

# HUNGARIAN SCHOLARSHIP IN LITERATURE

ENIKŐ MOLNÁR BASA

Library of Congress, Washington, DC,  
U.S.A.

Hungarians are well aware of the contributions made by Hungary and individual Hungarians to European, or Western culture. On the occasion of the millennium this theme was touched on again and again in the celebrations in the United States. While any quick list will identify greats in music (Liszt, Kodály, Bartók), in the arts (Kertész, Vasarely, Munkácsi), the physical sciences (Simmelweis, Kandó, Kemény, Szent-Györgyi, Wiegner, Newman) and even the social sciences (economist John C. Harsányi and Dennis Gábor, a pioneer of communication theory), Hungarian contributions in literature are less obvious. Georg Lukács of course comes to mind, but while his theories were often applied in literary analysis, he is really more of a political and social philosopher than a literary theoretician. The disciplines just mentioned cross political and linguistic barriers easily. With other disciplines, especially literature, this is not the case. Yet, Hungary has made important contributions to scholarship in this area also.

Werner Friederich in his *Outline of Comparative Literature* comments that in spreading the Italian culture of the Renaissance, "Of almost equally great importance for Eastern Europe [equal to Francis I of France and Marguerite of Navarre] was King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary who, around 1480, made Budapest [sic] the Danubian center of Italian Humanism."<sup>1</sup> What this meant for European culture is suggested by visitors to Hungary and comments on Matthias court long after his death. His library has remained famous, though its integrity did not long survive the king. He also patronized the printing press: the first press was set up in Buda in 1472 by Andreas Hess. In 1473 Hess printed *The Hungarian Chronicle*, thus predating the first English book to be published by Caxton. Foreign visitors at the court, notably Bonfini and Galeotto, ensured that Buda was more than just a distant outpost of the Renaissance. Janus Pannonius (1434–1472) was "one of the better known figures of Humanist poetry in Europe."<sup>2</sup> In the sixteenth century János Zsámboky, or Sambucus (1531–1584), was similarly recognized as a European philologist, poet, and historian. Since there was no longer a court at Buda, he settled in Vienna and so is associated with the Habsburg court. His book of poems, *Emblemata* (1564), made him one of the foremost figures in this literary fashion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The influence of his work on Shakespeare has been noted.<sup>3</sup> Of equal importance were his editions of classical works, the works of Janus Pannonius,

and those of various Hungarian chroniclers. These allowed at least his contemporaries a glimpse into Hungarian history and letters.

The renown of Hungarian scholars in early modern Europe is also represented by Stephen Parmenius of Buda. While only one of the many Hungarians who studied at Western European universities, or spent time in Western European centers of learning, he is notable for his Latin poem on the achievements of Sir Humphrey Gilbert and English explorers in the Age of Elizabeth, *De Navigatione*. Respected by his contemporaries, he unfortunately drowned off Newfoundland and did not write the epic commemoration of the colonization attempt of Raleigh and Gilbert that he had hoped to do. The comment on his death serves as one of the first “might have beens” of Hungarian influence on English letters. A companion who survived, Edward Hayes, paid tribute to him with these words:

Amongst whom was drowned a learned man, an Hungarian, borne in the citie of Buda, called thereof Budaeus, who of pietie and zeale to good attempts, adventured in this action, minding to record in the Latin tongue, the gests and things of our nation, the same being adorned with the eloquent stile of this Orator, and rare Poet of our time.<sup>4</sup>

The seventeenth century yielded fewer names of European repute. While Miklós Zrínyi, the poet (1620–1664), was a popular figure – as was his ancestor, the hero of Szigetvár – it was his military prowess not his literary skills that brought him fame. Miklós Tótfalusi Kis (1650–1702) is maybe the first of the technocrats to contribute to European scholarship. A preacher and printer from Kolozsvár, he spent time in Amsterdam and became an excellent designer of type: the so-called Jansen type is his legacy to modern type faces.

Matthias had put Hungary on the literary and cultural map of Renaissance and Baroque Europe. Continuity of the tradition of scholarly exchanges, however, was prevented by the fall of Hungary to the Turks and Austrian domination in the succeeding centuries. So in examining our topic we must look at other criteria. The emphasis shifts. George Biztray in his essay on Babits in *A Journey into History* writes, “Babits was one of those outstanding Hungarians who made his nation realize that it, too, was a guardian of traditional classical values as a distant but fully European nook of the continent, and a former Roman colony later Christianized, thereby preserving the continuity of its historical heritage.”<sup>5</sup> It is a paradigm that I will examine in the rest of this paper. Hungarian literature has remained in touch with European trends and practice, though often giving it a unique – or maybe characteristic – twist. For example, Virginia L. Lewis’ study, “The Other Face of Modernization: the Collapse of Rural Society in East Central European Realism and Naturalism,” argues, as she has done elsewhere, that “nation” centered literary discussion relegates important works to a marginal role. Just as Austrian, Swiss, and even East German literatures have been rele-

gated to footnotes of German literature and the representatives of these literatures have been considered marginal, Hungarian literary movements have not been recognized as part of the mainstream of European literature.<sup>6</sup>

Taking a positive spin on this, we should note that just such a difference of interpretation can contribute valuable insights to the understanding of European literary trends. (Need one digress to note the applicability of this principle in the discussion of the model literary cannon, the place of third world literatures in the literary tradition, the synthesis of old cultures (India, Japan, China) with twentieth and twenty-first century world literature? Do we need to reexamine just what comprises world literature?) When writers or critics do become aware of Hungarian literature, it captures their imagination. And it does so precisely because Hungarian literature presents a fresh interpretation of genres, themes and ideas familiar to these critics.

A chronological examination will show that the Renaissance period in Hungary (and East-Central Europe) had much in common with the themes familiar in the literatures of England and Germany. But folklore and folk poetry had maybe a stronger influence here. Or maybe we should say that this tradition had a more immediate impact than in Western Europe. L. Sziklay makes just this point in "The 'Popular' Trend in the Romantic Literature of Some Central-European Nations." He points out that in both Hungarian and the Slavic Central European tradition, the folk literature discovered in the nineteenth century was based on the literary traditions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thus, there was much less questioning of the role and value of folk poetry, much less of a struggle between learned and folk than in England and France.

The Hungarian song emerged as the amalgam of European (world literary) and home traditions, developing from Csokonai through the Kisfaludy brothers, Kölcsey, Vörösmarty, Czuczor, the Slovene Prešeren, the Serbian Radičević, the Rumanian Alecsandri, the Czech Čelakovský, Erben, Mácha — right up to the Hungarian Petőfi.<sup>7</sup>

Epic poetry also owes much to the so-called folk tradition in Hungary, which in many instances is a reflection of Renaissance and Baroque works. Arany, in seeking to create the Hungarian national epic, went back not so much to folk poetry as to this earlier tradition which in the nineteenth century was generally forgotten. He used chronicles, the heritage of narrative poetry, especially Ilosvay, popularized accounts in prose chapbooks, and oral tradition for his *Toldi*. Chronicles and historical accounts are perhaps more important in *Buda halála*. The point is that, while following some European conventions of the epic, he went to *both* folk tradition and Renaissance literary remnants to mold the new literature of Hungary. Vörösmarty was more rooted in the Sturm und Drang of Pre-Romanticism, and Petőfi much more in contemporary folkloristic and lyrical traditions.

In modern literature Ágnes Nemes Nagy and her translator Hugh Maxton can shed light on this same interplay of western influences and Hungarian expression. In the introduction to *Between* Nemes Nagy writes:

The poems which follow were written by a Hungarian poet. This means that they were born in a rather special medium, that of Hungarian poetry. For though I consider world poetry today more or less uniform, I am nevertheless aware that the poetry of the various nations or groups of poets may be regarded as separate dialects of this uniform, universal language of poetry. Nothing is further from my mind than to theorize about the history of literature; I simply wish to make two observations about Hungarian poetry as a whole. The first is that Hungarian poetry – may God forgive me for the word – is *important*.<sup>8</sup>

In her belief that there is a “universal language of poetry” of which national manifestations are merely dialects, Nemes Nagy argues that Hungarian literature, or at least poetry, is part of the heritage of the world. Of course, the problem of linguistic inaccessibility remains, and translations can only partially solve this. But we have to look at literature as a whole. We should be less concerned with periodization, influences, and receptions, or when and how styles and -isms migrated from country to country. Maybe then we will gain a perspective from which universal values can be seen in all literary productions.

She goes on to argue that while the difficulty of the Hungarian language, its isolation, and the challenges of translation are problems in making Hungarian part of the mainstream of world literature, there is also a positive side:

Every language is unique, the Hungarian language is even more unique... As a poet, however, I am not always rejoicing. The Hungarian language is isolated, the Hungarian language means certain death in world literature. But the Hungarian language lends itself extremely well to poetry. If I were to make a paradoxical argument in favour of this daring opinion, I would insist that Hungarian is so well suited to poetry *precisely because* it is isolated, because its existence in world literature is perilous, because a certain kind of hopelessness is part of its essence – which, of course, means hope *vis-à-vis* the ultimate problems of mankind, the constant, centuries (millennia) old experience of living through extreme existential situations.<sup>9</sup>

Ágnes Nemes Nagy’s translator, Hugh Maxton supports her contention that Hungarian literature is part of the universal language of poetry:

For all its isolation from neighboring languages, Hungarian is in this one important regard peculiarly a language of European romanticism, and this generates a tension in the work of such writers as Ágnes Nemes Nagy who are, in their broad literary philosophy, clas-

sicists or modernist/classicists. Perhaps Henrik Ibsen offers a compatible instance of a writer working through a relatively new literary language to achieve a poetic vision at some odds with the energies which led to the renewal of the language.<sup>10</sup>

Often whether a particular writer becomes known abroad is an accident of a fortuitous translation, a favorable political situation, or a publisher willing to gamble on an unknown and give it sufficient publicity to make an impact. As I pointed out in my introductory essay to *Hungarian Literature*,

When Hungarian literature is examined apart from its momentary political role, the universal values it addresses might be noticed. Such an approach would finally ensure a fairer evaluation, whether of the classics or of modern writers. I would not hesitate to call Zrínyi, Petőfi, Arany, and Ady great in the large context of world literature; and Illyés, Csoóri, and Sütő great in contemporary terms: their works address universal problems such as the individual versus the state, loss of identity, the role of the community, the responsibility of the individual to the modern world, the contribution of minorities to national and international cultures, and so on.<sup>11</sup>

The translator of János Pilinszky's *Selected Poems*, Ted Hughes, also appreciates the international impact of his subject. As he writes in the preface, the publication of Pilinszky's second volume of poems in 1959, a total of about fifty-two,

have gradually established his international reputation. It was recognized, from the start, that he spoke from the disaster-core of the modern world. ... Pilinszky's poetry proves itself to be almost a religious activity. Once we have said that, though, we realize it is also a by-product. The chief task is something else, an attitude, and more than that, a sustained commitment to certain loyalties, which involve Pilinszky's whole life at every moment. And it is true, his personality and his life are as exemplary, for Hungarians, as his poems: they are a single fabric. This insistence of Pilinszky's on paying for his words with his whole way of life, has confirmed the authority of his poems. And this is how they come to be an existential challenge to all who are deeply drawn into them.<sup>12</sup>

Such testimony attests to the role of Hungarian literature as a re interpretation of literary genres, themes, and ideas. Citing Maxton again, who is referring to Nemes Nagy but whose comment could be applied to other Hungarian writers as well:

Nemes Nagy remains a central figure in Hungarian writing through such persistent loyalty to responsibilities inherited from her predecessors and heightened by the undifferentiated terrorism of the fascist and post-fascist period. In terms of European literary history,

Thomas Mann provides the best measure for Anglophobe readers, Rilke also perhaps for German readers. In more local terms of literary technique, her prose poems bring her into contact with such figures of the new generation of Hungarian writers as Péter Esterházy whose collected fictions are called, simply, *Introductions to Literature*. She is thus both classicist and avant-garde for her informed readers, a latter-day modernist of great sensibility and intelligence.<sup>13</sup>

His reference to Thomas Mann and Rilke indicates that Hungarian literature should be seen as a new window on other literatures, not just a peripheral comment on them.

Hungarian literature has influenced other literatures directly, though the instances are rare. In the early nineteenth century Theodor Körner turned to the exploits of Zrínyi to inspire the Germans during the Napoleonic wars. His drama falls short of the *Szigeti veszedelem*. The thematic connection, however, put Miklós Zrínyi's work on the map. Similarly, Franz Grillparzer borrowed Hungarian history in his *Ein Treuer Diener Seines Herrn* but created a drama that lacked the national elements of Katona's work. His is a psychological study of loyalty. With even greater generalizations, literary critics often dismiss Petőfi as a populist writer, one who used folkloric elements to good effect, but was essentially an untutored writer of the Romantic era. The truth of course is that Petőfi was a complex poet whose intellectual and philosophical range should be compared to poets such as Wordsworth, Byron, or Shelley. His interpretation of Romantic poetry is certainly more varied than that of Robert Burns, with whom he is often compared. As George Bisztray argues in his essay, *Two Homelands: Mihály Babits and European Consciousness in Modern Hungarian Literature*, Babits

thought that the national value of any literature was in direct relation to its uniqueness, while its value for world literature was, paradoxically, in converse relation to the same. Consequently, certain cherished values of Hungarian literature had no relevance to world literature. Babits mentioned patriotism as an example: an idea worshipped by Hungarian authors and readers in the spirit of Greek and Roman literature as an expression of universal human feelings and rights; while in modern world literature patriotism was but a shallow phrase.<sup>14</sup>

Perspective plays an important part in the assessment of the literary value of a work or of the style, themes, and concerns which characterize a literature. As Babits suggested, it can condemn works to misinterpretation before the critic is able to approach the work without bias. Lack of translation hinders not only the interested reader; it closes off large areas of the literary spectrum from serious students also. Comparative studies, as Anne Paolucci pointed out in her introduction to the Council of National Literatures volume on Hungary, "includes

[besides *emergent* and *neglected* literatures], a third category of literatures generally ranked as *established*. Established literatures provide the standard in comparison with which other literatures get to be ranked as emergent or neglected."<sup>15</sup> But, this ranking is slanted in favor of the major Western European language and literatures, ranking as "emergent" not only the literature of Hungary but that of China, India, and Japan as well. Frank J. Warnke recognized that perhaps by limiting its attention to seven or so major languages (English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, German, Italian, and Russian) it is the Western European critics who "suffer from provincialism. Are we missing something, perhaps quite a lot?" he asks.<sup>16</sup>

The recognition of this problem of perspective by more and more literary scholars leads one to hope that Hungarian literature can enter as a more equal partner in the dialogue of comparative literature. The tools are not lacking, and these tools can enable students to gain familiarity with Hungarian literature so as to insure its inclusion in world literature surveys or to broaden parallels and comparative aspects dealing with other literary areas.<sup>17</sup> A list would be long and terribly boring, so in conclusion I will highlight only a few significant works which serve to mark the recognition of Hungarian literature in scholarly circles. Though now somewhat out of date, Albert Tezla's two important books, *An Introductory Bibliography to the Study of Hungarian Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) and *Hungarian Authors: a Bibliographical Handbook* (Cambridge: Bellnap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970), have not been superseded. They not only provide very useful annotations, but also indicate the libraries where the works are held. Several appendices increase the usefulness of the second work: brief descriptions of literary and learned societies and of the serials mentioned in the biographical sketches give histories of the institutions and periodicals that have shaped Hungarian literary life. Then there are bibliographies that give access to English-language materials. These are useful, since often translations appear in small press publications, or are printed by private individuals or foundations; seldom do large publishing houses consider such works sufficiently lucrative to publish them. Magda Czigány's *Hungarian Literature in English Translation Published in Great Britain 1830–1968* (London: Szepsi Csombor Literary Circle, 1969) and *Magyarországi irodalom idegen nyelven: a hazai szépirodalom fordításainak bibliográfiája, 1945–1968* by Magda Fajcsek and Mrs. Zoltán Szilvássy (Budapest: Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, 1975) are worth consulting, though again newer works are needed.

In journals, *World Literature Today* has long been a champion of "neglected" literatures and has not only regularly reviewed publications but also carries articles on individual literary figures or trends. The *Bibliography* of the Modern Language Association has increased its coverage of Hungarian literature also and its on-line bibliography identifies an impressive number of hits on Hungarian literature. Still, many journals, particularly those published in Hungarian, go unno-

ticed even though listed as being reviewed. Until it stopped publication, *Books from Hungary*, the quarterly journal of the Hungarian Publishers and Booksellers Association, carried annotations on recent publications in English, French, and German, and brief articles on selections of popular literature. Unfortunately, there never was a comprehensive index, so its usefulness was limited to information on the most recent publications. Maybe the most useful bibliography for literature, language, history, ethnography, and folklore is the *Hungarológiai Értésítő* of the Nemzetközi Magyar Filológiai Társaság published semiannually. It provides what is possibly the broadest coverage in terms of journals surveyed: over 13 pages in the title list. Many European journals are included, both from the states neighboring Hungary with substantial Hungarian minorities and from Western Europe. But among English-language publications, only *World Literature Today* is reviewed.

Turning to literary histories, a translation of the *Kis magyar irodalomtörténet* by Tibor Klaniczay, József Szauder, and Miklós Szabolcsi was published as *History of Hungarian Literature* (London: Collet, 1964). Unfortunately, the work is far too general and too ideologically committed to make much of an impact on Western literary analysis. Two other works, both almost double in length of the above, were intended to fill the ever-increasingly felt need for a definitive history of Hungarian literature. Neither fulfills this mission, though if read together, they can give a fairly accurate picture. The *Oxford History of Hungarian Literature from the Earliest Times to the Present* by Lóránt Czigány dismisses all literary activity up to the 18th century in some 80 pages out of a text of four-hundred and eighty-four. The lack of proportion, even the absence of certain important authors, remains a limiting feature. It also lacks a unified critical view which hampers the work. The inclusion of Hungarian writers living in the West is a useful feature, but with barely seven pages, the information is sketchy and incomplete. *A History of Hungarian Literature* by István Nemeskürty, et al. (Budapest: Corvina, 1982) is somewhat more popularizing than scholarly in its style and concerns, but it does cover all of Hungarian literature, not ignoring the earlier periods to concentrate on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It does not, however, include the literature of the Hungarians in the former Hungarian territories, or Hungarian literature produced in the West. On the other hand, it is, as H. H. Remak characterized it in the Preface, "a lively, direct, clear, and rich introduction to the literary facet of a noteworthy culture." The bibliography is particularly useful in that it includes English translations. The general sections have the breadth one would expect from such a work, but what is a particularly nice feature is a section on comparative aspects of Hungarian and European or American literature, and the interactions of individual authors with Western literature. A very full index and many portraits in the appendix complement the work nicely.



Better represented in English language works than Hungarian literary history are special topics. József Reményi's *Hungarian Writers and Literature* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1964) is a collection of essays on individual writers and themes. Most of the essays were written for periodicals and they are fairly general and somewhat more popular than scholarly. While again concentrating on the twentieth century, an extensive bibliography which includes periodical articles as well as monographs adds to its usefulness. David Mervyn Jones' *Five Hungarian Writers* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) is an excellent study of five major authors: Sándor Petőfi, József Eötvös, Kelemen Mikes, Mihály Vörösmarty, and Miklós Zrínyi. With the exception of Petőfi, these men are hardly known in the English world, and certainly there has been very little written on them. The praiseworthy project that Twayne Publishers began in 1974 could have led to a series of monographic studies on the major Hungarian authors; unfortunately, only a few appeared before the publisher decided to terminate his commitment in favor of more profitable ventures. The ones that did appear are: *Kálmán Mikszáth* by Steven C. Scheer (Boston, 1977); *Mihály Vitéz Csokonai* by Anna Katona, *Ferenc Molnár* by Clara Györgyey, and *Sándor Petőfi* by Enikő Molnár Basa, all in 1980, and *Imre Madách* by Dieter Lotze in 1981. Two other volumes, on *Miklós Radnóti* by Marianne Birnbaum, and on *Dezső Kosztolányi* by Dalma and Stephen Brunauer, were accepted, but not published. Fortunately, the *Uralaltaische Jahrbücher of Munich* published both manuscripts upon Twayne's default, so these volumes are also available. Since the purpose of the Twayne series is to introduce the non-professionals to little-known literatures, each volume is designed as a critical introduction, supplemented only by the necessary bibliographical, cultural, and historical background. These are not intended as definitive studies of any one author. A bibliography ensures the usefulness of the studies beyond the mere introductory function, however.

In the past few years, various compilations have included Hungarian literature in their repertory. The *Critical Survey of Poetry: Foreign Language Series*, edited by Frank N. Magill (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Salem Press, 1984) includes essays on Hungarian poetry and some individual authors. Regrettably, there is some unevenness in the essays, which stricter editorial supervision could have helped. What is more disturbing is that uninformed copy-editing led to essential passages being omitted. A brief bibliography is included for each poet, and thus some Hungarian writers who would otherwise remain quite unknown are introduced to the English reader. A significant contribution has been made by the series *World Authors* (New York: H. W. Wilson). The first volume covered 1950–1970; subsequent volumes cover five years each and present several significant modern writers whose works are available in English translation. Although many writers have appeared in the several volumes that have been published so far, the requirement that each author have work published in English translation has restricted the number of Hungarian writers who can be considered; I have been

unable to propose new ones for the forthcoming volume. The essays take the authors' own works as the starting point, and a bibliography leads the reader to further sources. The similar series, *European Authors, 1000–1900* and *Twentieth Century Authors* devote essays to classical authors. Mention should also be made of *World Literature since 1945*, edited by Ivar Ivask and Gero von Wilpert (New York: F. Unger, 1973), which contains a survey of Hungarian literature.

The Gale series, *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* (Detroit, 1981–) ranges widely in English critical literature to present a collection of essays, or excerpts from longer studies, on several major writers – Ady, Babits, József, Radnóti, Mikszáth and Móricz among them – as well as devoting a substantial section to Hungarian literature in general. The purpose of the series is to give a biographical-critical introduction to the writer; since the essays cover essentially the same ground from different perspectives, they can be very useful. Specific periods in Hungarian literature have recently received attention: Marianne Birnbaum's essay, "Humanism in Hungary" in *Renaissance Humanism, Foundations, Forms, Legacy*, edited by Albert Rabil (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988) places the early Hungarian Renaissance in context. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich's *Romanticism in National Context* (Cambridge University Press, 1988) gives space to Mihály Szegedy-Maszák's essay, "Romanticism in Hungary." The dominant concern of Hungarian literature for most of the modern period is addressed by George F. Cushing in "Social Criticism in Hungarian Literature since 1956" in *Perspectives on Literature and Society in Eastern and Western Europe*, edited by Geoffrey A. Hasking and G.F. Cushing (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989). Women writers are represented in two recent anthologies. Suzanne Fónay Wemple wrote on Lea Ráskay in *Women Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation* and Enikő Molnár Basa on Kata Szidonia Petrőczy in *Women Writers of the Seventeenth Century*.<sup>18</sup> The format of these volumes calls for a brief biographical-critical introduction followed by a selection of translations from the work of the writer being discussed.

In conclusion, then, we can say that there have been contributions to scholarship in Hungarian literature on various levels. Hungary and Hungarians have made significant contributions to literary study and history. Critics have been sensitive to comparisons and writers have been receptive to influences. Both have shed light on generally accepted values, genres, and themes from a unique perspective. It is time for some of these works to be more widely known, and particularly for more texts to be available in good translations so that the interplay of contexts can truly be two-way.

## Notes

1. Werner P. Friederich, *Outline of Comparative Literature from Dante Alighieri to Eugene O'Neill* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1954), 52.
2. Lóránt Czigány, *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 28.
3. Lajos Dézsi, "Magyar irodalmi hatás Shakespeare költészetében", *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 21 (1929): 235–242. Other studies of Hungarian references in Renaissance drama are to be found in: Lajos Bodrogi, "Shakespeare mirőlünk," in *Magyar Shakespeare Tár*, ed. Zoltán Ferenczi (Budapest, F. Kilián, 1908–1916?) 1 (1908), 178–209, and Fest, *op. cit.* "Mit tud a Shakespeare-korabeli angol irodalom Magyarországról?" 6 (1913), 168–182; "Adalékok a Shakespeare-korabeli irodalom magyar vonatkozásairól," 9 (1916), 282–283; and two other articles by Fest: "Magyar vonatkozások Ben Jonson műveiben," *Egyetemes Philológiai Közöny*, 37 (1913): 206–208, and "Magyar vonatkozások Marlowe drámáiban," *Irodalomtörténet*, 1 (1912): 117–119; László Országh, "Magyar tárgyú angol renaissance-drámák," *Egyetemes Philológiai Közöny*, 67 (1943): 405–411; Eugene Pivány, "Hungarians of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Literature," *Angol Filológiai Tanulmányok*, 2 (1937): 83–92.
4. David B. Quinn, *Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*, 2 vols. (1940; rpt. Nedeln, Liechtenstein, Kraus Reprint, 1967), 413.
5. Moses M. Nagy, ed., *A Journey into History: Essays on Hungarian Literature* (New York: P. Lang, c1990) (American University Studies), 158.
6. Virginia L. Lewis, "The Other Face of Modernization: the Collapse of Rural Society in East Central European Realism and Naturalism," *Neohelicon*, v. 22, no. 2 (1995): 223–225.
7. *European Romanticism* ed. I. Sötér and I. Neupokoyeva. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1977), 329–330.
8. Ágnes Nemes Nagy, *Between; Selected Poems of Ágnes Nemes Nagy*, translated by Hugh Maxton. (Budapest: Corvina; Dublin: Dedalus, c1988), 7.
9. *Ibid.*, 8
10. *Ibid.*, 80–81.
11. *Hungarian Literature*, Enikő Molnár Basa, ed. Review of National Literatures, v. 17. (New York: Griffon House Publications, c1993), 30.
12. János Pilinszky, *Selected Poems*, translated by Ted Hughes and János Csokits. (Manchester: Carcanet New Press, c1976), 9, 12.
13. Nemes Nagy, 90–91.
14. Moses Nagy, (*op. cit.*) 150.
15. *Hungarian Literature*, 12–13.
16. *Ibid.*, 14–15.
17. *Ibid.*, 136–137.
18. Both books are edited by Katharina M. Wilson, the second with Frank J. Warnke, and published by the University of Georgia Press, Athens and London, in 1987 and 1989 respectively.