

## “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” and Its Historical Addressee<sup>1</sup>

Urška Perenič

### Abstract

The central topic of this article is Josip Jurčič’s “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” (A goat trial in Višnja gora), which is among the writer’s most well-known and translated works. It was published in 1867 in the Celovec newspaper *Slovenski glasnik* and subtitled “a beautiful tale from olden times.” The article centers on the horizon of expectations and understanding of the reader, for whom the text, which with time became part of children’s literature, was intended more than 150 years ago. I will first try to illuminate the reader’s horizon of reading or frame of reference in order to ascertain the experience of the text’s historically original addressee. To do this I rely on Hans R. Jauss’s very inspiring study, “Roman de Renart,” on the analogy between animal essence and human nature. This leads to a reconstruction of “Kozlovska sodba’s” original addressee’s horizon of expectations that Jurčič addressed and which in this instance is a story in the oral folk tradition. At the same time, I show how the writer detached his work from the expectations by employing the tradition derisively and then surpassing it. “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” is neither a humoresque nor a depiction of some village life distant in time; instead, it is a caricature of contemporary life, a parody with strong political and social connotations (that are completely absent from adaptations of the original and picture book editions). My interpretation or explanation of the text answers the question of how the original addressee experienced this “beautiful tale.”

**Key words:** Slovene literature, Josip Jurčič, parody, horizon of understanding, reader, Hans R. Jauss, anthropomorphization

“Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori,” to which the author attached the subtitle “A Beautiful Tale from Olden Times” and which was published in two installments in the Celovec *Slovenski glasnik*,<sup>2</sup> edited by Anton Janežič, is probably among Josip Jurčič’s (1844–81) most well-known works, after *Deseti brat* (The tenth brother) and *Jurij Kozjak* (*George Koziak*). It has

---

<sup>1</sup> This article originated in the context of research program P6-0239, financed by the Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije (Slovenian Research Agency).

<sup>2</sup> The first part appeared on 1 August, the second on 1 October 1867.

been translated into thirteen languages,<sup>3</sup> in all cases picture book editions with an adapted—that is, abbreviated—text. This is also true of Marjan Manček's 1977<sup>4</sup> illustrated Slovene edition, aimed primarily at bringing the “beautiful tale from olden times” to young readers; it drops the subtitle, as do all similar editions.

On a long timeline from the middle of the nineteenth century to today, we observe marked changes to the horizon of expectations and the horizon of understanding of the literary text. Briefly, Jurčič's “beautiful tale from olden times” became, with time, a children's picture book. However, it is not the addressee of illustrated editions that interests us, but as regards the horizon of understanding and expectations, the reader this “beautiful tale” originally addressed—that is, the horizon of the historically first addressee, who we will also call the original (educated, elite) adult reader.<sup>5</sup>

The German scholar of Romance literatures Hans Robert Jauss addresses the question of the horizon of expectations of the reader for whom the text was originally intended in his study of temporally distant literature. In his book *Estetsko izkustvo in literarna hermenevtika* (Aesthetic experience and literary hermeneutics 1998), in a lengthy chapter on “The Literary Text in a Changing Horizon of Understanding,” Jauss is interested in what philologists and literary historians ought to do in order to access readers' experiences (1998: 414).<sup>6</sup> In doing so, he attempts to find a methodological solution, a sort of “recipe” that would help us illuminate the one-time, temporally removed, and past horizon of reading. As the founder

---

<sup>3</sup> There is a total of fifteen editions, including two in German and two in English. One German and one Belorussian are from the 1980s. The two English editions came out less than a decade apart, in 2009 and 2018, the work of two different translators.

<sup>4</sup> Before Manček's, the story was illustrated by France Kunaver in the series *Pionirska knjižnica* (1950). Mirko Rupel prepared the 1963 edition in the series *Sinji galeb*. He was the editor of Jurčič's *Zbrano delo* (Collected works, 1946–84).

<sup>5</sup> We will leave aside the question of crossover literature, to which “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” might belong according to several definitions (Milena M. Blažič has written most about this in the context of children's literature). The story does not appear to belong to the category. The reasons are the omissions of the prologue and individual passages with clear social and political connotations that therefore can no longer be present to contemporary readers, despite being key to correctly understanding the text and especially its satirical and parodic framework.

<sup>6</sup> In doing so he also points to the central dilemma of literary hermeneutics, which attempts to bridge the difference between the horizons of past and contemporary readers. It becomes clear that the literary historian or philologist, who is always first a reader (not a “super reader”) cannot be the ultimate authority in interpreting and understanding a text, but that his or her role is more supervisory (413).

and main representative of reception theory, which marked a transition from an aesthetics of production to an aesthetics of reception, Jauss is naturally critical of traditional philological interpretation,<sup>7</sup> even if it attempts to interpret and understand a text directly, basing itself on a text, or indirectly—that is, historically, with reference to sources and factual data about its original context. That is because he is convinced that literary objectivity is impossible. It has to be rejected on account of the literary historian’s inability to put aside his subjectivity. He adds that there has never been a text written to be read philologically and interpreted by philologists or read historically and interpreted by historians (1998: 413). Jauss is also negatively disposed to any sort of psychologizing, and to the view that analyzing readers’ experiences means interrogating discrete, individual reactions, in which case there would be about as many interpretations as readers (1998: 417). That is for him an equally unacceptable view.

However, if it is now clear how it might be possible to avoid incorrect conclusions about the experience of a historically first addressee, then it is simultaneously necessary to find out how to draw correct conclusions about experiences—how correctly to grasp the past transmission of two horizons: the horizon of expectations that a work affirms or even surpasses, and the audience’s horizon of expectations (1998: 418).

Jauss’s research on Medieval animal epics (*Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Tierdichtung* 1959) might contribute to resolving this dilemma, which is useful and provoking for the case of Jurčič’s “Kozlovska sodba” as well. I have in mind his very inspiring explanation of “Reineke Fuchs” (“Reynard the Fox”), to which he devotes a great deal of attention in the chapter referenced in his book on aesthetic experience. In the history of the tale’s interpretation, Jauss points to the old French version, “Roman de Renart,” of 1770, supposedly written by Pierre de Saint-Cloud. It was followed by numerous adaptations in different literary cultures (Jauss 1998: 414).<sup>8</sup> They all generally involve the escapades of a wily and deceitful red fox, which is anthropomorphized like the other animals (its main enemy is the wolf Isengrim) that it tricks. The author concludes that human characteristics in animal behavior have historically been explained in two ways. Animals could be perceived as naive, part of “the natural poetry of a basic understanding between people and animals”; their human attributes served to identify the literary genre of animal folktales. Or the anthropomorphized features of the animal characters were understood as an adaptation of epic heroes that were important in the contemporary Medieval

---

<sup>7</sup> He writes in a somewhat ironic tone about philologically exact but aesthetically blind positivism.

<sup>8</sup> Goethe’s is the most well-known German version.

epic about knights (1998: 414)—that is, as a way of parodying court love stories but also political and religious institutions.

Yet Jauss is not completely satisfied with these two ways of reading. Antithetical oppositions are important in both; what is forgotten is the simplest question of what the analogy between animal essence and human nature in “Roman de Renart” might have meant for an audience in 1176 (1998: 415). He tries to answer it by turning to the prologue to “Roman de Renart.” In it, Saint-Cloud writes two important things: that he intends to tell about something that has not been told before, and that he will offer some sort of list of works that in their time were much loved in society. They are *Troy*, *Tristan*, *fabliau*, *chanson de geste*—that is, an actual novel from Antiquity, a farce in verse, and a court novel or novel about knights. Jauss then uses Saint-Cloud’s words to explain that the author of “Roman de Renart” set the horizon of expectations—that is, the frame of reference of the original reader that he addressed, at the same time trying to detach his work, in which he derisively adopted the model of a knightly epic, from it. Therefore, the story of “Roman de Renart” must be read first as a parody of the moral structure and ethical tendencies of the knightly world and courtly love, which means that the reader recognizes human’s non-ideal, even beastly nature in the animal characters.

Although Jurčič’s text has nothing to do with the story of a wily fox and outfoxed wolf, it seems that Jauss’s approach, which reconstructs the assumptions of the society of the time of a Medieval, twelfth-century text, is doubtless applicable in searching for an answer to the question of what the contents of “Kozlovska sodba” could have meant to a reader around 1867.

“Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” continues the story from “olden times” about a famous lawsuit over a goat, about a Višnja gora pot, a famous snail, and equally famous cherry tree.<sup>9</sup> Thus, Jurčič assured the tale’s survival to this day.

The beginning of Jurčič’s “tale” can be read as a prologue. In it, he explicitly refers to a publication of his in the newspaper *Novice* several years prior, which told the story of the Višnja gora pot and thereby sparked the frightful anger of a certain man (probably from Višnja gora). Jurčič has in mind the publication of the first of four chapters of “Spomini na deda”

---

<sup>9</sup> The writer refers to the legend about the snail, which is a model of wisdom and caution, and about the pot and the cherry tree at the outset of the “tale.” The city father Žužnjaj also offers Višnja gora snail to the townsfolk as a model of caution. Then, during the deliberations, he defends Lisec the goat and his owner Drnulja.

(Memories of my grandfather),<sup>10</sup> entitled “Zakrpana Višnja gora, raztrgani Žuženberk” (Patched up Višnja gora, ripped up Žuženberk). It appeared in the newspaper *Kmetijske in rokodelske novice* in 1863. The humorous story about an ancient, leaky pot, which Jurčič heard from his maternal grandfather, is of course known from the story about Solomon and his unfaithful wife. We find it in popular books of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Rupel 1946: 298–99, Rupel 1967: 306).<sup>11</sup> Jurčič then explains how he also knows about the “famous snail” (though he will not tell about it) and “about that renowned cherry tree”—people in Višnja gora do not know whether it bears white or dark cherries because the children always eat them when they are still green. He would rather tell readers, “how clever the Višnjanjs are in judging [...] about a celebrated quarrel of olden times over a goat belonging to Luke Dogwood [Lukež Drnulja] and a vegetable garden of Andrew Strawcutter [Andraž Slamorezec] which had not been grazed” (Jurčič 2018: 1).<sup>12</sup> And he scornfully praises the “Višnja gora court’s wisdom” while thinking the opposite.<sup>13</sup>

In this way, the narrator, who conceals the author, actually allows later readers at a temporal distance to learn about the expectations of the contemporaneous reader, to whom “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” was originally addressed over 150 years ago.<sup>14</sup> If we can draw conclusions from the beginning of the “tale,” then we have a reader or a public that knew the tale from olden, bygone times of the Slovene people and who, possessing the pre-text and having a significant ironic distance from it, would be able to recognize in the goat’s trial a parody of contemporary reality.<sup>15</sup> In other

---

<sup>10</sup> The remaining chapter titles of the work, which the young writer published under the pseudonym J. Zavojšček, are: “Pozimski večeri na slovenski preji” (Winter evenings at a Slovene bee), “Jama, po kateri se pride na oni svet” (The pit that leads to the other world), and “Kaj se v Križmanovem prerokovanju poveduje o kralju Matjažu” (What Križman’s prophecy says about King Matjaž).

<sup>11</sup> Among the writings that mention the famous pot, the literary historian Mirko Rupel notes Mihael Verne’s travelogue “Potovanje po nekterih jugo-slavenskih krajih” and a folktale in verse, which a certain J.C. published in the magazine *Besednik* under the title “Kamniška modrost” (Rupel 1946: 299).

<sup>12</sup> “...kako je tekla v starem času sloveča pravda zastran kozla Lisca Lukeža Drnulje in nepopasenege vrta Andraža Slamorezca! (Jurčič 1967: 151).

<sup>13</sup> The disjunction that can arise from the difference between what is said and actually though (yielding comic effects) is cited in definitions of parody and travesty, which are related genres (Kmecl 1996: 179; Juvan 1992).

<sup>14</sup> The introduction to the text can be understood as a prologue (children’s illustrated adaptations of the original contain the narrator’s references to events surrounding the pot, snail, and cherry tree, but not direct references to the writer’s prior publication in *Novice*, which draws on the oral folk tradition) that demands the reader establish an ironic distance from what is told.

<sup>15</sup> The position of the editor of Jurčič’s *Zbrano delo*, Mirko Rupel (1967: 306) that “Kozlovska sodba” is more a “casually written kind of thing full of humor

words, we have in mind that historically first addressee who would apprehend “Kozlovska sodba” as an imitation of a story from the oral folk tradition and as a story that lampoons the contents of the pre-text, thus also changing or reclothing it (Kuester 2008: 558).<sup>16</sup> Since the text of “Kozlovska sodba” came from elements of the contents of another work, the term travesty can be applied to it. When we speak of a fictionalizing strategy (whether travesty or parodying a folk tradition) we must also take into account the paratextual element of the subtitle, because it points to the (actual) bases for the tale’s origins<sup>17</sup> that are not presented seriously, but sharply, maliciously, and critically.

All of this is the basis to which the author will immediately go on to apply contemporary political and social connotations,<sup>18</sup> attaching to it the “activism” of progressive Slovene middle class circles. In Jauss’s understanding, this is exactly what enabled a *new experience* for the audience of this “tale” in the form of affirmation as well as expansion of expectations. Derisive laughter is thus evoked in reading “Kozlovska sodba” insofar as the reader-addressee is able to recognize the humorous imitation of “a beautiful tale from olden times” and the caricature of the present (but not some distant) social life.

The narrator first “inserts” the character of the Višnja gora member of the petit bourgeoisie Lukež Drnulja into this society when he makes the reader aware of the difference between “long ago,” which is Drnulja’s childhood or lifetime and “today’s time.”<sup>19</sup> Even more important for the reader is the information that Drnulja “didn’t vote for German candidates, because at that time none of them needed it” (Jurčič 1967: 151).<sup>20</sup> The narrator thus calls forth contemporary socio-political circumstances, which

---

that Jurčič exploited since he first began writing,” is too modest, as is the genre marker humoresque, which has entered popular opinion. The story is far more than a humorous, joking depiction of life in times past. For this reason, I cannot agree with what Martina Orožen has written about “Kozlovska sodba” being a humoresque, “a lively social picture of *long-ago* village life” (emphasis mine) (1981: 272).

<sup>16</sup> The Italian *travestire* means “re clothe.”

<sup>17</sup> The term *pravljica* ‘folktale’ would mean something very different from *povest* ‘tale’.

<sup>18</sup> These are missing in all adapted picture book editions and therefore the contemporary reader is unaware of them.

<sup>19</sup> From a linguistic standpoint, Martina Orožen emphasizes contrastive, causative, and resultative conjunction /*priredje*/ and subordination on the syntactic level. They are one of the most important means of producing humorous or ironic results (1981: 274).

<sup>20</sup> “...ni za nemške kandidate glasoval, ker tačas ni bilo za nobenega treba” (Jurčič 1967: 151).

differ from previous ones, and Jurčič’s anti-German (and anti-Germanophile) stance, as well as indirectly Slovene national demands.

This information is missing in the published version of the text, but the original caricature of Drnulja’s person with significant corporeal features and character traits is preserved, indicating his inadequacies:

And our Luke, an old, thin, and hook-nosed man who worked as a night watchman for as long as anyone could remember... Some say that he was very pious and patient, while others think they know better and say that Drnulja the watchman had in him some God knows evil pride that Višnja gora burghers are supposed to pass on from generation to generation.<sup>21</sup>

At least as important for the course of events is the fact that Drnulja worked as a night watchman, which suggests his limited abilities, and his position as a Višnja gora “guard” is linked to an event that took place at night and earned him the enmity of the town council member Andraž Slamorezec.<sup>22</sup> We learn that Durnulja offended Slamorezec’s male honor and morality<sup>23</sup> for no clear reason when one night he came upon a suitor who was climbing to the window of the latter’s young and beautiful wife.<sup>24</sup> Slamorezec did not believe the watchman, accused him of libel, and demanded the city fathers fire him. That did not happen and it further inflamed Slamorezec’s hate of Drnulja. In the same place, in order to highlight the Višnja gora inhabitants’ dishonorable lives, the writer cleverly cites stories of mythological and historical fateful women (Cleopatra, Dido, Helena) who could mean something only to the educated (most elite) consumers of Slovene literature. This nocturnal event, which is only an apparent retrospective digression,<sup>25</sup> has important meaning for the parody. First, it derisively extols Višnja gora’s ethics and honor (again, meaning exactly the opposite), and second, because it helps to understand the “legal”

---

<sup>21</sup> “In naš Lukež, postaren, suh in kljukonos mož, ki je od pomnjenja že za ponočnega čuvaja služil [...] Eni trdijo, da je bil tako bogaboječ in potrpljiv; drugi pa hočejo bolj vedeti in pravijo, da je imel čuvaj Drnulja nekaj tistega, bog ga vedi morda čisla vrednega ponosa na sebi, kateri se vsem višnjanskim meščanom baje od roda do roda deduje in zapušča” (Jurčič 1967: 151–52).

<sup>22</sup> This event is also omitted in adaptations.

<sup>23</sup> Slamorezec is anything but a male figure worthy of honor. He is derisively called a *človeče* 'little man' (diminutive). He is small, has short legs, and his belly hangs over his belt because he likes to eat bacon and onion (Jurčič 1967: 152).

<sup>24</sup> On how the Višnja gora people’s names indicate their positive and negative characteristics, see Orožen (1981: 273), who mostly writes about their surnames (placing them among word formation derivatives).

<sup>25</sup> As expected, this is omitted in adaptations.

action in which the town councilor and overly amicable and “patient” watchman soon find themselves.

Drnulja’s exact opposite in the “tale” is the goat Lisec, who is neither “patient” nor “amicable”: “Whenever a dog would show up at the door, Lisec frantically pulled at his rope, aimed his horns, and prepared to butt him.”<sup>26</sup> Lisec is aggressive and most of all combative. Lisec knows how to think things over (not just chew them up), until one day, “a sweet sensation of freedom comes over him as he catches sight of the vegetable garden of the much-respected burgher, Andrew Strawcutter [Andraž Slamorezec], just below him.”<sup>27</sup> When standing on a rock by the fence he looks over Slamorezec’s garden, in which there are growing “enticing” vegetables and “beautiful” clover (Jurčič 1967: 153–54). Only if we the readers are familiar with the episode with Slamorezec’s wife, which the so-called original reader also found out about beforehand, can we recognize in Lisec’s great appetite for vegetables the “re clothed” desire to satisfy lust.

If we again refer to the initially posited ironic distance and anti-German stance, which is expressed mostly by Drnulja’s character, we can add to them the derisive mockery of honor, ethics, and religiosity, and contrast them to Lisec’s combativeness in particular, which he shows by his butting and stomping (“horned attacks”), then we must see human nature in the anthropomorphized goat (he thinks, feels lust, desires freedom). Lisec in fact aggressively “stomps” on feelings, honor, and conscience—on Slovene national consciousness—and is a projection of the struggle for liberty (of the homeland).

For this reason, the “tale” cannot contain actual litigation and a legal investigation into the truth. The “complainant” Slamorezec and Lisec’s “attorney,” the defendant Drnulja, are part of the same (petit) bourgeois camp, despite their quarrel over vegetables and Slamorezec’s wife and despite their differing and unequal statuses (councilor vs. watchman). When in an attempt to investigate the truth, as the Višnja gora “wise men”<sup>28</sup> set out to do, the community is divided into two unequal groups (one for “mercy” and the other for “death”),<sup>29</sup> the reader is at a loss as (un)worthy fellows speak one after another— Žužnjaj, Gobežel,

---

<sup>26</sup> “Kadar koli se je kak pes oglasil v vežo, trgal je Lisec neusmiljeno svoj motvoz in roge nastavljal in pripravljaj se na trk” (Jurčič 1967: 152).

<sup>27</sup> “neka sladka čut prostosti... obide, ko pod seboj zagleda zeleni vrt mestnega svetovalca Andraža Slamorezeca” (Jurčič 1967: 153–54).

<sup>28</sup> The term “wise man” has droll meaning as indicated by the suffix *-arh* as in / po vzporu / *patriarh* 'patriarch' (Rupel 1967: 307).

<sup>29</sup> On the one hand, the senior judge Pavle Zaropotaj suggests Drnulja’s goat ought to get five strokes for the sin of lust and evil thoughts, which Scripture forbids, while the elder Gobežel calls upon the people of Višnja gora to model themselves on the famous snail and forgive his sins.

Zaropotaj or Jurček Griža, Bošte Krevs, Peter Štrama, Marko Črmaž, Miha Kisovar, or Jožman Kravopasec.

The judges and leading elders of the community find themselves on opposite sides and are uncertain as to how properly to resolve the dispute, thus incurring distrust. As does the piously raised goat owner Drnulja. While cornel (Lat. *Cornus mas*), found in the folk saying *zdrav ko dren* 'healthy as cornel', is supposed to be a hearty, pest resistant, and sturdy tree with numerous health benefits,<sup>30</sup> Drnulja is anything but hearty and descent (simply note how he secretly and craftily picks greens for his goat in the woods while the latter chases the Višnja gora children). In addition to his meaningful appearance, the suffix *-ulja* in his last name suggests his depravity.<sup>31</sup> Jurčič flogs all *drnulja* (cornel fruits) along with the “creature” Drnulja and provokes disdain for characterless, pious people who believe in suffering, dissembling, and caution.

The characteristic of caution might well allude to the political differentiation that occurred in the last third of the nineteenth century—that is, to the political camp of cautious older Slovenes (as opposed to the more radical Young Slovenes), or simply to caution in general, which are in contrast to the characteristics of aggressiveness, resolve, courage, and perseverance displayed in the animal character Lisec.

Yet Lisec the goat cannot resolve the quarrel he has caused. That is something only the “famous pauper and visionary of Višnja Gora” (Jurčič 2018: 10)<sup>32</sup> can do when he steps before the panel of judges and reasons thus about a sin committed and not committed:<sup>33</sup>

Since the goat did not feast on the cabbage but would have liked to, because he looked over the fence but couldn't climb over it, he should get nine lashes upon his shadow. And his master Dogwood [Lukež Drnulja] should watch the beating blindfold, since he had tied the goat up badly. And because the

---

<sup>30</sup> It is worth recalling that it is an indigenous tree that once was a symbol of Slovendom and longevity.

<sup>31</sup> The Slovene comparative linguist Matej Šekli answered my query about whether it might be possible to connect the name Lukež with the Croatian *lukav* 'dissembling' because of his character features. He traces the name Lukež to the German Lukas. Old and Middle High German [s] became [ž] or [š] in Slovene (2020: 13). He added that *lukav* is not inherited in Slovene but borrowed from a neighboring Slavic language (the nasal [o<sub>c</sub>] in Slovene is [o] and not [u], so it would be \**lokav* in Slovene. But since Jurčič took a great deal from Croatian and Russian (Breznik 1944), it is fully possible that using *licentia poetica* he linked the two words via folk etymology.

<sup>32</sup> “...sloveč berač in vedež višnjegorski Flere Krivostegno” (Jurčič 1967:159).

<sup>33</sup> A sin was committed because the goat had licentious thoughts, and not committed because in the end he did not eat the vegetables.

goat escaped from him, we will waive a stick over him for half an hour. (Jurčič 2018: 11)<sup>34</sup>

Flere is an outsider (we learn that he has traversed much of the world), and he becomes Višnja gora's teacher of wisdom, because of which the people call him the "Višnja gora Solomon." Flere (the name comes from Florjan and means "blooming, light, bright, beautiful") is actually the one who "enlightens" Višnja gora and helps restore "harmony" to its two unequal sides. In view of Jurčič's membership in the progressive middle-class circle we might expect a more radical, activist conclusion, but it ends with a smoothing over of (ideological) conflicts and unity.<sup>35</sup>

However, this does not mean rejecting free thinking. The ideological world of the progressive circle<sup>36</sup> continues to live in the personified animal character of the thoughtful goat, whose shadow the people of Višnja gora see beaten (I have in mind the topos of "the donkey's shadow" from the lawsuit in the Thracian town of Abdera, to which Francè Prešeren refers)—that is, punished in a way that has no legal outcome. The goat, with his "mentality" and behavior represents the opposite of the people of Višnja gora, who are (in stark contrast) reduced to animal status. In Jurčič's words, the Višnja gora *drhal* 'crowd' or *krdelo* 'herd' is made up of ignorant and uncultured people. Jurčič's battle with the views of the middle-class crowd, which is evident when on Peščenjak Hill, by the Višnja gora gallows they beat Lisec's shadow (and wave a rod at Drnulja), is a very clear, quite sharp, and malicious concluding "commentary" by the author.

Based on the foregoing, it is possible to answer the simplest questions: what would "Kozlovska sodba" have meant to the original addressee and how to understand the story about the litigation over the goat, the trial itself, and the anthropomorphized character of the goat. In "Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori," Jurčič relied on a story from the oral folk tradition that represents the original reader's horizon of expectations and "re clothed" it. He did this especially by means of the prologue, which

---

<sup>34</sup> "Ker se kozel ni z zeljem mastil, pa bi se rad mastil, ker je čez plot gledal, pa ni mogel čez plot, zato naj bo po svoji *senci tepen* z devetimi udarci. Njegov gospodar Drnulja pak naj bo ta tepež gledal z zavezanimi očmi, ker je kozla slabo privezal. In zato, ker mu je ušel, zato bomo pol ure s palico zamahovali nad njim" (Jurčič 1967: 159).

<sup>35</sup> We might understand this in the spirit of cooperation between liberal and conservative tendencies. Solomon, the Old Testament teacher of wisdom, is best known for his judgment concerning two women who insisted they were the mother of the same child. It is less well known that Solomon was the last monarch of a united Israeli kingdom.

<sup>36</sup> Only one year later, in 1868, Jurčič is at the free-thought, progressive newspaper *Slovenski narod*, in Maribor.

establishes an ironic distance from the narrative, and then he goes on to use political and social connotations and skillfully introduces the middle-class Slovene progressive party's ideas (i.e., an anti-German stance, ridicule of wholesomeness, religiosity, aggressiveness, and free thinking), thereby surpassing the reader's expectations and distinguishing his work from the folk tradition's narrative model. The model is imitated in an ironic and parodic way, scornfully and maliciously—in a way it had not been told before. “Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori” must therefore be read as a parody on contemporaneous social life (not as a picture of some long-ago life or a humoresque). It concludes with an at least temporary reconciliation of the two camps, yet at the same time it is very clear that the only “victor” is the personified goat, who aims his horns at the reader and butts his (and nation's) conscience. As such it is a projection of the free-thinking spirit, as well as of unfettered and uncontrollable nature. The association with the *kozlovski spevi* 'goat songs' or “satirical plays” in which Dionysius's companions were dressed in goat costumes is probably not accidental.

University of Ljubljana

### Works Cited

- Breznik, Anton. 1944. *Jezik naših časnikarjev in pripovednikov*. Ljubljana: Družba sv. Mohorja.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. 1998. *Estetsko izkustvo in literarna hermenevtika*. Trans. Tomo Virk. Ljubljana: LUD.
- Jurčič, Josip. 1946. Spomini na deda. In *Zbrano delo 1*, ed. Mirko Rupel, 49–78. Ljubljana: DZS.
- . 1967. Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori. In *Zbrano delo 4*, ed. Mirko Rupel, 149–160. Ljubljana: DZS.
- . 2018. *A Goat Trial*. Trans. Evelina Ferrar and Marcus Ferrar. Ivančna Gorica: Zavod Prijetno domače.
- Juvan, Marko. 1992. Z obrobja v središče (pojmovanje parodije na Slovenskem). *Slavistična revija* 40.4: 385–410.
- Kmecl, Matjaž. 1996. *Mala literarna teorija*. Ljubljana: Mihelač & Nešović.
- Kuester, Martin. 2008. Parodie. *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie*. Ed. Ansgar Nünning, 558. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler.
- Orožen, Martina. 1981. Jezikovne značilnosti Jurčičeve humoreske Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori. *Jezik in slovstvo* 26.7–8: 271–75.
- Rupel, Mirko. 1946. Opombe. In Josip Jurčič, *Zbrano delo 1*, 298–300. Ljubljana: DZS.
- . 1967. Opombe. In Josip Jurčič, *Zbrano delo 4*, 306–307. Ljubljana: DZS.

**POVZETEK****KOZLOVSKA SODBA V VIŠNJI GORI IN  
ZGODOVINSKO PRVI NASLOVNIK**

*Osrednji predmet razprave je Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori Josipa Jurčiča (1844–1881), ki sodi med pisateljeva najbolj poznana in prevajana dela. Objavljena je bila 1867 v literarnem časopisu Slovenski glasnik v Celovcu in podnaslovljena kot “lepa povest iz stare zgodovine”. Natančneje nas zanima horizont pričakovanja in razumevanja bralca, za katerega je bilo to besedilo, ki je skozi čas do današnjih dni postalo otroška literatura, pred več kot 150 leti izvirno zasnovano. Da bi si zagotovili dostop do izkustva, ki ga je imel zgodovinsko prvi naslovnik besedila, poskušamo najprej osvetliti njegov horizont branja oz. njegovo predrazumevanje. Pri tem se naslonimo na posebej navdihujočo razlago Roman de renart Hansa R. Jaussa, v kateri se teoretik mdr. sprašuje, kako v zgodovinski perspektivi sploh razumeti v literarnem besedilu nakazano analogijo med živalskim bistvom in človeško naravo. V nadaljevanju rekonstruiramo horizont pričakovanja izvirnega naslovnika Kozlovske sodbe, na katerega se je Jurčič navezal in ga v našem primeru predstavlja zgodba iz narodnopripovedne tradicije, zraven pa pokažemo, kako je pisatelj od tega pričakovanja svoje delo že razložil, saj je v njem to tradicijo posnemal porogljivo in jo slednjič tudi presegel. Pokažemo, da Kozlovska sodba v Višnji gori ni ne humoreska ne slika nekega davnega vaškega življenja, temveč kvečjemu karikatura sočasnega življenja, parodija z močnimi političnimi in socialnimi konotacijami (te v priredbah izvirnika in slikaniški izdaji tako rekoč v celoti umanjajo). Postrežemo s svežo interpretacijo oz. razlago besedila, ki je hkrati naš odgovor na vprašanje, kako pravilno oz. ustrezno sklepati o izkustvu zgodovinsko prvega naslovnika te “lepe povesti”.*