

**OKSANA IAKIMENKO**

St. Petersburg State University, Faculty of Philology, Department of Finno-Ugric Studies

## **Hungarian Literature in Russian: The (Un)Natural Selection**

### **Abstract**

Despite close cultural relations between the two cultures, Hungarian literature had for a long period remained an unknown territory for the Russian readers. The article explores the ways Hungarian literature was perceived in Russia and in the Soviet Union and the reasons it was underrepresented in the literary canon of world literature translated into Russian language in the late 19<sup>th</sup> – first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The author presents and analyses key publications, editors, translators, and authors that defined the image of Hungarian literature within Russian and later Soviet cultural environment and compares various approaches to Hungarian literature representation in the Russian corpus of translated literature.

**Keywords:** Hungarian literature in translation, Russian literature, Soviet literature, literary translation, target culture reception.

It has always remained an issue for literary and translation studies scholars why particular literature does or does not become part of the recipient culture when translated into a given language. In the 1980s and 1990s, research within the Manipulation School (or Descriptive Translation Studies) produced many studies exploring relations between literary systems with the help of descriptive study of literary translation and considering the systemic nature of translational phenomena. The DTS approach developed by James S. Holmes, André Lefevre,

Gideon Toury and others, is the concept I find valuable when studying translational relationship between two literatures and the way one literature is seen in another language culture, since it goes beyond the purely linguistic, prescriptive concepts and considers historical, cultural and socio-political factors as well.

In my paper, I seek to explore how Hungarian literature being one of Central Europe's most prominent and well-developed national literatures made its way to Russian (and Soviet) readers from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century until the mid-1950s, and try to find explanations for the relatively minor role it plays in the corpus of world literature translated into Russian. The article is part of a larger study and covers only the period mentioned above.

The Russian audience took a rather belated interest in Hungarian literature. "Major" European literatures (like French, German, or, to a somewhat lesser extent, English – often in secondary translation from French) have become an essential part of Russian language literary environment since the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, exerting considerable influence on Russian authors (many of whom read French and German). However, it was only in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century when Russian publishers, translators and scholars began to translate from 'strange' languages, like Scandinavian or Oriental languages, as well as from Italian and Spanish. One of the reasons literatures written in these languages were poorly represented in the corpus of literature translated into Russian before late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century, was lack of professional translators, who could work with rare Oriental or less familiar European languages. Hungarian, e.g., had not been taught properly (as part of the Linguistics curriculum) in Russian, or even at Soviet universities until 1946 (!), and almost all translations from Hungarian published in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia were secondary translations from German or French.<sup>1</sup>

The first anthology of Hungarian poetry titled *Madyarskiye poety* (Hungarian Poets) was published in 1897. The collection was edited by Nikolai Bakhtin

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Imre Madách's *The Tragedy of Man*, that was first translated from German (1904); translations of prose were often much shorter than the original works, like *Those Who Will Die Two Times* (Akik kétszer halnak meg) published in Russian in 1881.

(1866–1940).<sup>2</sup> Son of the statesman Nikolai Ivanovich Bakhtin and grandson of the poet Ivan Bakhtin, Nikolai had initially pursued military career graduating from a cadet school in Oryol, later from Konstantinovskoye military school in St. Petersburg and served as a trainer-officer. In 1895, Bakhtin began to publish (mainly translations) but, since he was an officer, he had to use a pseudonym, thus the series of small poetry anthologies he edited and published in 1896-1905 came to be known as “Novich anthologies”. Modest as they might seem today, these anthologies first introduced Russian readers to ‘exotic’ literatures, namely to Chinese, Japanese, Swedish, Slovakian, Slovenian, Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian. Bakhtin’s collection consisted of more than 250 translations of poetry from various languages. The tiny book of Hungarian verse is, in our opinion, probably the first Russian attempt to look at Hungarian literature systemically, place it in the context of European literature and, at the same time, demonstrate its uniqueness.

Compared to few other translations from Hungarian that had made it into Russian literary magazines before 1895, this small (10x13 cm) volume included not only secondary translations from Hungarian into Russian through German or French, but also translations made by Russian poets from literal translations (Hungarian-Russian) provided by a Hungarian who knew Russian – poet, journalist, member of the Petőfi Society (Petőfi Társaság) and one of the editors of Mór Jókai’s *Ústökös* magazine – Endre Szabó (1849–1924) and had, in his turn, translated from Russian into Hungarian (one of his most famous translations is Dostoyevsky’s *Crime and Punishment*) and published a mirror-volume of Russian verse in Hungary. Szabó made literal translations of poems by Ábranyi, Reviczky, Endrédi and Tompa. Bakhtin also consulted Innokentij Boldakov, a librarian from the Imperial Public Library, who, as he mentions in the preface, was “well-read in the history of Hungarian literature”. Apart from a short but informative

---

<sup>2</sup> Not to be confused with Nikolai Mikhailovich Bakhtin (1894–1950), Russian philosopher and historian, brother of Mikhail Bakhtin.

introduction, in which the editor argues that “Lyrical poetry represents the most glamorous page of the new Hungarian literature; among the poems, especially, those by Petőfi, one finds works that can easily be viewed as best examples of the contemporary European poetry” (Нович 1897: 3–4], the book offers bios of all the poets placing them within the context of national and European literature, a comprehensive guide to Hungarian names and their transcriptions and an “explanatory glossary” to help readers with words like *betyár*, *honvéd* or *csikós* and major characters from Hungarian history like Árpád, Rákóczi or King Mátyás. Short texts about the authors of the volume’ are articulate and scholarly, with all traits of proper literary analysis. For instance, János Arany entry reads, “His significance is not in his novelty, striking ideas or inventiveness, but in the ability to depict things figuratively (especially details), and in unsurpassable shades of emotion so charmingly dear to the Hungarians” (Ibid: 117). Modern Russian readers might find the language of the 1897 translations a little obsolete, otherwise the translations are rather accurate and pragmatically coherent.

But for Novich’s anthology, Russian reading public would be familiar with only three names in Hungarian literature – Sándor Petőfi, Mór Jókai and Imre Madách. Lyudmila Shargina suggests that “the way Hungarian literature was perceived and assessed (from 1850s till 1917) was affected by how Russian autocracy viewed Hungarian Revolution of 1848-49 for many years after the Revolution had been suppressed” (Шаргина 2007: 28). Publishing a translation from Hungarian could even be risky – in 1881 *Polyarnaya Zvezda* (North Star) magazine was shut down for publishing Jókai’s novel *Szabadság a hó alatt* (Freedom under Snow), although the translator had omitted references to tsarist policy in Poland and Finland and changed some names.

A telling example of how Hungarian literature was seen in Russia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century is a 1906 dialogue between Lev Tolstoy and his personal physician and secretary Dušan Makovický, who was a Slovak, and was well-read in Central European literature of the time:

December 1. Afternoon. L.N. was looking through his letters and came to see me at the library with a printed German letter he read aloud. Editors of the Budapest newspaper Magyar Szó (...) plan to publish a questionnaire *What Europe's Greatest Minds Think about Hungarian Culture*.

– I don't think anything about it, – L.N sounded perplexed, – I have no clue to what Hungarian culture is like, – he continued staring at the letter. – Whom do they have – could you remind me, please?

– You'd know Jókai, for sure.

– Tried reading him – it's all shallow, romantic. He seems to have been quite prolific and has died an old man.

– They had a good poet, Arany, he wrote ballads. Then there was Madách's *The Tragedy of Man*. It was recently published in Russian; you could have read it.

(...) – Tragedy of man – the very thought of it is non-essential, not valid. (...) If they had anything I would have known. (Маковицкий 1979: 315)<sup>3</sup>

Tolstoy was no exception. *The Tragedy of Man* Makovický is offering had, by 1906, been translated into Russian three times: twice from German – by V. Mazurkevitch (1904) and N. Kholodkovsky (1904) and from Hungarian – by Z. Krashennikova (1905), and all because Maxim Gorky had mentioned it in 1899 in his article on Olive Shreiner (Горький 1941), but somehow the text did not become popular among Russian readers. Madách's tragedy was not the only Hungarian drama that had enjoyed multiple translations in the pre-WWI Russia. The Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) prompted translation of the play *Typhoon* (1909) by Melchior (Menyhért) Lengyel.<sup>4</sup> Between 1910–1914, the play was

---

<sup>3</sup> Quotes from Russian sources were translated by the author of the article.

<sup>4</sup> Russian audience would rather know Menyhért Lengyel (1880–1974) as the author of the story used by Bartók for his ballet *The Miraculous Mandarin*, and script-writer of the film *Ninotchka* (1939).

translated at least 4 times and even staged in Russia. Starting from 1914, Hungary as part of the Austria-Hungarian Monarchy, was mainly perceived as a hostile, enemy state, and its culture was portrayed as barbaric and non-existent. See e.g. a satirical volume *Tyoplaya kompaniya* (Inglorious Bunch), where Hungarians, described alongside other enemy nations, are labelled as “second-rate Austrians”; as for Hungarian literature, “the world knows little of great Hungarian poets, playwrights, novelists etc. (...) In the building of Hungarian literature Hungarians have no bricks of their own” (О.Л.Д’ОП 1915: 61, 94).

After the WWI, the October Revolution in Russia (1917) and the Hungarian Soviet Republic (1919), the situation changed dramatically, when after the downfall of the Republic many of its participants fled to the Soviet Union in the 1920s. A significant wave of political refugees (Zhelicki in (Желицки 2012: 172) gives a figure of 65-70 thousand Hungarian emigrants in the Soviet Union in early 1920s) included not only skilled workers, craftsmen, engineers but also a large number of ‘white collar’ workers – teachers, lawyers, journalists and intellectuals. Many of those would be trained at the Higher Party School to go back to Hungary but many stayed (later to be swept by Stalin’s Big Terror in 1934–37). Hungarian emigrants published their own magazine in Hungarian *Sarló és Kalapács* (Hammer and Sickle) in 1929–1937. Approximately 30 Hungarians worked in *Glavlit* – an ideological controlling body that censored all publications coming from abroad and distributed approved books (both fiction and non-fiction literature) and magazines to libraries and research venues as well as private letters coming in and out, for those to be ‘evaluated’ and translated. Although, this lasted only till 1937, when *Glavlit* stopped hiring emigrants no matter how trustworthy they seemed, this group of Hungarian censors-experts (Pál Hajdú, Béla Illés, Sándor Barta and many others) played a vital role in selecting texts to be translated and distributed. An even greater influence on the way Hungarian literature was represented in the Soviet environment came from the Hungarian Section within the International Association of Revolutionary Writers (MORP) (active from 1930). Out of over 60 members of the Section, 90% were members of the

Communist party and experienced political activists and held prominent positions in various Soviet literary associations: Béla Illés was Secretary General of MORP, member of the editorial board at the *Literatura mirovoj revolyucii* (World Revolution Literature) magazine and deputy editor at the *Vestnik inostranoj literatury* (Bulletin of Foreign Literature) magazine; Antal Hidas was in the MORP Presidium and worked as deputy editor at the *Literatura mirovoj revolyucii* (for a more detailed account see (Россиянов 1969). Illés, Hidas, Mathejka, Zalka, Karikás, József Lengyel and others worked in various Soviet publishing houses, magazines, edited the above mentioned *Sarló és Kalapács* magazine, treating literature rather as a tool to promote political agenda, and not as a form of art. Following the principles introduced by the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), to be a writer one had to take part in class struggles and perform certain political tasks, while the texts were to be as straightforward as possible, easy to understand and free from any complex aesthetics or experiment (thus even pro-communist but ‘too avant-garde’ authors like Lajos Kassák, were shunned).

This Soviet Union-based Hungarian literary authority began to create its own version of Hungarian literature to be presented to the Russian language readers. Predominantly Moscow-based writers and poets both wrote new books themselves and projected an image of Hungarian literature in translations the way they saw fit – i.e. with no previous tradition of Hungarian literature studies in Russia, one could literally invent a convenient version of a national literature putting it into a ‘proper’ historical and political perspective, as well as add oneself into the picture.

In the 1930s, emigrant writers published their own works in various magazines and as separate books. Their texts were either written in Russian (since many Hungarian emigrants had by then obtained various levels of language proficiency), or translated into Russian from German, as some authors could write in German or translate into German themselves, like Béla Balázs or Sándor Barta; less frequently texts would be translated directly from Hungarian by Russian

translators (e.g. Zinaida Kraseninnikova who began to work with Hungarian before 1917 – she was the one Gorky asked to translate Madách in 1903).

At the same time, to prove that all national literatures were evolving along the same lines towards social realism and communist values, there was still a need to present Hungarian literature in the light of the new theory. To enable the citizens of the new Soviet state, to “enrich their minds with knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind” (according to Lenin, this was the only possible way to become a true communist – see (ЛЕНИН 1981 (1920): 305) several publishing projects were launched both in Moscow and in Petrograd (Leningrad after 1924). The first series of this kind *Vsemirnaya Literatura* (World Literature) was started by Maxim Gorky in 1918 and aimed to publish best works of literature in translation giving “readers a chance to learn in detail, how literary schools emerged (...), how various nations’ literatures influenced each other, and to follow evolution of literature in the course of history” (Горький 1919). In the beginning, the series was more academic, mainly featuring translations of ancient and 15<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> century classics but, after merging with *Lengiz* publishers in 1924, its broader range included contemporary authors as well. It was here that the first Soviet anthology of Hungarian verse was published in 1925. The volume titled *Vengerskaya revolyucionnaya poeziya* (Hungarian Revolutionary Poetry) was edited by János Mathejka and translated by Sergei Zayaitsky (who used rough literal translations provided by Mathejka). The book is an interesting attempt to both fill a gap and present best examples of Hungarian poetry the way it could be seen by someone who grew up within the language and its culture, and would combine undeniably good texts with those in line with the Party ideology. Unlike their predecessors in the World Literature series, creators of this volume lacked solid philological background and were not experts of literature theory, replacing it with politics and ideology. The introduction is written in broken Russian (Mathejka confuses *pyesa* “drama” for *pyesnya* “song”, or mixes words like *otdel* and *razdel* – “department” and “section” etc.), undermining readers trust and



somehow diminishing validity of Hungarian poetry as part of a well-developed national literature. Mathejka does admit:

...it would be a mistake to see the episodes we are dwelling on here are the most important (...), neither are the poets we present the most significant in the history of Hungarian literature. On the contrary, some authors we name here, especially those from the group of social-democratic writers, have contributed nothing to Hungarian poetry from an artistic point of view. It is the circumstances under which they wrote (...) that give them a certain meaning. (Матейка 1925: 6–7)

Contrary to what is seen today as a Hungarian literary canon of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> century (which, of course is a debatable issue *per se*, but it is not the subject of our current study), in his description of the period literature Mathejka proclaims a talented but less poetically compelling proletarian poet Sándor Csizmadia (1871–1929) to be the best disciple of Sándor Petőfi, and portrays him as a “founder of a whole school in social-democratic party poetry” (Ibid: 7). He does admit, however, the role of Endre Ady as one of the nation’s leading voices, but calls him a “poet of those bleak, discontented, half-revolutionary elements with no class-consciousness” (Ibid: 30). As for other *Nyugat* authors (the ones we see today as Hungarian classics), namely Dezső Kosztolányi and Mihály Babits, they “get” only one poem each and are described in most scathing terms (Kosztolányi, e.g., according to Mathejka, is “one of the most dreadful and repugnant leaders of Hungarian fascism” (Ibid: 30) – no wonder he would not be translated into Russian for another four decades).

Otherwise, the volume features 11 poems by Ady and 18 by Petőfi, as well as 8 poems by Andor Gábor, 5 by Sarolta Lányi, 5 by Béla Balázs, etc. – one cannot help but notice the way Moscow-based Hungarian poets become *the* Hungarian poets. The quality of translations varies. Zayaicky confesses that he tried to “preserve alliterations and order of rhymes” but “sees his flaws”, since “nobody

before has tried to translate Hungarian poets preserving all their formal characteristics” and he had to “invent translation devices without ruining the nature of the Russian language” (Ibid: 32). To a Russian reader the volume would seem rather loosely edited: apart from striking irregularities in Mathejka’s Russian, one also notes lack of uniformity in translation of names (*Endre Ady* becomes *Андреас*, i.e. *Andreas*, while *Sándors* are all rightfully translated as *Шандоры*), and plain mistakes or omissions were overlooked by the editor. In Ady’s *Az őszi rózsák/Autumn Asters* poem e.g., in the phrase “Hogyha nem szeretnek, lakolnak / S lakolnak, hogyha már szerettek” (If they do not love, they expiate / And they expiate if they have already loved) the first negation is omitted “Объяты тоской, коль любят, / Коль любят. тоской объяты” (They grieve if they love, / If they love, they grieve). The sample of the book I worked with in the library of the Petőfi Literary Museum belonged to one of the authors, Andor Gábor, who was obviously unhappy with Russian translations of his poems and left many notes on the margins (Ibid: 145-147), suggesting a different translation for a whole stanza (147).

The reason I describe the 1925 anthology in such details is that it bears many traces that would characterize representation of Hungarian literature in the Soviet Union for the next two decades until 1945. A quick look at the bibliographic study of Hungarian Socialist Literature 1921–1945 (Botka 1972) – one of the first large scale attempts to register Russian-language *Hungaricana* – confirms the trends described earlier. The most frequently translated authors were Hungarian writers and poets that lived in the Soviet Russia: Gábor, Barta, Zalka, Mathejka, Hidas, Illés, Balázs. Even in the mid-1930s, many texts were still translated from German or French, not from Hungarian. Translators from Hungarian were scarce, some authors (Béla Illés), and there was no ‘school’ of translation from Hungarian into Russian, although such schools had already emerged in the 1930s for other language pairs (e.g. Kashkin-led group of translators) to train translators for magazines and publishing houses. Since there were no translators properly trained in Hungarian language and literature history, no one took the trouble to translate

18<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian classics, which, in turn, made it impossible to place works by contemporary Hungarian authors into the context of national culture.

Rendering names also seemed problematic: same authors had their names translated differently by different translators: Sándor *Gergely* would become *Герзей* (phonetic transcription) or *Гергель* (transliteration); József *Lengyel* had his name transliterated in the 1930s as *Ленгель* or *Ленгзель*, etc.

No major literary historians or critics wrote about Hungarian literature periods (with an exception of Lunacharsky), and Moscow-based Hungarian authors basically wrote about each other. Encyclopaedias and studies in world literature history would only mention Hungarian authors in the context of highly politicized dichotomy suggested by Soviet literary theory: they were either “progressive” (fighting for national independence in the past – like Petőfi, or for liberation of proletariat in the present) or “backward” and “reactionary” and thus unfit for Soviet audiences. 1934 *Literaturnaya enciklopediya* (Literary Encyclopaedia), e.g., labelled one of the most popular Hungarian authors of the time Ferenc Molnár as a “technically apt, witty but unprincipled herald of capitalists’ ethics” and advised against translating him into Russian (ЛЭ 1934: 445).

To sum up, with relations between the USSR and Horthy’s Hungary remaining complex during the interwar period (after revolutions and the Treaty of Versailles diplomatic relations between the two countries were only established in 1934) and very limited pre-revolutionary expertise (and translations) available, Hungarian literature was presented in the Soviet cultural environment mainly through the lens of the politically biased Hungarian writers and poets who basically decided which authors should be promoted and how the Hungarian literary canon should look like in Russian.

Ideological rather than aesthetical merits continued to be the ground for selection after WWII as a major shift in Soviet-Hungarian relations eventually made the country the Soviet Union’s satellite and member of the Communist Bloc. However, the situation now was different, and other factors came into play. Two anthologies – a volume of Hungarian short prose and a comprehensive collection

of Hungarian poetry – were published in 1950 and 1952, consequently. The latter, being part of a large-scale project, was meant to present Hungarian poetry from its beginnings till the present time and place it into a broader literary context as part of the literature created in the country that was no longer a political enemy but a close ally. A large book (82x108x16 cm) of nearly 600 pages was meant to establish a hierarchy for a given national literature once and for all (in 1950s *Goslitizdat* – State Fiction Literature Publishers published similar anthologies of Romanian, Chinese, Georgian poetry).

The two books reflected both old and new trends in representation of Hungarian literature in the Russian language and culture. On one hand, the Hungarian emigrants who settled in the Soviet Union during the 1920–1930s, and their children trained in Soviet universities would now broaden their scope for selection and introduce a more national-canon oriented approach: the 1952 poetry anthology edited by Béla Kun's daughter Ágnes Kun (under the pseudonym of Anna Krasnova) gave a slightly more adequate and diverse picture of Hungarian poetry than the one of 1925, and translations were made by either translators, who knew Hungarian, like Leonid Martynov, or by some of the best Russian poets of the time, like Boris Pasternak or Nikolai Zabolotsky, who worked from literal translations.

On the other hand, after the WWII we witness a new generation of translators and critics emerge – native Russian speakers who had learned Hungarian either during the war, or at the Military Foreign Languages Institute of the Red Army (VIIYaKA) that trained interpreters and translators for Soviet troops stationed abroad. These translators and editors selected works to be translated, applying to Hungarian literature the same methods that the post-war Soviet political authorities applied to the cultures of other countries that were now part of the Eastern Bloc. Exercising its political and ideological power, the Soviet state started to support those Hungarian writers who adhered to the principles of communist propaganda and described the new Hungary the way it suited the Soviet Union. Certain topics were taboo, others had to be covered according to

the “general line”: e.g., if one was to write about the war, Soviet soldiers could only be depicted as liberators, and any atrocities performed by them were to be seen as a retribution for Hungary’s actions during WWII. Those who played along were rewarded: in 1952 two Hungarian writers, Tamás Aczél and Sándor Nagy, received the Stalin Prize for their literary achievements. Needless to say, these authors had very little to do with real Hungarian literature of the time (Шаргина 2007: 30, Байков 2016: 26).

The story of the group of translators, who can be said to hold a ‘monopoly’ on translating from Hungarian in the 1950s and early 1960s is told by Vladimir Baikov (Байков 2016), an information officer and an interpreter and ‘curator’ to János Kádár in 1956. Baikov acknowledges that he got the first and only idea about Hungarian literature from Ferenc Hugai, an owner of a private language school in Gyöngyös, where Baikov was stationed as an army reporter in 1945. Later, in 1947 Baikov began to teach Hungarian literature at VIIYaKA and had to do some research of his own. All lectures he prepared were to be censored and reviewed by the Institute authorities. The students “were selected from army recruits, military cadets or high-school graduates, some had been to war”. The ones, who showed interest in literary translation – Yuri Shishmonin, Stepan Shevyakov, Gennadij Leibutin, Ivan Salim and others, later formed the group that would work with Hungarian literature for the next couple of decades and promote Hungarian literature that captured “Hungarian people taking confident steps towards building socialism” (Венгерские повести 1950: 7). The first Russian language anthology of Hungarian prose published after the war in 1950 reflected this approach in full: the texts selected were of purely propaganda nature (like the short story *Tar István ünnepe /István Tar’s Day* by Pál Szabó about an old man literally worshiping Lenin, Stalin and Rákosi). In such context, even a satirical story *Méreg /Poison* by a less odious Ferenc Karinthy seem to ‘fade’ and lose its grotesque qualities.

Comparing two approaches – that of Hungarians who presented Hungarian literature in the Soviet Union during the 1920–1940s and continued to do so until

the early 1960s when many of those who were still alive after 1937 cleansings, Gulag and the war, chose to return to Hungary, and that of the newly trained Russian translators with little background in humanities and literary studies – helps us understand why by the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century this rich and versatile Central European literature was still largely unknown to the Russian readers, and often seen as inferior to the literatures of the neighbouring countries.

It was only later in the 1950s and early 1960s when a new generation of literary scholars, graduates of language, literature and history departments at universities challenged this image and tried to present a more coherent and consistent view of Hungarian literature – both past and present. Translations and articles by Oleg Rosssyanov, Alexandr Gerschkovitch, Elena Umnyakova, Lyudmila Sharygina, and later – by Yuriy Gusev, Elena Malykhina, Larisa Vasilyeva, Tatyana Voronkina and many others have changed the way Hungarian literature would be seen in the Soviet Union and later in Russia in the late 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### References

- Венгерские рассказы и повести. 1950. Москва, Издательство иностранной литературы.
- Горький М. (вст. статья) 1919. Каталог издательства „Всемирная литература”. Петроград.
- Горький М. 1941. Аллегии Оливии Шрейнер // Горький, М. Несобранные литературно-критические статьи / М. Горький, М.: Худож. литература. С. 33–37.
- Ленин В. И. 1981 (1920) Задачи союзов молодежи (Речь на 3-м Всероссийском съезде Российского Коммунистического Союза Молодежи 2 октября 1920 г.) / Ленин ПСС. М.: Издательство политической литературы. Т. 41. С. 305.
- ЛЭ 1934. Литературная энциклопедия, т. 7. М.: ОГИЗ РСФСР.
- Маковицкий Д. 1979. Яснополянские записки. М.: Наука. Т. 2.
- Матейка И. О. (ред.) 1925. Венгерская революционная поэзия. Государственное издательство, Москва, Ленинград.
- Нович Н. (ред.) 1897. Магьярские поэты. С.-Петербург.
- О. Л. Д’Ор (Оршер И. Л.). 1915. Венгрия / Теплая компания. (Те, с кем мы воюем)... Петроград.

- Россиянов О. К. 1969. Из истории венгерской секции МОРПа / Литературное наследство. Том 81: Из истории Международного объединения революционных писателей (МОРП). М.: Наука. 395–421.
- Шаргина Л. 2007. Венгерская литература в зеркале советской критики / XX век. Русская литература глазами венгров, венгерская литература глазами русских. Москва. С. 27–40.
- Вотка F. 1972. Magyar szocialista irodalom oroszul. 1921–1945. Bibliográfia / Vengerszkaja szocialiszticeszkaja literatura na ruszskom jazüke 1921–1945 gg. Bibliograficeszkij obzor. Budapest.

### **Magyarok oroszul: a NEM természetes kiválasztódás**

**Oksana Iakimenko**, Szentpétervári Állami Egyetem, Bölcsészettudományi Kar,  
Finnugor Tanszék

#### **Összefoglaló**

Az oroszra lefordított idegen nyelvű irodalomban a magyar irodalom hosszú ideig ismeretlen terület maradt az orosz olvasók számára, annak ellenére, hogy a két kultúra között elég szoros a kapcsolat. Hogyan alakult a magyar irodalom képe a forradalom előtti Oroszországban és később, a Szovjetunióban, miért ismeretlen még mindig az orosz olvasó számára Európa egyik legizgalmasabb irodalma, miért maradtak el bizonyos szerzők és könyvek az orosz fordításokból, hogyan és miért kerültek magyar könyvek az orosz könyvpiacra – ezekre a kérdésekre próbál válaszolni a cikk. Az elemzés az első próbálkozásoktól (az 1897-ben megjelent Magyar költők [Magyarszkije poeti] c. első orosz nyelvű antológiától) a második világháború utánig, illetve az 1950-es évekig tart.

**Kulcsszavak:** magyar irodalom fordításban, műfordítás, befogadó kultúra recepciója.

### **Mađarska knjiŹevnost u ruskom prevodu: NEprirodna selekcija**

**Oksana Jakimenko**, DrŹavni univerzitet u Sankt-Peterburgu, Filološki fakultet, Katedra  
za ugrofinske studije

#### **SaŹetak**

Uprkos bliskim kulturnim vezama, mađarska knjiŹevnost je dugo bila nepoznat teren za ruske čitaoce. Ovaj članak istraŹuje naćine na koje je mađarska knjiŹevnost percipirana u Rusiji i Sovjetskom Savezu i razloge zašto je bila nedovoljno promovisana u knjiŹevnom kanonu svetske knjiŹevnosti prevedene na ruski jezik u kasnom 19. veku, pa do prve polovine 20. veka. Autorka predstavlja i analizira ključne publikacije, urednike, prevodioce i pisce koji su definisali sliku mađarske knjiŹevnosti u ruskoj, a kasnije i sovjetskoj kulturnoj sredini i poredi razne pristupe mađarskoj knjiŹevnosti i zbog ćega je ruskim čitaocima još uvek nepoznata jedna od najuzbudljivijih knjiŹevnosti Evrope, kako su i zašto mađarske knjige dospevale na rusko tržište knjiga – to su pitanja na koja članak nastoji da odgovori. Analiza se zasniva na prvim pokušajima (1897. je objavljena prva antologija na ruskom jeziku pod naslovom „Mađarski pesnici”) sve do posle Drugog svetskog rata, zaključno s pedesetim godinama prošlog veka.

**Ključne reći:** mađarska knjiŹevnost u prevodu, ruska knjiŹevnost, sovjetska knjiŹevnost, knjiŹevni prevod, recepcija u ciljnoj kulturi.