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Love, eros, and art hold a productive relationship which the early nineteenth century imagined to be the creative origin of art. After having reconstructed an ingenious-romantic model of artistic production, the paper shows that this love-based art-eros-model served as reference point in literature and music throughout the whole century, reflecting not only poetological but also fundamental socio-historical questions.
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In a famous letter, Robert Schumann states that his music embodied his love. Works such as Davidsbündlertänze, Kreisleriana, or Fantasie had originated solely from the love of his later wife Clara Wieck. In the light of their love, he created music embodying his “deep lament” about their separation forced by Clara’s father (Schumann 170).1 Sometimes, we may even hear this embodiment, e.g. when Schumann’s music ‘tells’ by intertextually referring to Beethoven’s song cycle An die ferne Geliebte: “Take to your heart these songs that I sang to you, beloved.” Aiming to reach his unreachable beloved, something happens between Schumann’s love and his art – and it happens to be his Fantasie in C major.

At about the same time, Charlotte Stieglitz, wife and muse of the writer Heinrich Wilhelm Stieglitz, committed suicide. She – and even more the contemporary discourse in media – understood this act as “self-sacrifice” in order to free her husband from his deep creative depression: Her death should be a “Caesarean section” enabling him to “give birth to art again” (Mundt 229).

1 If not marked specifically, German and French quotations are translated into English by the author.
What combines both cases is not only their historical coincidence but also the same motive, which is the central question of this paper: What is the origin of art?

At first, both of them seem to give diametrically opposed answers: love vs. death. However, having a closer look, we realize that the dynamics of distanciation, Clara’s distant love and Charlotte’s love death, pursue the same goal: art, to which the artist gives birth by longing for his unreachable beloved. Hence, putting them together, we may reconstruct a model of artistic production which was mainly formed in Romanticism, which concentrates the essential implications of romantic thought, and which serves as a universal role model for almost all further examinations of the origin of art. Since this art-eros-model, as I will term it, has its source in ingenious-romantic thought, it is embedded within a particular cultural and socio-historical context, but exceeds this context and influences poètological discourses until nowadays.

The Art-Eros-Model

At about the same time of Schumann’s composition and Charlotte Stieglitz’s death, Heinrich Heine, one of the early chroniclers of the ‘Romantic School,’ writes in one of his notebooks:

There are so-called talents … to whom everything comes from the outside and who imitate it like monkeys. … Moreover, there are geniuses … to whom everything comes from the soul and who arduously give birth to art … – There, making without life, without inwardness, mechanism – Here, organic growing (Heine 454f).

Heine locates the art-eros-model and the ‘birth’ of the artwork within two opposed concepts: Here, art as ingenium and the artist as genius who suddenly and unconsciously gives birth to a living artwork which organically grows out of the soul; there, within the “old system of art” as ars or techné, the idea of mechanically and consciously making art by imitation (Shiner 5). At the latest since the Querelle des anciens et des modernes and especially in the 19th century, artists reflect this dichotomy and define their artistry within one of these two major concepts of artistic production: the naturalistic or the culturalistic one.2

The art-eros-model arises as ingenious-romantic reaction to the culturalistic production understood as learn- and teachable technical-

---

2 I adopt this, simplified though useful, dichotomy from Christian Begemann’s studies (cf. Begemann, “Prokreation”).
intertextual act imitating ‘masterly’ exempla and following rhetorical rules (praecepta) within traditional textbooks (doctrinae). In contrast, genius poets like Goethe or Young present themselves as liberators from the bonds of imagination and favour innovation, subjectivity, and autonomy. They do not make art anymore in terms of rational and imitative “manufacture,” but create out of one single emotion caused by love. “True poesy, like true religion, abhors idolatry” and aims at “original composition” so that the genius artist “is born of himself, is his own progenitor” (Young 68). By ex-pressing himself, such a “second maker” creates a “living” artwork that “emerges as if from a natural birth and possesses, therefore, the oneness and life characteristic of an organism” (Wellbery 128).

We can find this initial power of love for artistic production around 1800 in works by Goethe, Tieck, Eichendorff, and most elaborately by E. T. A. Hoffmann: Just as Traugott in Der Artushof (1816) or Berthold in Die Jesuitenkirche in G. (1816) begin to paint because their beloveds have “stimulated [them] deeply” (Hoffmann, IV 212), the narrator of Die Abenteuer der Sylvester-Nacht (1815) enthusiastically cries at the beginning: “[Y]our love is the spark that burns in me, kindling a higher life in art and poesy.” (Hoffmann, II/1 330)

Nevertheless the question remains, how precisely is this process going to work. If art, love, and birth are related to one another and if art is to be ‘alive,’ it has to be related to that power keeping us ‘alive:’ the ‘vital power’ (cf. Herder 270–280). By leaving the exclusive literary discourse, we find this process within a long philosophical tradition, starting no later than with the poetical “children” in Plato’s Symposium (208eff.), as well as within the scientific discourse around 1800. Christoph Wilhelm Hufeland, one of the leading medical scientists of his time and Goethe’s personal physician, defines the “vital power” in Makrobiotik (1796) as “driving force” of both, intellectual and physical power: “It seems that … thinking and procreation (this is mental, the other physical creation) are closely interconnected and both use the most refined and sublimated part of the vital power.” (Hufeland 14f.) In the beginning of the 19th century, the imagery of natality is grounded in scientific knowledge and appears to be a lot more ‘real’ than it might seem today. Physical-sexual and intellectual energies have the same origin. The origin of art is love. More precisely, the art-eros-model consists of two different kinds of love: eminent erotic love, the artist’s sexual desire initiating the process of production; and higher ‘sublime love’ being merely mental and therefore leading to the mental birth of the artwork. Hence, the art-eros-model consists of three steps:
1. Evocation of eros by a (real) woman’s love initiating the process of artistic production.

2. Idealisation of the real beloved into a romantic ‘distant beloved’ and sublimation/internalisation of the eros.


In order to finally achieve birth, the artist needs to sublimate his eros about which Hufeland was explicitly talking. The artist’s desire cannot remain physical and real, but has to be “redirected” from the “originally sexual” to the higher aim of art “which is no longer sexual but which is psychically related” (Freud, SE IX 187). Within these dynamics of distantiation, the real beloved becomes an ‘idealized’, ‘transfigured’ distant beloved being a supplementary ‘inner image’ in between presence and absence, and the artist is torn between the (insufficient) real and this (unattainable) ideal woman. By this, the artist transforms his love into a specific never-ending longing, which we know as romantic Sehnsucht and which structurally corresponds to Plato’s definition of the eros as “mediator” (Symposium 201d–209e). The interpersonal, intersubjective eros moves inside and becomes intra-subjective and internalized. With this internalized eros, however, the male artist no longer longs for a real female body, but rather for an inner poetic ideal—which was right that role Clara Wieck played for Schumann and Charlotte Stieglitz was trying to achieve. Likewise, Traugott in Der Artushof realizes that he did not long for a real woman, but in fact for “creative art alive in me” (Hoffmann, IV 206). By longing for this ‘inner idea[,] erotic advance turns into aesthetic operation and the artist is actually longing for his art, his artwork to which he now, spontaneously and non-rationally, gives birth (Begemann, Kunst und Liebe 60).

Indeed, the Romantics beware of showing this last step of materialisation in detail. Apart from that, we recognize that the art-eros-model includes and represents almost all constituent implications of (poetic) Romanticism: For instance, it bases upon the idea of romantic Sehnsucht as well as the artist’s ‘Zerrissenheit.’ Its phallocentric, patriarchal structures are only conceivable within a lifeworld of ‘hegemonic masculinity’ wherein women serve merely as a function within a male process of creating a male world (Schmidt 28). Furthermore, as the process contains the teleological dynamics to reach the unreachable ideal, it follows the triadic model of history. Thereby, the erotically creating artist, opposed to the society, becomes a prophetic “vates” and mediates between the real world and the “higher realm” (Hoffmann, IV 68). With this ‘metaphysical’ “holy purpose of all

3 Eros, when set in italics, refers to this structure in between presence and absence.
art” (Hoffmann, *III* 129), the romantic process of production follows a ‘dualistic’ conception, like Romanticism in general.

### The Art-Eros-Model in the Nineteenth Century

The art-eros-model not only presents the ingenious process of artistic production, it also represents synecdochically central ideas of (poetic) Romanticism. From this it follows firstly that the literary art-eros-discourse also influences other arts, particularly music. Secondly, if we understand art as a socio-cultural product, reconstructing the model of its production may help us to understand socio-cultural transformations. Thus, if we now follow this productive relationship between love and art through the 19th century, we will be able to reconstruct various concepts of artistic production, art, and artistry as well as fundamental socio-historical contexts. This is the aim of my paper. Indeed, the following examinations, structured as miniature interpretations through the art-eros-burning-glass, are not complete. I am rather trying to give an overview of the varieties of modifications and transformations by predominantly focussing on German literature and music.

If the Romantics worked most effectively and most reflectively on the art-eros-model, if furthermore, for them, music is the “most romantic art,” and if they considerably predetermined the music of the whole century, it is no surprise that especially music participates in the naturalistic art-eros-discourse. For E. T. A. Hoffmann – specifically Beethoven’s – music opens the “unknown realm” by causing “this endless longing” which is the “essence of Romanticism” and the basis of the art-eros-model (Hoffmann, *II/1* 52). Unsurprisingly, one of the first composers within the art-eros-discourse is Beethoven whose song cycle *An die ferne Geliebte* (1816) has the code word already in its title. We do not even need to take part in the biographic speculations concerning Beethoven’s ‘immortal beloved’ to recognize significant concurrences with the art-eros-process. In Alois Jeitteles’ text, the (male) speaker addresses six songs to his ‘distant beloved.’ From a perspective of reader-response theory, we can interpret this act of singing as a performative speech act of creating art: By longing for and singing about his unreachable beloved, the first-person singer sub-

---

4 For the discourse in fine arts since the early modern period, cf. Pfisterer.

5 This is simply a pragmatic decision. Without any problems, one could concentrate on authors like Balzac, Zola, Wilde, or Dostoevskij. In several parts concerning the literary discourse, I take up on Christian Begemann’s paper *Kunst und Liebe*, whereas the musicological interpretations are in uncharted waters.
limates his “agony,” his “burning” love and “lust” and transforms it by his internalized *eros* within an ‘imaginative’ illusion of unity, “without artificiality,” in “these songs” (Beethoven 151–164). The music correlates with this art-eros-process in detail: On its large-scale form, it reflects the aspect of endless unreachability in its metric and harmonic cyclic structure. *Romantische Sehnsucht* as basic formal principle thus necessitates the first song cycle in the history of music. Harmonically, the last song (“Take to Your Heart these songs”), being the culmination point of the creative process, fluctuates between given E-flat and A-flat major. This subdominant struggling between the (harmonically) ‘real’ and ‘imaginary’ (Marston 144) and the extensively postponed “return of the cadential fourth” in the *Da Capo* (Reynolds 52) musicalizes the structure of the internalized *eros*. In its thematic-motivic structure finally, this last song combines and synthesizes almost every motif of the six previous songs: The “original motives return” and “the songs are figuratively there, represented by their motivic proxies” (ibid. 52) which, in turn, represent the idealized beloved. Everything what we have heard musically as well as textually, retrospectively proves to be part of a musico-literary creative process of *poetification*. Its result are the singer’s as well as Beethoven’s songs ‘to the distant beloved.’

With this work at the latest, the art-eros-model becomes present within the musical discourse, what we may prominently see in Schumann’s *Fantasie*. Rushing through the century, we pass numerous musical art-eros-works reaching from Schubert’s *Gretchen am Spinnrade* or Berlioz’ *Symphonie fantastique* via Wagner’s *Tannhäuser* as far as Godard’s *Dante*, Giordano’s *Andrea Chénier*, or Puccini’s *Tosca*. Whereas Act I of the latter opera reflects the idea of the ‘inner image’ in Cavaradossi’s painting of the Madonna as a starting point, Benjamin Godard’s relatively unknown opera *Dante* (1890) can be entirely understood as an art-eros-opera. Evidently, Édouard Blau’s libretto and the opera portray Dante as “genius” whose first major aria, his (poetic) chant, grows out of his lament about the loss of his beloved Béatrice (ibid. 49). Dante himself emphasizes the relationship between love and art: “If you leave me, will I still be able to sing?” Not yet knowing about the productive power of his longing to an unreachable beloved, he laments, “taking my love is taking my genius” (ibid. 123f.). Therefore, he initially initially chooses the culturallistic-intertextual way and invokes “Master” Vergile to dictate him the “ideal poem” (ibid. 197). However, the opera will disabuse him and introduce him to the art-eros-model.

---

6 Throughout the century, Dante served as a popular figure of poetological self-reflection, as we can see in C. F. Meyer’s *Die Hochzeit des Mönchs* (1884) or in Françoise da Rimini (1882) composed by Ambroise Thomas to whom Dante is dedicated.
In fact, literally invoking him, the opera corresponds not only with Dante’s work, but also with Thomas’ Françoise da Rimini, and Vergile appears within a dream. However, the fatherly-intertextual, culturalistic revenant Vergile surprisingly shows the naturalistic art-eros-way: Dante should complete his poetic work with the love of his “muse” and by creating out of his dreams, whereas Vergile assumes the role of the Platonic maieuht who “guides” Dante, just like the elenctic ‘midwife’ Socrates (Plato, Theaetetus 150b), towards the birth of his artwork (ibid. 201ff.). Correspondingly, his dream, wherein those figures appear in hell and heaven whom we know from Divina Commedia, reaches its climax when Béatrice angel-like enters on “celestial ways.” She has transfigured into an ideal beloved and demands from Dante to sublimate his “human tears” into “stars” (ibid. 252ff.). The poetological credo of the opera Dante is obvious: The poet naturalistically creates ingenious art by sublimating his love with the assistance of culturalistic midwifery. According to this, the opera remains totally within the naturalistic limits and integrates all romantic parameters such as the idea of the extra-ordinary (exiled) artist, the romantic Sehnsucht, or the ‘metaphysical’ purposes with the triadic idea of history aiming at “eternal love” (ibid. 257f.).

Dante demonstrates the dominating role of the art-eros-model throughout the whole century and shows how “deliberately traditional” Godard tries to be a Romanticist ignoring contemporary developments (cf. Smith). Only concerning the image of women, the opera is constantly standing on the threshold of its Romanticism: Béatrice is not merely a peripheral function; the opera rather takes a double perspective on the poet and on his beloved. Neither the poet Dante, nor the opera Dante would exist without Béatrice. The opera portrays him just as well as it focusses on her life and her grief as unreachable beloved. The only but crucial difference is that this grief as romantic Sehnsucht is productive for him, but destructive for her (Godard 283). Quite plainly, the opera demonstrates the mortalizing aspect of a process of artistic production based on the idea of ‘transfiguration:’ The presence of the supplementary ‘inner image’ implies the death of the represented who is the real beloved (Derrida 184). Consequently, Béatrice becomes pale, ill, and close to death. By focussing on her and foregrounding the unreachable beloved as a tragic figure, the opera, at the same time, devalues her as female person beside Dante: Within the art-eros-context and its image of women, she cannot exist equally in the face of the male poet. Béatrice has to die in order to save the opera’s total Romanticism. Thus, her death and the fulfilled idealisation as “muse” guarantee the success of the art-eros-process – and thus the birth of the artwork by the (ingenious-romantic) ‘poeta alter deus’ Dante:
I have to live; I have to sing for her!
God has made her mortal,
I, myself, will immortalise her! (Godard 336f.)

We can find a similar, but a lot more critical, perspective earlier in Friedrich Hebbel’s poem *Der Maler* (1835), Edgar Allen Poe’s story *The Oval Portrait* (1842/1845), or Theodor Storm’s novella *Aquis submersus* (1877) (Begemann, *Kunst und Liebe*). All three cases update the myth of Pygmalion: Within the art-eros-process, a painter as *demiourgos* confronts the Platonic rejection of merely imitative art (Plato, *Republic* 601af.) by naturalistically transferring ‘vital power’ and eros into a living artwork. Since he portrays his beloved, who evokes his *eros* and initiates the process of production, the second step of *distantiation* and substitutive ‘transfiguration’ paradoxically happens in her presence. Hebbel’s poem reflects this substitution of the real by the ideal beloved within a parallelism (Hebbel, *I/I* 175f.): In the beginning of the third stanza, the speaker describes the “red cheeks” and “bright eyes” of the portrait and changes afterwards over to the portrayed woman whose cheeks, in turn, become “pale” and whose eyes become “blind and dead.” When he then continues that she stands “completely perfect” in front of him, the reader would assume that he continues to speak about the woman. However, due to the supposed chiastic but parallel structure, he is actually speaking about the artwork, which became alive. The poem has already fulfilled the substitution without having named it yet. Even more: While the painter transforms his beloved into an ‘ideal image,’ while he is *objectifying* her into ‘living’ art, her hands become “cold” and her life is fading out. In the end, she is dead, the beloved in Storm’s story seems to be lifeless, and Poe’s painter cries: “This is indeed Life itself!” turned suddenly to regard his beloved: – She was dead!” (Poe, *Tales* 191)

Obviously, the three painters are *inverted* Pygmalions: Like him, they exceed the mimetic chasm between representation and represented, but only by erasing the latter. In accordance with Derrida’s thesis that “the image is death” (Derrida 184), Hebbel noted in regard of his poem that “imagination kills the real by imaging it” (Hebbel, *II* 3704). From this critical perspective, the artist within the successful art-eros-process is like a vampire: he creates the life of his artwork by sucking out the life of his beloved who becomes a ‘sacrifice’ of art. Given that vampirism is a form of banishing wild (female) sexuality, further that in 19th century the “feminine body is culturally constructed as the superlative site of alterity” (Bronfen XI), and that the narrator in Poe’s story is constantly trying “to calm and subdue” his imagination (Poe, *Tales* 188f.), the death of his beloved could be understood as a repressing fight against the ‘Other of
Reason’ (Böhme). This closely corresponds to the contemporary popular phantasy of the aesthetic “death … of a beautiful woman” (Poe, Philosophy 163). In our context, this has several consequences: Firstly, it leads to Poe’s Philosophy of Composition (1864) which is one of the major culturalistic poetics of the century. Therefore, we could read these three deaths as culturalistic critique of the inhuman, murderous naturalistic model. Nevertheless, Poe does not condemn this death, but rather calls it “unquestionably, the most poetical topic in the world” (ibid.). This is to say, that secondly, at a certain point, culturalistic and naturalistic models of production make the same effort of suppressing the natural, animalistic ‘other’ of the ‘disciplined’ ratio-centric ‘man of reason’ (Foucault). This means thirdly that for the age of Romanticism, at least in terms of art, love is only relevant in its relation to artistic production. Within the “typically romantic paradox of distantiation” (Luhmann 136), it is more about longing than about love in the sense of “stability in marriage or other intimate relationships” (ibid. 145) – and hence, it is about the erotic in between of presence and absence.

Therefore, on the second step, the artist intentionally instrumentalizes his love for his longing and his longing for his art (by this, exiling his demonic inner nature). If he, in contrast, does not realize that his eros is just internalized and his beloved is ‘ideal’, if he mistakes his ‘real’, merely sexual, desire for the ‘higher’ internalized eros, and if he is trying to fulfill his love, it inevitably ends in a catastrophe as Hoffmann’s Jesuiterkirche shows. When the painter Berthold reunites with his distant beloved and recognizes that she is “no illusion” but rather his wife, he takes the ‘ideal’ for the ‘real’ beloved who “satisfies his longing” (Hoffmann, III 136). Since satisfaction means realization and devaluation of the ideal, the artist’s ‘creative power,’ and thus the art-eros-process stops – and fails. There is only one, in most cases lethal, way to become productive again: “Berthold got rid of his wife and his children and happily started to paint.” (ibid. 138f.) To put it bluntly: For our artists, love seems to be no more than a necessary evil within the ‘higher’ aim of creating art. In all these cases, the art-eros-model succeeds because the real beloved dies – and following this logic, Charlotte Stieglitz took her own life and Béatrice loses hers.

As we will see later, the beloved’s position will considerably improve in the second half of the century, even though there are counter examples such as Dante. Godard portrayed the beloved Béatrice and crossed her out in order to remain within neo- or pseudo-romantic limits. However, considering her sorrowful life, would it not be possible possible that she, too, creates art in the art-eros-process instead of being used to be abused within? In order to question female authorship within the art-eros-context,
we might think of Schubert’s *Gretchen am Spinnrade* (1814), setting a poem from Goethe’s *Faust* to music and presenting exactly our test conditions: Gretchen is sorrowfully longing for her distant beloved. As the text begins with her grief, becoming more passionate and finally clearly erotic, the song follows this structure of climax by increasing melodically and dynamically. It begins musically and emotionally with the ‘spinning-wheel-motif’ in D minor communicating restless, deep appetent longing (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Spinning-wheel-motif (mm. 1ff.)](image)

Gretchen’s voice, her melody grows out of this musical sphere of unconsciousness so that by desiring her beloved, she begins to sing and tries to “re-create” him within a “sexual phantasy” (Kramer 175f.): from his still distant “walk” and “figure” via his “smile” and “eye” up to the physical sensation of his “handclasp,” and culminating in the (verbal) ejaculation “and ah, his kiss” (Schubert 14f.). Although Gretchen is (re-)creating something evoked by the erotic desire to her beloved, this is not a process of artistic production. As the final “resignation” (Kramer 176) of the repeated refrain “My peace is gone…” signals, the art-eros-model fails because Gretchen as a woman is thought to be less able to control her driving forces (Freud, *SE XXII* 134f.). She thus miss-takes the second step and does not sublimate her eros, but rather gives herself up to it within a “spasm of desire” (Kramer 176). Her singing is simply an illusionary result of her ‘undisciplined’ animal nature, a Dionysian orgiastic “ecstasy” which is at the same time “lust” and “break-down of the principium individuationis” and therefore death (Nietzsche, *Birth* 17–19). Consequently, it leads to her homonymic “Vergehen,” meaning firstly ‘dying of lust’ in the sense of sexual fulfilment, implying in the case of a woman secondly an ethical offence, and thirdly the ‘passing away’ of her singing as well as herself as a subject. Gretchen’s song cannot remain as an artwork, but rather passes away in the same ‘spinning-wheel-motif’ it came from. “Under the magic
of the Dionysian,” she “is no longer an artist” but “has become a work of art” (ibid.) – the male artist’s artwork: Schubert’s *Gretchen am Spinnrade.*

Perhaps, as her partner in music is Tannhäuser, Schubert’s Gretchen ends up on the couch in the Venusberg. Richard Wagner’s opera *Tannhäuser und der Sängerkrieg auf Wartburg* (1845) locates itself within the literary Venus cult and, thereby, within the art-eros-tradition. With the help of selected examples, I would like to illustrate that Wagner was constantly working with the art-eros-imagery so that we can reconstruct certain specific developments by focussing on his examinations of the model.

As the poets’ “task” within the singer’s contest is “to fathom the essence of love” (Wagner, *Tannhäuser* 32), the opera presents poets producing art by reflecting about love; and since love is the essential component of the creative process, *Tannhäuser* fathoms the essence of love in relation to artistic production. Thus, the opera’s *agon* contrasts two versions of the naturalistic model: the yet well-known one with the ideal of sublimatory asceticism closely linked to Christianity, and its Dionysian variation located in the Venusberg and closely linked to pagan, ancient Greece. *Tannhäuser,* as opposed to *Meistersinger,* does not discuss the ingenious model in contrast to the culturalistic concept, but rather problematizes its naturalistic erotic creative power. Wolfram von Eschenbach, on the one hand, is erotically “stimulated” by the “miraculous spring” of Elisabeth’s love (ibid. 33), not least indicated by various sexual metaphors. However, after Elisabeth has chosen Tannhäuser, Wolfram “loses all hope” (ibid. 29), “sacrifices himself,” sublimates his desire into “the purest essence of love” and creates art by longingly “looking up to only one star,” his idealized beloved Elisabeth. By naming the erotic “ardour” that has “deeply penetrated” his “soul,” the essential “fair distance” to his ‘romantic beloved,’ the “sublime love,” the “angelic” idealization, and the ‘holy purpose of art’ leading to distant “eternal” “realms,” Wolfram accurately describes the mechanisms and parameters of the art-eros-model (ibid. 37).

Unquestionably, he gives the correct answer: Love holds poetical and creative “miraculous power” but only in form of ‘sublime love’ (ibid. 35). Remarkably, Wolfram’s naturalistic art-eros-concept correlates with the concept of man in ‘bourgeois hegemony’ (Gramsci) of the mid-19th century. There, the major task is domesticating its animal nature and eliminating or reducing erotic passion within an ideal of asceticism often linked to Christian principles (Lukas). In contrast, the pagan poet Tannhäuser, ruled by the demonic Dionysian power of Venus, subverts this generally accepted idea of man. He modifies the art-eros-model by increasing the naturalistic moment *in extenso* and solely aiming at “pleasure in joy-
ful desire” (Wagner, Tannhäuser 36): instead of sublimation and romantic Sehnsucht, he favours constantly renewed (sexual) pleasure and fulfilment (ibid. 34). Wagner’s music reflects this, too: The formal “indifference” between “melodic foreground and harmonic background” causes the oceanic “magic” of the Venusberg-music since “the listener has the feeling of losing his normal footing” (Dahlhaus 30). Structurally, this ‘footing’ and the existence of foreground and background enable perspective and, thereby, the spatial idea of the unreachable ‘horizon’ being the precondition for the erotic logic of romantic Sehnsucht (Koschorke 84). If this precondition gets ‘lost,’ romantic Sehnsucht becomes logically impossible and the process of production collapses. Furthermore, not only his song is remarkable but also the way it comes to him: “Ridden by a strange magic,” he “seems to awake from a dream” with “an expression of ecstasy” and begins to sing with an “uncanny smile” (Wagner, Tannhäuser 35). This is the ‘inner poet’ on stage; and in this moment, Tannhäuser stands up for that inner animal nature which Poe’s, Hebbel’s, and Hoffmann’s painters domesticated.

In text, music, and dramaturgy, Tannhäuser’s concept thwarts the essential elements of the art-eros-model. There are doubts whether his model of artistic production may succeed, but the crucial point is that Tannhäusers modifications are part of the ‘discovery’ of a new phenomenon: the unconsciousness. Refusing the second step of sublimation, Tannhäuser “seeks the emancipation of the flesh” and understands love only as “psychophysical entity.” Considering the romantic parameters, which we almost entirely have found within Wolfram’s concept, Tannhäuser’s perspective pushes the whole opera close to Young Germany (Borchmeyer 143, 124). Indeed, following Victor Turner’s ‘social drama,’ the Wartburg society and the opera immediately sanction Tannhäuser’s uprising. In order to reintegrate him and to prevent schism, they send him to Rome, where even the Pope refuses to absolve him from his sins. Only Elisabeth’s self-sacrifice releases him as she transforms her love from amor in caritas and substitutes sexual-unconscious by religious powers. His ensuing death prevents him from ‘schismatically’ re-entering the Venusberg and the death of both of them secures the art-eros-model and the Romanticism of the opera within the Venusberg-tradition.

Nevertheless, Tannhäuser carries the naturalistic aspect as far as to the very limits, and Wagner is reduced to modifying the model. On the one hand, in his theoretical opus magnum Oper und Drama (1851), he translates the complete art-erotic vocabulary on the medial level of the music drama in order to explore the undisciplined unconsciousness, to control it by knowledge within a “consciousness of the unconsciousness” (Schneider). On the other hand and similar to Eduard Mörike’s Mozart auf der Reise nach Prag (1855), the dialectic construction of Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg
(1868) combines muse and wife, and ties together the naturalistic and the culturalistic concept of art. According to the Master-Singer Hans Sachs, rules do not exclusively have culturalistic, but also naturalistic origins. They form a post-erotic “image of early love” and “conserve” the initial erotic stimulus from the first step. By referring to them, poets can reactivate the erotic power of the “lovely desire” and create art even in “hardship and trouble … of marriage” (Wagner, *Meistersinger* 121–123). If the nature of rules is erotic, culturalistic production remains a naturalistic erotic process, and becomes itself a form of eros (Begemann, *Prokreation*). ‘Stability in marriage’ and the art-eros-model no longer are incompatible. If artists are re-socialized, their beloveds revaluated as wives, and marriage becomes the focus of the action, the *Meistersinger* substitutes romantic parameters by bourgeois-realistic ones. Wagner modifies the romantic framework but without actually leaving it and rehabilitates culturalistic-intertextual aspects though within the naturalistic limits. In this way, Master Sachs’ pupil Walther states that “Walter von der Vogelweide was my Master,” but immediately corrects this intertextual-culturalistic statement by appending that he “learnt to sing in the forest at the bird-pasture [Vogelweide]” (Wagner, *Meistersinger* 42). Intrinsically and consequently, both models are interwoven: The ‘Vogelweide’ as origin is just as natural as it is cultural. Only the combination of both models successfully leads to art.

The previous interpretations have demonstrated that the art-eros-model is without problems only conceivable within the conception of a self-disciplined, ratio-centric autonomous (male) subject. It nevertheless explicitly bases on unconscious ‘driving forces’ and contributes to the discovery of the unconsciousness. However, it is still romantically idealized and not yet thought as wild ‘animal nature’ (Marquard 159). As soon as such destructive ‘dark powers’ are recognized, the ingenious autonomous subject as well as the art-eros-model becomes problematic. From now on, the model develops further in two directions, accompanied by two different anthropological conceptions: Either human beings are nature-controlled and, just as their – and Tannhäuser’s – art, driven by the unconsciousness (finally leading to Surrealist experiments); or they are culture-controlled and art is constructed by culturalistic discourses. Wagner’s *Meistersinger*, which was intended to be a satyric counterpart to the naturalistic romantic tragedy *Tannhäuser*, blazes the latter way.

On this way, Wagner’s *Meistersinger* is accompanied by Jacques Offenbach’s opera *Les Contes d’Hoffmann* (1881) also presenting a highly reflective contribution to the discourse on the origins of art. From the perspective of its end, Offenbach’s work with Jules Barbier’s libretto refers back to
the beginning of the 19th century and of this paper. Main protagonist in this opera – and in its hypotextual ‘drame fantastique’ (1851) – is E. T. A. Hoffmann who particularly formed the art-eros-model and, in France, served as the paradigm for the naturalistic ingenious-romantic artist. As such, in the frame acts, the protagonist Hoffmann7 invents three stories forming the three inner acts: The opera thus presents Hoffmann’s process of artistic production right on stage.

Since “this ardent flame”8 of love and longing to his unreachable beloved Stella (Offenbach/Barbier 18), who once has left him, initiates his process, Hoffmann creates poetry right within the art-eros-model. He has seen Stella again in the opera, where she performs the role of Donna Anna in Mozart’s Don Giovanni, and his so far repressed desire arises within a mémoire involontaire. While singing the ‘Legende de Klein-Zack,’ an ordinary song about a dwarf and ‘his figure,’ Hoffmann makes a Freudian ‘slip’: As in French, the personal pronoun “sa” means both, ‘his’ and ‘her’ figure, Hoffmann is suddenly reminded of Stella, mixes her up with Klein-Zack and loses himself in a daydream. Consequently, the well-structured music slides into a passionate fantasy and by dreaming of his early love, Hoffmann switches into present tense and from neutral, unfocalized into intern focalized first-person narration (Offenbach 84ff.): from objectively reproducing to subjectively producing art.

This is the moment when Hoffmann’s ingenious process of poetic production begins. Correspondingly, he exchanges the philistine’s beer for the poetic punch and by “getting lighted bluish,” the setting converts into the central poetological metaphor in French Hoffmann-reception: the wine bar as camera obscura. From now on, Hoffmann poetifies everyone who appears on stage: Dramaturgically reflected by the same singers, figures like his diabolized opponent Lindorf or Stella’s servant Andrès reappear fictionalized in the three following stories. However, Hoffmann primarily focusses on his ‘star-like’ idealized beloved Stella, “whose eternal echo resounds in his heart” (Offenbach/Barbier 38). By gazing at her invisible opera theatre in the back of the stage, he sings of “three women within the same woman,” “three souls within one single soul” (ibid. 44–46) – and creates three stories about ‘three women’ out of one ideal ‘soul’ being nobody else than his unreachable beloved Stella.

Right at this moment of ‘birth’ and creation, we hear a single, unaccompanied cello cantilena which appears for the first time in the third

7 The protagonist Hoffmann will be typographically distinguished from E.T.A. Hoffmann.

8 This quotation refers via Gounod’s Faust (1859) and Berlioz’ La Damnation de Faust (1846) back to Schubert’s Gretchen am Spinnrade.
scene (Figure 2). Lindorf reads a stolen letter from Stella addressed to Hoffmann wherein she asks Hoffmann to forgive her by sending an inviting key to her ‘loge’ (ibid. 20–26):

Figure 2: Key scene Act I/3 (Offenbach 42f.)

In fact, Stella is nothing less but a distant beloved. She rather becomes unreachable within this scene because the key – yet before Freud a clear sexual symbol – does not reach Hoffmann. Textually, dramaturgically and musically, the opera thus marks Stella’s ideal character. Throughout the entire Act I, her space is the invisible theatre behind the stage. From the very beginning, the opera clearly presents Stella as Donna Anna as figure of art – not least, because her first ‘entrance’ is exclusively within the fictional and fictionalizing medium of a ‘letter’ which is read by Lindorf so that we do not even hear her ‘real’ voice. Stella is neither dramaturgically nor musically present, but her letter and her lacking voice is supplemented by that cello melody we will later hear in the moment of the ‘birth’ of the artwork. This melody substitutes Stella’s physical-sexual voice and transforms it into a romantic ‘pure voice.’
[T]he substitute becomes more real than the original, the violin and the cello “sing” better – or, to be more exact, sing more – than the soprano or the baritone, because, if there is a signification of sensuous phenomena, it is always in displacement, in substitution, i.e., ultimately, in absence, that is most brilliantly manifest. (Barthes 286)

Offenbach is musicalizing what Hoffmann has visualized: Since this pure desexualized instrumental voice ‘becomes more real than the original,’ we may regard this ‘inner voice’ as the equivalent to the literary transfigured ‘inner image.’ Hence, this cello melody is Stella as ideal beloved – and this key scene becomes the key-scene without which Hoffmann’s tales and Les Contes d’Hoffmann would have never come into being.

However, as already the title signals (‘Tales of/by Hoffmann’), Offenbach’s opera is a musico-literary highly ambiguous and self-reflective work. Self-reflexivity demands the ability of referentiality to distinguish between the represented and the representation which happens in Offenbach’s opera primarily by intermedial and intertextual interactions. By having a closer look at this scene, we notice the reminding emphatic expression “Souviens-toi!” Indeed, this indicates that Hoffmann must have met the singer of the Donna Anna in her loge before. However, regarding the complex narrative construction, we could ask: Who should remember? and what? There are at least three recipients: Hoffmann as intended, Lindorf as fictional real, and the audience as non-fictional real recipient. Immediately, the well-read French listeners could have been reminded of Hoffmann’s story Don Juan (1813): there, likewise, the narrator meets the singer of Donna Anna for an erotic-aesthetical exchange in her loge. Thus, in a self-reflective turn, the opera communicates with us, invites us to (re)construct further intertextual relations, and refers to its own reception-aesthetical and intertextual structure. Now, at the latest, we notice countless further hypotexts: from Chamisso, Janin, or Musset via Wagner, Meyerbeer, Gounod, or Delibes up to numerous quotations of Offenbach’s own works (Pourvoyeur). The key-scene of the naturalistic art-eros-model at the same time draws our attention to its own culturalistic-intertextual making. In contrast to its level of histoire, the opera itself, on its level of discours, proves to be an intertextual-technically knotted work in the sense of a musico-literary ‘bricolage.’ Hence, we have both models in one scene: the naturalistic and the culturalistic one, the former as quotation, the latter as its thwarting critical comment.

As ambiguous intertextual ‘open work,’ Les Contes d’Hoffmann questions the origins of art as well as its relation to love and negotiates both domi-

---

9 For information about the complex genesis and history of reconstruction, see Kaye/Keck.
nating models of artistic production: By differing between the represented (art-eros-model) and the representation (culturalistic structure), it reflects and overcomes the represented. If we rethink the opera with this hypothesis in mind, we find several more examples, such as the famous Barcarolle “Belle nuit d’amour.” This number seems to present the romantic naturalistic ideal of pure sound and unity in love (Hadlock 127) but proves to be intertextually based on the pre-existent material of Offenbach’s opera Les Fées du Rhin (1864). With its (inter-)context of the fairies’ temporarily demonic chant, this music is not identical with itself. Instead of unity, it embodies culturalistic ambiguity. Piece by piece, the opera deconstructs the art-eros-model and its romantic parameters: With the ideal of unity, it also questions the telos of the triadic system and, by this, the metaphysical ‘distant realm’ as well as the ‘holy purpose of art.’ Moreover, women like Olympia, who almost kills Hoffmann while dancing with him, break out of their roles, and finally, The Muse, representing art qua profession, appears to be voice of “bon sens” (Offenbach/Barbier 46, 148), thus being a culturalistic anti-muse opposed to the naturalistic muse Stella. The opera’s Romanticism, the naturalistic model, and its genius Hoffmann are merely quotations within a culturalistic intertextual discourse. In such a self-reflective circulation of quoted quotations, however, art is no longer naturalistically born but rather culturally made.

This seems to be the end of the art-eros-model and its Romanticism. Several preconditions have radically changed: The creative principle of ‘innovation’ has turned into historicist epigonism; bourgeoisie bears down to its first crisis; the individual suffers a dangerous crisis of perception, knowledge and subjectivity; women’s movements rise up; and at the latest with Feuerbach’s philosophy, metaphysical concepts implode. As Nietzsche states three years before Les Contes d’Hoffmann was premiered, the “Genius too does nothing except learn first how to lay bricks then how to build,” then “continually seek[s] for material” and “rejects, selects, knots together” (Nietzsche, Human 86, 83). Originality, the idea of the original genius, and the naturalistic art-eros-model have themselves become elements of the culturalistic discourse. The model of artistic production has become a model for artistic production. If artists like Godard or several writers in stories by Gottfried Keller, such as Die mißbrauchten Liebesbriefe (1865), attempt to produce art by meticulously ticking off every element of the art-eros-model, the culturalistic discourse entirely incorporates the naturalistic concept of art and reveals the problematic character of models in general. Taken to extremes, the fundament of the naturalistic ingenious-romantic model changes dramatically: love itself becomes a cul-
tural construction. Nevertheless, even a quick look at manuscripts such as Gustav Mahler’s unfinished Symphony No. 10 (1910) convinces us of the survival of the art-eros-model and its predominance (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Fearing to lose his wife “Almschi” after having revealed her love affair, Mahler wrote in his manuscript: “to live for you! to die for you!” (ÖNB Mus.Hs.41000/5)
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»Vzemi si k srcu te pesmi«: ljubezen, eros in umetniška produkcija v 19. stoletju
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