

Jana-Katharina Mende

Introduction: Hidden and Invisible Multilingualism in 19th-Century European Literature: Theory and Practices

1 The myth of monolingual national literature and 19th-Century Europe

Literature in 19th-century Europe is conceptually national and monolingual. Through the combined efforts of existing and developing language institutions, emerging philological disciplines, the literacy of the general population, and a strong ideological connection between emerging nation states and linguistic homogeneity, the nationalization and standardization of one language in many European states seemed complete by the end of the 19th century (cf. Mattheier 2000: 1097).

The relationship between nation and multilingualism however appears equally straightforward: given the demand for national unity and linguistic homogeneity multilingualism is most often characterized as a disturbance or cause of conflict within nation states (excepting deliberately multilingual nation states within Europe like Switzerland or Belgium). In theories of nation-building, a common language is one of the most prominent factors: Anderson quotes Johann Gottfried Herder's demand that each people has its own national education and language and characterizes this as a specifically European construct (Anderson 2006: 67–68). As Habermas puts it concisely for the conceptualization of the German nation in the 19th century: "The linguistic community had to coincide with the legal community within one nation-state." (Habermas and Pensky 2001: 9). However, below those "national print-languages" (Anderson 2006: 67) linguistic variety and multilingual activity in day-to-day life as well as in culture and literature still existed and even flourished. Thus, the perception that multilingualism is not a feature of the 19th century, but a phenomenon that only became relevant during the 20th century, is, as Gogolin pointed out for the history of education in Europe, a myth (Gogolin 2021: 298).

Jana-Katharina Mende, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, e-mail: jana-katharina.mende@germanistik.uni-halle.de

The myth of a common and national language and literature, as told from the 18th and 19th centuries onward, is designed to create unity and exclusivity within national communities. Multilingualism plays a role in creating, maintaining, and deconstructing this myth. To question the creation of this myth and the roles of multilingualism in it, the contributors had to do necessary “spade-work in the archives” (Brown 2018: 42).

The scope of the volume ranges from Belgian, Romanian, Bulgarian and Polish “national” literatures to case studies on German, Swedish, Portuguese, and Hungarian “national” authors. Theoretical contributions focus on particular social groups and genres and offer new approaches to multilingual women’s writing, travelogues, multilingual theories *avant la lettre*, and quantitative approaches to multilingual literary history.

Because of its broad scope the volume offers heuristic explorations in the field along three lines: hidden multilingualism of so-called national authors, hidden multilingualism within national literatures, as well as typological and theoretical approaches of hidden multilingualism.

2 Constructions of monolingualism in 19th- Century language and literature histories in Europe

Two mutually influential tendencies were at work at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century. The democratization of language during the French Revolution was an important factor against multilingualism. The nationalization of language and literature aimed not only at general understanding but also at linguistic and cultural homogeneity.

The nationalization of language originated in Germany with the monolingual interpretation of Herder’s diction of unity between nation and language. Together, both tendencies helped to bring forward a new paradigm of language – the monolingual paradigm: “For the monolingual paradigm, the mother tongue is the site of nativity and pure origin” (Yildiz 2012: 67).

However, the difference between the effort to democratize through the means of a common language and to nationalize through the means of one particular language should be considered as Fishman points out (cf. 1968: 44–45). As he explains “[n]ot all language differences that exist are noted, let alone ideologized” (Fishman 1968: 44).

The ideologic meaning can also be connected to multilingualism. National monolingualism might accept particular linguistic combinations in diglossic use and reject others (Fishman 1968: 45) whereas democratic monolingualism rejects multilingualism, as it must always exclude some groups.

However, the early beginnings of the monolingualization of Europe did not have an immediate impact on the general population who as of that moment did not know that they were supposed to limit themselves to one language and continued to use several languages, according to the region, different domains, or speakers in their lives. Literacy and monolingualism emerged at the same time and people went from illiterate multilingualism to literate monolingualism within a century. This led to a historically new (self-)perception as monolingual nations and individuals (Gogolin 2021: 298). The success, Gogolin argues further, of this perception was so strong that until today the 19th century appears firmly monolingual and knowledge of its construction and constructedness is lost outside of expert circles:

The extent to which this implementation process was successful can be demonstrated by the fact that the knowledge of this history *as history* has largely disappeared from memory (apart from the memory of specialists). It belongs to the lost memory, that many aspects of what counts as self-evident today constitute the reified, de-historicized version of propositions of a not too-distant past (Gogolin 2021: 300).

The hidden, lost, and ignored information about multilingualism in the history of and during the 19th century culminates in Gogolin's monolingual habitus: "This is what I called a 'monolingual habitus' [...]: the forgetting of history, or in other words, the transfer of a man-made concept into the idea that it represents the nature of the things" (Gogolin 2021: 300).¹ Uncovering hidden multilingualism, therefore, is the only strategy to counter this.

Methodological monolingualism (Leperlier 2020: 3) and the monolingual paradigm dominate 19th-century literary history writing as has been pointed out most succinctly by Casanova:

As a result of the appropriation of literatures and literary histories by political nations during the nineteenth century, although we do not always realize it, our literary unconscious is largely national. Our instruments of analysis and evaluation are national. Indeed the

¹ Gogolin's monolingual habitus is responsible for the creation of the monolingual paradigm: "For the monolingual paradigm, the mother tongue is the site of nativity and pure origin" Yildiz (2012: 67) Leperlier identifies this unconscious standard of one language as the basis of philological research methodological monolingualism Leperlier (2020: 3).

study of literature almost everywhere in the world is organized along national lines (Casanova 2004: XI).

The responsibility for this lies, according to Biti, clearly with German Romanticism and the unity of nation, language and literature propagated by Herder, Fichte, Goethe, the Schlegel brothers, and others:

As a matter of fact, German Romanticists promoted German language as the platform of unification and consolidation of the homeless, ‘humiliated and insulted’ individuals and nations at the beginning of the nineteenth century, trusting that it would become universal currency for all foreign spiritual wares and that Germans would concomitantly take over the command of the world partition of symbolic values (Biti 2013: 2).

Nevertheless, 19th-century European ideas of nationhood and national culture still referred to a multitude of nations as Hárs emphasizes in his analysis of the reception of Herder’s notion of *Kulturation* and *Nationalkultur* (cultural nation and national culture) (Hárs 2008: 12).

Recent research has provided a more nuanced understanding of the works by the aforementioned authors. August Wilhelm Schlegel, the older Schlegel brother, is the most openly multilingual among them, and his oeuvre can only be comprehended from a transcultural and European perspective (Mix/Strobel 2010: 1). Friedrich Schlegel’s translations, lectures on European literature, and works on Sanskrit language and literature oscillate between transculturalism and national appropriation. A study by Weissmann (2021) examines Goethe’s multilingual competencies. Herder’s work as a translator has been interpreted as a form of intercultural transfer (Maurer 2012), and his notion of culture has been re-examined as a form of intercultural transfer (Adler 2012). Hence, even the staunchest advocates of 19th-century monolingualism only appear so at first glance. A closer examination often reveals an at least ambivalent position concerning the diversity of languages and nations, ranging from what Herder succinctly termed “unentbehrliches Übel” [indispensable evil] to “beinahe ein wirkliches Glück” [almost a true bliss] (Herder 1985: 24).

Undoubtedly, Romantic theory also exhibits monolingual preferences. This is also represented in writings on polyglottism – celebrated in Renaissance and Baroque times – from the time of Romanticism as we can see in Schleiermacher’s reflections on translation:

Denn so wahr das auch bleibt in mancher Hinsicht, daß erst durch das Verständniß mehrerer Sprachen der Mensch in gewissem Sinne gebildet wird, und ein Weltbürger: so müssen wir doch gestehen, so wie wir die Weltbürgerschaft nicht für die ächte halten, die in wichtigen Momenten die Vaterlandsliebe unterdrückt, so ist auch in Bezug auf die Sprachen eine cloche allgemeine Liebe nicht die rechte und wahrhaft bildende, welchen

für den lebendigen und höheren Gebrauch irgend eine Sprache, gleichviel ob alte oder neue, der vaterländischen gleich stellen will. Wie Einem Lande, so auch Einer Sprache oder der andern, muß der Mensch sich entschließen anzugehören, oder er schwebt haltlos in unerfreulicher Mitte

[However true this may hold in some respects, that it is only through the understanding of several languages that man is educated in a certain sense, and becomes a citizen of the world, we must admit that, just as we do not consider world citizenship to be genuine, which in important moments suppresses the love of the fatherland, so also with regard to languages such a general love is not the right and truly educating one, which for the vivid and elevated use of any language, whether old or new, wants to put it on an equal footing with the native tongue. As to one country, so also to one language or the other, man must decide to belong, or he floats unstable in unpleasant midst] (Schleiermacher 2002 [1813]: 87).

The relation between nation and language, nation, linguistic choice and individual in Schleiermacher's reflections seem entirely clear. As nobody wants to float helplessly in unpleasant middle ground, everyone must choose one language.

This overview makes it clear that the monolingual paradigm is rooted in 18th and 19th century European thought and brought forward an ideal of monolingual national literature which in turn had a huge effect on the perception of literature and nation in colonial and postcolonial settings. But even from within Europe, the formula of one nation, one literature, and one language was by no means representative of the linguistic, literary, and social reality. Literary reality, as this volume will show, demanded several language choices from its authors but also allowed for middle ground and linguistic diversity.

3 Framing (hidden) multilingualism in 19th-century theory and now

Contemporary theories on multilingual literature frame multilingualism most often in the context of migration and globalization and link it to multiculturalism (Olsson and Englund 2013, vol. 13; Schmitz 2009; Vorderobermeier and Wolf 2008, 3; Kriegleder et al. 2014; Siller and Vlasta 2020; Schmeling and Schmitz-Emans 2002). Multilingualism, in that sense, becomes a visual signal for texts that are interpreted as simultaneously multilingual, multicultural, and transnational. Unlike linguistic research (Blommaert 2012), literary analysis of multilingual texts often implicitly favors multilingualism as a sign for a more open worldview. World literature and the study of global literary connections are linked to this view on multilingual and transnational literature, the analysis of

which is characterized by “the importance of non-translation, mistranslation, incomparability and untranslatability.” (Apter 2013: 4). In Apter’s view multilingual writers belong to this “new” world literature in a modern sense which includes power dimensions and political stances through language choices in a global postcolonial world and are directed against a monolingual (English) literature of translations.

Structurally, the phenomenon of multilingualism can refer to authors or texts. By now, the designation of translingual or exophonic writers has been established for those writing in a language different from their first language (Kellman 2020) while multilingual writers are those whose language biography includes the simultaneous learning of more than one language which is then found in their works.

The terminology used in this book relies on several decades of research on modern multilingual literature. Until today, no consistent terminology has been agreed upon, instead several ‘quasi-synonyms’ are being used to describe various types and forms of language contact in literature: Knauth lists *multilingualism*, *bilingualism*, *colingualism*, *plurilingualism*, *polyglossy*, *interlingualism* and mixed language (2004: 266). Grutman had already coined the term *heterolingualism* and added it to the list, referring to the linguistic situation of Quebecoise literature (Grutman 1997: 9). The general ‘foreignness’ of poetic language is one of the meanings of term *exophony* which simultaneously refers to writing in a language that is a writer’s first or native tongue and deconstructs Eurocentric monolingual norms (Stockhammer, Arndt, and Naguschewski 2007: 21). Exophony recalls notions of intertextuality and limitless poeticity which marks poetical language: “How can the quantity of conventions, formulas, and commonplaces that make up the language of literature be limited, even for a single era? We would never be able to reach the end – ‘es würde ins Grenzenlose gehen’ – to quote Goethe’s words again.” (Guillén 1993, 42: 260). This “flou terminologique et conceptuel” [terminological and conceptual flow] (Anokhina and Sciarrino 2018: 13) leads from Grutman’s *heterolingualism* to Kellman’s *translingualism* and the distinction of *multi-* and *plurilingualism* designating the difference between the use of several languages by a group of people vs. the linguistic versatility of an individual (Anokhina and Sciarrino 2018: 14).

Likewise, the spatial metaphor “between languages” (*Zwischen den Sprachen*, *entre les langues*, *między językami*) is often used to denote ambiguous language use and linguistic contacts in literature (Zanetti, Marchi, and Baschera 2019).

The latest in this long list of terminological attempts to grasp the complex intersections of different languages, literatures, and cultures is Gramling’s no-

tion of *supralingualism* and *ordolingualism* to refer to the global and technological use of language diversity to profit from it on a global and interconnected market (Gramling 2021: 13).

Despite the terminological flow and development, the terms belong to certain areas that overlap. Whereas some refer to social or collective forms of language contact like polylingualism, plurilingualism, supralingualism and ordolingualism, others refer to both that and textual phenomena like heterolingualism, translilingualism, and exophony. Multilingualism functions like an umbrella term to include all those different aspects.

We do not want to add to this already impressive list and have opted instead for the common denominator multilingualism, adding different definitions or classifiers when necessary.

Furthermore, as Guillén declares for comparative literature and its relation to multilingual literature, multilingual literary studies also need a historical perspective (Guillén 1993: 42–16; Lennon 2015). This has already been outlined in a pioneering volume on 19th-century multilingual literature aiming to “close the gap” (Anokhina, Dembeck, and Weissmann 2019: 2) between plurilingual Renaissance and multilingual avantgarde.

The specific linguistic, literary, and cultural constellations of 19th-century literature have to be considered when analyzing its multilingualism. While forms of written multilingualism appear similar in today’s multilingual literature and literary texts from the 19th century, functions might differ widely. The use of multilingualism and language in 19th-century literature changed significantly compared to today’s literature or even 20th century experimental actions in different languages. Now, multilingualism is strongly connected to translilingual, liminal, hybrid transfers between languages and literatures, often questioning hegemonic and (post-)colonial power structures and leading to multilingual ethics (see Kilchmann 2019: 79, Alexandrova 2020: 219). What might be a transcultural function in a text today could help to create a unique national identity in the 19th century as we can see in the cases of Bulgarian (Kris-teva and Tsibranska-Kostova), Romanian (Dondorici) and Hungarian (Gángó) literature. The English language – as sign of hegemony, global communication, or postcolonial situation today – played a much lesser role in 19th-century literature. Recognizing the cultural values and reconstructing the usage of different languages leads to the discovery of historical functions of multilingualism. Linguistic differences in historical texts demand even greater attention than today’s multilingual literature, as the historical difference goes together with other linguistic varieties making it hard for today’s readers to identify historically meaningful differences.

The question of how to investigate multilingual historical literature also raises issues of how to interpret linguistic variation. The ethical background of linguistic choices and of multilingualism in general are completely different for the 19th century – instead of writing against nation states and national literature, multilingual authors more often than not helped to create national literature and strengthen nation states and nationalism through multilingualism while simultaneously and actively contributing to knowledge transfer and literary exchange.

The central aspect of multilingualism in the 19th century is that it is perceived as an exception by today's research and that it often occurs in hidden and invisible forms. Hidden multilingualism describes the strategic efforts to make multilingual literature in the 19th century invisible to create a homogenous monolingual picture of national literature and national authors. Theoretical approaches to hidden multilingualism as well as case studies show how – despite the thick blanket of monolingual research and material, archives, and texts – researching hidden multilingualism is possible and leads to new findings on 19th-century literary history.

Hidden multilingualism shares traits with Radaelli's concept of latent multilingualism, which is used to describe forms of multilingualism within a literary text which are not apparent on the surface of the text (Radaelli 2011: 61).² However, hidden multilingualism is not only limited to those forms which, according to Radaelli, appear intratextually as loan translations, mirror translation or below the lexical level of language as morphemes or phonemes creating a "strange" foreignized word. Similarly, Dembeck and Parr define latent multilingualism as mere mentions of other languages in the text which indicate its fictive otherness (Dembeck and Parr 2017: 10).

Hidden multilingualism also entails what is called false monolingualism by Anokhina and Sciarrino (2018: 20):

Enfin, une autre de ces situations est le faux monolinguisme ou monolinguisme apparent. Celle-ci concerne les auteurs que l'on considère traditionnellement comme monolingues,

2 Radaelli defines latent multilingualism opposite to manifest multilingualism in literary texts as follows: "Latente Mehrsprachigkeit dürfte die häufigste Form von literarischer Mehrsprachigkeit überhaupt sein. Ein Text ist immer dann latent mehrsprachig, wenn andere Sprachen nur unterschwellig vorhanden und nicht unmittelbar wahrnehmbar sind; er weist also auf den ersten Blick eine einsprachige Oberfläche auf" [Latent multilingualism is probably the most common form of literary multilingualism of all. A text is always latently multilingual when other languages are only present indirectly and are not immediately perceptible; thus, at first glance, it has a monolingual surface] Radaelli (2011: 61).

mais dont le processus d'écriture a en fait mobilisé plusieurs langues. Pour ne citer qu'un exemple, le roman *I Promessi Sposi* d'Alessandro Manzoni, considéré comme le texte fondateur de la langue moderne italienne, a connu plusieurs phases de rédaction où le dialecte milanais était mélangé à du français, avant de connaître une nouvelle version normalisée selon la norme toscane

[Finally, another of these situations is false monolingualism or apparent monolingualism. This one concerns authors who are traditionally considered monolingual, but whose writing process actually involved several languages. To give just one example, the novel *I Promessi Sposi* by Alessandro Manzoni, considered the founding text of the modern Italian language, went through several phases of writing in which the Milanese dialect was mixed with French, before a new version was standardized according to the Tuscan standard].

Multilingualism appears during the production of texts and can be found in manuscripts, letters, on the margins but not in the final publication. Different, but similar aspects of this type of hidden multilingualism are receptive or passive multilingual forms which become apparent in intertextual references,³ through research on readings and translations, published and unpublished, of seemingly monolingual authors.

Yet another facet of hidden multilingualism concerns forms of multiple and hybrid multilingual authorship and the involvement of translators, correctors, and publishers in the creation and production of literary texts. This aspect refers to multilingualism of marginalized groups in literary history which were structurally underrepresented: female writers, writers writing in minority languages, or members of socially disadvantaged groups. According to Kilchmann, multilingualism itself could also be a disadvantage that led to an exclusion from the canon (Kilchmann 2019: 82). Elitist and non-elitist forms of multilingualism are thus equally investigated, resulting in new findings beyond the canon.

Whereas hiddenness describes the strategies of making multilingualism invisible, invisibility is an established concept in translation studies and research on female writing to describe the lack of attention and visibility this kind of writing has gained so far (Venuti 1995; Sanmann, La Hennard Dutheil de Rochère, and Cossy 2018). Especially Venuti's invisible translator⁴ has brought this metaphor to the forefront of discourses on language and literary transfer, multilingual authors are, however, even more in the shadow of monolingual national literature. This volume offers several examples and approaches to un-

³ Receptive and intertextual multilingualism is described as covert and translated multilingualism by Hitzke (2019, Band 6: 29), referring to Walkowitz's concept of literature that is "born translated" (2015).

⁴ On the connection and conflicts between the study of plurilingualism and translation see Lennon (2010: 55–56).

derstanding the linguistic and literary functions at play, referring both to current theoretical concepts as well as offering new ways to grasp hidden multilingualism.

4 Multilingual reflections: what to expect in this volume

Working on multilingual literatures from different European regions and languages meant that we had to include examples and quotes from more than 15 languages, and even more linguistic combinations in the form of translations, code-switching or language mixing. Making all this available to an equally heterogeneous multilingual audience from different philologies, countries and linguistic backgrounds was a challenge. This challenge was solved by going (partly) monolingual: through translations and by choosing English as the language of publication, we have created a book which contains the original quotes in different languages and multilingual combinations as well as English translations.

In our decisions regarding the language of publication we, all contributors, tried to include questions raised by Dembeck and Mein about postmonolingual scholarly writing (Dembeck and Mein 2013: 134). The tension between linguistic precision and interlingual transfer – unavoidable when writing about multilingualism (Dembeck and Mein 2013: 139) – is reflected in the many translations of original quotes, which all contributors included in their analysis. Thus, this volume makes hitherto lesser-known texts, which have mostly not been translated, at least partly accessible in English. Using English as the language of publication and not one of the other languages of the authors (German and French were also candidates as the working languages of several of the contributors) was mainly an editorial decision which allows for the distribution of the text to a wider audience. As much as we are happy to be read, we also regret the necessity to publish a volume on multilingualism not multilingually but in a hegemonic language of an academia of the Global North. Multilingualism appears however in other forms in the text. Sometimes, the need for translation has led to extensive back-and-forth translations to render different versions of a text in English. We hope for multilingual and postmonolingual readers who will accept quattrolingual tables as well as skipping those parts of the text which feel redundant for our multilingual readership.

The volume is structured in three parts: Part 1 investigates the multilingual backdrop of national literatures and literary history of Bulgarian, Belgian, Romanian, and Polish literature. Part 2 presents interpretations of works of national authors, their literary production and their reception as monolingual authors through the lenses of hidden multilingualism with examples from German, Portuguese, Swedish, and Hungarian literature. Part 3 offers typological and theoretical approaches for a systematic study of 19th-century hidden multilingualism in literature.

4.1 Part 1: National literatures and their forgotten multilingual history

The first part of the book examines the multilingual foundations of national literature in the center and periphery of Europe. Strategies of covert linguistic and literary transfers through cultural mediators, translations, relay-translation published as books, essays, articles, and journals were fundamental in creating a picture of a homogenous monolingual closed national literature. Rewriting the histories of national literatures from a multilingual angle these articles shine a light on the covered up and forgotten layers of literary history and create a heuristic typology of hidden multilingualism within national literature.

Kristeva and Tsibranska-Kostova retrace the creation of Bulgarian national literature in the time of the Bulgarian National Revival (1762–1878) through translations and relay-translations of English literature into Bulgarian. By analyzing the various multilingual actors and actions responsible for “transcreating” Benjamin Franklin’s essay *The Way to Wealth* (1758) into Bulgarian via French, the authors uncover the hidden multilingual history of the translator, Gavril Krüstevich, as well as the multilingual foundations of Bulgarian literature itself. The intensive translatory work of the time transferred texts from Greek, Russian, French, and German into Bulgarian, thus modeling it after existing literatures as well as creating new and hybrid forms for a Bulgarian audience as the detailed analysis of the relay-translation of Franklin’s essay via the French version shows. At the same time, the tensions between building the foundation of a monolingual national literature in Bulgarian and the multilingual way it is done are brought to light through the comparison of different linguistic versions of the texts.

Nation-building is also a factor in van Hooijdonk’s chapter in which the author uncovers multilingual genres and strategies to show how the field of Flemish literature emerged between French and Dutch literature. Literary and linguistic politics were negotiated in literary and cultural journals like *Le*

Spectateur Belge, ouvrage historique, littéraire, critique et moral [The Belgian Spectator, Historical, Literary, Critical, and Moral Work] edited by the Flemish abbot Leo De Foere and the *Letter- en Staatkundig Dagblad* [Literary and Political Daily] (1 February 1820–29 August 1820), published in Ghent by the brothers Pierre and Johan Hendrik Lebrocquy. These journalists, translators, and editors were cultural mediators: “Polyglots themselves, they can highlight but also strategically hide the multilingual reality of the Southern Netherlands” (van Hooijdonk in this volume, p. 73). Van Hooijdonk analyzes how literature is portrayed in those journals to demonstrate the liminal position of Flemish literature in French and Dutch in the 19th century. Discursively, the editors strive to create a unique Flemish literature while at the same time using their multilingual language skills to portray Flemish literature as a monolingual and national unity in their journals. Hidden multilingualism appears on many levels: within the work of the cultural mediators, in texts and articles in those journals, sometimes mocking mixed-language use, sometimes engaging in translatory practices. Lastly, the article investigates the medium of literary journals as a tool in building a national literature as well as a place of multilingual and translatory exchange.

Dondorici examines and evaluates the multilingual foundations of Romanian literary history in the 19th century. The Romanian literary field experienced an influence from “Western” culture at the end of the 18th and first half of the 19th centuries, the impact of Greek literature and language giving way to French. Education in different European capitals made most Romanian writers multilingual. Society was equally if not more multilingual than their authors. Most Romanian writers in the 19th century were multilingual, using different languages for correspondence and Romanian for immediate publication. Dondorici analyzes the complex multilingual societal situation and how it overlaps with literature in the 19th century. Detailing the cases of Mihail Kogălniceanu and Alecu Russo, both highly multilingual writers, she shows how they were instrumental in creating the emerging Romanian literature through translation. After analyzing the intense bilingual exchange with French literature on a linguistic, textual, and thematic level, Dondorici researches the reception of multilingualism as hidden multilingualism in Romanian literary historiography and concludes that multilingualism thus far has mainly been seen as a betrayal or deviation from an implied monolingual norm.

The chapter on French-Polish literature and the oeuvre of Zygmunt Krasiński begins with a general introduction on the position of French literature and language in Polish (Romantic) literature and then considers the specific bi- and trilingualism in the works of one of its most important representatives,

Zygmunt Krasiński. Pietrzak-Thébault questions the role of passive multilingualism and argues that reading in foreign languages was a common practice not only among Polish, but also among European writers during the Romantic period. Next to hidden passive multilingual practices, she also investigates how scholars have neglected plurilingual sources and their history. Using the example of the most well-known Romantic author, Adam Mickiewicz, she illustrates how scholars have systematically overlooked multilingual writings by the Polish author and how this has influenced the view of his works. Finally, an analysis of Zygmunt Krasiński's writings during his stay in the bilingual surroundings of Geneva (1829–1832) shows the intricate linguistic, social, and poetical developments of his multilingual writing practices. He was influenced not only by his French linguistic environment, but also by his correspondence with the British journalist Henry Reeve, which had a major impact on the development of Krasinski's French texts. His reception of Byron's works in English was the source of intertextual multilingual experiments in his works and also shows the significance of passive multilingualism. The foundations of his poetical multilingual education influenced his entire work as a poet in Polish and French. The article shows how important it is to analyze multilingual poetical works in the context of European Romanticism and how multilingual this epoch of Polish Romanticism has been.

4.2 Part 2: Multilingual re-lectures of national authors

The second part of the book investigates what hiding and forgetting an author's multilingualism implies for the (later) reception and understanding of their works. The image of the national author as a literary and cultural authority of the 19th century always refers to a monolingual writer who might know foreign languages but is not classified as a multilingual writer. Thus, literary history positions national authors as pillars of national literature whereas openly multilingual authors like Heinrich Heine or Adelbert von Chamisso are positioned at the periphery or in the 'in-between' of Schleiermacher's middle ground. Re-reading the works, investigating the creative linguistic production and analyzing the text from a multilingual perspective in this part questions assumptions about those national authors and the role of multilingualism in their own writing. Chronologically and geographically crossing 19th century Europe, this part covers articles on the Hungarian author József Eötvös (1813–1871), the works of the German realist author Theodor Fontane (1819–1898), the Portuguese author José Maria de Eça de Queiroz (1845–1900), and the Swedish poet Edith Södergran (1892–1923). Thus, the development of hidden multilingualism in the per-

ception of multilingualism of authors and the national context can be traced through time and different linguistic and literary constellations.

The case of the bilingual writer József Eötvös perfectly illustrates 19th-century hidden multilingualism as the article by Gábor Gángó argues. Gángó analyzes the language shift of the Hungarian writer who grew up in a German family speaking and writing in German. Gángó reveals not only the already known facts of Eötvös's bilingualism between German and Hungarian but equally includes a thorough analysis of his works in Hungarian which were written with the help of several correctors and even translators. This hybrid multilingual authorship is a central aspect in Eötvös's appearance as a Hungarian language author. Analyzing Eötvös's correspondence with those translators and correctors, often friends, Gángó shows that hiding his faulty Hungarian was an intentional decision meant to strengthen the national role of those works and Eötvös's own position within Hungarian national literature. Also, pseudo-translations of Eötvös's German texts are investigated for the role they play in creating a monolingual image. The research tendencies to stick to the picture of the competent Hungarian writer instead of a bilingual cultural mediator are revealed in the investigation of today's reception of Eötvös's works, thus offering a new reading and rethinking his standing within Hungarian "national" literature.

Gunkel's chapter investigates conflicts of national monolingualism and European multilingualism in the German realist author Theodor Fontane's autobiographical text *Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870* (1871). The article describes Fontane's language biography and his status as a canonical German author, which developed significantly during his lifetime and makes him an atypical example of multilingual literature. The historical context of the linguistic conflict between German and French is the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, in which the author himself was a prisoner of war. The status of French as a language of prestige and education in Europe is contrasted in the work with French as the language of the enemy. As Gunkel demonstrates linguistic ambiguity through multilingual code-switching enables the narrator to tell the story from a specific Franco-German perspective, as much playing with stereotypes as reaffirming them. Latent and hidden multilingualism often represents national characteristics in the protagonists of the text. Further, the translation of *Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870* into French by the multilingual Polish-French author and translator Téodor de Wyzewa, *Souvenirs d'un prisonnier de guerre allemand en 1870*, transformed the hidden multilingualism into real monolingualism by undoing French-German code-switching entirely. Gunkel compares the two versions and draws the conclusion that the different forms of hidden multilingualism in the

text are essential for its perspective beyond nationalism while the translation as a typical example of 19th century reception of Fontane makes the text less ambiguous and more national by deleting its multilingual elements.

A contemporary of Fontane, the Portuguese author Eça de Queiroz also stood between national realistic and naturalist writing and a polyglot European education in an upper-class living environment. Orlando Grossegeesse's article investigates the textual finesse of hiding multilingualism within a highly poetic and ambiguous short story by Eça de Queiroz. The author spent a long time in consular service in Newcastle, Bristol, and eventually as a consul-general in Paris. The national author turned privileged migrant equally reflects on liminal and poetic migratory experiences through latent multilingual elements in his Portuguese short story *Um poeta lírico* (1880). The story of a Greek poet in exile who now earns his living as a waiter allows for multiple allusions to other languages and the condition of multilingualism itself. The short narrative achieves a lot in little space as the analysis of Grossegeesse shows. Through hidden intertextual multilingualism via the language of the place of action, English, Greek, and the language of the narrative, Portuguese, several linguistic and social conflicts arise between the elitist polyglot first-person-narrator. Here, the story of a poet turned waiter after migrating can be read as a transcreative play with the liminal position of the author himself. Intertextual forms of a multilingual and cosmopolitan elite are confronted with the worries of an unprivileged migrant working class. Grossegeesse also shows how realist literature moves towards multilingual fin-de-siècle literature.

Ståhlberg's study of the avant-gardist poet Edith Södergran investigates the multilingual education and oeuvre of the Swedish author at the beginning of the 20th century and shows how monolingualism has established itself to a degree that it becomes invisible even in blatantly obvious examples. Here, unlike the other examples, multilingualism is not actively hidden by authors to appear more national or to create poetic tension but is simply overlooked by a monolingually trained discipline.

Retracing Södergran's multilingual childhood in Raivola, Karelia and at a German school in St. Petersburg leads to a detailed language biography, investigating the linguistic competences and their use for poetic creation of the poet.

A careful analysis of several poems shows how invisible traces of several languages can be found on the phonetical, morphological, lexical, and cultural level of most of her poems. Ståhlberg concludes that the specific poetic style of Södergran has its roots in her multilingual competences which fueled and enabled her creative literary expression. A multilingual re-evaluation of her works is necessary to find other parts of this hidden multilingualism. Eventually, this

article also pleads for a postmonolingual attitude to replace the monolingual habitus in research.

Through individual case studies the shifting attitudes towards multi- and monolingualism in different European regions as well as during the course of the 19th century show different types of false monolinguals and hidden multilingual authors. Eötvös represents the early attempt to transform bi- and multilingual authors into monolingual national authors as part of national reforms,

Fontane embodies the already established monolingual national author whose multilingualism takes on a utilitarian form in his literary writing which is not even classified as multilingualism. Eça de Queiroz represents another variation of this type as the migrant national authors whose migratory identity remains hidden by his national status.

Finally, the established monolingual paradigm even confuses the multilingual traces in the poetic oeuvre of Edith Södergran as avantgarde literature as Ståhlberg demonstrates in her study on Södergran's plurilingual poetic work.

4.3 Part 3: Theoretical contributions on hidden multilingualism

The third part of the volume contains theoretical frames and typologies to analyze, explore and categorize 19th-century multilingualism in literature in a systematic way.

Vlasta proposes a first typology of multilingual travelogues, a genre that links the crossings of geographical and linguistic borders. A popular genre in the 18th and 19th centuries, it held nevertheless a peripheral position within the canon, and its multilingual dimension has not yet been studied systematically. Vlasta investigates three types from more open forms to hidden multilingualism in travel writing as well as the multilingual biographies that are the result of the authors' travels. She shows and explains instances and functions of code-switching and code-mixing in Charles Dickens' *Pictures from Italy* (1846) and George Sand's *Un hiver à Majorque* (1842) [Winter in Majorca]. Intertextuality features strongly in 19th-century travel writing and also causes multilingual transfers which might or might not be visible on the surface of the text. Mary Shelley's travelogue *Rambles in Germany and Italy in 1840, 1842, and 1843* (1844) and Karl Philipp Moritz' travelogue *Reisen eines Deutschen in England im Jahre 1782* (1783) [Journeys of a German in England. A Walking Tour of England in 1782] are used as examples to illustrate the many forms and functions of intertextual multilingualism in travel writing. Latent multilingualism – referencing Radaelli's term for multilingual text elements which are only visible if one

understands the source language – plays an important role in many travelogues at the time, among them Goethe's *Italienische Reise* [Italian Journey], Johann Gottfried Seume's *Spaziergang nach Syrakus im Jahre 1802* (1803) [Walk to Syracuse in 1802], and Fanny Lewald's *Italienisches Bilderbuch* (1847) [Italian Picturebook]. Through those three types of open, semi-open, and hidden multilingualism, the article concludes with a first and tentative typology of multilingualism in historical travelogues.

Jöhnk's chapter on female writing and multilingualism gives a systematic approach to (in)visibility of gender and multilingualism in 19th-century female writing. Translingual literature from the 19th century is presented and analyzed as gendered writing, hidden because of the gender of the writer and the multilingual form. Jöhnk adapts theories on gender and multilingualism by Hélène Cixous (*1937) as well as poetical contributions by Gloria Anzaldúa and Yoko Tawada to include historical texts and multilingualism into the analysis. Referring to the works of the sociologist Joanne Nagel, Jöhnk strengthens the link between nationalism and masculinity which in turn paves the way for an intrinsic link between transnational and translingual female writing outside the nation.

The historical analysis of hidden multilingual writing of female writers presents Germaine de Staël's little-known work as a translator from German into French. The study of Staël's translation of Goethe's poem *Der Fischer* [The Fisherman] reveals a creative play with the female voices in the poem which are made more audible in the French translation. Linguistic and literary imperfection characterize Leonor de Almeida's, the 'Portuguese Stael', translations which are part of the correspondence between the author and her friend, Teresa de Mello Breyner. Through careful and detailed close-reading of those texts, Jöhnk concludes that hidden multilingualism is an important feature not only of current female writing but allowed female writers to create translingual and inclusive creative spaces in the 19th century too.

A general theoretical conceptualization of how multilingual writing in 19th century literature can be found and included in linguistic and literary historical studies form the aim of the last two contributions.

Bär's chapter on linguistic and literary criticism as a source of multilingual research gives instructions on how to systematically search for hidden or hard to find multilingual instances in large corpora of 18th and 19th centuries' German and English literature. In two parts, Bär introduces historical language theory in contemporary texts on multilingualism, problematizes variation and 'natural languages', and introduces a corpus-based method to find hidden instances of multilingual language use. He situates multilingualism within historical lan-

guage theory as part of individual historical language use (called *usage* in Bär's terminology). He investigates multilingualism as a subject in historical texts. Using Goethe's works as a case study he applies a corpus-based methodological search to investigate Goethe's use of multilingualism. Finally, he proposes a database modelled to generate data on forms and functions of (hidden) multilingual historical texts.

Mende's chapter models a mixed-method approach to historical multilingual literature. Based on a corpus of historical biographical literary dictionaries Mende proposes a systematic investigation of traces of hidden multilingualism in monolingual sources like literary histories and biographical literary dictionaries. The dictionaries from the end of the 19th century, Brümmer's *Lexikon der deutschen Dichter und Prosaisten* (1876/1877) [Dictionary of German poets and prose writers] and Pataky's *Lexikon der Frauen deutscher Feder* (1898) [Dictionary of women of the German pen] contain biographical and bibliographical details of 19th-century writers who published in German. The aim of those dictionaries was to include as many authors as possible, without differentiating between genres, influence, success or literary merits. The first part of the article investigates explicit mentions of language skills, multilingual publications and linguistic information about authors in those dictionaries. The second part shows how a semi-automatic analysis of geographical and biographical data can map places of residence of authors. This is based on the hypothesis that multilingual surroundings also lead to multilingual writing activities. The literary scene of Bratislava (Preßburg) in the 19th century serves as a case study to explore the hypothesis. The analysis exposes a large multilingual network of writers, using both regional, interregional, and transnational forms of multilingual exchange. The study recommends a mixed-methods approach, using both quantitative and traditional qualitative methods to study historical multilingual literature.

4.4 Hidden multilingualism continued or “demythologizing” 19th century monolingualism

This volume is indebted to multiple works on literary history of minority literatures, regional multilingualism, and case studies of different types of European multilingualism in 19th century literature. It gives a heuristic approach to one specific phenomenon – hidden multilingualism – which it exposes, analyzes, and makes visible on a transnational, transregional, and translingual level. However, this volume also has a hidden list of themes, examples, approaches that were not or could not be included. Hopefully, the heuristic exploration of

the phenomenon leads to further research on other covertly multilingual literary histories and the case studies and proposed approaches may prove useful for enabling and analyzing future sightings of hidden multilingualism. Thus, this volume contributes to demythologizing the myth of one unified monolingual 19th century literature.

5 References

- Adler, Hans. 2012. Übersetzen als Kulturtransfer. In Clémence Couturier-Heinrich (ed.), *Übersetzen bei Johann Gottfried Herder: Theorie und Praxis*, 45–61. Heidelberg: Synchron, Wiss.-Verl. der Autoren.
- Alexandrova, Boriana. 2020. *Joyce, Multilingualism and the Ethics of Reading*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Anderson, Benedict R. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, New York: Verso.
- Anokhina, Olga, Till Dembeck & Dirk Weissmann. 2019. Close the Gap! Literary Multilingualism Studies and the 19th Century. In Olga D. Anokhina, Till Dembeck & Dirk Weissmann (eds.), *Mapping Multilingualism in 19th Century European Literatures: Le plurilinguisme dans les littératures européennes du XIXe siècle*, 1–5. Vienna: Lit.
- Anokhina, Olga & Emilio Sciarrino. 2018. Plurilinguisme littéraire: de la théorie à la genèse. *Genesis* 46, <http://journals.openedition.org/genesis/2554>. (6 November 2019.)
- Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London, New York: Verso.
- Biti, Vladimir. 2013. The Fissured Identity of Literature: The Birth of National Literary History out of International Cultural Transfers. *Journal of Literary Theory* 7(1–2). 1–30.
- Blommaert, Jan (ed.). 2012. *Dangerous Multilingualism: Northern Perspectives on Order, Purity and Normality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, Hilary. 2018. Women Translators in History: Towards a ‘woman-interrogated’ approach. In Angela Sanmann, Martine La Hennard Dutheil de Rochère & Valérie Cossy (eds.), *Féminin/invisible: Women authors of the enlightenment: übersetzen, schreiben, vermitteln*, 27–51. Lausanne: Centre de Traduction Littéraire de Lausanne.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press.
- Dembeck, Till & Georg Mein. 2013. Postmonolingual schreiben: Zum Jargon der Philosophie. *Zeitschrift für interkulturelle Germanistik* (3). 133–147.
- Dembeck, Till & Rolf Parr. 2017. Mehrsprachige Literatur. Zur Einleitung. In Till Dembeck & Rolf Parr (eds.), *Literatur und Mehrsprachigkeit: Ein Handbuch*, 9–14. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1968. Nationality-Nationalism and Nation-Nationism. In Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson & Jyotirindra Das Gupta (eds.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, 39–51. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Gogolin, Ingrid. 2021. Multilingualism: A threat to public education or a resource in public education? – European histories and realities. *European Educational Research Journal* 20(3). 297–310.
- Gramling, David. 2021. *The Invention of Multilingualism* (Key topics in applied linguistics). Cambridge UK, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grutman, Rainier. 1997. *Des langues qui résonnent: L'hétérolinguisme au XIXe siècle québécois*. Montréal: Fides-CÉTUQ.
- Guillén, Claudio. 1993. *The Challenge of Comparative Literature* (Harvard studies in comparative literature 42). Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen & Max Pensky. 2001. *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays* (Studies in contemporary German social thought). Cambridge, Mass., London: MIT Press.
- Hárs, Endre. 2008. Herder oder die Erfindung des Nationalen. *kakanien revisited* 12(3). 1–13.
- Herder, Johann G. 1985. Über den Fleiss in mehreren gelehrten Sprachen. In Herder, Johann G., Ulrich Gaier (ed.), *Frühe Schriften: 1764 – 1772* (Bibliothek deutscher Klassiker 1), 22–29. Frankfurt am Main: Dt. Klassiker-Verl.
- Hitzke, Diana. 2019. *Nach der Einsprachigkeit: Slavisch-deutsche Texte transkulturell* (Post-colonial perspectives on Eastern Europe Band 6). Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Warszawa, Wien: Peter Lang.
- Kellman, Steven G. 2020. *Nimble Tongues: Studies in Literary Translingualism* (Comparative Cultural Studies). Ashland: Purdue University Press.
- Kilchmann, Esther. 2019. II.3. Mehrsprachige Literatur und Transnationalität. In Doerte Bischoff & Susanne Komfort-Hein (eds.), *Handbuch Literatur & Transnationalität*, 79–89. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Knauth, K. A. 2004. Multilinguale Literatur. In Monika Schmitz-Emans (ed.), *Literatur und Vielsprachigkeit* (7), 265–289. Heidelberg: Synchron Wiss.-Verl. der Autoren.
- Kriegleder, Wynfrid, Manjiri Paranjape, Franz Patocka, Andrea Seidler & Sandra Vlasta (eds.). 2014. *Mehrsprachigkeit und multikulturelle Literatur* Wien: Praesens-Verl.
- Lennon, Brian. 2010. *In Babel's Shadow: Multilingual Literatures, Monolingual States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lennon, Brian. 2015. 6. Challenges to monolingual national literatures. In Ulrike Jessner-Schmid & Claire J. Kramsch (eds.), *The Multilingual Challenge*, 143–160. De Gruyter.
- Leperlier, Tristan. 2020. La langue des champs. *CONTEXTES. Revue de sociologie de la littérature*, <https://journals.openedition.org/contextes/9297>.
- Mattheier, Klaus J. 2000. Die Herausbildung neuzeitlicher Schriftsprachen. In Werner Besch, Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann & Stefan Sonderegger (eds.), *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, 2nd edn. 1085–1107. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Maurer, Michael. 2012. Herder als Theoretiker der interkulturellen Beziehungen. In Clémence Couturier-Heinrich (ed.), *Übersetzen bei Johann Gottfried Herder: Theorie und Praxis*, 29–44. Heidelberg: Synchron, Wiss.-Verl. der Autoren.
- Mix, York-Gothart & Jochen Strobel. 2010. Der Europäer August Wilhelm Schlegel: Roman-tischer Kulturtransfer – romantische Wissenswelten. In York-Gothart Mix & Jochen Strobel (eds.), *Der Europäer August Wilhelm Schlegel: Romantischer Kulturtransfer – romantische Wissenswelten*, 1–10. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Olsson, Anders & Axel Englund (eds.). 2013. *Languages of Exile: Migration and Multilingualism in Twentieth-Century Literature*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

- Radaelli, Giulia. 2011. *Literarische Mehrsprachigkeit: Sprachwechsel bei Elias Canetti und Ingeborg Bachmann*. Berlin: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH.
- Sanmann, Angela, Martine La Hennard Dutheil de Rochère & Valérie Cossy (eds.). 2018. *Féminin/visible: Women authors of the enlightenment: übersetzen, schreiben, vermitteln*. Lausanne: Centre de Traduction Littéraire de Lausanne.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 2002 [1813]. Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens. In Martin Rößler (ed.), *Akademievorträge. Kritische Gesamtausgabe.: 1. Abt. Band 11.*, 65–93. Berlin u.a.: De Gruyter.
- Schmeling, Manfred & Monika Schmitz-Emans (eds.). 2002. *Multilinguale Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Schmitz, H. 2009. Von der nationalen zur internationalen Literatur: Transkulturelle deutschsprachige Literatur und Kultur im Zeitalter globaler Migration. Brill.
- Siller, Barbara & Sandra Vlasta. 2020. *Literarische (Mehr)Sprachreflexionen*. Wien: Edition Praesens.
- Stockhammer, Robert, Susan Arndt & Dirk Naguschewski. 2007. Einleitung: Die Unselbstverständlichkeit der Sprache. In Susan Arndt, Dirk Naguschewski & Robert Stockhammer (eds.), *Exophonie: Anders-Sprachigkeit (in) der Literatur*, 7–27. Berlin: Kulturverl. Kadmos.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Vorderobermeier, Gisella M. & Michaela Wolf (eds.). 2008. „*Meine Sprache grenzt mich ab ...*“: *Transkulturalität und kulturelle Übersetzung im Kontext von Migration*. Wien: Lit-Verl.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. 2015. *Born translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature* (Literature now). New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Weissmann, Dirk. 2021. *Les langues de Goethe: Essai sur l'imaginaire plurilingue d'un poète national*. Paris: Éditions Kimé.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Zanetti, Sandro, Pietro de Marchi & Marco Baschera (eds.). 2019. *Zwischen den Sprachen: Mehrsprachigkeit, Übersetzung, Öffnung der Sprachen / Entre les langues: plurilinguisme, traduction, ouverture des langues*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag.

