculated his relation was to categories like publication, print, and the book. There is a remarkable overlap between the formal operations in his late works and the media operations that surrounded the publication of these works. The meaning of Goethe's late work is always deeply and self-consciously intertwined with the changing conditions of communication in which it was produced.

In returning to those material and narrative spaces that were marginalized by the manuscriptural-biographical perspective canonized by the Weimar editors, I will look beyond markers like the *Privileg* and focus instead on the complex diffusion of Goethe's works in print that surrounded and ultimately concluded in the final collected edition. At the same time, I will try to illustrate how Goethe's use of language and narrative also contributed to what we might call a particular media imaginary. His fictions, too—most prominently on display in his last major prose work, *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* (*Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman Years*)—played a pivotal role in addressing the rules and protocols of print communication. When taken together, Goethe's uses of print, publication, and narrative, far from establishing and

solidifying the regulatory system that was emerging in the nineteenth century, in fact strongly resisted this program. The values of personality, sovereignty, nationality, totality, and permanence that suffused the Weimar edition and that were at the heart of literature's classificatory system in the nineteenth century were, in Goethe's own collected edition, distinctly posited as problems.

In its divergence from such norms, Goethe's late work discloses a moment when categories like print, the book, and the work—all essential to the organization of the modern literary system—were still spaces of extreme fluctuation. It suggests that the pioneering work of an earlier generation of book historians, whose aim was to establish the essence of such categories, now needs to be revised. Recent works by Adrian Johns, Leah Price, Meredith McGill, Paul Keen, and Clifford Siskin are some of the many projects that have begun this endeavor of revision, to show how historically variable such categories were. My essay is thus conceived as part of this larger ongoing project, which addresses a simple question that yields surprisingly diverse answers: how did users use print to make literature?

As the proliferation and distribution of print objects accelerated around the turn of the nineteenth century, numerous writers were participating in the struggle to regulate, define, and stabilize the literary system. Goethe's late work assumes importance because of the way it imagined things differently. In place of the book as a spiritual fortress, it prioritized values like transformation, diffusion, and connectivity. It attempted to refashion literary communication within, and not against, the conditions of reproducibility and mobility that were print technology's most salient features. It aimed to establish protocols for the control of communication that were crucially based on principles of decreasing control. Most important, it challenged and expanded the categories on which the

literary system had come to depend. In thinking about the nature of the book, Goethe was thinking about the nature of literature.

Literature Unbound

In what was labeled “Anzeige von Goethe’s sämtlichen Werken vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand” (“Advertisement for Goethe’s Complete Final Authorized Edition of His Collected Works”), printed in the popular daily newspaper *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände* in July 1826, Goethe defined the key terms of his final literary project. “Nun mögte von so Manchem, was hier noch zu sagen wäre, nur zu berühren seyn, wie man der gegenwärtig angekündigten Ausgabe die Prädikate von *sämtlich*, *vollständig* und *letzter Hand* zu geben sich veranlaßt gefunden” (“Of what remains to be said, it shall only be touched upon how one had occasion to give the present forthcoming edition the predicates *collected* [or *complete*], *complete*, and *final authorized*”). Here, one expects Goethe to authorize the model of monumentality that would later inform the Weimar edition. Yet something different happens in this short advertisement. In Goethe’s words, *sämtlich* is defined as “sodann Alles, was vorerst werth schien, aus den Papieren des Verfassers mitgetheilt zu werden” (“everything that appeared worth sharing from the papers of the author”). What has been collected is based on a criterion of value (“werth”) that defines the act of collection first and foremost as one of selection. Instead of stressing the likeness or the unity of the collection’s parts, this definition of “everything” emphasizes what has been left out. Goethe goes on to define his next term by arguing that *vollständig* represents, on the one hand, “des Verfassers Naturell, Bildung, Fortschreiten” (“the author’s nature, formation, and progress”) and, on the other hand, his “vielfaches Versuchen nach allen Seiten hin” (“multifaceted striving in all directions”). Completeness encompasses

both the temporal evolution of the writer (“Fortschreiten”) as well as the spatial diffusion or diversity of his work (“Versuchen nach allen Seiten”). The edition’s completeness is a function of both time and space, but Goethe’s use of gerunds (*Fortschreiten*, not *Fortschritt*; *Versuchen*, not *Versuche*) emphasizes process over completion. Finally, on the term *letzter Hand*, Goethe writes, “Der Ausdruck letzter Hand jedoch ist vorzüglich vor Mißverständniß zu bewahren. Wo er auch je gebraucht worden deutet er doch nur darauf hin, daß der Verfasser sein Letztes und Bestes gethan, ohne deshalb seine Arbeit als vollendet ansehen zu dürfen” (“It is principally important, however, to protect the expression *letzter Hand* against misunderstanding. Wherever it has been used, it only signifies that the author has done his last and best, without allowing his work to be seen as concluded”; 762). The works are complete (*vollständig*) without being concluded (*vollendet*). They extend beyond the work of the author’s hand.

The advertisement thus constructs a fiction of the collected edition significantly different from the one created by the privilege on the title page of the edition. Set apart and at a distance to the physical edition, the advertisement emphasizes the a-partness of the writer’s works. It underscores their diffusion, not their unity. Far from advancing the Weimar editors’ ideals of nationality and monumentality, in Goethe’s hands the collected works becomes a vehicle for negotiating the contradictory energies of transformation and preservation that were at the heart of the spreading culture of print. Instead of imagining the “purity” and the “completeness” of the print edition as something timeless, national, and monumental, Goethe was attempting to represent the paradoxical idea of the in-completion of completion of the print object. Publication is understood as a process or an event, not a fixed or fixable moment.

The advertisement suggests that the collected edition should be seen in a larger con-

tinuum, pointing not only to the forms that might come after it but to the elements that came before it and that also belong to it, even if at a distance. Goethe's practice of collection, while claiming to be a totality ("vollständig"), did not aim to reproduce that totality in the closed textual confines of the collected edition. The exclusion of texts was in fact a way of including them. By making simultaneous claims to totality and to openness, Goethe was refashioning the collected edition as something that included precisely that which was beyond its own textual borders. And it was this attention to the outside and the elsewhere that generated the most contemporary criticism of Goethe's undertaking. In his *Kritik der neuesten Cotta'schen Ausgabe von Goethe's Werken* ("Critique of the Latest Cotta Edition of Goethe's Works" [1828]), Friedrich Schütz, the author of a seven-volume work on Goethe's philosophy, queried, "Is it enough to lament that of the 'hitherto dispersed publications' that Goethe invokes, only 'some things' and not, as one would very much desire, 'everything' is included in this *Ausgabe letzter Hand!*" (44). The status and the location of "everything" was at stake in the construction of the collected edition, and the friction that the advertisement generated for contemporary readers was in the edition's redefinition of what "everything" meant and where it was located.

As a way of approaching what this new book of everything might look like, I will focus on the publication history of a single work from the final collected edition: Goethe's last major prose fiction, *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* (1808–29), which was conceived as a sequel to his popular bildungsroman *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (*Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship* [1796]). As part novella collection, epistolary novel, and travel novel, the *Wanderjahre* has always posed classificatory challenges to literary scholars.⁶ If one can speak of an interpretive consensus regarding this novel today, it would surround the importance of what Volker Neuhaus first iden-

tified as the "archival fiction" at the novel's heart. Drawing on a Bakhtinian notion of the novel as the genre of multiple genres and discourses, numerous recent works of scholarship have highlighted the way the novel seems to register as many linguistic points of contact with the world as possible (Dane; Herwig; Schöbeler). As Erhard Bahr writes in his *The Novel as Archive*, "The problems of the *Wanderjahre* consist of the plurality of discourses and their discontinuity, instability, and transience" (99). However productive such readings have been, as a category to model the novel the archive is ultimately, in my view, far too static to account for the importance of the way information moves in the novel. In the words of information theorists, it privileges processing over transmission, where transmission seems equally, if not more, important to the novel's structure.

When we take into consideration the elaborate publishing strategy that constituted the novel in print, such questions of transmission become even more pronounced.⁷ To discuss the *Wanderjahre* is to discuss a textual system that appeared in different versions in various early-nineteenth-century print formats over the course of two decades during Goethe's lifetime, from the newspaper to the miscellany to the novel to the collected edition. At the same time, a vast majority of Goethe's work on the second version of the *Wanderjahre*, which has become the version scholars most often refer to when they discuss the novel, was undertaken during Goethe's production of the *Ausgabe letzter Hand*.⁸ There is a concrete overlap between the creative energies invested in assembling and editing his collected works and assembling and writing this major work. In addition, the second version of the *Wanderjahre* was never published as a stand-alone work but only as part of the collected works. It is specifically inscribed into the textual universe of the edition. Finally, like the collected works, the *Wanderjahre* was composed of numerous

other works that had been previously published. From its inception, the *Wanderjahre* was surrounded by questions of collection that were at the heart of the collected works. It appears as a microcosm of the collection, a work about the works and thus about literary work itself.

“If the *Mona Lisa* Is in the Louvre, Where Is *Hamlet*?”—F. W. Bateson

In the spring of 1822, following the publication of the first version of *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* one year earlier, Goethe published an essay in the *Morgenblatt* entitled “Geneigte Theilnahme an den *Wanderjahren*” (“Inclined Participation in the *Journeyman Years*”). It was offered as a response to an ongoing literary debate about the merits of the *Wanderjahre* as a novel. Of the many reasons why the reception of Goethe’s latest work had been so rancorous, arguably the most significant was the appearance of a second *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*, written by Johann Pustkuchen and published almost simultaneously to Goethe’s (Wolf). The instability of reception to which Goethe’s intervention in print one year later was a response was thus due in large part to the problem of repetition that surrounded the *Wanderjahre* as a text: there were too many *Wanderjahres*. The appearance of a second *Wanderjahre* was not, however, a unique event (and thus could not be written off as a literary coincidence or nuisance) but was indicative of the larger role repetition played in the *Wanderjahre*’s textual life. The *Wanderjahre* was not only conceived as a sequel, it also consisted of numerous works that had been previously published in pocketbook miscellanies. Pustkuchen’s reuse of the title *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* was not to be understood as a parody, then, but as a representation of a reading experience that had overwhelmingly come to define the title of *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*, an amplification of the increasingly vague

boundaries that seemed to constitute this literary “work.”

The strategy of republication that was amplified by the *Wanderjahre*’s double appearance in 1821 dated back to 1808 with the publication of the novella “Die pilgernde Törin” (“The Foolish Woman on a Pilgrimage”), the first of several novellas that were individually published in Johann Friedrich Cotta’s pocketbook miscellany, the *Taschenbuch für Damen* (*Ladies’ Pocketbook*) and that were later included in the *Wanderjahre*. “Die pilgernde Törin” was a translation from an anonymously written French story, and thus the first work to appear in print that would later appear again in the *Wanderjahre* was a translation—a text that, like the sequel into which it would later be incorporated, pointed to preexisting material. This problematization of the boundaries of the *Wanderjahre* was further underscored when Goethe published the first four chapters of the *Wanderjahre* in Cotta’s *Taschenbuch* in 1810, chapters that were framed in the miscellany by the novel’s title, *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre. Erstes Buch* (*Wilhelm Meister’s Journeyman Years: Book One*). Where “Die pilgernde Törin” had pointed backward to another text from which it derived, the publication of material in 1810 pointed forward to a work that did not yet exist. Wolfgang Bunzel has argued that “these pre-publications [*Vorabdrucke*] were components of a directed strategy of publication to gain readers” (“Das ist” 36). Certainly, but this strategy does more work than simple advertising. Even Bunzel’s term *Vorabdrucke* makes an interpretive choice by determining that the novellas are part of the *Wanderjahre*, that they are not separate works. Yet it is this (a)partness—how they relate to the larger whole—that Goethe plays with in how they appear in print.

The first four chapters of the *Wanderjahre* published in 1810 were not only framed by a title page with the words *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre. Erstes Buch*, they were

also paginated in roman numerals. They were typographically set off from the rest of the pocketbook, a choice that we know was Goethe's, not Cotta's (Bunzel, "Das ist" 45). The roman numerals marked the integrity and the apartness of the *Wanderjahre* from the rest of the miscellany. At the same time, however, chapter 1, "Die Flucht nach Aegypten" ("The Flight to Egypt"), concluded not the way it would conclude in the *Wanderjahre* but with the words

(Hier folgt im Original ein Brief an Natalien, wodurch die Wanderjahre eingeleitet und an die Lehrjahre angeknüpft werden.)

(*Taschenbuch* viii)

(Here follows in the original a letter to Natalie, through which the *Wanderjahre* is introduced and connected to the *Lehrjahre*.)

Thus the integrity that was typographically achieved through the roman numerals was simultaneously undermined through the parentheses that marked off a space that referred somewhere else. The excerpt, itself an indication of something incomplete, was here explicitly made incomplete. It was in essence an excerpt of an excerpt. The entirety of the first book that the title page announced was thus undermined by the parenthetical invocation of another textual space ("in the original"). At the same time, this other textual space—the original and thus origin—did not yet exist, upending the notion of originality on which the category of the excerpt depended. Finally, it was crucial to the logic of this publication that the part that was missing was framed as the introduction to the *Wanderjahre* and as the connection to its prequel, the *Lehrjahre*. The other textual space denoted by the parentheses—called the "original"—was supposed to mark both a beginning and a continuation of another work. It was deeply divided, in other words, between marking an origin and erasing the condition of originality. What we find in these two initial publications is the steady

accumulation of texts that point to other texts through pointers that oscillate between the delineation and violation of textual boundaries.

This strategy continued right up until the publication of the first version of the *Wanderjahre* in 1821. In 1815, Goethe published an advertisement in the *Morgenblatt* ("Antwort auf eine Anfrage über *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*" ["Answer to an Inquiry about *Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman Years*"]) that apologized for the absence of the *Wanderjahre* from the German book market. The advertisement did not announce the pending appearance of a work, thus amplifying the work's presence, as an advertisement should, but instead substituted itself for a work that would not appear for another five years, indicating once more a text's absence. This advertisement was followed over the course of the next few years by the publication in Cotta's miscellany of portions of novellas that would all later be included in the *Wanderjahre*: the first part of "Das nußbraune Mädchen" ("The Nut-Brown Maid"); the first half of "Die neue Melusine" ("The New Melusina"), with a preface that was not included in the *Wanderjahre*; "Der Mann von funfzig Jahren" ("The Man of Fifty"), an incomplete novella; and finally, the second half of "Die neue Melusine." In other words, the prepublications of the *Wanderjahre* consisted of a translation, an incomplete excerpt, an advertisement for an absent book, half of a novella, half of another novella with an original preface, an incomplete novella, and then the concluding half of a novella that had appeared three years earlier in print. Did the second half of "Die neue Melusine" point backward to its first half or forward to the pending publication of the *Wanderjahre*? What was the status of the "pre" in these prepublications?

With almost half of the novel in print by the time the 1821 edition appeared, it was little wonder that readers were critical of the repackaging of already printed and remunerated works. The feuilletonist Ludwig Börne claimed that Cotta's son had told him that

“Goethe pulled out all his old stuff just to fill up the book,” and Friedrich Glover charged that the whole project was driven by “base financial speculation” (Bunzel, “Das ist” 68). For early-nineteenth-century readers, the *Wanderjahre* looked like nothing more than reprinted goods. The appearance of Pustkuchen’s *Wanderjahre* simply underscored a problem that readers had come to associate with the work. The problem was that the publishing event of the *Wanderjahre*—an event that by 1821 had spanned over a decade and would last another eight years—did not fit under either of the available early-nineteenth-century rubrics of reception. It was neither an original work nor the reissue of a classic in the service of fashioning a national heritage. The *Wanderjahre* challenged the agreed-on calculus of originality and repetition that early-nineteenth-century readers had come to expect from print media.

This predicament of novelty and repetition was magnified in the 1820s when Goethe significantly rewrote the *Wanderjahre* in the course of the decade but then only republished it as part of his final collected edition. Like the excerpts that had appeared in Cotta’s miscellany, the *Wanderjahre* as a whole was now framed by a larger textual apparatus. The ambiguous textual boundaries that surrounded the *Wanderjahre* in the collected edition were amplified by the ambiguous textual boundaries between the 1821 and the 1829 versions. As Goethe wrote next to the listing for the *Wanderjahre* in the advertisement to his collected edition,

Die wunderlichen Schicksale, welche dieß Büchlein bey seinem ersten Auftreten erfahren mußte, gaben dem Verfasser guten Humor und Lust genug, dieser Produktion eine doppelte Aufmerksamkeit zu schenken. Es unterhielt ihn, das Werklein von Grund aus aufzulösen und wieder neu aufzubauen, so daß nun in einem ganz Anderen Dasselbe wieder erscheinen wird. (“Anzeige” 759)

The marvelous fate that this small book experienced on its first appearance gave the author both the desire and good mood to give this production renewed attention. He found it entertaining to undo the work from the bottom up and rebuild it anew, so that in something totally different the same thing will appear.

Goethe informed his readers that the *Wanderjahre* in the collected works was indeed going to be something new (“to undo the work from the bottom up and rebuild it anew”), at the same time that he continued to challenge any claim to originality and autonomy for this “new” work (“so that in something totally *different* the same thing will appear”). What we find in Goethe’s late work is the way the *version* (*Fassung*) captured something essential about the new condition of communication in which the author saw himself working, the increasing diffusion and connectivity of print media. The new media landscape allowed for the greater dissemination of a work at the same time that it made it possible to draw tighter connections between parts. Where the literary work under Goethe’s aegis seemed to fuse claims to novelty and sameness, it simultaneously asserted the centrality of material expansion to the literary project. Whether it was in the form of republishing the fragmentary novellas or republishing the novel only as part of the collected works, we can see how the *Wanderjahre* enacted a paratextual program that redefined the location of the literary work, that continually transgressed and expanded the work’s boundaries so that the demarcation of the text became increasingly problematic. And yet as we saw in Goethe’s publications in the miscellanies, material deployment was only half of the equation of thinking about literature and the book. The changes Goethe made at the level of language and narrative from version to version crucially affected the imaginative reception of this increasingly diffuse work.

The Arrow and the Map

In book 2, chapter 7, of the *Wanderjahre*, we find the novel's hero, Wilhelm, traveling to the Lago Maggiore in Italy. It is one of many spaces that Wilhelm will traverse in the course of the *Wanderjahre*'s three books, from the naturalism of the steep cliffs of the alps, to the domesticity of the uncle's bourgeois salon, to the didacticism of the pedagogical province, to the colonialism of the American settlement, to the cosmological projections of Makarie's abode. The Lago Maggiore is significant because it is here where we are told that Wilhelm will undergo an important transition in his life. Indeed, in the original plan for the novel—before Cotta's publishing conditions forced Goethe to transform the work from two to three volumes—the Lago Maggiore was to mark the end of the first volume. The biographical transition was to be amplified by the material caesura of the physical book.

And yet the Lago Maggiore's importance to the novel lies not so much in the way it marks a distinct transition but in the way this textual site is overwhelmingly defined through its references to numerous other textual spaces. Wilhelm's traveling companion, the painter, has read the *Lehrjahre*—the prequel to the novel we are reading—and is on a pilgrimage to the home of one of its most memorable characters (Mignon); the travelers later encounter characters from the novella "The Man of Fifty"; the widow from "The Man of Fifty" tells Wilhelm her story, which is the novella we have just read; the narrator informs us he has included excerpts from another text (a text by C. V. Meyer); and finally, the painter sings Mignon's song from the *Lehrjahre*, a song that leads to a narrative crisis that concludes his and Wilhelm's time on the Lago Maggiore.

Far from enacting a moment of leaving behind, then, the scene of the Lago Maggiore is much more about the problem of the new

beginning. It is a strategy that undoubtedly owes much to the renewed popularity of Cervantes's *Don Quixote* in the early nineteenth century, and taken together such devices are in themselves not terribly remarkable. They do little to amplify or draw attention to the variety of Goethe's publishing practices that surrounded the text. But critics have never before noted an instance of intertextuality that I have so far omitted, one that is crucial for making sense of how the formal arrangement of the *Wanderjahre* participates in the late Goethe's thinking about writing and print.

When Wilhelm and his traveling companion at the Lago Maggiore decide to find the two women from the novella "The Man of Fifty," the narrator describes their quest in the following way:

Nun stellten sie Kreuz- und Querfahrten an, die Punkte wo der Freunde in dieses Paradies einzutreten pflegt beobachtend. Ihre Schiffer hatten sie mit der Hoffnung Freunde hier zu sehen bekannt gemacht, und nun dauerte es nicht lange, so sahen sie ein wohlverziertes Prachtschiff herangleiten, worauf sie Jagd machten und sich nicht enthielten sogleich leidenschaftlich zu entern. Die Frauenzimmer einigermaßen betroffen faßten sich sogleich, als Wilhelm das Blättchen vorwies und beide den von ihnen selbst vorgezeichneten Pfeil, ohne Bedenken, anerkannten. Die Freunde wurden alsbald zutraulich eingeladen das Schiff der Damen zu besteigen, welches eilig geschah. (501)

They now began crisscrossing the lake, observing the points where their friends tended to appear in this paradise. They had informed their skipper that they had hopes of seeing friends here, and it was not long before they saw a beautifully ornamented ship gliding toward them. They hurried after it and did not restrain themselves from passionately preparing to board it immediately. The two women, who were somewhat taken aback, quickly composed themselves as Wilhelm showed them the small piece of paper and they both recognized, without a second thought, the arrow, which they themselves had drawn.

The men were speedily and warmly invited to board the women's ship, which occurred with great haste.

Putting aside other details of this scene, I would like to pause and look more closely at the arrow and the little piece of paper that play such an important and yet barely noticeable role. There is a certain logic to the idea that a piece of paper and an arrow could facilitate Wilhelm and the painter's entry into the women's nautical salon. There is nothing contradictory, in other words, about the function of paper and arrow as communicative devices. But on another level, these signs make little sense in the context of this scene. We have never before encountered the small piece of paper and the arrow in the second version of the *Wanderjahre*: there is an element that remains unexplained, indeed unexplainable, about them. We might say that they operate as empty signifiers, as objects that invite and yet stubbornly resist interpretation, much like the little casket that circulates throughout the novel and that no one can open.

When we turn to the equivalent scene in the first version of the *Wanderjahre*, however, we find these two signs amply described. We see how they functioned as a way of facilitating communication between characters at a distance. At the conclusion of "The Man of Fifty" in the first version, Hersilie tells Wilhelm in a postscript how he will be able to find the characters of the novella:

Um Ihnen nun den Weg zu zeigen, wie Sie das liebenswürdige Paar auf Ihren Wanderungen treffen können, so ergreife ich ein wunderliches Mittel. Sie erhalten hiebei den kleinen Ausschnitt einer Landkarte; wenn Sie diesen auf die größere legen, so deutet die darauf gezeichnete Magnetnadel mit der Pfeilspitze nach der Gegend, wo die Suchenswerten hinziehen. (126)

To show you how you can meet this lovely pair on your travels, I will turn to rather strange means. You are receiving in this letter a small excerpt of a map; when you place this piece

on the larger map, the point of the magnetic needle that is drawn on it will direct you to the region where those you seek have gone.

In the first version, we learn how Hersilie has constructed an elaborate cartographic game. Wilhelm's task is to find where on the larger map this excerpted piece fits, and when he has done so, the arrow that is drawn on the excerpt will point him where to go on the larger map. Only through the combination of the excerpt with its larger original will the sign (the arrow) make sense.

Thus what is amply described in the first version is left underdescribed in the second. The first version's more specific moniker of the "excerpt" becomes the decidedly vaguer "piece of paper" in the second. Instead of arguing for these signs' opacity in the second version, then, we might be inclined to argue, as the editors of the Frankfurt critical edition have done, that this omission of an explanation in the second version could be identified as a "mistake." "Goethe overlooked," write the editors, "the need to include in the second version an explanation of this mention of the arrow and the little piece of paper, both here and at a later point" (Goethe, *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* 1129n). To argue that Goethe overlooked something (however probable) is to rely on a problematic hermeneutical model that distinguishes between intentional changes and accidental changes. How would we be able to reliably differentiate omissions that are meaningful from ones that are mistakes in the process of rewriting? In arguing that something has been overlooked, something is being overlooked. Like the invocation of the importance of ambiguity, invoking the act of overlooking is a consequence, I would suggest, of not reading the text in its material context. The significance of the absence of explanation in the second version only emerges when we take into account the media operations that surrounded the publication of the *Wanderjahre* and that led to this

variation. Only then does this “mistake” or “non-sense” emerge as an allegory of reading and communication.

The arrow in the second version does not function as a mistake or an opaque sign, then, but instead *as an arrow*, literally pointing the reader somewhere else, a somewhere else that I would identify as the first version of the *Wanderjahre*, in which the arrow’s meaning is explained. By not including the explanation of the arrow in the second version, Goethe has placed the reader in the same situation as Wilhelm. Just as Wilhelm had to place a piece of one map on top of a much larger map for the piece to make sense, we as readers are invited to perform the same cartographic operations on the second version—to conceive the second version as an excerpt and to lay it onto a much larger map (or textual space) that would include the first version. Only then do the sign (the arrow) and the text (the map) make sense. This crucial moment in the frame narrative of the second version does not frame the work as either new or definitive but merely as part of a larger textual unit. Both sign and text are critically reconceived as excerpts. They do not resist meaning but radically expand the location of meaning. According to the arrow and the map, the meaningful unit is always the composite, the compound, and the collected.

The crucial point of this operation is how elegantly it mirrors the publishing practices that surrounded the work. The scene—so central to Wilhelm’s self-fashioning—constructs a reader capable of interpreting the material expansionism of Goethe’s late literary work, an expansionism that significantly depended on manipulating and participating in the distributive and decentralizing energies of the expanding print technology. When the painter in the Lago Maggiore scene reveals himself to have read the novel’s prequel, the *Lehrjahre*, we are meant to see how knowledge of such larger textual universes was becoming increasingly important to reading

experiences in the early nineteenth century. Balzac’s transition to thinking of the “work” as a massive, unified “oeuvre” a year after Goethe’s death in 1833 would arguably mark the highpoint of this move toward larger and larger literary systems, a tradition that one could see concluding, and unraveling, in Robert Musil’s endless modernist novel, *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften* (*The Man without Qualities*). The arrow and the map in the second version of the *Wanderjahre* apply this principle of intertextuality—the displacement of meaning to a textual space beyond a single work’s boundaries—not from one work to another but from one version to another of the same work. Goethe’s project anticipated in many ways other nineteenth-century projects of rewriting, most notably exemplified by Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass*, but Goethe’s asked that one observe the entirety of this process so that that each subsequent version only made sense in relation to all earlier versions.

Nineteenth-century readers were critical of Goethe for not including the first version of the *Wanderjahre* in his *Ausgabe letzter Hand* because they felt that the two versions constituted two separate creations and that a truly complete collected edition should contain all Goethe’s “works.”⁹ But this was just the inverse of the critique that readers had made against the inclusion of the previously published novellas in the novel—namely, that there was no difference between the novellas in the miscellanies and the novellas that appeared in the *Wanderjahre* and thus they should not have been reprinted. In either case, the works are either the same or they are absolutely different. They are conceived of as finite objects and finite reading experiences. What the arrow and the map performed with elegant concision was the problematization of this logic of sameness and difference, and they did so by arguing for the importance of the material location of literary work. They located literary work, and thus the work itself,

not in some ideal and crucially immaterial space but instead in the material operations of circulation, distribution, and reproduction that accompanied and defined its reception. They oriented the reader's gaze to the mobile artifacts of literary life. There is an amazing coincidence, in other words, between the reader figured in the *Wanderjahre* and the reader that the discipline of book history aims to construct today.

The Work of Art as *Techno-Präparat*

If the arrow of the Lago Maggiore in the *Wanderjahre* refigured the work as something that evolved over time and that incorporated these prior moments into itself, there is a key scene in book 3 that points forward, that establishes the work as a kind of limitless futurity. At the moment that Wilhelm experiences another biographical turning point—this time a crisis in his anatomy training to become a doctor—a man intervenes and leads him into an adjacent room. The room's walls are adorned with artificial limbs that have been made by Wilhelm's new guide. It is, on the one hand, a space of pure prosthesis, a media chamber of technologized body parts. These objects, however, are not artificial substitutions for lost body parts but instead artificial representations of various layers of body parts, to be used in anatomical training. Of the numerous spatiotemporal reorientations that this scene performs, the most significant is the substitution of substitution itself as the "Surrogat" is reformulated as a "Präparat" (604), a word that refers to an object that has been chemically treated in preparation for anatomical observation. In a play on the prefix *pro* in the German *Prothese*, the "beneath" depicted in these anatomical prostheses now also represents the "before." The new supplement marks both a (chemical) compound and a preliminary stage.

The *Präparat* can thus be read as a powerful metaphor for the literary work.¹⁰ Like

the arrow of the Lago Maggiore, the anatomical prosthesis points to something that is not there. But unlike the arrow and the operations of map reading it implies, the prosthesis points forward instead of backward. The work that is conceived as a technological preparation not only encompasses its various past permutations but now also anticipates, and in some sense participates in, the production of itself in the future. Like Wittgenstein's assertion that the most important works were those he did not write, the technological *Präparat* incorporates into itself all the forms that the work has not yet assumed. According to the didactic space of the adjacent room of anatomical sculptures, the work is figured neither as an intact, organic corpus nor as a fundament to secure the walls of a spiritual or national fortress. Instead, the work is figured as a prophetic, radiant, technological compound. It transcends the author's control and transgresses spatiotemporal boundaries to allow for more fluid literary and cultural configurations.

The Weimar editors imagined that they were printing "everything about everything" in a single textual unit that was not only bound by an ultimately finite number of volumes but also a finite amount of time. Goethe's project of collecting everything, on the other hand, disaggregated the text from a single, unified material location and unbound the temporal horizon that constituted the "work" as well. Through the strategic deployment of a range of print formats—the newspaper, the pocketbook miscellany, the novel, the collected edition—Goethe's late work exhibited an intense interest in using print's power of reproducibility, transmissibility, and depersonalization to radically transform the notion of what a work was and where literary work was to be located. In rethinking the nature of the printed book, Goethe was rethinking the nature of literary work. No longer confined to the immaterial space of the imagination or the confessional paradigm of articulating interiority, literature

was powerfully reconceived in its intersection with material and social spaces of communication. If the printed book was reconfigured in the *Wanderjahre* as an endlessly regenerating system of texts, then the *Wanderjahre* itself was to be the key, or in more modern terms, the programming code to this system. According to Goethe's late work, literature's future and literature's meaning depended on a fundamental reimagination of what the printed book could do.

NOTES

1. All undocumented translations in this essay are my own.
2. For a discussion of Wieland's collected edition, see Ungern-Sternberg; for Scott, see Millgate; and for Goethe, see Hagen, "Goethes Ausgabe."
3. In his letter to the Bundesversammlung, Goethe writes, "Das Mittel jedoch, einen anerkannten geistigen Besitz dem einzelnen Verfasser zu erhalten, hatte sich schon bald nach Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst hervorgetan, indem, bei ermangelnden allgemeinen Gesetzen, man zu einzelnen Privilegien schritt" ("Nevertheless, the means for an individual author to maintain his acknowledged intellectual property emerged soon after the discovery of the printing press, whereby in the light of a general deficiency of laws, one turned to individual privileges"; *Briefe* 239).
4. Goethe's emphasis on the nationalizing function of the congress's act was made explicit in his letter: "Sollte nun aber gegenwärtig der erhabene Bundestag, der Verein aller deutschen Souveränitäten, nicht dergleichen als Gesamtheit auszuüben geneigt sein, was die Einzelnen vorher anzuordnen und festzusetzen berechtigt waren und noch sind, und wäre nicht durch einen solchen Akt das entschiedenste Gewicht auf deutsche Literatur und Geistesbildung kräftigst zu betätigen?" ("Should not the noble Bundestag, the union of all German sovereignties, be equally inclined to exercise itself as a totality today, in a similar fashion to the individuals who were and continue to be afforded such rights? And would not such an act powerfully exercise the most decisive influence on German literature and spiritual development?"; *Briefe* 239). The importance of the unifying function of this title-page moniker is further underscored by the fact that Goethe insisted on it even though it was a fiction: the Bundesversammlung did not have the legal authority to grant a federation-wide privilege (Fröbe).

5. For a lengthier discussion of the process of Goethe's canonization in the nineteenth century, see Hohendahl.

6. For a history of the novel's reception, see Bahr. For a discussion of the *Wanderjahre*'s relation to Goethe's other novels, see Vaegt, Blackall, Brown, and Blessin.

7. For a discussion of the genesis of the *Wanderjahre*, see Bahr; Reiss; and Schellenberg, although Schellenberg's article curiously only focuses on the first version and contains no new information but does contain factual errors (the novellas are said to all be published in 1809) as well as interpretive misreadings (the 1829 version is referred to as a "new work").

8. See Erich Trunz, who demonstrates the way it was the *Wanderjahre* and not *Faust* that was Goethe's primary occupation ("Hauptgeschäft") during 1828–29.

9. Friedrich Schütz writes, "The old text would have to be reprinted in a complete edition of Goethe's collected works" (38).

10. Wilhelm's anatomical training is also the center of Marc Redfield's lucid reading of the *Wanderjahre*, which describes this scene's interrogation of *techné*, dissection, and unknowability as a critique of humanism and thus the ideals of the aesthetic state. By contrast, where I see the *Wanderjahre* articulating a particular political vision is through its endorsement of certain modes of technological communication that enable different and importantly nonnational political formations to take shape.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Bahr, Ehrhard. *The Novel as Archive: The Genesis, Reception and Criticism of Goethe's Wilhelm Meister's Wanderjahre*. Camden: Camden, 1998.
- Bateson, F. W. "Modern Bibliography and the Literary Artifact." *English Studies Today*. Ed. Georges A. Bonnard. Bern: Lang, 1961. 67–77.
- Blackall, Eric A. *Goethe and the Novel*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1976.
- Blessin, Stefan. *Goethes Romane. Aufbruch in die Moderne*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1996.
- Borchmeyer, Dieter. "Sophiens Reise von Weimar nach München." *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 106 (1989): 230–39.
- Brown, Jane K. *Goethe's Cyclical Narratives*. Durham: U of North Carolina P, 1975.
- Bunzel, Wolfgang. "'Das ist eine heillose Manier, dieses Fragmente-Auftischen.' Die Vorabdrucke einzelner Abschnitte aus Goethes *Wanderjahren* in *Cottas Taschenbuch für Damen*." *Jahrbuch des freien deutschen Hochstifts* (1992): 36–68.
- . *Poetik und Publikation. Goethes Veröffentlichungen in Musenalmanachen und literarischen Taschenbüchern*.

- Mit einer Bibliographie der Erst- und autorisierten Folgedrucke literarischer Texte Goethes im Almanach (1773–1832). Köln: Böhlau, 1997.
- Dane, Gesa. *Die heilsame Toilette: Kosmetik und Bildung in Goethes "Der Mann von fünfzig Jahren."* Göttingen: Wallstein, 1994.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979. 2 vols.
- Fröbe, Heinz. "Die Privilegierung der Ausgabe 'letzte Hand' Goethes sämtlicher Werke." *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 2 (1960): 187–229.
- Goethe, J. W. "Antwort auf eine Anfrage über *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*." Ed. Friedmar Apel. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke* 19: 706.
- . "Anzeige von Goethe's sämtlichen Werken vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand." Ed. Anne Bohnenkamp. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke* 22: 757–65.
- . *Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche 1823–1828.* Ed. Horst Fleig. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 37.
- . "Geneigte Theilnahme an den *Wanderjahren*." Ed. Stefan Greif and Andrea Ruhlig. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke* 21: 290–92.
- . *Sämtliche Werke. Briefe, Tagebücher und Gespräche.* 40 vols. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker, 1985–.
- . *Werke. Vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand.* Stuttgart: Cotta, 1827–30. 40 vols.
- . *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre.* Ed. Gerhard Neumann and Hans-Georg Dewitz. Goethe, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 10.
- Golz, Jochen. "Das Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv in Geschichte und Gegenwart." *Das Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv 1896–1996.* Ed. Golz. Weimar: Böhlau, 1996. 13–70.
- Grimm, Hermann. Vorwort [Foreword]. *Goethes Werke.* Vol. 1. Weimar: Böhlau, 1887. xi–xvii. 143 vols.
- Hagen, Waltraud. *Die Drucke von Goethes Werken.* Berlin: Akademie, 1971.
- . "Goethes Ausgabe letzter Hand. Entstehung und Bedeutung." *Marginalien* 99 (1985): 1–22.
- Herwig, Henriette. "Schule der Entsagung? Zur Kritik der moral-pädagogischen Instrumentalisierung von Goethes *Wanderjahren*." *Spuren-Signaturen-Spiegelungen. Zur Goethe-Rezeption in Europa.* Ed. Anke Bosse. Köln: Böhlau, 2000. 539–48.
- Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. *Building a National Literature: The Case of Germany 1830–1870.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Keen, Paul. *The Crisis of Literature in the 1790s: Print Culture and the Public Sphere.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Kernan, Alvin. *Samuel Johnson and the Impact of Print.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
- Kuhn, Dorothea, ed. *Goethe und Cotta: Briefwechsel 1797–1832.* Stuttgart: Cotta, 1979–83.
- McGill, Meredith L. *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.
- Millgate, Jane. *Scott's Last Edition: A Study in Publishing History.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1987.
- Neuhaus, Volker. "Die Archivfiktion in *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*." *Euphorion* 62 (1968): 13–27.
- Price, Leah. *The Anthology and the Rise of the Novel: From Richardson to George Eliot.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- [Pustkuchen, Johann]. *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre.* Quedlinburg: Basse, 1821.
- Redfield, Marc. *Aesthetic Ideology and the Bildungsroman.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.
- Reiss, Hans. "Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre. Der Weg von der ersten zur zweiten Fassung." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* 39 (1965): 34–57.
- Schellenberg, Renata. "The Genesis of Goethe's Last Novel: *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*." *New German Review* 17 (2001): 47–63.
- Schöblier, Franziska. *Goethes Lehr- und Wanderjahre: Eine Kulturgeschichte der Moderne.* Tübingen: Francke, 2002.
- Schütz, Friedrich. *Kritik der neuesten Cotta'schen Ausgabe von Goethe's Werken, nebst einem Plane zu einer vollständigen und kritisch geordneten Ausgabe derselben.* Hamburg: Nestler, 1828.
- Siskin, Clifford. *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998.
- Suphan, Bernhard. Vorbericht [Preface]. *Goethes Werke.* Vol. 1. Weimar: Böhlau, 1887. xviii–xxv. 143 vols.
- Taschenbuch für Damen auf das Jahr 1810.* Stuttgart: Cotta, 1810.
- Trunz, Erich. "Die *Wanderjahre* als 'Hauptgeschäft' im Winterjahr 1828/29." *Studien zu Goethes Alterswerken.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1971. 99–121.
- Ungern-Sternberg, Wolfgang von. "C. M. Wieland und das Verlagswesen seiner Zeit." *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 14 (1974): 1213–534.
- Unsel, Siegfried. *Goethe und seine Verleger.* Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1991.
- Vaget, Hans. "Goethe the Novelist: On the Coherence of His Fiction." *Goethe's Narrative Fiction.* Ed. William J. Lillyman. New York: de Gruyter, 1983. 1–20.
- Wolf, Thomas. *Pustkuchen und Goethe. Die Streitschrift als produktives Verwirrspiel.* Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999.