



Goethe

# The Sorrows of Young Werther

A new translation by David Constantine

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS

## THE SORROWS OF YOUNG WERTHER

JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE was born in 1749, the son of a well-to-do citizen of Frankfurt. As a young man he studied law and briefly practised as a lawyer, but creative writing was his chief concern. In the early 1770s he was the dominating figure of the German literary revival, his tragic novel *Werther* bringing him international fame.

In 1775 he settled permanently in the small duchy of Weimar where he became a minister of state and director of the court theatre; in 1782 he was ennobled as 'von Goethe'. His journey to Italy in 1786–8 influenced the development of his mature classical style; in the 1790s he and his younger contemporary Schiller (1759–1805) were the joint architects of Weimar Classicism, the central phase of German literary culture.

Goethe wrote in all the literary genres but his interests extended far beyond literature and included a number of scientific subjects. His creative energies never ceased to take new forms and he was still writing original poetry at the age of more than eighty. In 1806 he married Christiane Vulpius (1765–1816), having lived with her for eighteen years; they had one surviving son, August (1789–1830). Goethe died in 1832.

DAVID CONSTANTINE is a poet and translator, and co-editor (with Helen Constantine) of the journal *Modern Poetry in Translation*. He has published volumes of poetry, short stories, and a novel, and is a translator of Hölderlin, Goethe, Kleist, and Brecht. His translations of Goethe's *Faust, Parts I and II* are published by Penguin, and his translation of *Elective Affinities* is in Oxford World's Classics. In 2010 he won the BBC National Short Story Award.

## OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS

*For over 100 years Oxford World's Classics have brought readers closer to the world's great literature. Now with over 700 titles—from the 4,000-year-old myths of Mesopotamia to the twentieth century's greatest novels—the series makes available lesser-known as well as celebrated writing.*

*The pocket-sized hardbacks of the early years contained introductions by Virginia Woolf, T. S. Eliot, Graham Greene, and other literary figures which enriched the experience of reading.*

*Today the series is recognized for its fine scholarship and reliability in texts that span world literature, drama and poetry, religion, philosophy, and politics. Each edition includes perceptive commentary and essential background information to meet the changing needs of readers.*

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS



JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE

*The Sorrows of Young  
Werther*



*Translated with an Introduction and Notes by*  
DAVID CONSTANTINE

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© David Constantine 2012

The moral rights of the author have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published as an Oxford World's Classics paperback 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Library of Congress Control Number: 2011939885

Typeset by Cenveo, Bangalore, India  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

ISBN 978-0-19-958302-7

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

## CONTENTS

<i>Introduction</i>	vii
<i>Note on the Translation</i>	xxix
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	xxx
<i>A Chronology of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe</i>	xxxii
THE SORROWS OF YOUNG WERTHER	I
<i>Explanatory Notes</i>	113

*This page intentionally left blank*

## INTRODUCTION

*Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*), published in the autumn of 1774, made Goethe's name; but for three or four years before then he had already been writing with great self-confidence and distinction. Briefly as a young student in Leipzig he adopted the poetic tone and manners of his urbane rococo contemporaries; but moving to Strasbourg in 1770 and meeting the critic and philosopher Herder, he was directed by him into ballads, folk-songs, the deeply congenial world of so-called primitive song. Characteristically, that literary influence conjoined at once with a passionate love—for Friederike Brion—and in poems addressed to her—'Mailied', 'Heidenröslein', 'Willkommen und Abschied'—he broke through into his own poetic voice. With his early work on *Faust* (the so-called *Urfaust*), and the 'Shakespearian' chronicle-play *Götz von Berlichingen* and a dozen more vital and characteristic poems ('Der Wanderer', 'Wandrer's Sturmlied', 'Mahometsgesang', 'Ganymed'...), Goethe's achievement by his mid-twenties was prodigious in its originality, force, and variety. *Götz*, written and published in 1773, was first performed in April 1774 in Berlin, and by the end of that year, after *Werther's* appearance in September, Goethe had become, as Byron said half a century later, 'the first literary character in Europe'.

Goethe was the chief maker of the movement in German literature known as *Sturm und Drang* (literally, 'storm and stress'). There were other gifted and important writers in it too, J. M. R. Lenz, for example, and, at the end of the period, Friedrich Schiller; but Goethe was pre-eminent and, unlike others, moved on, sloughing off one skin for the next (the image is his). *Sturm und Drang* in its language, gestures, forms, was a literature of revolt. Enlisting Shakespeare, the writers sought to uncover a culture of their own from under the dead tradition of the French; to be more natural, more local, achieve an identity. There was a social and political edge to this, most obvious in Goethe's *Urfaust* (not published till 1887), Schiller's *Die Räuber* (*The Robbers*), and Lenz's *Der*

*Hofmeister* (*The Tutor*), but the successful revolt was all literary, benefiting later writers, among them the politically far more definite Georg Büchner and Bertolt Brecht.

*Sturm und Drang* is usually studied as a distinct period of German literature, separate from Germany's own Romanticism (Novalis, Tieck, Friedrich Schlegel, Brentano) and those of Britain and France; but really, from a larger perspective, it belongs in the context of a European Romanticism beginning in the 1760s. Viewed like that, Goethe was and, despite his later Classicism, remained, a Romantic writer and *Werther* is a Romantic text. In that novel, in his early *Faust*, and in dozens of lyric poems he was already in the 1770s asserting, as Keats would nearly fifty years later, 'the holiness of the heart's affections' in 'the true voice of feeling'. The relative naturalism of his language anticipates Wordsworth's championing, in the Preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* (1798/1800), of the use in poetry of 'the real language of men'. And most strikingly, what *Werther* suffers and describes in his letter of 3 November, that loss of spirit, is the anxiety and horror in the heart of all Romanticism that Coleridge called, in his ode of that name (1802), 'dejection'—when the genial spirits fail, when the 'shaping spirit of Imagination' cannot sustain any vital connection between the subject and the world.

### *The Makings of Werther*

Goethe was—he said so himself—a 'confessional' writer; that is, what he wrote came in large measure out of the life he lived. How directly and obviously depended of course on the project in hand—poems, fictions, plays have their own determinants—and, somewhat, on the phase of life in which he wrote. *Werther* (1774) and *Elective Affinities* (1809) are both novels. Of the latter he said, 'I lived every word of [it]'; but also, his chronicler Eckermann reports: 'He said there was nothing in his *Elective Affinities* which had not been really lived, but nothing was there in the form *in which* it had been lived.'<sup>1</sup> But when *Werther* came out the people close to it and

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens* (1837–48), 9 Feb. 1829 and 17 Feb. 1830.

soon everybody else quite understandably believed that much or even most of it had really been lived *and in that form*.

In part it is a matter of genre. Lyric poems may be very autobiographical and many of Goethe's are, in all the phases of his life; but novels and stories are more likely to induce readers to wonder are the characters and situations 'true' because, if written at all in the realist mode, they need more of the real world's details for their existence and effect than poems do. For *Werther*, his first novel, Goethe used the stuff of his own and other people's lives with a quite extraordinary immediacy and ruthlessness.

There are three main contributions of biographical and autobiographical fact to the making of *Werther*: the triangle: Goethe–Christian Kestner–Charlotte Buff (who became Kestner's wife); the life and suicide of Karl Wilhelm Jerusalem; and the triangle: Goethe–Peter Anton Brentano–Maximiliane von La Roche (who became Brentano's wife).

Goethe moved to Wetzlar in May 1772 to get some practical experience of law, the profession he had studied for and in which he took no interest. There he got to know Christian Kestner, a secretary at the courts, and, at a dance on 9 June, the young woman Kestner intended to marry, Charlotte Buff. In March of the previous year her mother had died, leaving her, then aged eighteen, the second-oldest of twelve children, to look after the family and manage the household. Goethe, Kestner, and Charlotte became a close trio; and to her family also Goethe was fondly attached. In a fashion already characteristic, he broke out of the entanglement and left Wetzlar without warning on 11 September, and on foot and by boat made his way down the Lahn to Koblenz, where he met the sixteen-year-old Maximiliane von La Roche. He was back home in Frankfurt by the nineteenth.

In book 13 of his autobiography *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (*Poetry and Truth*) Goethe had this to say about quitting Charlotte Buff and meeting Maximiliane von La Roche: 'It is a very pleasant feeling when a new passion starts in us before the old has quite lapsed—as at sunset when we see the moon rising opposite and enjoy the double radiance of both heavenly lights.' The fictional Lotte, mostly Charlotte Buff, has Maximiliane's black eyes.

Goethe and Karl Wilhelm Jerusalem had been students together for two years (1765–7) in Leipzig and renewed their acquaintanceship, never very cordial, in Wetzlar. Jerusalem, an amateur of the arts and philosophy, held a secretarial post; got on badly with his superior, an envoy at the Court; and was in love with a married woman by the name of Elisabeth Herd who didn't love him and complained about him to her husband. Jerusalem shot himself on the night of 29–30 October 1772. Goethe, back in Wetzlar in early November, appalled by this event, found out all he could about it and his chief source was Kestner who wrote, perhaps at Goethe's bidding, an extraordinarily full account, much of which Goethe utilized for *Werther*. During the rest of November 1772 Goethe busied himself collecting details about Jerusalem rather as the Editor in his novel would about the fictional Werther. He put many of these biographical facts as well as many details of his own relationship with Kestner and Charlotte directly into the novel, as though he were indeed the editor and/or narrator of his own terminated life. Years later in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* he wrote another version. *Werther*, near the beginning of his career, is a particularly drastic example of the compulsive working and reworking of the stuff of life, his own and other people's, that would be Goethe's way of being in the world for the rest of his days.

Kestner and Charlotte were married on 4 April 1773, but neither that nor Jerusalem's suicide was the immediate catalyst for the writing of *Werther*. Goethe saw the La Roches, mother and daughter, intelligent, artistically gifted and lively women, in Frankfurt that August. When he saw Maximiliane next, in January 1774, again in Frankfurt, she was married—to the businessman Peter Anton Brentano, more than twenty years her senior and a widower with five children whom she had to look after. For those two weeks in January Goethe continued his relationship with her. They were like brother and sister, he recalls in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, far closer in age than she and her husband, while he was, Goethe says, 'the only one in her entire circle in whom she could hear an echo of that music of the intellect and the spirit to which in girlhood she had grown accustomed'. But Brentano was no Kestner and did not in the least want Goethe in his family. Maximiliane bore Brentano

twelve children (among them Bettina and Clemens, two Romantic writers) and died in 1793, aged thirty-seven.

Maximiliane and her mother left Frankfurt 31 January 1774 and Goethe began writing *Werther* next day. He saw that the three chief biographical ingredients listed above could be made into a novel which would fuse and exceed them. He describes the writing thus in book 13 of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*:

I had entirely isolated myself, indeed I had forbidden my friends to visit me. Inwardly also I put to one side everything that did not belong to my project but gathered together everything that had any bearing on it. I went over my recent life, the stuff of which I had not yet put to any poetic use. In those conditions, after long and manifold and secret preparations, I wrote *Werther* in four weeks without beforehand setting down any plan of the whole thing or the treatment of any of its parts.

Writing, he understood the figurative life of the characters and circumstances he was so precisely shaping: how they could stand for the society he lived in and were, furthermore (which is why the novel lasts) archetypal in their pattern and their fate.

The project magnetizes certain real details, those it can use, draws them along with it in a shaping process, leaves aside those, perhaps important in 'the real story', in which it has no interest, and invents others which were not in that story at all. The project is a novel, it derives from and bears powerfully upon real life but it is a work of fiction, making its own truth as it goes along, taking, shaping, discarding always and only in the interest of—to get closer and more finely to—that truth. It is this mixture of apparent fidelity to some of the facts and apparent indifference to or recklessness with others that people involved in the lived story found so disconcerting when they read the novel that came out of it. Hence Kestner's touching complaint that 'his' Lotte would never have been so forward as to organize a counting game and slap the players when they made a mistake. And quite understandably he did not like the portrayal of himself as Albert. But for the writer all that matters is the truth of the novel, of the fiction he is making; which truth stands in a complex and vital relationship with the factual

truth but is not it, is not seeking to be it, seeks only its own. All writers who draw on the lives they live among other people act and must act like this—D. H. Lawrence's friends were often appalled and hurt by what he had 'done to them' in his fictions—and Goethe in *Werther*, his first novel, was already astonishingly aware of his duty, as a writer, to the truth of fiction, and of the fraught and unstable relationship there will always be between a novel and the lived life it springs from. By employing an Editor—a scrupulous collector of the material—Goethe, in a way common among novelists then, ostensibly authenticates his account and encourages readers to feel that these things really happened. At the same time (more of this later), he allows the Editor to exceed his role and to become, in effect, an omniscient narrator; which is to say, to become quite blatantly what he was anyway: an agent of fiction.

And what is the truth even of the 'real' story? The Editor reports that whilst he found general agreement as to the facts, there were differing views as to the ways of thinking and feeling ('Sinnesarten') of the people involved. He diligently collects and presents every scrap of documentary evidence, because, he says, 'it is so difficult to uncover the very particular true motivations of even one action when it occurs among people who are not of the common run'. Even the documents themselves are, of course, by no means unequivocal. The truth is, we live among fictions. All our thinking, feeling, and writing makes up versions of what we like to call reality; and our versions are subject to continual alteration with the passage of time and under the impress of other people's versions. Novels and poems, which are fictions made of the stuff of life, again and again will alter our decided versions of the lives we have lived and are living now. Beyond any doubt, Goethe's *Werther* altered the way its readers viewed their lives; doubtless many lived or wished to live differently because of it. And that effect is latent in the novel still. Any reader may activate it.

### *The Form of Werther*

The story of *Werther* (or most of it) is told in letters. The epistolary novel was well established in European fiction by the time

Goethe came to use it. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Samuel Richardson before him, Choderlos de Laclos after him, are masters of the form; and comparing *Werther* with their great novels—Richardson's *Pamela* (1740–1) and *Clarissa* (1748–9), Rousseau's *Julie, ou La Nouvelle Éloïse* (1761), and Laclos's *Les Liaisons dangereuses* (1782)—at once reveals its peculiarity. A story told in letters, presented as real documents, pleases readers who like to think it really happened. Goethe will have chosen the form for its immediacy, its inherent sense of life being lived. Werther writes his letters very soon after the lived events. Or he breaks off a letter to go on with the life he is describing in it. And he writes his last up to the very moment of his death. All these are possibilities inherent in the chosen form. But there is another—a large and abundant resource—which Goethe chooses not to employ. The novels of Richardson and Laclos revel in a multiplicity of perspectives. Letters go to and fro among a whole cast of characters, events are reflected upon from very different angles, and the writer shifts in tone of voice and in judgement according to his or her present correspondent. Goethe does none of that. Apart from the Editor's interventions, the form of *Werther* is a one-sided correspondence. No letters are presented from Werther's main addressee, Wilhelm (a rather shadowy figure), nor are any of the notes Lotte wrote to Werther (we hear of a few) nor any more substantial communication from her. All replies of whatever kind to letters written by Werther must, we presume, have gone into the stove along with much else shortly before his death. Their absence is an ingredient of the fiction; but, before that, Goethe's suppression of them is a masterly violation of the epistolary novel's form.

The letter is an intrinsically dialogic form of writing. It addresses another person in the expectation or hope of a reply. Laclos's novel moves with great force and complexity in that dynamic of address and answer among half-a-dozen correspondents. In *Werther* there are no replies; effectively, in a dialogic form, the young man wanting correspondence conducts a monologue. He also keeps a diary; he alludes to it (p. 38), but we read nothing of it. That too must have gone into the flames. The diary's monologic form would certainly suit the increasingly solipsistic Werther. But as Goethe saw,

it would be more expressive of his hero's situation and tragedy to choose a form implying dialogue and use it as a monologue. A one-sided correspondence—not a correspondence at all—is a telling image of Werther's fate. Much of what the novel is 'about' is realized in that master-stroke of form.

One-sidedness, a bad thing in a coroner accounting for a suicide, may be a good thing in a novelist, and in the case of Goethe's *Werther* most definitely is. The complex perspectivism of *Les Liaisons dangereuses* gives the reader a bewildering number of slants on the story being told. That is not the same as 'a balanced view'. We don't go to novelists for a fair and balanced view of things but for the felt truth, however partial, of being human in particular circumstances. Laclos gives us a variety of perspectives; Goethe quite deliberately limits his. One-sidedness—an achievement, not a regrettable accident, of Goethe's chosen form—is a means to the truth of his hero's situation.

But what about the Editor? To a degree unprecedented in the tradition of the epistolary novel Goethe's Editor affects or seeks to affect the reader's reception of the story in which he is not otherwise a participant. He introduces himself as the diligent collator and presenter of everything he could find concerning Werther's life and death; as the story proceeds he adds the occasional rather pedantic footnote; and he appears in person again towards the end, regretting that the documentation has become fragmentary and telling us that he has done his level best—talking to those closely or at all involved—to gather and assess the facts and the different views of those facts. In that role or pose he sounds like a living corrective to one-sidedness, as though we might expect from him the balanced account. In practice he compromises his position at the outset. Having said that he has gathered together and now lays before us all he could find on the subject of 'poor Werther', he continues: 'and I know that you will thank me. His mind and his character will compel your admiration and your love, and his fate will compel your tears.' The Editor offers us Werther as an object of admiration, love, and pity, and commends 'this little book' to any reader 'feeling driven as he was', as a comforter and a friend. That is not neutral.

The curious marker of this partiality is the occasional elision of the role of the Editor into that of third-person omniscient narrator. Viewed strictly, in keeping with his stated office, he can only know what is in Werther's recovered letters, two being to Lotte, the rest to Wilhelm, and whatever else he has learned from anyone he approached in his researches—talking to them he may get some idea of what thoughts and feelings were at play in the chief characters. In practice he grossly exceeds the brief and scope that any such investigative procedures might have given him. He forgets himself—or Goethe does—and becomes at times, in effect, an omniscient narrator. For example:

Even as he walked, his thoughts turned to this subject. 'Oh yes,' he said to himself, grinding his teeth—'Close, friendly, tender, and sympathetic in all his dealings with her, a lasting peaceful fidelity! Complacent satisfaction, that's what it is, and indifference. Does not any wretched piece of business engage him more than the woman who is so precious? Does he know how fortunate he is? Can he value her as she deserves? He has her—well then, he has her—I know that, just as I know other things, I believe I have got used to the thought, it will still drive me mad, it will still be the death of me—And has his friendship to me held good? Does he not think my devotion to Lotte a trespass on his rights and my attentiveness to her a silent reproach? I know it full well, I feel it, he does not like to see me, he wishes me removed, my presence is irksome to him.'

Since Werther is alone, this can only be a—quite plausible—monologue invented by the Editor/Narrator. He does the same for Lotte (pp. 95–6): she is alone with her very troubled thoughts which it is not likely she shared as documentary evidence with the diligent Editor. Really, the Editor seems not able to resist the pull into omniscience at those moments when he feels the story needs it. He becomes a narrator, an agent of the fiction, close to the author, driven deeper and deeper by the force of imaginative sympathy. Hard to know whether Goethe in the passion of the first writing of *Werther* even noticed this sliding. I doubt if his first readers did, or cared a jot about it if they did. And when Goethe revised the novel more than a decade later he not only let that mixing of editor with narrator stand, he made further use of it,