

Editor's Note: Selected Programmatic Translation Projects from the *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*

Levente T. Szabó

Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca

Corresponding author emails: tszabo.levente@ubbcluj.ro

Editor's Note: Selected Programmatic Translation Projects from the *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*

Abstract: This selection presents previously unexplored translation projects from *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*, the first international journal of comparative literature. These rediscovered experiments reveal the journal's pioneering understanding of translation as a central comparative procedure rather than a derivative act. Through multilingual and dialectal renditions—from Romanian to Romani, Japanese, and Transylvanian Saxon—the editors, Hugo von Meltzl and Sámuel Brassai, envisioned translation as creative mediation, cultural negotiation, and theoretical reflection. By foregrounding translation's interpretive, generative potential, this collection illuminates the early institutionalization of comparative literature and its foundational commitment to linguistic diversity and equality.

Keywords: *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*, comparative literature, translation projects, multilingual and dialectal translations.

Citation suggestion: Szabó, Levente T. "Editor's Note: Selected Programmatic Translation Projects from the *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*". *Transilvania*, no. 6-7 (2025): 96-109. <https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2025.6-7.08>.



Literary translation represents one of the most paradoxical phenomena in the emergence of national literary cultures in the nineteenth century, as well as in the formation of the modern world literary system. On the one hand, the number and circulation of translations grew to an unprecedented scale, with variations in their nature, type, and significance—both within individual national literatures and within the ecosystem of world literature. Yet, at the same time, translation was accompanied by an extraordinary degree of open or covert disdain and stigmatization.

Let us put this claim to the test and engage in a brief thought experiment: have we ever asked ourselves—whether as specialists of the period or as lay readers—how many distinguished translators from the nineteenth century we can name or recognize? Are we not more likely to recall figures who are primarily known as outstanding literary authors or scholars rather than as translators? Do we have on our list a translator whose exceptional achievements are acknowledged solely for their translation? Unless we are specialists in the history of nineteenth-century translation, the list of the period's most significant translators that we can compile is likely to be quite short. This is despite the fact that, in many respects, the nineteenth century was the first great modern era of translation. Large-scale translation projects were driven by the need to mediate between newly emerging national literatures and they played a fundamental role in shaping the canon of modern world literature.

The paradox, of course, is entirely understandable: without the professionalization of translation in the nineteenth century, modern national literatures would not have taken the form they ultimately did in this age of mediation, negotiation, and relationality. However, concerns over national literary character, the emphasis on linguistic and cultural purity, and fears of contamination frequently relegated translation to a secondary status. This devaluation is evident in the fact that the heroes of national literatures at the time were typically their "own" original authors, positioned in contrast to "foreign" authors of "foreign" literatures. Within this paradigm, cultural brokers and intermediaries necessarily occupied a subordinate role. As a result, translation came to be perceived as imitation, mechanical labour, or non-creative work—a mere handmaiden to masterpieces written by original authors.

In this context, it is particularly striking and profoundly thought-provoking that the founders of the first international journal of comparative literature sought to organize their project—and the conceptual framework of the emerging discipline—partly around the notion of translation. For Hugo von Meltzl and Sámuel Brassai,



translation was no less original, creative, and dependent on interpretation than any other form of literary creation. They viewed translation as both a creative literary endeavour and a scientifically grounded activity, embracing diverse translation strategies and philosophies. The journal itself welcomed a wide range of translation approaches, reflecting this open-minded stance.

The founders actively engaged in translation experiments themselves, both in poetry and prose. It is worth recalling that Meltzl had already published significant volumes of translations during his university years, while Brassai had shown a keen interest in the theoretical aspects of translation since the 1830s. This convergence of practical engagement and theoretical inclination was organically incorporated into the editorial vision and world-literary perspective of *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*. For this reason, the translations, translation experiments, and broader translation projects published in the journal deserve far more attention than they have received thus far. They not only illuminate the fundamental principles and practical evolution of the early institutionalization of comparative literature but also reveal that the founders and numerous contributors to *Acta Comparationis* regarded emerging (interpretive) translation studies as an integral component of the field of comparative literature.

In this issue, we revisit two significant, experimental, and innovative translation projects from *Acta Comparationis*. The first project was part of the journal's earliest issues: Meltzl and Brassai selected a lesser-known poem by Sándor Petőfi, the recently canonized Romantic Hungarian author—his love poem *Reszket a bokor, mert...* (*The Bush Trembles Because...*)—as the starting point for an ambitious initiative. Their goal was to have the poem translated into every language of the world. They expected that the submitted translations would not only showcase the diversity of world literature but also demonstrate the generative, interpretive nature of translation itself—the way different types and strategies of translation produce distinct interpretations. This project was remarkable, significant, and innovative within the context of early, emerging comparative literature. At the same time, it remains highly revealing and thought-provoking: the fact that this large-scale proto-comparative initiative remained incomplete yet yielded numerous translations invites reflection on the selection of languages and linguistic varieties included, the commentaries accompanying them, and what these choices reveal about the experiment's underlying conceptions of language, literature, global circulation, and interliterary relations. Moreover, these aspects shed light on how the founders of *Acta Comparationis* conceptualized translation itself.

For this issue, we have selected translations that function as *interventions into the field*, refining and clarifying key scholarly debates while challenging academic stereotypes and misconceptions. These selections bring to light previously unexplored questions, offering new insights into the historical and theoretical dimensions of translation within the broader framework of comparative literary studies.

It is symbolic that the very first translation published in *Acta Comparationis* was in Romanian. In recent decades, several scholars have rightfully questioned the absence of Romanian among the journal's primary languages. This issue, however, requires further contextualization within the language policies of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the internal complexities and non-homogeneous status of Romanian communities in both Transylvania and the broader Romanian territories, as well as the broader dynamics of Hungarian-Romanian relations at the time. What makes *Acta Comparationis* particularly distinctive is that, in multiple ways, it directly opposed the assimilationist language policies prevalent in contemporary Hungary. The journal published a substantial number of Romanian-language texts. It is particularly telling, however, that even in this earliest instance, the editors relied on Grigoriu Silași as translator—a figure to whom this issue dedicates both a significant portrait and a critical analysis clarifying numerous key questions. Silași was not only the first and most important Romanian contributor to *Acta Comparationis*, but he also maintained a close professional relationship with Meltzl, who consistently supported him—particularly when he was dismissed from his position following the first ethnic conflict at the University of Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg. In this context, the fact that the journal's comparative translation project began with a Romanian-language translation carries an additional layer of meaning and significance.

The Italian translation also offers important insights. The editors entrusted the translation of the poem into Italian to Giuseppe Cassone—someone who was a *full-time* translator and thus represented the emerging role of the modern professional translator (this special issue also includes a portrait of Cassone). Multilingual, Cassone dedicated his entire life to translation; he worked on the translation of entire literary oeuvres, often revisiting and reworking the same texts multiple times. His approach aligned with *Acta Comparationis's* broader conceptualization of translation: not merely as a derivative act but as an independent and specialized literary role—an indispensable pillar of comparative literature. At this stage, the emphasis was no longer necessarily on the "original" text itself, but rather on the translation as a meaningful entity in its own right—its process, its interpretive transformations, the cultural energies it generated, and the unique surplus value it contributed to literary and cultural mediation. In this framework, translation was not simply a means of transmission but an intellectual act of re-creation, negotiation, and recontextualization that actively shaped literary and cultural discourse.

It is particularly fascinating that the founders of *Acta Comparationis* conceived of translation as an open-ended process—one that actively provokes further alternative translations. When Hugo von Meltzl included one of his own earlier German translations in the series, he accompanied it with a commentary in which he explicitly encouraged readers and colleagues to produce additional alternative German renditions. Here, translation is not understood as a fixed, finalized, or definitive work; rather, it functions as a mirror that reflects the openness and interpretability of a literary text through various cultural positions and languages. Meltzl, however, takes this idea even further, seeing translation as a particularly powerful means of reflecting on the nature, usage, and status of national languages. As a Transylvanian Saxon, he maintained a complex relationship with the emerging ideal of a standardized German language. He used his own variant of German as an academic language and, in a striking editorial decision, regularly printed German nouns in lowercase in his journal—an unconventional stylistic choice that signalled a broader intellectual stance. Within this larger framework, his advocacy for regional linguistic diversity acquires renewed relevance. Together with Brassai, he consistently championed the literary and public legitimacy of regional linguistic varieties and dialects, not only in German but across languages.

Meltzl's perspective—deeply rooted in his own ethnic and linguistic identity—manifests itself clearly in the *Acta Comparationis* translation project, where the Petőfi text was translated into regional linguistic variants and dialects. Equally remarkable for its time is the journal's engagement with Romani translators. Two permanent Romani contributors, Boldizsár József and Tini Teréz, translated the poem into two distinct Romani varieties, each adhering to a different translation ideal. One translation employed the Romani dialect spoken around Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg, where the majority population was Hungarian, while the other used the Romani variety spoken around Bistrița/Beszterce/Bistriz, a predominantly Saxon region. This translation experiment deliberately highlighted the interpretive nature of translation by using the linguistic and ethnic diversity of a single region's Romani community to illustrate the multiplicity of possible readings. Furthermore, this effect was amplified by the contrast between a formally faithful translation in one case and a more freely adaptive rendition in the other. These editorial and methodological choices sedimented the early emancipation of translation studies whereby translation was envisioned as a creative and generative act, an essential form of literary production and mediation.

The second translation project revisited in this compilation from *Acta Comparationis* commemorates the fiftieth anniversary of Goethe's death. Symbolically, the journal's editors chose to mark this occasion by translating one of Goethe's well-known poems, *Gleich und gleich*. However, the true surprise lies in their selection of target languages: rather than choosing the so-called "world languages" or even the dominant European languages, they opted for a different approach—one that was both an experimental venture and a deliberate statement. First and foremost, this project served as an experiment in testing how a literary work they considered of world-literary stature could engage with and shape linguistic varieties that had traditionally been dismissed as inferior, secondary, or not inherently "literary." At the same time, the project challenged the assumption that cultural vitality aligns with geopolitical or sociolinguistic hierarchies. It affirmed that even linguistic varieties spoken by very few people are fully capable of producing literary masterpieces or serving as literary mediums. In doing so, *Acta Comparationis* proposed a sociolinguistic ideal of world literature that was entirely consistent with one of its most frequently reiterated principles: the ideal of linguistic equality. The journal's editors asserted that every language and culture embodies unique, irreplaceable values, and that translation does not merely transfer meaning but always adds to the "original," in effect re-creating it. It is also important to recognize that the journal's founders, in a distinctly Romantic spirit, saw poetry as the true medium of world-literary potential and value—the very essence of literature itself. This explains why the majority of the journal's translation projects and analytical studies focused overwhelmingly on poetry.

Our decision to include these two translation projects alongside *Acta Comparationis*'s lesser-known programmatic texts and articles seeking to reassess the journal serves three distinct purposes. First, we aim to make visible and tangible the rich and compelling textual canon—comprising programmatic writings and diverse comparative literary practices—that has been largely overlooked in the scholarship on the journal. Second, we seek to address a gap that, at times, contributed to a reluctance even among comparatists to engage with the journal. Its multilingual nature, coupled with its limited circulation, often made it difficult to navigate, and scholars lacked clear reference points for its evaluation. Finally, we intend to correct and refine certain stereotypes that have stigmatized the journal, while broadening and deepening the perspectives from which we view the early development of global comparative literature.

The texts are presented in their original form, preserving their exact wording. Footnotes include the original marginal or footnotes provided by the authors or editors, while our own explanatory or supplementary notes appear in square brackets. The texts were published in:

"Tremura rugulu, cà..." (trans. Grigoriu Silași), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1877: 249–250.

"Il ramoscello tremula..." (trans. Giuseppe Cassone), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1877: 250.



- "Der Strauch erzittert, denn..." (trans. Hugo Meltzl), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1877: 250–251.
"La feuille tremble..." (trans. Frédéric Amiel), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1877: 400.
"Izdral o czino ruk, ké..." (trans. Boldizsár József), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1878: 440–441.
"Lätt busken skålvfer, ty..." (trans. Victor Emanuel Öman), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1877: 421.
"Ge toghá thuphe..." (trans. Kristóf Szongott), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1881: 30–31.
"Tori nga tomare ba..." (trans. KIYO-ô-HONGMA), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1882: 1878.
"E krianga râzinelpes..." (trans. Terézia Tini), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1882: 1975–1976.
"Túng pì žeu tschy" (trans. Tcheng Ki-tong), *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 1880: 1369–1371.

**Translations of the poem *Reszket a bokor, mert...* by Sándor Petőfi
into the languages of the world**

1. Romanian

Tremura rugulu, că...

Tremura rugulu, că
Sborà 'n élu paseré.
Sufletu-mi tremura,
Câci vini in mintea mea;
In minte mi-venisi,
Copila micuté,
'N lumea èst' mare tu
Cea mai mare margé.

E plina Dunarea,
Dór' va sî esundá;
Si 'n anima-mi abíá
Incape patim'a.
Rosa, iubesci-me?
Io te iubescu de totu:
Tat'a mum'a-ti nu potu
Se te-ame mai cu focu.

Candu convenisemu, sciu
Cà sinceru me iubiái.
Erá caldu vér'a atunci,
Acum'a iérna grea-i.
De nu me mai ami, te
Binecuvente dieu;
Mii de ori inse, de
Mai sum amatulu teu.
(trad. Grigoriu Silași)

2. Italian

Il ramoscello tremula...

Il ramoscello tremula,
Che un uccellin v'è su:
Anche il mio cuore tremula,
Poiché al pensier mi sei tornata tu.
Tu al mio pensier tornata
Sei, mia fanciulla cara,
Tu gemma smisurata,
Di questo mondo assai più

grande e rara!

Pieno è 'l Danubio, sboccano
L'onde spumose già:
Pieno è 'l mio cuore, gravita
La brama ardente e calma più non ha
Parla, o fanciulla mia,
Tu m'ami? lo t'amo oh quanto!
Il padre non potria
E la tua madre anch' essa
amarti tanto!

Quando ti vidi in ultimo,
Tu mi volevi ben;
Correva allor la fervida
Està, ma 'l verno incontra ora ne vien
Or più non m'ami? e sia
Ahi, benedetta! O ancora
M'ami, o fanciulla mia?
E benedetta mille volte ogn' ora!
(transl. Giuseppe Cassone)

3. German

Von dem voranstehenden schönen Petőfischen Gedichte bereitet unsere Redaction schon seit Jahren eine Polyglotte vor. Doch ist ihr bislang nicht gelungen mehr Übersetzungen zu erhalten, als die voranstehenden u. ausserdem eine class. griechische u. eine altnordische, sowie einige Übersetzungen in verschiedenen deutschen Dialekten. Folgendes ist die deutsche Übersetzung, wie sie sich in meinem *Petőfi. Auswahl aus seiner Lyrik* (Leipzig, Kollmann 1871) S. 90 findet. (Sie erschien auch im Berliner Bazar 1875. Mai.)¹

Der Strauch erzittert, den...

Der Strauch erzittert, denn
Ein Vöglein setzt sich hin:
Mein Herz erzittert, denn
Du kamst mir in den Sinn!
Du kamst mir in den Sinn,
Du liebes Mägdelein,
Du dieser grossen Welt
Allgrösster Edelstein!

Die Donau ist so voll,
Sie überfliesset schier;
So voll ist auch mein Herz —
Voll Sehnsucht schwillt es mir.
Liebst du mich, Röslein, sprich?
Ich lieb' dich allezeit,
Wie Vater, Mutter dich
Nicht lieben allebeid'.

Ich weiss, du warst mir gut,

1. [The editorial team has been preparing a polyglot edition of the beautiful Petőfi poem presented above for several years. However, thus far, it has managed to obtain only the preceding translations, along with versions in Classical Greek, Old Norse, and several German dialects. Below is the German translation as it appears in my *Petőfi: Auswahl aus seiner Lyrik* (Leipzig: Kollmann, 1871), p. 90. (It was also published in the *Berliner Bazar* in May 1875.) – TSzL]



Als wir zuletzt uns sah'n;
Da war noch warmer Lenz,
Jetzt will der Winter nahn.
Liebst du mich nicht mehr, sei
Gesegnet, Mägdlein, ach!
Liehst du mich noch — dann sei
Gesognet tausendfach!

Der Unterzeichnete ersucht nun alle Freunde dieser Sache: dass sie andere Übersetzungen dieses Gedichts, das oben in sehr wortgetreuer Verdeutschung steht, gefälligst unserer Redaction mitteilen möchten, behufs Benützung in der seinerzeit zu publizierenden Polyglotte. Die Quellen sollen gewissenhaft angeführt werden.²

Meltz

4. French

La feuille tremble...

La feuille tremble, quand l'oiseau
Veut se peser sur elle;
Mon coeur tremble, il est le rameau
Effleuré par ton aile.
Tu m'apparais; je vois encor
Passer ta tresse blonde,
O vierge le plus pur trésor
Que je sache en ce monde!

Le Danube est gros aujourd'hui,
Sa rive en vain le presse;
Mon coeur déborde comme lui,
Tout gonflé de tendresse
M'aimes-tu? Moi, si tu me veux
Je t'aime, ô tête chère,
Plus que ne sauraient, entre eux deux,
T'adorer père et mère.

Je sais qu'en Avril, à l'adieu
Tu paraissais m'entendre;
Mais Avril n'est plus. Du ciel bleu,
Les frimas vont descendre.
Suis-je oublié? malheur! mais sois
Heureuse, ô mon amie.
Si tu m'aimes encor, — cent fois,
Mille fois sois bénie!

Clarens, le 6. October 1877. H. Fréd[éric] Amiel.

Amiel Frigyes tanár, az Institut National Genevois szépirod. osztályának elnöke: *Les Étrangères Poésies traduites de diverses littératures etc.* (Paris. Sandoz et Fischbacher 1876.) c[ímű] gyűjteményben megkísérlett a francia irodalomban eddig ismeretlen fordítói elvet meghonosítani; miért is, amint hozzánk intézett egy levelében mondja, a párisi "critiques officielles" őt megtámadták. Még Theuriet András is a *Revue des deux Mondes*-ban (1877. febr.),

2. [The undersigned hereby requests all friends of this endeavor to kindly share with our editorial team any alternative translations of this poem, which is presented above in a very literal German rendering, for potential inclusion in the polyglot edition to be published in due course. The sources should be meticulously cited. – TSzL]

ki néhány igen helyes tételt állít fel a fordítás művészetéről, nem veszi számba a kezdet roppant nagy nehézségeit.³

5. Romani

Izdral o czino ruk, ké...

Izdrál o czino ruk, ké
Puchlyász pé léaszté esiriklyi;
Izdral m'ro vogyi, ké
Avilyál andré m'ri gogyi;
André m'ri gogyi avilyál,
C'ziné cshé, ke hál sukár:
Máskár o gyémánti
Tu hál o máj kucs bar
Phérgyi hin é Duná,
Té ávri dindsél;
André m'ro vogyi inké
Budédér ná részél.
Piranész man m'ri luludy?
Ké mé piranav tut,
Tro dát, t'ri dáj mándár
Fédér ná dikhel tut.
Kana ékhétané hámász,
Dzsánav ké mán pirángyál;
Akor táto nyiláj hász,
Jévend thej sil hin; sudrílyál.
Te na piranész mán kide,
Átsh lé gulé dévlehe;
Inke té piranész mán kide,
Tiro hom zsuzsé vogyélie.

Kolozsvár, Boldizsár József⁴

6. Swedish

Lätt busken skålvfer, ty...

Lätt busken skålvfer, ty
En fogel flög der in.
Mitt hjerta skålvfer, ty
Du kom uti mitt sinn';
Du kom uti mitt sinn',
Du lilla flicka blid,
Du störsfca ädelsten
I denna verld så vid.

Full flödar Dunas ström,

3. [Professor Frigyes Amiel, president of the Literary Division of the Institut National Genevois, attempted to introduce a previously unknown translation principle into French literature in his anthology *Les Étrangères: Poésies traduites de diverses littératures*, etc. (Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher, 1876). As he noted in a letter addressed to us, this endeavor provoked criticism from the official Parisian critics (*critiques officielles*). Even André Theuriot, writing in the *Revue des deux Mondes* (February 1877), while formulating some highly commendable principles regarding the art of translation, failed to account for the immense challenges inherent in pioneering such an approach. – TSzL]

4. Herr J. Boldizsár (früher Musiker, jetzt Gastwirt) seiner Nationalität nach Rrom, ist bedeutender Autodidact und Naturdichter. — Die Transcription ist magyarisch. Red. [Mr. J. Boldizsár (formerly a musician, now an innkeeper), a Romani by nationality, is a notable autodidact and natural poet. — The transcription follows Hungarian orthography. Ed. – TSzL]



Han bryter öfver brädd;
Så ryms mitt hjertas glöd
Ej heller i sin bädd.
Har du mig kär, min ros?
Min kärlek är så stor,
Att mer dig älska ej
Din fader och din mor.

När sist vi råkades,
Jag säg du höll mig kär;
Men då var sommar varm,
Kall vinter nu det är.
Om du har glömt mig rén,
Gad signe dig, mitt allt ;
Men har du gömt mig, då
Välsignad tusenfaldt!

Örebro. V. E. Öman,

7. Armenian

Ge toghá thuphe...

Gê toghá thuphê, zi
Thêrcshun vêrán icsáv.
Gê toghá hokisz, zi
Ezkhjéz midkhész peráv,
Ezkhjéz midkhêsz peráv,
Zphokrákujn ághcshigê,
Vor jész mjédz áskhárhi
Mjedzákujn 'támánté!

Li e csêrov Dunán,
Kuche ter gê tháphi.
Szêrdisz mecs pháphákn ál
Háziv or gê megni.
Gê szirjész im dzárvárt?
Ná jév jész gê szirjém,
Avjéli zkhjéz vêcsh májrt
Szire, khán jész, hájrêt.

Jérp miádjégh eink
Szirjéchir, kidim the
Hájnsám dákh ámár er
Ájzsmig cêmer, churd e.
Iszg theor vêcsh szirjész,
Aszduadz êzkhjéz orhne,
Pájc, theor ter szirjész,
Házáránkám orhne.⁵

Szongott Kristóf

5. In dieser armenischen Übersetzung des *Der stranch erzittert, denn...* ist die Transkription magyarisch: cs = deutsch tsch; sz=ss; z = franz. in zèle; v = w; zs = franz. in jardin [In this Armenian translation of *The branch trembles, for...*, the transcription follows Hungarian conventions: cs = German tsch, sz = ss, z = French z as in zèle, v = w, zs = French j as in jardin – TSzL]

8. Japanese

*Tori nga tomare ba...*⁶

I.

DER STRAUCH ERZITTERT...

TORI nga tomare ba, koyeda nga ugoku
omaï omoëba, tobitats bakari
hiroi sekai ni, takara to you wa,
ornaï no hoka ni, ari wa sen.

II.

DIE DONAU IST SO VOLL...

Kazoïro no ai mo oyoba nu, wattassi no
koiwa, hon-ni Donau no mits mitite,
ahuru-ru made ni koissiki wo, omaë wa
sirazu ni, orukaï no.

III.

ICH WEISS, DU WARST MIR GUT . . .

Its zo ya ôta, sono toki wa, ma da
atacakaki harugessiki, ima wa
same yuku huyugare no, sore to
mo ima nu wasurenu ka tatoï
wassurete kuretatote, wasya waruku
wa omoya sen.

Yedo (Wien.) KIYO-ô-HONGMA

9. Romani dialect from Bistrița/Beszterce/Bistritz

E krianga râzinelpes...

E krianga râzinelpes,
Vasoslar tshuñaspes opre e tshirikli;
Moro vodyi inke râzinelpes,
Vasostar aviljal tu an moro g'ndos.
Tu aviljal ande moro g'ndos,
Tu drage tshayo,
Ande kodo baro vesh
Kai hin okutsh jemantose bara!

E Dunare hin p'rdyi,
Ki de prdyi kauri tshudelpes.
Ki de hin, ti moro vodyi,
Ke inke tshudelpes ari vashe but dragoshtya.
Kames man, tu tsine ruzhe?
Me kamau tut seko panda.

6. S. die deutsche übersetzung in *Petöfi. Auswahl aus seiner Lyrik* (Leipzig Kollmann. 2.A. München) p. 90. Obige übersetzung verdanken wir der frdl. vermittlung des oberst Baron Carlos von Gagern Attaché der japanischen gesandtschaft in Wien. Die übersetzung ward schon ausführlicher angezeigt durch uns in einer augustnummer von 1880 des *Ellenör*, ohne dass jedoch daselbst mehr als bloss die erste strophe des japanischen textes mitgeteilt worden wäre. Herr Kiyô-ô-Hongma, der sich um unsre ungarische litteratur grossen dank erworben hat, war so gütig sein ms auch in Katakanaschrift uns zu überlassen. Es soll gelegentlich lithographiert mittzeteilt werden. Red. [See the German translation in *Petöfi. Auswahl aus seiner Lyrik* (Leipzig: Kollmann, 2nd ed., Munich), p. 90. The above translation is owed to the kind assistance of Colonel Baron Carlos von Gagern, Attaché of the Japanese Embassy in Vienna. This translation was previously reviewed in greater detail by us in an August issue of *Ellenör* in 1880; however, only the first stanza of the Japanese text was published at that time. Mr. Kiyô-ô-Hongma, who has earned great gratitude for his contributions to Hungarian literature, graciously allowed us to access his manuscript, also in Katakana script. This will be lithographically reproduced and published at a later date. The Editors – TSzL]



Tai inke mai but
Sar t'ro dad tai sar tri day.

Me janau ke homas tu ke dragon
Dye sar janglam amen sigeder.
Ami antos ka has primavara,
Ami a kana avel o baro yevent.
Kana man budeder na kames, joi,
O gulo del inke te vazdel take,
Inke tu man te kame man
Inke milvar pokitsom te vazdel tuke o gulo del.

T[erézia] T[ini]⁷

10. Chinese

Jedermann weiss welch' grosse freude Goethe zu teil ward, als er erfuhr, dass die Chinesen szenen aus seinem Werther auf porzellantassen malten. Anregungen dieser art, so unbedeutend sie der gewöhnlichen litterarhistor. betrachtungsweise auch erscheinen mögen, haben sicherlich ihren anteil an der conception der grossartigen idee der *weltliteratur* gehabt. Von der übersetzung eines Goethe'schen produktes ins chinesische jedoch verlautete unseres wissens noch nichts. Eine solche übersetzung ist nun jüngst dem Petőfi'schen specimen unserer polyglotte zu teil geworden, dank den bemühungen des grossen Ungarnfreundes prof. SCHOTT an der universität Berlin. Der gesandtschaftsattaché oberst TSCHEN-KI-TONG hat die eigens von SCHOTT angefertigte chinesische übersetzung in umstehend mitgeteilte poetische form umgegossen. Herr prof. SCHOTT seinerseits hebt (in seinem sehreiben vom 23. vor. monats) ausdrücklich hervor, dass die "abschwächung" des originals an einzelnen stellen von TSCHEN-KI-TONG herrühre. Vielleicht bedingt die classische sprache Pekings, in welcher das gedicht abgefasst ist, einen gewissen conventionellen zwang; wir vermögen uns die diplomatische kälte nicht anders zu erklären. Den in den fussnoten enthaltenen wertvollen commentar, nebst einer deutschen⁸ interlinearversion verdanken wir gleichfalls herrn prof. SCHOTT.⁹

Túng pì žeu tschy...

Túng pì žeu tschy

Mozogni ama hajlékony ág
huang-ñào tsó-tschy
sárga-madár ülni-pihenni
jao-jao uò sin
rázkodni-reszketni enyim szív
sin hu tsái tszý
szív oh benne gyermek
hjú-tsje tszý hi!
oh-oh gyermek ah!
mèi tshìè hào hi !

7. Vgl. die metrische übersetzung Boldizsár sen. sw. 1878, 9. 440 (im Klausenburger dial.) Obiges ist prosa. [Compare the metrical translation by Boldizsár Sr., Sw. 1878, 9, 440 (in the Cluj dialect). The above is rendered in prose. – T. Sz. L.]

8. die wir einstweilen gegen eine getreue ungarische umtauschen wollen. Red. [which, for the time being, we intend to exchange for a faithful Hungarian version. Ed. – T. Sz. L.]

9. [Everyone knows the great joy Goethe experienced when he learned that the Chinese were painting scenes from his *Werther* on porcelain cups. Inspirations of this kind, however insignificant they may appear from the perspective of conventional literary-historical analysis, undoubtedly played a role in shaping the grand concept of *Weltliteratur* (world literature). As for the translation of a Goethean work into Chinese, however, to our knowledge, no such endeavor has been reported. Such a translation has now recently been achieved with a work by Petőfi, thanks to the efforts of Professor Schott, a great friend of Hungary, at the University of Berlin. Colonel Tscheng-Ki-Tong, an attaché to the Chinese embassy, has reworked the Chinese translation specially prepared by Professor Schott into the poetic form presented here. Professor Schott, for his part, emphasizes explicitly (in his letter dated the 23rd of last month) that the "dilution" of the original text in certain passages is attributable to Tscheng-Ki-Tong. Perhaps the classical language of Beijing, in which the poem is written, imposes a certain conventional constraint; we can explain the diplomatic reserve in no other way. We also owe the valuable commentary contained in the footnotes, along with an interlinear German translation, to Professor Schott. – TSzL]

szép meg jò ah!
schi sò pào hi!
 világ hol tisztelni ah:
Tá tschjang màn schùi
 Nagy folyam tele víz
tschhy liu schang-schang
 ő folyik hullámozva
sjang-szy màn tschung
 vágy betelni benső
tschhi jí jang-jang
 őt elárasztani nagyban
tszỳ tschhàng ái uò
 gyermek igazán szeretni engem
hi líu tschhu khèu
 miért szégyenleni kibocsátani száj
uò tschhang hí ni
 én mindig szeretni téged
kuó jü fá-mù
 túl tenni apa-anya
Tszỳ uò tshu tschjän
 Mióta én először látni
tsi tschy ör sin
 legott felismerni tiéd szív
fang uei nuàn tschhun
 akkor lenni vala enyhe tavasz
hu ping süe tshin
 egyszerre jég-hó meglepni
keu sjang-uàng hi!
 ha elfelejteni ha
uò pǔ tszỳ juán
 én nem gyermek (reád) haragudni
kuò sjang-ñän hi
 igazán emlékezni ah
kúò uò sò juän
 bizonyára én mit kívánok.

Die transcription der zur zeit als classisch geltenden Pekinger mundart ist deutsch; wobei man jedoch folgendes beobachten muss: Der vocal *y* (nur nach zisch- oder sauselauten) stellt ein dumpfes, in seinen consonantischen vorgänger beinahe untergehendes *i* dar. — *lod* (auch nach *s*) ist unser *j*; dem *j* der Franzosen hingegen entspricht *z* mit darübergerstelltem hacken. — *ñ* is magyarisch *ny*. — Ein *h* hinter *k*, *ts* (unserem *z*) u. hinter dem sauselenden *tsz* u. *tsch* ist blosser hauch. — *h* vor *i* und *j* ist etwas pfeifend, kommt dem nord- u. mittel deutschen *h nach* schwachen vocalen (z. b. in *ich*) am nächsten. — *ö* ist das palatale *r* der Berliner, bildet aber ein Stammwort für sich. — In den endungen *ei* und *eu* dürfen die constituirenden vocale nicht nach deutscher manier zusammenfließen sondern müssen säuberlich getrennt bleiben. — ` ist steigende, ´ aber fallende betnung.¹⁰

Universität Berlin.

[Wilhelm] SCHOTT

10. [The transcription of the Beijing dialect, currently considered classical, follows German conventions, with the following observations. The vowel *y* (used only after sibilant or hissing sounds) represents a muted *i* that almost blends into its preceding consonant. *lod* (even after *s*) corresponds to the German *j*; however, the French *j* is represented by *z* with a small hook above it. *ñ* corresponds to the Hungarian *ny*. An *h* following *k*, *ts* (our *z*), or the hissing *tsz* and *tsch* is merely an aspiration. An *h* before *i* and *j* has a slightly whistling quality, resembling the North and Central German *h* after weak vowels (e.g., in *ich*). *Ö* corresponds to the palatal *r* of Berliners but functions as a root word in its own right. In the endings *ei* and *eu*, the constituent vowels must not merge in the German manner but should be distinctly articulated. The grave accent (`) indicates rising intonation, while the acute accent (´) indicates falling intonation. Schott (University of Berlin) – TSzL]



**The translation project from Goethe's *Gleich und gleich*
*Nordtransilvanische Polyglotte zur Semisaecularfeier des Todestages Goethe's*¹¹
XXII. MÄRZ MDCCCLXXXII**

Goethe
Gleich und gleich

Ein Blumenglöckchen
Vom Boden hervor,
War früh gesproset
In lieblichem Flor.

Da kam ein Bienchen
Und nachte fein: —
Die müssen wohl beide
Für einander sein.

I. Magyar [Hungarian]
Egy pár

Nőtt egy virágszál
A mezőbe fel,
Illatlehelve
Pici kelyhivel.

Keblére suhant egy
Dönögő kis méh:
Úgy lesz, hogy egyik
A másiké.

[transl.] Farnos [Dezső]

II. Domokosi (Szolnok-Doboka megyei) népnyelv [The dialect of Domokos (Szolnok-Doboka County)]

Egy kis virágbimbó nyílt
A szíp kedves tavaszon,
Messze érzett a szíp bűze
A zöggülő határon.

Kelebibe szípen megbújt
Egy zunagó kis méh:
Úgy van talám, úgy van nyílva,
Hogy ez a pár egymásé.

III. Semeni cu semeni [Romanian]

Unu gaocelu
Din pamentu esîndu
De tempurú
Pré mandru 'nflorindu,

Vine-o albinitia
Saruturi i fura:

11. *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum* 11, no. 105 (1882): 1944–1946.

A fi pentru-olalta
Li-e datu in natura.

[Trans.] dr. Gregoriu Szilasi

IV. Transilvanisch-Sächsisch [Transylvanian Saxon translation]
(Bistritzer dialekt: Nîsnersch)¹²

Än'm blâmchi sei knêpchi
Aus'm iêrtreich kruch,
Äm fräejôr wuni ther là went
Iwer the liwâde zuch.

Thô fluch ä klî boachi
Of thet blâmchi eru;
Thä zwê — thôt es frit —
Se hu sich schu.

V. Siebenbürgisch-Armenisch [Transylvanian Armenian translation]
(Magyarische transcription)

NÊMÁN U NÊMÁN

Meg zánkágozázghig
Dzázghgun áchuorig
I kednen i ver
Ganuch er puszer.

Meghuig mê theráv
Vange khácher geráv:
Bedk jen êllálu
Jergukn iraru.

[transl. by] Novák [Antal]

VI. Ungarisch-Jüdisch-Deutsch [Hungarian–Yiddish–German]

Jedes Tipele hat sei Starzele

Ä blum hatt' e bimbô
Ûn hat gewelt fûn der erd raus gäin,
Grod wors im Choideschîr
Ûn de blüm wor eppes schäin.

Is gekhümme e bînele
Ûn hat drôn gesakt güt —
Jäch glaab dass dös is ä Z vek,
Weg'n de bînole hats geblít.

[transl. by] Serena A.

12. [The translation was probably made by Hermine Meltzl, Hugo von Meltzl's wife. – TSzL]



VII. Rom (Kolozsvári tájszólás.) [Romnia translation – Cluj/Kolozsvár/Klausenburg dialect]¹³

Ek tsinoñi luludyi
avri avilyas
anda le phu
thai kisi shukar has.

Avilyas ek berelyi
pe luludyi çutilyas —
eketane barilyas
o solo du.

[trans. by] Nagy

VIII.

TZUI NA NONO [Japanese translation]
(Goethes *Gleich and Gleich* in japanischer sprache)

Shi-ö rashiki iro ni
Utzutz wo nukashi kuru
Hatchi to hana to no
Sono naka wa
Hanare tomo nā
Suī ta doshlī.

[trans. by] JUROKUI KIYO-Ô-HONGMA

Da die japanische sprache wol nur eine der entferntesten, und zugleich ältesten schwestern des Magyarischen ist, so mag Goethe auch in Dai-Nippon's wunderschönen idiom an dieser stelle (wol zum erstenmale) erklingen.¹⁴

13. Obige sieben sprachen (bez. dialekte) schwirren auf jedem nordtransilvanischen markte tagtäglich durcheinander. (Slaven giebt es ganz Siebenbürgen bekanntlich keine.) [The aforementioned seven languages (or dialects) mingle daily on every market in northern Transylvania. (As is well known, there are no Slavs in all of Transylvania.) – TSzL]

14. [Since the Japanese language is likely only one of the most distant and, at the same time, oldest sisters of Hungarian, it is fitting that Goethe's words resonate here (perhaps for the first time) in the beautiful idiom of Dai-Nippon. – TSzL]