Chronotopos
A Journal of Translation History

Karin Almasy

Setting the canon, translating the canon. Translations in Slovene school readers and translation policy within the school system of the Habsburg monarchy (1848–1918)

2/2019
DOI: 10.25365/cts-2019-1-2-4

Herausgegeben am / Éditée au / Edited at the: Zentrum für Translationswissenschaft der Universität Wien

ISSN: 2617-3441

Abstract

The second half of the nineteenth century is of crucial importance in Slovene history, as during this time, a sense of national consciousness began to be disseminated, literacy increased significantly, and different Slovene vernaculars were developed into a modern, supra-regional, standardized, and codified Slovene language. These developments were intertwined and enabled by general processes of modernization within the Habsburg Monarchy, under which the Slovenes had lived for centuries alongside speakers of other languages. At the same time, spurred on by the ideas of the liberal Revolution of 1848, a modern school system was first established within the monarchy. The demand for modern schoolbooks to be used within this system was a considerable challenge, especially for Slavic languages like Slovene, which were not yet fully developed. This task proved to be impossible without relying heavily on translations, and, starting in 1848, modern schoolbook production soon led to an increase in translation activity. This paper examines the historical circumstances surrounding the creation of Slovene schoolbooks between 1848 and 1918, the main agents in the field, the volume and the characteristics of translations included in schoolbooks, if and when they were marked as translations, translation strategies, and ideological steering through translations. It also examines the issues of whether and how the state, through the Ministry of Education, controlled or guided these translations activities while also controlling content within schoolbook production in general.

Keywords: translation history, Habsburg empire, nineteenth century, school readers, canonization, agents of translation, pseudo-originals, rewritings

Zum Zitieren des Artikels / Pour citer l'article / To cite the article:
Almasy, Karin (2019): Setting the canon, translating the canon. Translations in Slovene school readers and translation policy within the school system of the Habsburg monarchy (1848–1918), *Chronotopos* 2 (1), 43-62.
DOI: 10.25365/cts-2019-1-2-4

Karin Almasy

Setting the canon, translating the canon.

Translations in Slovene school readers and translation policy within the school system of the Habsburg monarchy (1848–1918)

Abstract

The second half of the nineteenth century is of crucial importance in Slovene history, as during this time, a sense of national consciousness began to be disseminated, literacy increased significantly, and different Slovene vernaculars were developed into a modern, supra-regional, standardized, and codified Slovene language. These developments were intertwined and enabled by general processes of modernization within the Habsburg Monarchy, under which the Slovenes had lived for centuries alongside speakers of other languages. At the same time, spurred on by the ideas of the liberal Revolution of 1848, a modern school system was first established within the monarchy. The demand for modern schoolbooks to be used within this system was a considerable challenge, especially for Slavic languages like Slovene, which were not yet fully developed. This task proved to be impossible without relying heavily on translations, and, starting in 1848, modern schoolbook production soon led to an increase in translation activity. This paper examines the historical circumstances surrounding the creation of Slovene schoolbooks between 1848 and 1918, the main agents in the field, the volume and the characteristics of translations included in schoolbooks, if and when they were marked as translations, translation strategies, and ideological steering through translations. It also examines the issues of whether and how the state, through the Ministry of Education, controlled or guided these translations activities while also controlling content within schoolbook production in general.

Keywords: translation history, Habsburg empire,nineteenth century, school readers, canonization, agents of translation, pseudo-originals, rewritings

Introduction

This paper sheds light on an understudied part of shared Slovene/Austrian history: translations within the context of the school system. Careful examination of the school system and schoolbook production brings into focus the groundbreaking

modernization processes that took place between 1848 and 1918. Through this examination of the newly established school system after 1848, it becomes evident that during the second half of the nineteenth century that what was essentially still a feudal society transitioned into a modern one. This transformation occurred mostly by gradually moving away from a religious orientation, which dominated every aspect of life, and by establishing literacy and basic education for all (OSTERHAMMEL 2009: 1097). By focusing on the role of translators and translations within the state-led production of schoolbooks, light is also shed on an even more understudied topic: the tremendous, though rarely appreciated, contribution of translation to this processes of modernization as well as to the standardization of Slovene language and Slovene nation-building. Thus, examinations of translations in schoolbooks of this time are of relevance not only to Translation Studies scholars wishing to learn more about Slovene translation culture (PRUNČ 2008), but also to historians focusing on the discursive construction of national identities (e.g., CILLIA, REISIGL & WODAK 1999; FEICHTINGER, PRUTSCH & CSÁKY 2003; JUDSON 2006; KOSI 2013; ALMASY 2014; JUDSON 2016; KOSI & STERGAR 2016), who served as my "natural interlocutors" (RUNDLE 2012: 232) when conducting this research.[1] Studying translations draws attention to the polycultural and transnational and examines what connected speakers of different languages, how they lived together in a common space (HEPPNER 2002), what they shared, how they collaborated, what they had in common, and what they learned from each other, rather than looking at what separated them. Translation history thus has the potential to counter the nationalist narratives that have long dominated national historiographies:

> *Der Fokus auf den Beitrag von Kulturtransfer- und Übersetzungsprozessen für die Herausbildung nationaler Identitätsmuster hat […] unzweifelhaft eine fruchtbare ideologiekritische Seite, indem er besonders wirkungsvoll nationalistische Reinheits- und Homogenitätsphantasien unterläuft. (GIPPER & DIZDAR 2015: 8)*

Within the "polycultural communication space" of the Habsburg empire (WOLF 2012: 87–193), various language regulations were established to meet the 1848 ideal of equality among the Empire's nationalities and their right to cultivate their lan-

[1] This paper shares results of the author's doctoral thesis project, mentored by Erich Prunč, completed in 2017, and published as ALMASY (2018).

guages in public.[2] Because language and translation (which is inseparable from language but is rarely mentioned) played an important role in constructing national and other collective identities, the Habsburg empire seems to be an ideal area of research for translation historians.

This paper will first give a brief overview of the historical context of the Habsburg Monarchy in the nineteenth century, the Slovene situation starting in 1848, and the development of the modern school system within the monarchy. The paper will then focus on translations in Slovene schoolbooks and school readers in particular—the anthology-like, canon-setting, and most commonly used type of schoolbooks at the time. The focus will then shift to the wider circumstances of schoolbook production and the approval process and look at whether the state-controlled translations in schoolbooks through some sort of specific translation policy. Furthermore, the paper will shed light on the agents of translations in Slovene schoolbooks and their different roles and responsibilities. Throughout the paper, methodological questions on the research of translation in history will be addressed and the interdisciplinary nature of translation history will be highlighted.

The historical context: Slovenes and the Slovene language within the Habsburg Monarchy, 1848-1918

Slovene-speaking subjects of the Habsburg Monarchy lived in the historical crownlands of Carniola, Styria, Carinthia, the Austrian Littoral, and the two Hungarian Comitats of Zala and Vas, where they had lived for centuries alongside their German-, Italian-, or Hungarian-speaking neighbors. Diglossia among the intellectual elites of Slovene origin (FISHMAN 1967) was widespread. In the Austrian half of the Habsburg Monarchy, referred to as Cisleithania, where most Slovenes lived, German was the language of law, bureaucracy, higher education, intellectual debate and correspondence (even among Slovene intellectuals) as well as a *lingua franca* within the entire monarchy. Slovene was often limited to informal, verbal, and private use.

A national Slovene group identity among the broader masses of society did not really develop until the end of the nineteenth century. There was no older statehood, historical dynasty or Slovene nobility with which they could have aligned themselves, and although Catholicism was an important aspect of Slovene identity, religion was not a distinctive feature with which they could have distinguished themselves from their predominantly German and Italian neighbors. Thus, they relied heavily on lan-

[2] In 1867, paragraph 19 of the *Staatsgrundgesetz* finally granted these collective language rights. Franz Joseph I. (1867).

guage and ethnicity as the dominant paradigms for their "national awakening." At this time, language in the Habsburg Monarchy was no longer simply a means of communication, but was instead a source of identity and a symbol of the existence of nations and the establishment of certain group solidarities used to mobilize ethnicities (HROCH 2005: 178–200). As a result language policy in the late nineteenth century Habsburg Monarchy, which very much included issues of language policies in schools (ALMASY 2014: 128–169), became the new battleground for nationalist conflicts (JUDSON 2006; CVIRN 2016). The more important language became in the mid-nineteenth century as an ethnic marker, the more Slovene intellectuals became acutely aware of the inadequacy of the Slovene language. Therefore, the Slovene political agendas were related to language and their political demands were organized around language policy.

In 1848, the Slovene language was, by objective standards, far from being a fully developed, supra-regional, standardized, and codified language able to fulfill all the necessary functions of a "national" language, especially since a variety of genres had not yet been developed. For example, the very first Slovene novel, *Deseti brat* by Josip Jurčič, was only published in 1866, and the first normative Slovene spelling, Fran Levec's *Slovenski pravopis*, was published in 1899. Moreover, very little specific terminology for the sciences, law, and other specialized fields existed, and so specialized texts were essentially non-existent. As a result, a push for the development of the Slovene language began to gain momentum, and without translations, this development would not have been possible. As Gipper and Dizdar, note, translation is often the midwife of national literature ("Geburtshelfer nationaler Literaturen") and is found at the beginning of this development from vernaculars to a "national" standardized language (GIPPER & DIZDAR 2015:8), and this was no less true for the Slovene language. Or in other words:

> *Sprachliche Eigenständigkeit im Sinne einer (modernen) Standardsprache entwickelt sich zwangsläufig auch über Übersetzung. In vielen Fällen, wenn nicht sogar in der Regel, geht die übersetzte Literatur des Anderen/Fremden der eigenen („nationalen") Literatur voraus. Anders gesagt: das (prestigereiche) Fremde zwingt förmlich zur Schaffung einer eigenen Literatur, die als Kollektiv dienen soll und somit früher oder später zur Nationalliteratur avanciert. (Karvounis 2015: 110)*

Due to this overall symbolic importance of language and the need to cultivate and extend the Slovene language, many of the trailblazers in the Slovene master narrative, or what Jarausch and Sabrow describe as "the dominant narration about the past in a

certain cultural community at a certain time" (JARAUSCH & SABROW 2002: 17), were writers, poets, intellectuals, scholars, teachers, and language reformers. In other words, the Slovene nation was constructed as a "literary nation" (HLADNIK 2002: 2). Among the most important yet often undervalued agents of language development and the dissemination of a common national group identity were those involved in the school system and schoolbook production, which included editors, writers, and translators of schoolbooks as well as teachers and public officials, who will be discussed later on in this paper.

The establishment of a new school system and the development of schoolbooks

The school system within the Habsburg Monarchy began when Maria Theresia declared schools to be a *Politikum* in 1770. After the important reforms of the school system inspired by the liberal ideas of the Revolutions of 1848 and the 1869 *Reichsvolksschulgesetz*, the Catholic Church lost all supervision over schools, and the educational system finally became a state-led endeavor. Founded in 1848, the Ministry of Education, known as the *Ministerium für Cultus und Unterricht*, took on the role of providing and overseeing a basic education for all people instead of just the privileged upper class. The main goal of a basic school education changed from providing obedient subjects with a moral and religious instruction to raising responsible, mature citizens who were able to earn a dignified living and contribute to their own well-being and to that of the state as a whole.[3] Due to this radically different mindset, many new schools were built, and for the first time there were many educated, well-trained teachers. As a result, the literacy rate increased dramatically within just a few decades, as did the average level of education and standard of living (SCHMIDT 1966: 18–21; ENGELBRECHT 1986: 226; ALMASY 2018: 45–137).

A completely new school system created a demand for a large number of new schoolbooks and other teaching materials, much of which were issued directly by the *k.k. Schulbücherverlag*, the official publishing house in Vienna. Starting in the 1860s, the

[3] See the radically different wording in Maria Theresia wish, as expressed in the *Schulordnung* "aus den Schulen wohlgesittete und brauchbare Unterthanen zu erhalten" in comparison to the *Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Oesterreich* from 1848: „Die Volksschule hat dasjenige Maß von Kenntnissen und Fertigkeiten [zu vermitteln], welche künftig bei jedem mündigen Bewohner des österreichischen Staates vorausgesetzt werden müssen, damit er durch redlichen Erwerb sein Bestehen zu sichern, die Rechte und Pflichten, welche aus den neuen Staatseinrichtungen ihm erwachsen, zum Wohle des Ganzen und seiner selbst auszuüben, und ein menschenwürdiges Leben zu führen im Stande sei. (MARIA THERESIA 1774: 119; [VON EXNER 1848: 5F).

first Slovene monographic schoolbooks were created specifically for scientific and academic subjects in secondary schools like as physics, chemistry, biology, history and geography in addition to practical schoolbooks for various forms of vocational schools.[4] However, the most common and widely used form of schoolbook was the reader or textbook (*Lesebuch*, and in Slovene *berilo* or *čitanka*). In the lower classes, the reader, along with the *Rechenbuch* and the *Katechismus*, were often the only schoolbooks used. These readers were a sort of anthology of various genres and topics, and they provided reading materials for almost everything taught over the course of one or two academic years.

These school readers offer a good overview of text production in general, since they contain a wide range of material written at age appropriate levels. These areas included poetry and prose; fiction and non-fiction; texts from the sciences, history, geography, and ethnology; as well as fables, tales, stories, and parables. This universal, encyclopedic, and anthology-like character also makes the school reader a fascinating object of investigation because it was an important instrument of canonization in which patronage becomes visible (ALMASY 2017b). André Lefevere, for example, foresaw the potential of introductory anthologies in the higher education system for setting the canon, and even though he referred to a slightly different type of anthology (an exclusively literary anthology), the following is nevertheless also true for the nineteenth century school reader:

> *Canonization appears at its most obvious and also its most powerful with the spread of higher education. It has found its most impressive – and most profitable – monument to date in the publication of that hybrid crystallization of the close and lucrative cooperation between publisher and institutions of higher education: the introductory anthology […] (LEFEVERE 1992: 22).*

The rare, pre-1848 readers with predominantly religious content could not be used anymore, so new schoolbooks and appropriate texts for them were in urgent need. This high demand for new schoolbooks in all the languages of the monarchy, and especially for the not-yet-fully developed Slavic dialects, could only be met by relying

[4] These thematic schoolbooks were mostly translations of German schoolbooks, and their main importance lies in the development of Slovene terminology for the natural sciences, which had previously been non-existent. In this following paper, however, I focus mainly on the translations in school readers, because their variety of content provides a better overview than schoolbooks for specific subjects like mathematics and chemistry would. For more detail regarding the translation of the first monographic science schoolbooks, see: ŽIGON, ALMASY & LOVŠIN (2017).

heavily on translations. Franz Exner and Heinrich Bonitz, the founding fathers of the Austrian school reforms, were aware of this, and in the *Organisationsentwurf,* the 1849 document providing the foundation of the Austrian education reform, they suggested using translations to alleviate this shortage:

> *Wenn die Literatur einer Sprache einen in den Schulen anwendbaren stofflichen Inhalt von genügender Menge und Mannigfaltigkeit nicht darbietet, um durch ihn die gestellten Zwecke zu erreichen, so ist dem Mangel einstweilen durch gute Uebersetzungen abzuhelfen […] (N. N. [Exner/Bonitz] 1849: 28).*

The production of modern Slovene educational materials, and readers in particular, which began after 1848, had an enormous effect on a still predominantly semi-literate, poorly educated society. For many children and households, these readers were often the only reading material they owned other than a Bible or a catechism. These schoolbooks, however, were not only important for combating illiteracy; they were also a basic source of information and, as in the case of Slovene, of major importance for the development of a standardized written language and a common group identity. Because the types of authors, texts, and ideas introduced to Slovene youth through those readers were so influential, it is worth investigating the content of these readers as well as who wrote them, who translated texts for them, and who controlled the production of these readers.

Setting the canon

Schoolbook production was supervised by the Ministry of Education, and it had to approve every schoolbook before they could be used in schools. Thus, the state had an exclusive monopoly on the approbation of school materials. The decision was made based on one, two or sometimes even more reports from experts (*fachmännische Gutachten*). The ministry asked the regional authorities, or *Landesschulbehörden*, to send them these reports, and these authorities then selected experts in the field. In the case of Slovene schoolbooks, they were Slovene teachers, professors, schoolbook editors, school principals, school supervisors, or officials working in some other capacity within the school system. Thus, the ones selected to evaluate the quality of these books had expertise in school matters, a good command of Slovene and, for as state officials, an internalized *habitus* of loyalty toward the monarchy and the emperor. This process of quality management could be considered comparable to modern peer review for scholarly publications, because reports about materials found

to be lacking were sent back to the schoolbook authors or editors anonymously with requests for improvement. (ALMASY 2018: 327–343).

It is worth noting that the ministry in Vienna always followed the experts' recommendations and never overruled them. If a Slovene schoolbook was hindered from being published, it was because Slovene experts (rightfully) claimed it was lacking in quality. Also noteworthy is the fact, that the ministry did its best to avoid nepotisms and reach a supra-regional consensus, especially in language matters. A lot of the reviewers' concerns were linguistic and were often caused by the still very apparent regional differences and animosities concerning the not yet fully standardized Slovene language, and in particular regarding the Carniolan and Styrian Slovene variants. So, if an author/editor from Carniola submitted a schoolbook for the ministry's approval, they would ask the local Styrian authorities for an expert report and vice versa. There were even cases when the expert opinions from Carniola and Styria, colored by their regional preferences and necessities, differed so widely that the ministry asked the local authorities from the Austrian Littoral to settle the dispute with a third opinion (ALMASY 2018: 335ff).[5]

It is, in fact, quite surprising how little micromanaging the ministry engaged in regarding more specific issues like which requirements for schoolbooks would be set by the ministry and the extent of ideological steering.[6] Some very general guidelines were set in the *Hauptgrundsätze für die Verfassung Slovenischer Lesebücher* concerning the content of Slovene school readers, which required "ein gesunder Idealismus […] soll dem Schüler aus dem Lesebuche entgegenströmen" that should be expressed through "tiefe Verehrung der christlichkatholischen Religion", "Treue und Liebe zu unserem gemeinsamen Vaterlande Oestereich und dessen erlauchtem Herrscherhause", and "Liebe zu unserem eigenen Volke." Moreover, the students were supposed to also learn about "den Charakter und die Vorzüge der übrigen Völker", a goal for

[5] All these observations are based on extensive archival research into the entire production of Slovene school readers and the approval procedures of these schoolbooks accompanied by expert reports. Archival research was conducted in both the Austrian and the Slovenian State Archives (*Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv* ÖSTA AVA and *Arhiv Republike Slovenije* ARS), as well as in the Slovene National Library (*Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica* NUK), the Slovene School Museum (*Slovenski šolski muzej* SŠMUL), and the *Schulbuch- und Schulschriftensammlung* of the Austrian Ministry of Education (BMB). For more detail about my archival sources and the methodology, see ALMASY (2018: 327-343; 381-387).

[6] Even though the topic of ideological steering through translations was the focus of my doctoral thesis, due to a lack of space, I will abstain from discussing it here at length. For ideological steering through translations see PRUNČ (2010) for detailed examples from Slovene school readers, ALMASY (2018: 349-326).

which the document specifically mentions translations as a means for achieving this: "Diesem Zwecke sollen gute Uebersetzungen von Werken der Weltliteratur dienen, aber auch Reisebeschreibungen, Aufsätze udgl. über das Ausland." (NUK, N.N.).

However, the ministry did not go beyond these general guidelines. There were no specific instructions regarding which authors, texts, or content should or should not be included. The editors and authors of schoolbooks were given considerable freedom in their micro-decisions, and in the end, a book only needed approval from the expert reports to pass the approbation process. The experts were asked to indicate in their reports if the content and the language of the schoolbooks were "angemessen und zweckmäßig" (ALMASY 2018: 352). As a result, such general phrases were common in these reports. Due to the fact, that the ministry's guidelines were mostly superficial and the ministry almost never interfered with an editor's decisions at the microlevel, the state monopoly on the approbation of schoolbooks was a regulatory tool for setting the school reading canon rather than a form of censorship in the most literal sense of the word (ALMASY 2018: 100–110).[7]

Returning to the topic of translations, the following questions can be raised: Were translations regularly discussed in these expert reports? Was there some sort of state-led translation policy by which the ministry also regulated the use of translations in schoolbooks? Did the experts discuss translations in their reports? As established in the *Organisationsentwurf*, the use of translations was allowed and mentioned as a tool to import innovations into not yet fully developed literatures. However, since state regulations of schoolbook production in general were rather superficial and generic, it naturally followed that translations were also not heavily regulated.

Not only were there no official regulations regarding translation, there was also little attention paid to them in the experts' reports. In fact, the word *Übersetzung* rarely appears in files about schoolbook approbation or within the reports themselves. If translation as a concept was mentioned, it was only as part of very superficial observations like "die Lesestücke [seien] mit großer Gewandtheit übersetzt und hinsichtlich der sprachlichen Korrektheit – einwandfrei" (K. K. MINISTERIUM FÜR CULTUS UND UNTERRICHT 1917). Translated texts were discussed though, but hardly ever *because* they were translations and not original Slovene texts. If they were given consid-

[7] Traces of what could truly be considered censorship were only to be found during the highly politicized time of World War I and the established "war absolutism". During that time, translations in school readers also came to be viewed from an ideological perspective, as either politically reliable (translation from German source texts) or suspicious (translations from Slavic source texts). Due to a lack of space, I will not discuss the war years in detail. For more information, see ALMASY (2018: 327–369).

eration, then the discussion of them was based on the same types of issues on which original texts were also judged: whether they were, in terms of content and of language, "zweckmässig und angemessen." Translation in and of itself was not a concern for ministry officials, regional authorities, or experts evaluating materials, so it was hardly ever discussed. The only issues of importance were if schoolbook texts were linguistically acceptable and correct, contained appropriate content, and were, in ideological terms, "reliable," meaning they conveyed the necessary messages regarding Catholicism and love for the emperor and the monarchy. Which and how many translations to include was primarily decided by the editors of school readers and was a decision often dictated by necessity, especially in the early decades after 1848 when appropriate, original Slovene texts were not widely available.

Translating the canon

When I decided to investigate translations in Slovene schoolbooks from 1848–1918, I followed the advice of Anthony Pym, who claims that "[l]ittle history can be construed from the analysis of isolated translations. Worse, quite superficial history can result from hypotheses that are pumped up after summary testing on just one or two cases." (PYM 1998: 39). This was the reasoning behind my decision to undertake an extensive quantitative analysis of all the texts in eight Slovene readers written for the higher schools (*Gymnasien*), which comprise half of the readers (first editions) published between 1848 and 1918, and contain a total of 902 texts.[8] Again, I focused on readers because they offer an extensive overview of a large part of Slovene text production at the time. I found that (1) around a third of all texts in the sample were translations, among which were quite a few "[u]nmarked translations or 'pseudo-originals' (translated texts falsely presented and received as originals)" (PYM 1998: 60); (2) a very unevenly genre-specific distribution of translations among the different types of texts; (3) German, Czech, and Croatian/Serbian were by far the most common languages of source texts, and (4) a very wide variety of different translation strategies were employed, ranging from source text loyal to very free forms of rewriting, adaptations, and localizations.

[8] In this quantitative overview, I listed information on the content of the text, whether it was prose or poetry, the author and/or translator (if available), the source text, the source text language, and whether a text was marked as a translation. I combined information provided in the readers themselves with other research finding, especially into the biographical background of the authors/translators. For detail on the methodology, see ALMASY (2018: 383–386).

Translations and pseudo-originals

The exact number of translations is difficult to pin down to something more specific than an estimate of around a third of the total number for a few reasons.[9] First, when working within historical contexts, it is not always easy to determine whether or not a text is a translation. In this analysis, I identified many pseudo-originals in the sample.[10] In general, information about the origin of texts, authorship, translation, etc. was much less frequently provided than it would be today. Uncanonical non-literary texts, which were very common in school readers (especially in those for the lower classes) were even less frequently marked. Modern standards of identifying authorship and consciously avoiding plagiarism were not standard practice at the time, so including the names of authors or any other bibliographic information was done much more haphazardly in nineteenth century Slovene school readers that it would be today. However, two facts suggest the invisibility of translations was not accidental and cannot be explained by looser citation conventions in comparison to today's standards. Firstly, hidden translations or pseudo-originals were more common in readers compiled by certain editors than they were in those compiled by others. Secondly, all of these traced back to German source texts – not a single one originated from texts in Slavic languages (ALMASY 2018: 203–222). This can be better understood within the context of the times, in which the Slovene national movement was trying to gain momentum and develop its own language, which its nation-building relied heavily on. This also meant a need for Slovene education to use translations as a means of distancing itself from the predominantly German influence on literature and schoolbooks. Nationally oriented Slovene intellectuals were acutely aware of the overwhelming need for, or one could say an overbearing dependency on, translations from German language sources. Therefore, from the perspective of those creating a national consciousness, this dependency on German source texts and the resulting high number of translations had to be reduced, or at least hidden, in Slovene school

[9] The precise numbers in my sample were: 198 (22%) texts were definitive translations, 70 (8%) additional texts that most likely are translations, another 80 (9%) text that might be translations, and 554 texts (61%) were original Slovene texts. The in-between-categories (17% altogether) consist of texts that, due to evidence within the text, biographical data about the author, and/or bibliographic data on the text, I strongly suspect to be translations but for which I was unable to find a source text. ALMASY (2018: 188).

[10] There were 139 texts in the sample transparently marked as translations, but I was able to prove through identifying the source text that another 59 texts were also translations. There were 70 more texts I strongly suspected were translations but for which I was unable to find definitive proof. Almasy (2018: 208).

readers. This wide-spread approach among Slovene intellectuals regarding translations was clearly expressed by the writer, poet, and literary critic Josip Stritar in 1870:

> *Prestava je vendar tuje, izposojeno blago: to pa bodi še tako lepo, ne moremo se ga prav veseliti; s prestavami se jezik gladi in vadi, slovstvo se z njimi ne bogati; narod more svojo lastnino imenovati samo, kar je zrastlo iz njegovih tal. (*STRITAR *1955: 119)*
>
> *[Translations are always foreign, borrowed goods: No matter how beautiful they may be, we cannot be really take pleasure in them; language is smoothed over and practiced through translations, but our literature will not be enriched by them; a nation can only call its own that which has been grown on its own soil.]*

Genre specifics

The translations in the sample were very unevenly distributed and depended on the text genre because in 1848, the different text genres in the Slovene language were still very unevenly developed. Whereas, for example, poems in original Slovene production were already available in large numbers, prose – and non-fiction texts with specialized context from the sciences or history in particular – were still rare. Thus genres that were underdeveloped or had yet to begin developing contained higher numbers of translations, while there were very few poetry translations in the sample.[11] This would seem to support Erich Prunč's observation that within nineteenth century Slovene translation culture, translations were avoided in more developed genres and were more likely to be used to extend and cultivate undeveloped or underdeveloped genres (PRUNČ 2007:168). So translations did in fact fulfil the role suggested for them in the *Organisationsentwurf* by assisting and filling in gaps where original text production was not yet sufficiently available. This made them, from a standpoint of nation-building, a kind of "necessary evil" (STRITAR 1956:203).[12]

Source languages

Within the sample, the most common source text language was predominantly German, which was a natural result of the role of the German language had in higher education and among intellectuals within the monarchy. All told, more than half of all

[11] Among the 371 poems in the sample, only 43 poems (12%) were translated and 316 were of Slovene origin. Meanwhile, among the 129 texts from natural history (biology, chemistry, physics), 37% were translations (48 in comparison to 31 original Slovene texts). The remaining texts fall into the in-between-categories of "probably a translation" and "most likely a translation" and are cases in which I could not prove for certain were translations or were original Slovene texts without foreign origin. ALMASY (2018: 191 and 199).

[12] In the Slovene original, he stated: "Prevode samo za silo!".

translations in the sample came from a German source text. But even though texts of a technical or scientific nature most often came from a German source text, no text genre was completely free of translations from German sources. Furthermore, secondary translations from languages like Greek and Latin were mostly likely to come from a German translation rather than the original language. The other half of translations had a Slavic source text – mainly Croatian/Serbian and Czech, with only a few, rare examples from Russian and Polish source texts.

In comparison to translations from German source texts, translating texts from the languages of the more developed and admired Slavic "brother" peoples carried no stigma and instead affirmed a Slovene national spirit by showing awareness of an inter-Slavic connectedness. Among the Slavs, the Slovenes especially looked up to the Czechs and the other South Slavs. The Czech language was older and more developed than Slovene, and the editors of the first post-1848 Slovene readers particularly relied on already-existent Czech readers, such as Čelavkovský's 1850s series *Česká čítací kniha* and translated a great deal of material from them. About half of Slavic source texts came from a Czech source, while the other half came from South Slavic sources. Among these, legends, folk tales, and heroic epics, especially of Serbian origin like the legends of the Battle of Kosovo Polje, were the most common. A Slavic consciousness was thus not only present in the choice of source texts but was also demonstrated by the choice of content. However, the over-arching framework for all schoolbooks had to be loyalty to the Emperor Franz Joseph I and the House of Habsburg, of which Slovene authors and editors were fully aware. As a result, the orientation in Slovene readers was strictly Austro-Slavic rather than pan-Slavic that looked toward Russia (JELAVICH 1990: 272; MORITSCH 1996).

Translation strategies

Close examination revealed that a variety of translation strategies were employed in creating these texts. At one extreme, there were examples of highly source text-orientated translations, especially among translations of informational texts, which preserved German syntax to such an extent that the Slovene texts read almost like German. At the other extreme, there were very free forms of rewritings, especially among non-canonic texts. Some examples of these were localizations (for example, transferring certain stories into a Slovene or a Slavic setting or connecting general content to a specific Slovene surrounding), adaptations (texts translated based on one or more source texts that were shortened, adapted, and rewritten to suit Slovene school children), self-translations (translations by the authors themselves who transformed their own German texts into Slovene versions), and creative free-rendering of

poems into Slovene versions. Since these readers assembled all sorts of texts and text adaptations, the concept of rewriting as defined by Lefevere (1992) appears to be a very useful concept for describing the different forms of text production found in nineteenth century Slovene school readers. Again, as with the problem of marked/unmarked authorship/translations, we must not transfer too-narrow concepts of today into the past: Conceptualizing to narrow just in black-and-white categories of original text vs. translation does not do justice to the diverse reality in nineteenth century Slovene school readers. The gray area in between, texts neither belonging clearly to one of those binary categories, was substantial.

Agents of translation

Again, even though the Ministry of Education had final approval, it did not micromanage the process of creating schoolbooks, leaving authors and editors with considerable freedom in choosing their material and deciding what content and authors to include as long as their choices fell within the general ideological framework of Catholicism and loyalty toward the monarchy. Furthermore, there were a variety of approaches and decision-making involved in translation. Thus, for these readers, the editors held a great deal of power as "secondary authors" (SERUYA et al. 2013: 7), because they are the ones deciding content, texts, and authors to include or exclude. They re-conceptualized, structured, shortened or rearranged already-existing texts, assigned writing or the translation of new texts to specific authors, and often wrote or translated themselves. Thus, they were important agents of canonization and translation, although many of their contributions to the Austrian school system and the development of Slovene language are largely forgotten. If they are remembered, it is mostly for their other achievements such as literary or scholarly work (ALMASY 2017a).

Following the premise "Study translators, then texts" (PYM 1998:30), certain questions present themselves. Who were the people steering the educational and intellectual orientation of Slovene youth so substantially through writing or editing Slovene schoolbooks? What information is available about the translators and their professional background? In order to answer these questions, I consulted archival material in the extensive Slovene biographical lexicon (ZRC SAZU 1925-2013) to learn more about these people and to identify their motivation, their habitus, and the different forms of capital in the Bourdieusian sense necessary to succeed with such an difficult endeavor. (BOURDIEU 1998; ALMASY 2018: 139–187) The agents involved acted out of personal conviction (in Bourdieusian terms, "illusio") rather than a desire for finan-

cial gain. Due to the state's price regulations, small print runs, and lack of payment for additional work, there was no real money to be made writing or editing Slovene schoolbooks. As the editor Janez Bleiweis stated, spending one's time and energy on such a difficult endeavor was "eine Gabe am Altar des Vaterlandes" – a patriotic contribution to one's fatherland (K. K. LAIBACHER STATTHALTEREI 1850).

The editors – all together 24 men – of Slovene readers published between 1848 and 1918 were either employed within the Austrian school system or were connected to it in some other way. Their professional occupations thus ranged from primary school teachers to *Gymnasialprofessoren* and from school principals to regional or state officials (*Schulrat, Bezirksrat, Landesschulrat, Minsterialbeamter* etc.). Generally, the more influential a series of readers was, and the higher the level it was created for (especially for the *Gymnasium*), the more incorporated cultural capital its editor would have had. Those of this group who were primary school teachers only compiled readers for introductory reading lessons in the *Volksschulen* (most often only what was known as the *Abecedniki* or *Prvo berilo* used in the first year). Those with more prestige within the educational system took on the task of compiling the more complex and sophisticated readers needed for the higher levels.[13] Readers for the *Gymnasien* were compiled by high ranking state officials, scholars and/or otherwise influential men like Janez Bleiweis, Johann Kleemann, Fran Miklošič, Anton Janežič and Jakob Sket.

Turning away from the editors and toward the writers/translators of texts for Slovene school readers, what can we learn about their professional background and what can we learn about the translation activities?[14] In terms of their professional backgrounds, half of them worked in some capacity within the Austrian school system, mainly as teachers but also as principals, schoolbook editors, and regional or state officials within the school system. Just over a third of them (37%), were members of the clergy. These two groups also intersected, since 16% were both clergymen and teachers,

[13] These observations are the result of extensive research into the background of the 24 editors of all published Slovene school readers. The editors often edited series of readers rather than just a single volume for consecutive school years and often also revised editions. See ALMASY (2018: 142–180).

[14] The following is, again, based on the sample of 902 texts from Slovene school readers, for which 228 authors/translators were named. Among those, 55 were of foreign origin and thus authors of source texts such as Andersen, Schiller, Pushkin. 147 Slovene authors/translators were named, for which biographical information is also available. There were an additional 26 names for which no biographical data was found. The following observations are thus based on the 147 Slovene authors/translators for whom biographical information is available. Every one of them contributed at least one text to these readers. For more detail, see: ALMASY (2018: 180–186).

which reflects the fact that, until the middle of the nineteenth century when the modern school system began to produce secular intellectuals, the small Slovene elite was mostly comprised of priests. Only another 25% of the authors/translators named in the readers had some other sort of professional background. Among them were the rare female author/translators as well as attorneys, politicians, scientists, doctors and the like. In other words, there were two distinct, professional groups who decided on the content and the values taught in these readers: teachers and priests.

Examination of the available biographical information of these editors revealed there was no separation of authors/editors and translators into two professional groups as they are thought of today, and the majority of Slovene intellectuals contributing to school readers (98 out of 147, or 67%) were engaged in both activities.[15] Most intellectuals from the nineteenth century Slovene elite were not only teachers, priests, politicians, writers, or poets, but *also* translators. In other words, Pym's observation that "the cases most fleshed out tend to be translators who found fame wearing a different hat, as authors, political figures, polemicists, and so on" (PYM 2009:32) also holds true for this case. None of them had his or her professional identity exclusively shaped by being a translator.

Instead of a Conclusion: Desiderata for translation history in the Habsburg monarchy

The Habsburg Monarchy and its ideal of equality among languages, various language regulations in general, its school system, and school readers in particular, still offers much untapped potential for translation history research, as do many other multilingual and multiethnic empires of the time. The research summarized here provides insight into Slovene translation culture between 1848 and 1918 through the use of translation in school readers, but it is merely a first step. A desirable goal for future studies would be comparative studies of the use and treatment of translations along with the content and values taught in schoolbooks in other languages from the monarchy, such as Czech, Ruthenian (that is Ukrainian), Croatian/Serbian, Polish, Hungarian, Romanian, and Italian, to see if they differ, and if so, how much. Focusing on translations can be especially fruitful because it involves focusing on the interconnectedness, interdependencies, cooperation, and contacts among the different

[15] Of course, there is a wide range of translational professionalism and frequency within the sample. Some may have been professional writers and translators who regularly translated pieces of world literature, while others may have just contributed a modest text to a school reader. ALMASY (2018: 185f).

language/ethnic groups within the empire. From what I can judge from my own research, which also included German, Czech, and Croatian school readers for comparison purposes and research on source texts, such research reveals how much alike and how interconnected large parts of Habsburg Central Europe were. In order to get a better understanding of the agents involved and the diversity of translations in such a historical setting, already-established theoretical framework in Translation Studies, including Bourdieu's Field Theory and Lefevere's Rewriting can be particularly useful. Finally, in comparison to the already well-researched phenomenon of pseudo-translation (TOURY 1995: 40), research into pseudo-originals, which is frequently encountered when investigating historical settings, is yet to be identified as a desideratum in Translation Studies.

References

Primary sources

[EXNER, Franz Seraphin von] (1848): *Entwurf der Grundzüge des öffentlichen Unterrichtswesens in Oesterreich*, Wien.

FRANZ JOSEPH I. (1867): "Staatsgrundgesetz vom 21. December 1867 über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger für die im Reichsrathe vertretenen Königreiche und Länder", *Reichsgesetzblatt für das Kaiserthum Oesterreich*, Wien, 394–398.

ARS, (AS 31; Namestništvo; Fasz. 31/14), K. K. LAIBACHER STATTHALTEREI, (1850): *Protokoll, aufgenommen in der Beratung über die Verfassung des slowenischen Lesebuches fürs Gymnasium I. Theil am 13. Jänner 1850 zu Laibach.*

ÖSTA AVA (Unterricht 1848-1918, Fasz. 4979, Sign. 24 E), K. K. MINISTERIUM FÜR CULTUS UND UNTERRICHT (1917): *Genehmigung des "den Thronwechsel betreffende Gedenkblattes", Akt Nr. 16162*, Gutachten von B.S.I. Johann Thuma in Adelsberg.

MARIA THERESIA (1774): "Schulordnung für die deutschen Normal- Haupt- und Trivialschulen. Patent vom 6ten Dezember 1774". In: Theresianisches Gesetzbuch (ed.): *Sammlung aller k.k. Verordnungen und Gesetze vom Jahre 1740 bis 1780., die unter der Regierung des Kaisers Josephs des II, theils noch ganz bestehen, theils zum Theile abgeändert sind, als ein Hilfs- und Ergänzungsbuch zu dem Handbuche aller unter der Regierung des Kaisers Joseph des II. für die k.k. Erbländer ergangenen Verordnungen und Gesetze in einer chronologischen Ordnung.* Wien: Joh. Georg Mößle k.k. priv. Buchhändler, 116–137.

NUK ROKOPISNA ZBIRKA (MS 1488; Jako Sket, ostalina II, III. Gradivo) (N. N.): *Hauptgrundsätze für die Verfassung Slovenischer Lesebücher (Nach dem Lehrplane für die slovenische Sprache)*. Typewritten copy. Bilingual.

N. N. [EXNER/BONITZ] (1849): *Entwurf der Organisation der Gymnasien und Realschulen in Oesterreich.* Wien: k.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.

STRITAR, Josip (1955): *Zbrano delo. Šesta knjiga. Prešeren. Kritična pisma. Pogovori 1870-1879. Zona. Polemika. Popotna pisma*. Ljubljana: DZS.

STRITAR, Josip (1956): *Zbrano delo. Sedma knjiga. Pogovori 1881-1894. Dunajska pisma. Krajši spisi. Dostavki*. Ljubljana: DZS.

Secondary sources

ALMASY, Karin (2014): *Wie aus Marburgern „Slowenen" und „Deutsche" wurden: Ein Beispiel zur beginnenden nationalen Differenzierung in Zentraleuropa zwischen 1848 und 1861*. Graz: Pavelhaus.

ALMASY, Karin (2017a): "Fallen into oblivion: On "forgotten" Slovenes from the 19th century school book production in the Slovene Collective memory". In: ĆWIEK-ROGALSKA, K. & FILIPOWICZ, M. (eds.): *Słowiańska pamięć. Slavic memory*. Kraków: Libron, 207-222.

ALMASY, Karin (2017b): "Heimat und Welt in konzentrischen Kreisen. Wissenskanon und Vorstellungswelten in slowenischen Volksschullesebüchern um 1900". In: Pfaffenthaler, M. & Göderle, W. (eds.): *Dynamiken in der Wissensproduktion. Räume, Zeiten und Akteure im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert.* Bielefeld: transcript, 123-148.

ALMASY, Karin (2018): *Kanon und nationale Konsolidierung: Übersetzungen und ideologische Steuerung in slowenischen Schullesebüchern (1848-1918)*. Wien/Köln/Weimar: Böhlau.

BOURDIEU, Pierre / BEISTER, Hella (transl.) (1998): *Praktische Vernunft: Zur Theorie des Handelns.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

CILLIA, Rudolf de; REISIGL, Martin & WODAK, Ruth (1999): "The discursive construction of national identities", *Discourse & Society* 10 (2), 149–173.

CVIRN, Janez (2016): *Das „Festungsdreieck": Zur politischen Orientierung der Deutschen in der Untersteiermark (1861-1914)*. Wien: LIT.

ENGELBRECHT, Helmut (1986): *Geschichte des österreichischen Bildungswesens: Erziehung und Unterricht auf dem Boden Österreichs. Von 1848 bis zum Ende der Monarchie.* Wien: Österreichischer Bundesverlag.

FEICHTINGER, Johannes; PRUTSCH, Ursula & CSÁKY, Moritz (eds.) (2003): *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Innsbruck: Studien-Verl.

FISHMAN, Joshua (1967): "Bilingualism with and without Diglossia; Diglossia with and without Bilingualism", *Journal of Social Issues* XXXIII (2), 29–38.

GIPPER, Andreas & DIZDAR, Dilek (2015): "Einleitung: Übersetzung als Konstruktionselement nationaler Identität". In: DIZDAR, D.; GIPPER, A. & SCHREIBER, M. (eds.): *Nationenbildung und Übersetzung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 7–16.

HEPPNER, Harald (ed.) (2002): *Slowenen und Deutsche im gemeinsamen Raum: Neue Forschungen zu einem komplexen Thema*. München: R. Oldenburg.

HLADNIK, Miran (2002): "Der Einfluss des Bilinguismus auf die Auswahl der zu übersetzenden narrativen Gattungen (Am Beispiel slowenischer Literatur)", *Kakanien revisited* 2002, 1–7.

HROCH, Miroslav (2005): *Das Europa der Nationen: die moderne Nationsbildung im Vergleich*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

JARAUSCH, Konrad & SABROW, Martin (2002): "‚Meistererzählung' – Zur Karriere eines Begriffs". In: JARAUSCH, K.H. & SABROW, M. (eds.): *Die historische Meistererzählung: Deutungslinien der deutschen Nationalgeschichte nach 1945*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 9–32.

JELAVICH, Charles (1990): *South Slav nationalisms. Textbooks and Yugoslav Union before 1914*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

JUDSON, Pieter M. (2006): *Guardians of the Nation: Activists on the language frontiers of imperial Austria*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

JUDSON, Pieter M. (2016): *The Habsburg Empire: A new history*. London: University Press.

KARVOUNIS, Christos (2015): "Sprache, Nationenbildung und Übersetzung. Europäische Beispiele mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des griechischen Sprachraums zwischen 1774 und 1832"". In: DIZDAR, D.; GIPPER, A. & SCHREIBER, M. (eds.): *Nationenbildung und Übersetzung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 109–124.

KOSI, Jernej (2013): *Kako je nastal slovenski narod: Začetki slovenskega nacionalnega gibanja v prvi polovici devetnajstega stoletja*. Ljubljana: Sophia.

KOSI, Jernej & STERGAR, Rok (2016): "Kdaj so nastali "lubi Slovenci"? O identitetah v prednacionalni dobi in njihovi domnevni vlogi pri nastanku slovenskega naroda". *Zgodovinski časopis* 70 (3-4), 458–488.

LEFEVERE, André (1992): *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London/New York: Routledge.

MORITSCH, Andreas (ed.) (1996): *Der Austroslavismus: Ein verfrühtes Konzept zur politischen Neugestaltung Mitteleuropas.* Wien: Böhlau.

OSTERHAMMEL, Jürgen (2009): *Die Verwandlung der Welt: Eine Geschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. München: Beck.

PRUNČ, Erich (2007): "Deutsch-slowenische/kroatische Übersetzung 1848-1918. Ein Werkstättenbericht", *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 53, 163–175.

PRUNČ, Erich (2008): "Zur Konstruktion von Translationskulturen". In: SCHIPPEL, L. (ed.): *Translationskultur: Ein innovatives und produktives Konzept*. Berlin: Frank & Timme, 19–42.

PRUNČ, Erich (2010): "Zur ideologischen Steuerung von Übersetzungsprozessen". In: BREITENFELLNER, H. & ŠKOFLJANEC, M. (eds.): *Avstrija_Slovenija: kulturni stiki.*

Österreich_Slowenien: kulturelle Begegnungen, Maribor, 25.-27. November. Maribor: Univerzitetna knjižnica, 85–107.

PYM, Anthony (1998): *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

PYM, Anthony (2009): "Humanizing Translation History", *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies* (42), 23–48.

RUNDLE, Christopher (2012) "Translation as an approach to history", *Translation Studies* 5 (2), 232–248.

SCHMIDT, Vlado (1966): *Zgodovina šolstva in pedagogike na Slovenskem III.: (1848-1870)*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

SERUYA, Teresa; D'HULST, Lieven; ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra & MONIZ, Maria L., (2013): "Translation anthologies and collections: An overview and some prospects". In: Seruya, T. et al. (eds.): *Translation in anthologies and collections (19th and 20th centuries)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1–16.

TOURY, Gideon (1995): *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub.

WOLF, Michaela (2012): *Die vielsprachige Seele Kakaniens: Übersetzen und Dolmetschen in der Habsburgermonarchie 1848 bis 1918*. Wien: Böhlau.

ŽIGON, Tanja; ALMASY, Karin & LOVŠIN, Andrej (2017): *Vloga in pomen prevajanja učbenikov v 19. stoletju: kulturnozgodovinski in jezikovni vidiki.* Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Folozofska fakulteta.

ZRC SAZU [Znanstvenoraziskovalni center / Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti] (ed.) (1925-2013): *Slovenska biografija*. https://www.slovenska-biografija.si/ (15.12.2019)