

## ZSIGMOND KEMÉNY'S *GYULAI PÁL*: NOVEL AS SUBVERSION OF FORM

THOMAS COOPER

Indiana University, Bloomington, IN,  
USA

This article argues that *Gyulai Pál*, the first completed novel by Zsigmond Kemény, constitutes a new genre in the Hungarian literature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A blend of different genres (drama, narrative verse, epistle, diary, etc.), *Gyulai Pál* exposes the artificiality of literary representation by assimilating discordant styles into a structured unity. It comprises a collage of literary formulae that forms a meta-narrative about the production of literary discourse itself.

The distinctiveness of this novel in the Hungarian literature of its time suggests that Kemény was influenced by works from the other literary traditions of Europe. Particularly relevant are the works of German romantics, who specifically characterized the novel as a blend of genres, a concept shaped largely by their reading of *Don Quixote*. Thus *Gyulai Pál* serves as an introduction into Hungarian literature of an approach to composition influenced by theoretical concepts from other literatures of Europe.

An investigation of Kemény's critical writings on the novel suggests an explanation for his adoption of this approach. Kemény was convinced that his was an era troubled by moral ambivalence arising out of the diminishing authority of the church, an ambivalence not unlike the moral and theological uneasiness of the Renaissance. The article suggests that Kemény found in *Don Quixote* a genre capable of coping with these uncertainties.

The distinctive features of *Gyulai Pál*, though perhaps not so prominent, are nevertheless present in Kemény's other novels. While these novels do not constitute the same sort of encyclopedic compilation of genres, they are still comprised of clashing styles that foreground the processes of literary production. The article concludes with the suggestion that Kemény's novels mark a crucial shift in the evolution of Hungarian literature away from more strictly defined (often poetical) genres to more amorphous (often prose) genres.

**Keywords:** novel, fiction, incongruity, irony, convention, translation, canon, anti-canon, genre, tradition, perspective

The novels of Hungarian author Zsigmond Kemény have remained something of an enigma in literary scholarship. While literary historians and even other novelists (Pál Gyulai, Zsigmond Móricz) have, since the time of the author's death,

*Hungarian Studies* 16/1 (2002)

0236-6568/2002/\$5.00 © 2002 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

acknowledged the importance of Kemény's contribution to Hungarian literature, this acknowledgement has been offset by a reluctance to analyze or even describe the distinctive features of his works. Faced with the task of attempting to characterize the *oeuvre* of an author who wrote long and extremely varied works, many historians of Hungarian literature have escaped into comparisons, likening Kemény's novels to the fiction of other prominent European authors, such as Walter Scott or Heinrich von Kleist.<sup>1</sup>

These comparisons, however, far from serving as tools for an analysis of Kemény's novels, in fact trivialize questions of style by inviting readers to ignore the peculiarities of Kemény's works in order to facilitate a superficial resemblance with other European novels. Thus the question of influences, rather than leading to some understanding of Kemény's fiction, becomes a means for simplification. Indeed by positing these influences historians of Hungarian literature have shirked the task of providing any serious analysis of Kemény's style and offered instead vague generalizations, valid only if one ignores the distinctive features of his works.

If Kemény's contribution to Hungarian literary culture is to be properly understood new methods must be adopted. The search for what appear to be specific influences on his fiction must be suspended in favor of a consideration of how Kemény's novels relate to what Claudio Guillén describes as the "cluster of conventions [that] determines the medium of a literary generation."<sup>2</sup> Only then does it become possible to understand the significance of the influences the author chose in order to create works distinct within that tradition. The detection of influences may then yield conclusions concerning theoretical questions shared by authors otherwise distant in time or space.

In this essay I will examine Kemény's first completed novel, *Gyulai Pál*.<sup>3</sup> I will show that this is a work that, as Walter Reed writes of Don Quixote, "adopt[s] an antagonistic stance both toward the literary canon and toward its own precursors."<sup>4</sup> Like Don Quixote, *Gyulai Pál* is a subversive blending of genres (drama, narrative verse, epistle, diary, etc.) that exposes the artificiality of literary representation. It is a collage of literary formulae that opposes contrasting conventions and undermines the prestige of traditional forms of composition.

The uniqueness (in the Hungarian literature of its time) of this ironic, self-subverting text suggests that Kemény drew his principles of composition from other literary traditions of Europe. In fact, Kemény in his search for a genre appropriate for an age he considered "inquisitive and skeptical in its thinking,"<sup>5</sup> turned to the German romantics, in whose writings he found a fascination with the novel. This amorphous genre, perhaps the most revolutionary of the prose experiments of the Renaissance, he appropriated for his own works. His first novel appears as the product of a theoretical restlessness similar to the uneasiness of the

Renaissance, when the tension between neo-classicism and the baroque bore so many new approaches to composition.

Published in 1847, *Gyulai Pál* takes as its subject the court intrigues of late sixteenth-century Transylvania. In this it bears resemblance to the novel *Jósika István* (1845) by Kemény's contemporary, Miklós Jósika. Each novel tells the tale of a man favored at the court of prince Zsigmond Báthori but doomed to become the victim of political intrigue. However, whereas the title character of Miklós Jósika's novel is, in the words of Kemény's biographer, "an epic hero who, [...] in spite of all his mistakes, advances with raised head towards his fate,"<sup>6</sup> Kemény's novel offers no such exemplification of virtue. On the contrary *Gyulai Pál* is rich with ambiguities. These ambiguities are created through a blending of narrative styles. As he wanders from the various perspectives of the different characters the narrator switches to drastically different styles of narration, often commenting on the act of narration itself. The tension between the contrasting styles emphasizes the tension between the conflicting perspectives of the characters. Moreover, the contrasts in the styles adopted both by the narrator and by the characters imply different fictional levels, each of which seems questionable when viewed from the perspective of the others. The characters' efforts to interpret their fates are exposed as constructs that serve as much as a refuge from the world of the novel as an attempt to understand it. Even the perspective of the reader is undermined. By compelling the reader to confront the stark contrasts in style, the narrator reminds him/her of his/her own complicity in recognizing, within the divergent literary codes of the text, the aesthetic and moral traditions implicit in those codes. The reader is forced to acknowledge that the reflexes of his/her own judgment have been shaped by the same sort of fictions as those through which the characters of the novel attempt to understand their world. Ultimately the novel can be seen as a parody of the act of reading. It is a pastiche of literary conventions that exposes the precariousness of any attempt to interpret reality through language.

The first two chapters of *Gyulai Pál* are written in a prose rich with metaphor and florid descriptions. Gyulai is given an introduction that might befit the knight of a medieval romance. He appears as one of the leaders of a funeral procession: "In his right hand Gyulai carried an enormous lance with a black flag, while a heavy shield weighed down his left hand."<sup>7</sup> The connotations of the original Hungarian text are hard to preserve in English. In the original the vocabulary is somewhat metaphorical. For example, instead of "jobb kezében" ["in his right hand"] we find "jobbájában" ["in his right"], an archaic form even at the time Kemény was writing. Instead of "zászló," a common word for flag, we find "lobogó," a less often used noun created from the verb "lobogni," meaning "to flame, flutter, or flap." The description of the horses is equally metaphorical: "Dark locks flowed

from their raven colored stallions, kissing the unblemished white snow[.]”<sup>8</sup> The timbre of these passages suggests that this is a chivalric tale of virtue exemplified in a heroic knight.

The second chapter begins with equally affected metaphorical descriptions:

The young year wore its rosy headdress; from the valleys it breathed a blend of odors; on the mirror of the stream it saw playful images, in the sky a dark blue glaze and silver veils of clouds; betwixt the green paths of the forests could be heard the love music of birds and, from behind the cliffs, the joyous whispers of the wind.<sup>9</sup>

Again it is worth mentioning that in the original text the somewhat quaint words (“rét” for “valley” instead of the more common “völgy”, “vidor” for joyous instead of “vidám”) harmonize with the metaphors to lend the text the tone of a highly stylized romance.

However, already in this chapter references to literature beyond the text undermine the credibility of the narrative. One of the characters, for example, is said to be fond of Italian poetry:

After hearty horseback riding he read soft Italian poets. He would invite Békessi [...] to dine with him, where women played the harp and sang, where they emptied golden chalices, where clever witticisms flowed.<sup>10</sup>

The description of the repast, coming immediately after the mention of Italian poets, seems as much a fanciful image borrowed from a work of fiction as a plausible account of the meal.

Alongside this reference to literature outside the text are more jarring disruptions of the narrative. The narrator occasionally pauses to comment on his own narration. As a troupe of actors assembles to perform a play about the siege of Jeriko the narrator interrupts the tale to apologize to the reader: “I regret that the plan of this novel only permits me to lead my readers through the preparations for the show up to the raising of the curtain.”<sup>11</sup> The narrator even goes so far as to reproach himself while at the same time offering an explanation for his hesitance to narrate the action of the play: “This perhaps reflects poorly on me. But it serves as some consolation that enough authors – from bishop Turpin to Mr. James – have written heroic plays already.”<sup>12</sup> While the narrator’s interruption is an explicit indication of the fictiveness of the text, the notion that it is unnecessary to narrate the action of the play because such tales have been written about enough already is a more subtle reminder of the artificiality of any (even this) text.

In the middle of the second chapter begins the first of many radical transformations in the format of the narrative. For the rest of the chapter the text takes the

form of a dramatic script in which the characters exchange dialogue with one another. In these passages most of the main characters that have not already been introduced are presented. As the narrator vanishes temporarily from the text new stylistic conflicts emerge. These conflicts lie in the contrasting forms of expression of the characters. The struggle on the part of one character to adopt a particular style of discourse is thwarted by the refusal of another character to comply. The resulting tension casts doubt on the reliability of the characters and, moreover, the styles of discourse they adopt.

The first of these contrasts occurs in the conversation between three members of a troupe of Spanish actors. Guzman, a prompter, whose task is to remind actors of their lines, attempts to persuade two other members of the company, Battista and Pierro, of his brave and heroic nature:

Guzman: In me flows the blood of hidalgos: blood untainted, and thirsting for action. If only they would write ballads and chronicles impartially, then Cecil would sing of me, and the next century would speak of a marvel. But the lute and the pen are in the service of barons, marquis and princes. They only praise them, while Guzman, the famous, the hero and adventurer...

Pierro: scurries unnoticed into the prompter's box.

Battista: (To Pierro) Greasy-grimy prose! How dare you stand in the path of fervor? (To Guzman) Noble knight! Give accounts from your romantic life. I am on good terms with the student Gergely, who worked for a great poet, my master Tinódi Sebestyén, for two years as...

Pierro: His boot-cleaner.

Battista: Yes, perhaps, but his master, instead of paying him his monthly earnings, acquainted him with the secrets of twelve syllable verse lines.

Guzman: (sighing) What good is that to me?

Battista: You don't realize what I'm getting at?

Pierro: (with affected zeal) You are too modest, and you don't want to see how my friend Battista gazes into those regions of the firmament where Gergely is going to knock out the axel of Charles' Wain in order to make room among the stars for the heroic don Guzman.<sup>13</sup>

Pierro's insistent interruptions do more than simply emphasize a factual contrast between Guzman and Battista's lofty aspirations and their lowly lives. They upset the style of discourse in which their musings are expressed and remind the reader to be wary of rhetoric.

As he begins telling the adventures of his youth Guzman's grasp of the narrative style he has chosen begins to slip. Though he strives to strike the tone

of a chivalric romance he cannot prevent even the credulous Battista from perceiving the inconsistency between his story and the story implied by his choice of style:

Guzman: Ah youth, the life of adventure! Even now I look back with delight on those shining days, when in the dark nights we plucked the guitar and whistled. The princess and the duenna pined. We climbed up to the balcony and stopped by the corner of the gate. The bashful night heard a hundred times the sigh, Inéz, Catherine!

Battista: By your leave heroic Don Guzman, there must be some chicanery here, for how am I to imagine someone both on the balcony and at the same time behind the gate? And why would the person be first the princess, then the duenna, first Inéz, then Catherine? Not to mention that whistling accompanied by guitar does not makes for much of a serenade.

Guzman: You tartar! Chicanery! Imagine next to me Don Alvarez: we only had one guitar, so I whistled [...] And since he did in fact talk the whole time with Inéz, I chose the duenna. However we were both knights and both as poor as church mice.<sup>14</sup>

Battista's questions prompt the reader to consider the incongruity between Guzman's misadventures and the story implied by the style of discourse he has chosen. The reader is reminded of Guillén's contention that "Literary conventions [...] mirror in ironic ways the routines of social conformism."<sup>15</sup> Any literary formula, according to this view, serves as a vehicle for a particular value system. Guzman's failure to exemplify the qualities implicit in the style of discourse he has chosen emphasizes that literary formulae are *nevertheless fictions* that may serve to mask the absence of the very values they supposedly embody.

The relationship between fiction and the lives of the characters in the novel is explored further in a conversation between two of the female actors of the troupe. In this passage two contrasting fictions are opposed to one another. Sofronia, in preparation for the performance, practices her dialogue before being interrupted by her friend Cecil:

Sofronia:

For which one does my heart beat? Achan or Khimat?  
 For which shall I sacrifice my faith and homeland?  
 For which will the walls of Jericho crumble?  
 And vanish from my breast the ruins of righteous feeling?  
 Gushing blood, struggling mind unravel your doubts:  
 You love deliriously, but two, or one?

Cecil: who has entered unnoticed and overheard Sofronia's monologue, sings:

On the banks of Guadalquivir

Two knights ambled:  
 One hobbled clumsily  
 The other was a hunchback.  
 And what a scandal! What a marvel!  
 The whole countryside proclaimed  
 That the dainty Florinda  
 Loved neither of the two!<sup>16</sup>

The opposition in this passage is between Sofronia's dialogue, written (in the original Hungarian text) in rhyming alexandrines, and Cecil's impish verve. The absurd juxtaposition of the anguished question "for whom shall I sacrifice my faith and homeland?" and the deformed hunchback makes the rhetorical affectations of Sofronia's text seem ludicrous. Thus, a difference is established between Sofronia's dialogue, a fiction within the fictive novel, and Cecil's response, also a fiction. The rhetorical affections of Sofronia's text (for example, the metaphorical "ruins of righteous feeling" or the graceful caesurae in the original) demand that the reader approach her monologue with the respectful sobriety, at least until the concluding line. The suggestion that perhaps she loves two men (and is therefore certainly not the virtuous heroine her style might imply) undermines the righteousness referred to in the preceding lines. This absurd conclusion begins the transition into Cecil's text, a verse that insists on its own grotesqueness. The contrast between the two texts emphasizes that, whatever the stylistic differences between them, each is fictional and that, as fiction, *neither* has any greater claim to significance than the other. This in turn reminds the reader that the validity of any literary convention or style depends entirely on the reader's willingness to accept the parameters defined by that convention or style. Even if the reader were prepared, upon beginning Sofronia's text, to take it seriously, the fact that Cecil's lines flagrantly violate the parameters established by this text alters this. The reader can no longer passively accept the styles (or for that matter the values implied by the styles) adopted by the characters as necessarily legitimate. On the contrary he/she is compelled to confront his/her own complicity in validating or dismissing the particular fictions of the text. The reader is forced to acknowledge that simply by recognizing the contrasts between different styles he/she is making an aesthetic judgment. This judgment is itself merely a reference to the conventions established by previous works of literature. By compelling the reader to recognize that his/her ability to discriminate is determined by the same sorts of fictive texts as those through which the characters attempt to understand their world, the novel reminds the reader that his/her judgment is no less precarious than the judgments of the characters themselves.

As Sofronia continues reading part of her role to Cecil, the relationship between her fictional text and her fate in the novel further undermines the perspective of the reader. She reads the close of her monologue:

Maiden! If your heart's whim has fallen on two scabbords,  
 If to two men you are tempted by similar wonder,  
 And for their twin perfection every vessel in you beats,  
 Who should say then that you are either faithful or licentious?<sup>17</sup>

In the course of the novel Sofronia will be faced with the dilemma outlined in this text, which constitutes a mere fiction within the fictive novel. The fact that the fictions within the novel serve as mirrors (even parodies) for the lives of the characters invites the reader to consider how fiction itself mirrors and parodies life. As they explore through fictions the quandaries that they face, the characters parody the reader in the act of reading. Thus the contrasts between the various fictive levels upset not only the legitimacy of the characters' attempts to construct some understanding of their fates, but even the reader's confidence in the value of his/her own attempts to discriminate between these fictive levels. The reader is reminded that his/her interpretation of the world of the novel may be qualitatively no different from the obviously fictional interpretations offered by the characters themselves.

The novel contains numerous other examples of contrasting styles and narrative interruptions that continually throw into question the credibility of the characters, the narrator, and, most importantly, the concept of narrative itself. The eleventh chapter begins with the extremely subversive sentence "Az éj nem tartozott a regényesek közé,"<sup>18</sup> which is very difficult to translate. The sentence could be translated as, "The night was not among the romantic sorts of nights." However, this translation is problematic given the possible meanings of the word "regényes." This word is a derivative of the word "regény," which simply means novel. At the time Kemény was writing Gyulai Pál the word "regény" had only been in use for twenty years. It was a neologism based on the old Finno-Ugric word "rege," meaning tale. Indeed, some of its early appearances were on the title pages of the novels by Kemény's contemporary Miklós Jósika. The adjective "regényes" was used to mean romantic or fantastic. However, it could also simply mean appropriate for novels. László Szalay, one of the figures of language reform in Hungary (a movement the goal of which was to introduce new words into Hungarian based on Finno-Ugric roots and morphology), defined "regényes" as "fitting for a novel, novel-like."<sup>19</sup> Given this definition of the word, an alternative translation of the passage might be, "The night was nothing like those described in novels." This possibility is particularly interesting in light of the passages that follow: "The petulant air did not sweep streets with stormy wings, it did not rip down the signs above the stores and the inns, it did not make the fronts of [the] broad eaves creak[.]"<sup>20</sup> This series of negations constitutes an allusion to the types of literary formulae that shape a reader's expectations. The narrator thus seems to anticipate and even mock the reader's reaction to the narrative. Other times the narrator



mimics the speech of the characters, thus blurring the distinction between his perspective and the perspectives of the characters. As Eleonor, a woman highly susceptible to suggestion, awaits her husband, the description of setting seems to be less the view of a third person narrator and more the troubled thoughts of the character: "The mysterious noises of night had begun, those sounds that resemble the whispering of spirits, sounds about which we cannot know, did we hear them or just imagine them?"<sup>21</sup> Just as Sofronia recited a fictive text that mirrored the dilemma she faced, Eleonor will explore her confused feelings through a verse about a girl who fled to a convent to escape temptation. Finally, the introduction of different narrative formats (including epistle and diary) continues, up to the close of the novel, to create discordant clashes that force the reader to confront the artificiality of the texts.

The examples cited, however, suffice to illustrate that *Gyulai Pál* is fundamentally an anti-canonical work that thrives on the subversion of established literary paradigms. It is the novel as Bakhtin characterized it:

The novel as a whole is a phenomenon multiform in style and variform in speech and voice. In it the investigator is confronted with several heterogeneous stylistic unities, often located on different linguistic levels and subject to different stylistic controls.<sup>22</sup>

Indeed, one only need consider the five basic types of stylistic unities Bakhtin identifies in order to see how closely *Gyulai Pál* conforms to his conception of the novel:

- (1) Direct authorial literary-artistic narration (in all its diverse variants);
- (2) Stylization of the various forms of oral everyday narration (*skaz*);
- (3) Stylization of the various forms of semiliterary (written) everyday narration (the letter, the diary, etc.);
- (4) Various forms of literary but extra-artistic authorial speech (moral, philosophical or scientific statements, oratory, ethnographic descriptions, memoranda and so forth);
- (5) The stylistically individualized speech of characters.<sup>23</sup>

Kemény's novel contains clear examples of each of these five categories. Yet they coalesce to form a structured artistic unity that transcends any of the individual stylistic unities of which it is composed.

At the time of its publication *Gyulai Pál* was unique in Hungarian literature. Both the prose fiction and the poetry of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Hungary were characterized by the tendencies of the so-called populist movement. The leading figures of this movement sought to establish a body of literature that could be considered distinctly Hungarian. They took their inspira-

tion from the culture and traditions of the Hungarian peasant. András Dugonics, for example, in his novel *Etelka* (1788), tells the tale of a heroine of Hungarian legend from before the time of the Hungarians' arrival in Europe. Mihály Fazekas' novel *Lúdas Matyi* (1804) recounts the great deeds of another figure of Hungarian lore. The three most famous verse epics of the first half of the nineteenth century (Mihály Vörösmarty's "The Flight of Zalán" (1824), Sándor Petőfi's "John the Hero" (1845), and János Arany's "Toldi" (1847)) all deal with characters from Hungarian folklore. Hungarian literary critics expressed the central tenet of the movement in explicit terms. In his book *National Traditions* (1826) poet and critic Ferenc Kölcsey, whose poem "Hymn" (1823) became the text of the Hungarian national anthem, wrote, "the original spark of true national poetry must be sought in the songs of the common people."<sup>24</sup> János Erdélyi, perhaps the first Hungarian author who could properly be called a literary theorist, echoed this sentiment when he exhorted Hungarian authors to shake "the yoke of the influence of foreign cultivation from our necks."<sup>25</sup> Thus this movement, though perhaps anti-canonical in its attempt to elevate popular culture to the level of high culture, was nevertheless in some ways a dogmatic attempt to replace the old canon with a new canon rooted in Hungarian traditions.

*Gyulai Pál*, though certainly not untouched by the ideas of the populists, nevertheless stands well outside their canon. For example, as noted by Hungarian literary historian Mihály Szegedy-Maszák, though Kemény does incorporate into his novel tidbits of Hungarian folk culture such as proverbs, these stylistic affections are juxtaposed with references to such celebrities of European literature as Balzac and Goethe. They constitute merely another of the many styles of discourse in the novel that "create tension between the willfully mannered layers of style."<sup>26</sup> It could be argued that Kemény's choice of subjects (characters from Hungarian history) harmonized well with the poetics of the populists. However, Kemény's novel is fundamentally anti-canonical. It parodies even the histories it pretends to imitate. As Bakhtin writes of the novel in general and its relationship to other genres, "there can be no talk of a harmony deriving from mutual limitation and complementarity."<sup>27</sup>

The appearance, then, in 1847 of a novel that bears stronger similarity to *Don Quixote* than to any work of literature in the Hungarian literature of its time suggests that the influences that shaped Kemény's ideas concerning this genre came from the other literary traditions of Europe. The most likely source of Kemény's conception of the novel is to be found in the works of German romantics. Several of the most prominent figures of the German Romantic movement characterized the novel as a blending of genres that seeks to transcend poetic dicta. Friedrich Schelling described the novel as "a mixture of the epic and the drama."<sup>28</sup> He insisted on the ironic nature of the novel when he claimed "the highest tragedy is allowed in the novel, as is the comic, only that the author remains untouched by

both.”<sup>29</sup> Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis) suggested that the novel “should include all the genres of style in a [...] sequence.”<sup>30</sup> August Schlegel contrasted the novel, which he considered the genre of the romantic movement, with classical literature. Art and poetry of the ancient world, he argued, were based on strict divisions. “The romantic,” however, “indulges in indissoluble mixtures; it melts all oppositions (nature and art, poetry and prose, gravity and jest, memory and presentiment, spirituality and sensuality, the earthly and the godly, life and death) deeply within one another.”<sup>31</sup>

Reverberations of these notions are palpable in Kemény's first novel. *Gyulai Pál* is, as Hardenberg suggested a novel must be, a compilation of genres. The fundamental irony implied by the narrator's refusal to adopt a consistent narrative format echoes Schelling's insistence that the author of a novel remain indifferent to both its tragic and comic elements. August Schlegel's contention that the genre of the Romantic movement (in contrast to the poetry of the ancient world) delights in indissoluble mixtures finds its echo in the indissoluble mixture of the novel itself. Indeed, in a letter to his contemporary Miklós Jósika, written at the time he was composing, *Gyulai Pál* Kemény himself drew a similar contrast between the classical age, with its precise forms, and his own age:

I now live in the midst of so many furious passions that, because of the great mist, I cannot see those gentle lands where the figures of classical poetry move silently, regularly, with dignity, and, most of all, in dress, custom and temper that befits their age.<sup>32</sup>

As Kemény's biographer Ferenc Papp points out this passage “clearly indicates the romantic inclination of his imagination.”<sup>33</sup>

Yet the German philosopher whose ideas had perhaps the greatest impact on Kemény's conception of the novel was August Schlegel's brother, Friedrich Schlegel. It was Schlegel who hazarded the most explicit definitions for this amorphous genre. In “Brief über den Roman,” part of an essay entitled “Gespräch über die Poesie,” Schlegel insists that it is the blending of genres that is the distinctive characteristic of the novel:

I can hardly imagine the novel as anything other than a mixture of tale, song, and other forms. Cervantes never composed any other way, and even the otherwise so prosaic Boccaccio ornaments his collection with a frame of songs. If there is a novel in which this is not the case and cannot be the case, this lies merely in the individuality of this work, not in the character of the genre. It is rather an exception.<sup>34</sup>

In an essay entitled “Literature” Schlegel argued that as a genre the novel proposes “to poeticize the element of common life that is set in opposition to poetry and to vanquish this opposition[.]”<sup>35</sup> It is in this liberal form of the novel, Schlegel contended, that “wordly wisdom has sought refuge from scholasticism.”<sup>36</sup>

Schlegel's reference to Cervantes reminds one that the German romantics themselves were strongly influenced by the ideas of Renaissance authors. Schelling, for example, wrote a philosophical treatise based on the ideas of Bruno entitled "On the Natural and the Divine Principle of Things." The popularity of Tieck's translation of *Don Quixote* indicates the status this novel held in the eyes of the German romantics. In a review of this translation Friedrich Schlegel himself exhorted his contemporaries, "Let us forget the popular scribblings of the French and the English and strive to imitate these models."<sup>37</sup> This exhortation makes clear that *Don Quixote*, itself an anti-canonical work, had been adopted by the German romantics as a sort of a archetype for what was considered by them the genre of romantic movement. Given the popularity of *Don Quixote* among the German Romantics (with whose works Kemény was certainly familiar) and the structural similarities between this novel and *Gyulai Pál*, it seems highly likely that Kemény's model for his novel was *Don Quixote* itself, or at least Tieck's translation.

It is irrelevant, however, to identify such an influence without attempting to understand the theoretical issues that prompted Kemény to search for a model outside the Hungarian literary tradition. As already noted, the dominant trend in Hungarian literature during the first half of the nineteenth century was the so-called populist movement. As with any artistic trend the aesthetic standards of this movement embodied social attitudes. Kölcsey expressed these attitudes when he wrote, "it is the poet's duty to erect poetic monuments to the past deeds of the nation."<sup>38</sup> The luminaries of the era, with their somewhat dogmatic insistence on the purity of Hungarian folk culture and the glory of the Hungarian past, created works that exemplify not only aesthetic but also moral apotheoses. Their works present unambiguous heroes from Hungary's mythical past exemplifying virtues of courage, loyalty, humility, honesty, etc.

For Kemény any genre the poetics of which implied such apotheoses was unsuitable. He considered his age an era of moral ambivalence. In an essay entitled "Principles concerning the novel and the drama" Kemény wrote of the moral uncertainty that, in his opinion, beset his generation. Moral conviction springing from unquestioning faith, he contended, was faltering and slowly being replaced by

that enlightened and indulgent disposition [...], which is loath to throw the stone of reproach at anyone, which, with impartial comprehensiveness, wishes to look into the heart of the other, which can grasp all the motives of the soul's caprices and [...] pardon its consequences.<sup>39</sup>

His generation, Kemény claimed, insisted on only one principle: "audiatur et altera pars, hear out the other side as well, for perhaps it too is able to justify itself?"<sup>40</sup> Kemény contended that, of the various literary genres, "it is the most suspect,

from the point of aesthetic value, the most unstructured in form that best does justice to these characteristics of our age – that is, the novel.”<sup>41</sup>

*Don Quixote* provides an archetypal model of a genre capable of incorporating numerous perspectives. In *Don Quixote*, as in *Gyulai Pál*, the tension between conflicting styles of narration emphasizes the tension between the conflicting perspectives of the characters. In chapter 14, for example, Chrysostom chooses an ornate verse form for his reproach to Marcela for scorning his love, whereas Marcela, in her blunt response, chooses an unembroidered prose. The authority of the narrative is continually undermined. For example, in the ninth chapter the narrator insists, “if any objection can be made against the truth of this history, it can only be that its narrator was an Arab – men of that nation being ready liars[.]”<sup>42</sup> The conversations between Don Quixote and Sancho Panza seem to provide a blueprint for the exchanges between Guzman and Pierro. The crucial feature of *Don Quixote*, however, that made it an ideal model for Kemény is the fact that none of the texts within the novel emerges as privileged. As Walter Reed notes,

In *Don Quixote* the literary fictions often come out ahead of the overconfident assumptions about ‘truth’. The barber and the curate, those figures of normative sobriety, turn out to be avid consumers of romances themselves, and Sancho’s proverbs are applied with the same imaginative irrelevance as Quixote’s chivalric scenarios.<sup>43</sup>

Nor in Kemény’s novel does any single character’s perspective emerge as authoritative. On the contrary the shifts in style continue, up to the close of the novel, to throw into question the interpretations of the characters. The reader is offered no help in determining whether or not there was any merit (practical or moral) in the protagonist’s fatal loyalty to the prince.

Yet whether or not *Don Quixote* provided the specific model for Kemény’s first novel, his choice of genre was certainly influenced by theoretical questions similar to those raised by authors of the Renaissance. The Renaissance crisis that emerged as authors began questioning traditional sources of authority (for example Thomas More, in *Utopia*, appealed to reason over religious dogmatism, while Erasmus published the Greek text of the Bible, throwing into question the authenticity of Jerome’s translation, on which the Church had relied) resembled the sorts of crises that Kemény felt beleaguered his own generation. Kemény contended that the collapse of the old system in which the Church had played the leading role in public life had undermined the foundations of social order:

Fissures appear in the whole structure, and doubts arise in our hearts about its stability. We, however, wrench off rock after rock and, trembling from fear of the collapse, we accelerate it. We are curious in our search for the flaws of our social relations, nimble in making

them seem ridiculous, almost as much as we are eager in our curiosity to accept the new social principles, yet prepared to mock them incisively.<sup>44</sup>

Kemény believed that in dealing with moral questions his generation was characterized by a similar bustle in thought and impotence in action. Those who consider themselves materialists, he claimed, hesitate to translate this view into action. Those who recognize some religious or spiritual responsibility are embarrassed to make too much of a spectacle of their beliefs. “We have no deep faith in either direction,” Kemény wrote. “We see the weaknesses of both.”<sup>45</sup> The novel, as a genre that undermines rather than affirms traditional value systems exemplified in literature, provides the ideal medium for exploring this uncertainty and ambivalence.

With Kemény as with authors of the Renaissance this crisis of authority prompted questions concerning the nature of the individual. In his famous essay “On the Inconsistency of our Actions” Montaigne had thrown into question the reliability of the individual him/herself:

Those who make a practice of comparing human actions are never so perplexed as when they try to see them as a whole and in the same light; for they commonly contradict each other so strangely that it seems impossible that they have come from the same shop.<sup>46</sup>

No individual, Montaigne cautioned, is consistent with his/her past. “We are all patchwork,” he claimed, “and so shapeless and diverse in composition that each bit, each moment, plays its own game. And there is as much difference between us and ourselves as between us and others.”<sup>47</sup> In passages strikingly reminiscent of Montaigne’s essay Kemény arrived at a similar conclusion:

In real life, in our day to day relations, the character of the huge majority of people resembles a seemingly straight, yet continually changing path. Strictly speaking no one remains consistent with his/her past; [...] It is not through the compulsions of our actions that we grow distant from our past (in our temperament, our thinking, and our will). Oh no! We grow different simply because we have seen, we have experienced, we have lived. Our disposition gains or loses through the passing of days and the small experiences we gather, and along with our tastes, our desires, our discoveries, even the social circle into which we step, foreign peculiarities slowly permeate our whole being until they become organic parts of our character, like nourishment in the body.<sup>48</sup>

In his description of this process Kemény resorted to a metaphor typical of the baroque in its use of nature as an analogy for human growth:

This transformation, the only explanation for which lies in the passage of time, is not the mark of carelessness or profligacy, not the characteristic of inconstancy, but rather as natural process of our character as is growth, thickening, [...] then [...] decomposition in the organic life of a tree.<sup>49</sup>

Again the novel, as a genre founded on inconsistency and change, provides a medium for the expression of this view of human nature. Kemény himself contended, “the novelist – who can bring his art closest to real life – [...] reflects this natural development[.]”<sup>50</sup>

*Gyulai Pál* may seem unique even among Kemény's other novels. None of his other works shows the same flamboyant disregard for the propriety of literary conventions. However, though perhaps more subtle, his other novels are characterized by the same inclination to parody. They too are novels in the Bakhtinian sense of the genre. On the first page of *The Fanatics* (1858–1859), for example, the narrator interrupts his account of the Thirty Years War to draw the reader's attention to the style of the narrative: “But why such an elegiac tone instead of the facts on which we should look back?”<sup>51</sup> This interruption suggests the ironic stance of the narrator towards his own narration. By questioning the appropriateness of the style, the narrator denies any sort of authorial ownership of the previous passages. Furthermore he discredits any assumption of meaning in the opening paragraphs, insinuating rather that these statements are merely a convention of discourse. In the novel *Widow and Daughter* (1855–1857) the narrator often mimics and parodies the speech of the characters. In the following passage, for example, the narrator explains why the widow disapproves of her daughter: “She sang psalms beautifully, but, alas, she sang secular songs as well.”<sup>52</sup> The insertion “alas” constitutes the perspective of the widow, not the narrator. It expresses both the widow's despair and the narrator's disdain for her excessive severity. It is, as Bakhtin writes, “a special type of double-voiced discourse. It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author.”<sup>53</sup>

Kemény's novels constitute an entirely new genre in Hungarian literature, a type of literature, to borrow Reed's characterization of the novel, “suspicious of its own literariness.”<sup>54</sup> If one accepts Guillén's contention that “[i]n the history of the novel a change of goals would seem to call for a change of means,”<sup>55</sup> Kemény's adoption of a genre foreign to Hungarian literature implies a new role for literature in Hungary. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Kemény sought neither to exemplify nor implicitly to affirm any social or moral code. On the contrary his goal was to explore the ambiguity and uncertainty that he felt encumbered his generation.

Kemény's contribution to Hungarian literature has never been properly characterized. His works garner praise that is little more than a perfunctory recognition of the scope and complexity of his *oeuvre*. There seems to be little acknowledgment of the impact his fiction had on the development of the novel and other genres in the Hungarian literary tradition. For example, in his book *Aspects et parallélismes de la littérature hongroise* István Sőtér wrote that the works of Kálmán Mikszáth (a novelist who rose to fame in the latter half of the nineteenth century in Hungary) constitute "a social critique without example since Eötvös [a contemporary of Kemény]." "However," Sőtér notes, "this critique is not direct, it manifests itself in transpositions, sometimes in an enigmatic or ironic way or dissimulated beneath the serene colors of an apparently indulgent humor."<sup>56</sup> Sőtér's contrast between the ironic works of Mikszáth and the stylistically consistent works of Eötvös implies that the ironic aspect of Mikszáth's social critiques constituted a new feature in Hungarian literature. In fact the irony in Mikszáth's novels represents the continuation of a tendency introduced by Kemény.

Kemény's influence, however, certainly extended beyond one writer. Bakhtin writes:

Of particular interest are those eras when the novel becomes the dominant genre. All literature is then caught up in the process of "becoming," and in a special kind of "generic criticism." [...] Those genres that stubbornly preserve their old canonic nature begin to appear stylized. In general any strict adherence to a genre begins to feel like a stylization, a stylization taken to the point of parody, despite the artistic intent of the author.<sup>57</sup>

In the later half of the nineteenth century the novel did emerge as the dominant genre in Hungary. The verse epic, the genre in which some of the most popular works of the first half of the century had been written, almost vanished. Verse forms, partly in conjunction with the ascendancy of the prose novel, became more free and varied. They too became, in Bakhtin's words, "dialogized, permeated with laughter, irony, humor, elements of self-parody[.]"<sup>58</sup> Hungarian literature experienced a tremendous diversification culminating in a boisterous avant-garde movement in the early twentieth century. This was by no means due solely to the influence of Kemény's novels. However, it was Kemény who lit a spark of innovation, when he introduced into Hungarian literature a genre that thrives on the subversion of established convention.



## Works cited

- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. "Discourse in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. "Epic and Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Translated by J. M. Cohen. New York: Penguin Books, 1950.
- Czigány, Lóránt. *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- Erdélyi, János. *Válogatott művei*. Budapest, 1961.
- Guillén, Claudio. "A Note on Influences and Conventions." In *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- von Hardenberg, Friedrich (Novalis). "Fragmente." In: *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik*. Edited by Andreas Müller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Kemény, Zsigmond. *A rajongók*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1969.
- Kemény, Zsigmond. "Eszmék a regény és a dráma körül." In: *Munkáiból*. Edited by Pál Gyulai. Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1905.
- Kemény, Zsigmond. *Gyulai Pál*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1967.
- Kemény, Zsigmond. *Özvegy és leánya*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1967.
- Kölcsey, Ferenc. *Ferenc Kölcsey összes művei*. Budapest, 1943.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*. Translated by Donald Frame. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Németh, Béla G. *Türelmetlen és késlekedő félszázad*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1971.
- Papp, Ferencz. *Báró Kemény Zsigmond*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1922.
- Reed, Walter. "The Problem with a Poetics of the Novel." In *Towards a Poetics of Fiction*, ed. Mark Spilka. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977.
- Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Philosophie der Kunst." In *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik*, ed. Andreas Müller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Schlegel, August W. "Über dramatische Kunst und Literatur." In *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik*, ed. Andreas Müller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Brief über den Roman." In *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1980.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Kritische Fragmente." In *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1980.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Literatur." In *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1980.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Tiecks Don Quixote Übersetzung." In *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1980.
- Sőtér, István. *Aspects et parallélismes de la littératures hongroise*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966.
- Sőtér, István. "Kemény Zsigmond." In *A magyar irodalom története 1849-től 1905-ig*, ed. István Sőtér. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965. V. IV.
- Szalay, László. "Észrevételek." Cited in *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. [The Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Hungarian Language]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.
- Szegedy-Maszák, Mihály. *Kemény Zsigmond*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1989.

## Notes

1. For example, Lóránt Czigány, author of *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature from the Earliest Times to the Present*, makes the vague assertion, in the few pages devoted to Kemény, that he “learned from Walter Scott.” (*The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984. 209) István Sötér, chief editor of the six volume *History of Hungarian Literature*, claims that in Kemény’s first unfinished novel one feels the influence of Victor Hugo and Walter Scott. (“Kemény Zsigmond.” In: *A magyar irodalom története 1849-től 1905-ig*. Ed. Sötér, István. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965. Vol. IV. 244. “Regényén érezhető Hugo, Scott [...] hatása.”) In his book *Aspects et parallélismes de la littérature hongroise*, Sötér describes Kemény’s novel *Férj és nő* (Husband and Wife, 1852) as “an imitation of the French social novel of the time.” (*Aspects et parallélismes de la littérature hongroise*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1966. 118. “... une imitation du roman social français du temps.”) Béla G. Németh, a prominent scholar of Hungarian literary history, notes that Kemény’s characters have often been compared with those of Dostoyevsky and adds that “One could, with no less justification, liken Kemény to the great demonic eccentric of German romanticism, Heinrich von Kleist.” (*Türelmetlen és késlekedő félszázad*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1971. 132. “Alakjait és őt magát is többször hasonlították Dosztojevskij figuráihoz. Nem alap nélkül. De nem kevesebb joggal lehetne hasonlítani a német romantika nagy démoni különcéhez, Heinrich von Kleisthez.”)
2. Claudio Guillén. “A Note on Influences and Conventions.” In: *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton University Press, 1971. 61
3. “Gyulai Pál” is the name of the protagonist of the novel. This could be translated into English as “Paul Julius.” In Hungarian the family name “Gyulai” is given first, before the Christian name “Pál.” The protagonist of the novel, Pál Gyulai, is not to be confused with the author and critic Pál Gyulai, who was one of Kemény’s contemporaries and admirers.
4. Reed, Walter. “The Problem with a poetics of the Novel.” In: *Towards a Poetics of Fiction*. Ed. Mark Spilka. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1977. 64
5. Kemény, Zsigmond. “Eszmék a regény és a dráma körül.” In: *Munkáiból*. Ed. Pál Gyulai. Budapest: Franklin-Társulat, 1905. 131. (“... a mi korunk gondolkodásában vizsgáló és kételkedő.”)
6. Papp, Ferencz. *Báró Kemény Zsigmond*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1922. Vol. I. 345. (“Jósika István valójában eposi hős, ki [...] minden tévedése ellenére emelt fővel siet végzete felé.”)
7. Kemény, Zsigmond. *Gyulai Pál*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1967. 93. (“Gyulai jobbájában óriás lándzsát hordozott sötét lobogóval, míg balját nehéz paizs terhelte.”)
8. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 93. (“Hollószín méneikről sötét uszály folyt le, csókdosva a szeplőtlen fehér havat[.]”)
9. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 107. (“Az ifjú év rózsapártában jár; a rétekről illatvegyet szív; a folyam tükrén mosolygó képleteket, az egen sötétkéék zománcot és ezüstszín párafátyolt lát; az erdők zöld járdai közt minden lombról szerelmes madárzenét és a szirtok megöl vidor légakakat hall.”)
10. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 108. (“Erős lovaglás után lágy olasz költőket olvasott. Békessit [...] ebédre hivatá, hol hárfás nők énekeltek, arany serlegek ürítették, és elménckedés folyt.”)
11. Kemény. *Gyulai Pál*. Vol. I. 110. (“Sajnálom, hogy e regény terve csak a mutatványok készületeire és a színelőző függöny felvonataláig engedí olvasóimat elvezetni.”)
12. *Ibid.* V. I. 110. (“Ez rám nézve kedvetlen körülmény; de némi vigasztalásul szolgál, hogy vitézi játékokat Turpin püspök óta James úrig elegen irtak már le.”)
13. *Ibid.* 112–13. “Charles’ Wain” refers to the constellation otherwise known as the Big Dipper. The Hungarian text of this exchange is as follows:

- Guzman: Bennem hidalgók vére foly: szeplőtlen vér és tett-szomjas. Ha a balladákat s krónikát részrehajlatlanul írnák, akkor rólam énekelne Cecil, és csodát beszélne a jövő század. De a lant és toll grófoknak, márkiknak, hercegeknek van zsoldjában. Csak őket dicsérik, míg Guzman, a híres, hős és kalandor ...
- Pierro: Észre nem vétetve a sűgőlyukba búvik.
- Battista: (Pierrohoz) Csúszó-mászó próza! Hogy mersz a lelkesedés útjába állani? (Guzmanhoz) Nemes lovag! Nyújtson ön vázlatokat regényes életéből. Én jó lábon állok Gergely diákkal, ki egy nagy költőnek, Tinódi Sebestyén uramnak két esztendeig volt ...
- Pierro: Csizmatakarítója.
- Battista: Igen ám, de gazdája havi fizetés helyett bevezette a tizenkét lábú versek készítésének titkaiba.
- Guzman: (sóhajt) Ez mit használ engem?
- Battista: S ön nem veszi észre, hová nézek?!
- Pierro (színlett hévvel) Ön túl szerény, s nem akarja látni, miként Battista barátom egyenesen az égnek azon tájékára néz, hol Gergely diák félre fogja dőlni Göncöl szekereinek rúdját, hogy a csillagok közt helyet készítsen vitézljő don Guzmannak[.]
14. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 114. The Hungarian text of this exchange is as follows:
- Guzman: Ah, a fiatalok, a kalandorélet! Most is gyönyörrel emlékezem azon fényes napokra, midőn sötét éjjel pengettük a gitárt s fűtyöröltünk. A hercegleány, a duenna epedeztek. Mi fölmásztunk az ablakerkélyre, és megállottunk a kapu sarkánál. A szemérmes éj százszor hallá e sóhajtást: Inéz! Katica!
- Battista: Engedelmével vitéz don Guzman, itt valami kuruzslatnak kellett közbejönni, mert hogy képzeljek én valakit egyszerre az ablakerkélyre és a kapusarok mögött? Aztán miért legyen egy némbor hol hercegleány, hol duenna, hol Inez, hol Katica? Nem is említve, hogy a fűtyülés gitárkísérettel nem szerenádra való.
- Guzman: Tatárt, kuruzslat! Képzelve ön mellett don Alvarez: gitárunk csak egy volt, tehát ... én fűtyörésztem [...] S minthogy ő történetesen örökké Inezzel beszélt, én a duennát választám. Azonban mindketten lovagok voltunk és szegények, mint a templomegér.
15. Guillén. 65–66.
16. Kemény. *Gyulai Pál*. Vol. I. 122. The Hungarian text is as follows:
- Sofronia:
- Melyikért ver szivem? Achán-e vagy Khimat,  
 Kiért fölálodom hitemet s hazámat?  
 Kiért dőlnek romba Jerikó falai,  
 S tűnnek keblemből a jobb érzés romjai?  
 Habzó vér, küzdő ész fejtsd meg kételyidet:  
 Szeretsz örvöngön, de kettőt-e vagy egyet?
- Cecil: ki észrevetlen lépett be, s Sofronia monologját kihallgatta, énekl:
- Guadalquivir partjain  
 Két lovag csatangolt:  
 Egyiknek lába sántít,  
 A másik púpos volt.  
 S mely botrány! Minő csoda!!  
 Egész tájék hirdeti,  
 Hogy a kecses Florinda  
 Egyiket sem szereti.
17. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 122. The Hungarian text is as follows:
- Lány! Ha szűd eszménye két hüvelybe szállott,

Két alakhoz csábít hasonló ámulat,  
S ikertökélyekért ver benned minden ér:  
Ki mondja meg neked, hű vagy-e, vagy ledér?

18. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 218.
19. Szalay, László. “Észrevételek.” Cited in: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára.* (The Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Hungarian Language.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976. Vol. III. 362. (“regénybe illő; romanhaft.”)
20. Kemény. *Gyulai Pál.* Vol. I. 218. (“Az ingerült lég nem sepré viharszárnyakkal az utcát, nem tépte le a boltcímet és a korcsmacégerért, nem csikorgatta [a] széles eszterhák homlokfáit[.]”)
21. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 149. (“Az éjnek az a rejtélyes zsvajva kezdődött, mely szellemsuttogáshoz hasonlít, s melyről nem tudhatni: halljuk-e vagy képzeljük?”)
22. Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. “Discourse in the Novel.” In: *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 261.
23. *Ibid.* 262.
24. Kölcsey, Ferenc. *Ferenc Kölcsey összes művei.* Budapest. 1943. Vol. I. 369. (“... a való nemzeti poézis eredeti szíkráját a köznépi dalokban kell nyomozni.”)
25. Erdélyi, János. *Válogatott művei.* Budapest, 1961. 202–203. (“az idegen műveltség befolyásának igáját [...] nyakunkról[.]”)
26. Szegedy-Maszák, Mihály. *Kemény Zsigmond.* Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1989. 98. (“feszültséget teremt az írásmód szándékoltnak mesterkéltnak rétegével.”)
27. Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. “Epic and Novel.” In: *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* 5.
28. Friedrich Wilhelm Schelling. “Philosophie der Kunst.” In: *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik.* Ed. Andreas Müller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966. 257. (“... man [könnte] den Roman auch als eine Mischung des Epos und des Drama beschreiben[.]”)
29. *Ibid.* 260. (“... das höchste Tragische ist ihm [dem Roman] erlaubt wie das komische, nur daß der Dichter selbst von beiden unberührt bleibe.”)
30. Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis). “Fragmente.” In: *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik.* 233. (“Sollte der Roman alle Gattungen des Stils in einer [...] gebundenen Folge begreifen?”)
31. August W. Schlegel. “Über dramatische Kunst und Literatur.” In: *Deutsche Kunstanschauung der Frühromantik.* 303–304. (“Die antike Kunst und Poesie geht auf strenge Sonderung des Ungleichartigen, die romantische gefällt sich in unauflöslchen Mischungen; alle Entgegengesetzten: Nartur und Kunst, Poesie und Prosa, Ernst und Scherz, Erinnerung und Ahndung, Geistigkeit und Sinnlichkeit, das Erdische und Göttliche, Leben und Tod, verschmelzt sie auf das innigste miteinander.”)
32. Cited in Papp, Ferencz. Vol. I. 358–359. (“Én most annyi bösz szenvedély légkörében élek, hogy a sok köd mián nem láthatom azon szelid jellemű tájékat, hol a classikai költészet fényalakjai mozognak halkán, szabályosan, méltósággal s mindenek fölött korszakaihoz illő öltözetben, szokásokkal és kedélylyel.”)
33. *Ibid.* Vol. I. 359. (“... pontosan megjelöli képzeletének romantikus irányát.”)
34. Schlegel, Friedrich. “Brief über den Roman.” In: *Werke in Zwei Bänden.* Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1980. Vol. II. 179–180. (“... ich kann mir einen Roman kaum anders denken als gemischt aus Erzählung, Gesang und andern Formen. Anders hat Cervantes nie gedichtet, und selbst der sonst so prosaische Boccaccio schmückt seine Sammlung mit einer Einfassung von Liedern. Gibt es [page break] einen Roman, in dem dies nicht stattfindet und nicht stattfinden kann, so liegt es nur in der Individualität des Werks, nicht im Charakter der Gattung, sondern es ist eine Ausnahme von diesem.”)

35. Schlegel, Friedrich. "Literatur." In: *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Vol. II. 258. ("... das der Poesie entgegengesetzte Element des gemeinen Lebens zu poetisieren und sein Entgegenstreben zu besiegen[.]")
36. Schlegel, Friedrich. "Kritische Fragmente." In: *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Vol. I. 167. ("Die Romane sind die sokratischen Dialoge unserer Zeit. In diese liberale Form hat sich die Lebensweisheit vor der Schulweisheit geflüchtet.")
37. Schlegel, Friedrich. "Tiecks Don Quixote Übersetzung." In: *Werke in Zwei Bänden*. Vol. I. 316. ("Laßt uns die populäre Schreibung der Franzosen und Engländer vergessen and diesen Vorbildern nachstreben.")
38. Kölcsey, Ferenc. Cited in Czigány. 113.
39. Kemény, Zsigmond. "Eszmék a regény és a dráma körül." In *Munkáiból*. 131–132. ("... azon felvilágosodott és engedékeny érzület [...], mely senkire a kárhuztatás követ nem szereti dobni, mely tárgyilagossággal kíván a más szívébe tekinteni, mely a lélek minden mozzanatainak indokait felfogni, eredményeit [...] megbocsátani tudja[.]")
40. *Ibid.* 132. ("... hallgattassék ki a másik fél is. Mert hátha az is szintén képes magát igazolni?")
41. *Ibid.* 132. ("Korunk e tulajdonainak leginkább bir a szépirodalom minden nemei közt a legkétségesebb aesthetikai becsű, a legformátlanabb alaku, tudniillik a regény, eleget tenni.")
42. Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote*. Translated by J. M Cohen. Penguin Books, 1950. 78
43. Reed. 68.
44. Kemény. "Eszmék a regény és a dráma körül." In: *Munkáiból*. 130. ("Az egész épületen repedések látszanak s tartósága iránt szívünkben kételyek fészkeltek. Mi azonban követ kő után feszítünk le, s rettegve az összeroskadástól, előmozdítjuk azt. Kíváncsiak vagyunk társadalmi viszonyaink hibáinak kikeresésében, fűrgék nevetségessé tételében, majdnem oly mértékig, mint a mennyi újságvágygyal fogadjuk az új társadalmi eszméket és a mennyi elmeállal állunk készen azok kigunyolására.")
45. *Ibid.* 130. ("Egyik irány felől sincs mély hitünk. Mindeniknek kémleljük gyengeségeit.")
46. Montaigne, Michel. *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*. Translated by Donald Frame. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957. 239.
47. *Ibid.* 244.
48. Kemény. "Eszmék a regény és a dráma körül." In: *Munkáiból*. 143–144. ("A valódi életben, a mi hétköznapi viszonyaink közt, az egyenesnek rémlő, bár folyvást változó utvonallhoz hasonlít az emberek óriás többségének jelleme. Szorosan véve senki nem marad multjához következetes; [...] Nem saját tetteink kényszerei miatt távozunk multunktól, kedélyvilágunk-, gondolkodásunk-, és akaratunkra nézve. Oh nem! Másokká csak azért leszünk, mert láttunk, mert tapasztaltunk, mert éltünk. Fogékonyságunk a napok haladása és az apró élmények által veszt vagy nyer, és izleteinkkel, vágyainkkal, tanulmányainkkal, sőt a körrel együtt, melybe lépünk, egész lényünkbe lassanként idegen sajátságok mennek át, hogy a jellem organikus részeivé váljanak, mint a testben a táplálék.")
49. *Ibid.* 144. ("Az ily átalakulás, melynek minden magyarázata csak a lefolyt időből áll, épen nem a könnyelműség bélyege, nem a változékonyság tulajdona, hanem jellemünknek oly természetes processusa, mint egy fa organikus életében a növés, vastagodás, [...] s utóbb a [...] rothadás.")
50. *Ibid.* 144. ("És a regényíró – ki a művészetet legközelebb hozhatja a valódi élethez – [...] visszatükrözött eme természetes fejlődést[.]")
51. Kemény Zsigmond. *A rajongók*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1969. 7. ("De minek ily elégiai hang a tények helyett, melyekre vissza kell gondolnunk.")
52. Kemény, Zsigmond. *Őzvegy és leánya*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1967. 10. ("A zsoltárokat gyönyörűen énekelte; de, fájdalom, világi nótákat is danolt.")
53. Bakhtin. "Discourse in the Novel." In: *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. 324.

54. Reed. 64.
55. Guillén. 65.
56. Sótér. *Aspects et parallelismes de la littératures hongroise*. 232–233. (“Cette critique, cependant, n’est pas directe, elle se manifeste par des transpositions, quelquefois de [sic] façon énigmatique et ironique ou dissimulée sous les couleurs sereines d’un humour indulgent en apparence.”)
57. Bakhtin. “Epic and Novel.” In: *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. 6.
58. *Ibid.* 7.