

PARADIGMS OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY HUNGARIAN FOLK DRAMA

Márta Zabán

Assoc. Researcher, PhD, "Babeş-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca

*Abstract: In early 19th century Hungarian literature, folk drama (the so-called népszínmű) is the genre to represent, akin to western European popular dramatic genres, a sense of literature quite different from that of elite literary genres, while it also targets a different public, employing different tools. The study analyses the interpretations written in the second part of the XIXth century about the folk dramas of Ede Szigligeti. The controversies regarding these dramas show the different notion about the literary concept, the concept of drama, that of folk and popular and last but not least about the concept of folk-dramas formed in the Hungarian Literature by the thinkers of the era. The paper tries to expose the different worldviews of the era's critics hidden behind the different manners of using rival concepts.*

*Keywords: folk drama, popular literature, Hungarian literature, nationalism, 19<sup>th</sup> Century*

In the region populated by Hungarian-speaking communities, during the second part of the 19th century, literature adopts an increasingly national character and the folk paradigm also gains in emphasis. The issue of popular character is an extremely complicated one though, the phenomenon noted as folk output seems to be quite different depending on the approaching system of thought, this is how the texts of such character frequently acquire different batches of meaning.

So far, in relation to 19th century literary folk art, literary historians mostly dealt with the importance of epic as a genre, and with the relationship between folk poetry and folk trends in literature. Folk art was not brought into discussion in relation to other genres either, while researchers in the field of Hungarian literature have so far written next to nothing on the popular (folk) character of folk drama. As a genre, folk drama does differ from other possible genres in the folk paradigm, and as we will soon see, 19th century thinkers did take this difference into consideration, even if they interpreted it in various ways.

By mid-nineteenth century, drama becomes a genre holding, for many thinkers of the age, the promise of a proper representation of the nation.<sup>1</sup> Drama was interpreted as a legitimate medium for the role of national representation. From this viewpoint, within the paradigm of folk trend in literature, folk drama should have been the most significant dramatic genre. There is a strong trend within the reception of folk dramas written by Szigligeti, according to which one should interpret drama according to the type of national representation it achieves, and these dramatic pieces may be considered unsuccessful to the extent to which various critics considered the national representation they provided improper.

The most important mid-nineteenth century drama critics agreed that from the viewpoint of national representation, drama was a significant medium of the day, nevertheless their

---

<sup>1</sup>Gusztáv Szontagh, *Blair Hugo retorikai és aestheticai leckéi*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 19. 305–310. – Ferenc Toldy, *Eposi és drámai kor. Drámai literatúránk' jelen állapotjáról. Szontagh Gusztáv ellen*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 21. 345–348. – Gusztáv Szontagh, *Eposi és drámai kor. Drámai literatúránk jelen állapotjáról, D. Schedel Ferencnek igazolásul*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 23. 379–383. – Ferenc Toldy, *Végszó az eposi s drámai korról és drámai literatúránkról*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 24. 394–399.

opinions varied as to whether to interpret the written text or the stage performance. In his 1855 essay on contemporary Hungarian literature, *Egy századnegyed a magyar szépirodalomból*, János Erdélyi notes that already by the first half of the century certain polemics surfaced “trying to separate, despite their kindred nature, dramatic text and stage performance”<sup>2</sup>. According to Erdélyi, these critical polemics are accountable for the fact that drama as literature and drama intended for stage took increasingly different paths in Hungarian culture: “This is when the dichotomy appeared, according to which literary drama is something quite different from dramatic output meant for the stage.”<sup>3</sup> He seems to find the root for the split in dramatic and artistic effect in this dichotomy, too,<sup>4</sup> and this is important as one of the heaviest arguments used by critics against Szigligeti, as will be soon demonstrated, is that the attempt on Szigligeti’s part to build stage effect ruins the quality of his folk drama. The simultaneous existence of the above mentioned tendencies (the paradigm of folk art, the “nationalisation” of literature, the subsequent problematic ride of the dramatic concept) create a special context within which from mid-century, the genre of folk drama, born by the beginning of the nineteenth century, is reinterpreted, it acquires special connotation and gains a new taxonomic position within the literary system of the age.

The history of literature considers Ede Szigligeti to be the father of folk drama, and even though he was mostly active during the first half of the century, a significant part of his output reaches over to the second half of the century. In the following, I will analyse the content of negative criticism directed against Szigligeti during the second half of the 19th century in order to trace the way of thinking of the critics involved and their view of the genre. I will analyse the type of folk drama concepts and folk drama images at work in their critical writing and the modelling concepts of folk art and literature behind.

One of the special characteristics of pieces of criticism targeting folk dramas by Szigligeti is that they mostly disagree with Szigligeti in what pertains to the generic norms of folk drama. The majority of critics disappointed with his works are visibly against both Szigligeti’s theoretic stance and whatever he implements of it. Nevertheless, as it will be soon demonstrated, they actually do not disagree with Szigligeti in points they explicitly formulate during the argument, but in most cases there is a difference in opinions due to a difference in the use of concepts, or a difference simply originating in the fact that the parties to the polemics are employing different terminologies, thus their statements cannot really intersect. Translated to the case of folk drama this means that arguing parties are operating with differing folk drama concepts. So for the majority of critics who reject the folk dramas written by Szigligeti, the reason behind is not an actual failure in the dramas criticised but a set of expectations to which they not only did not comply, but according to the author they did not even have to comply. Thus for us it is best to trace various concepts of folk drama that mould the thinking process and argumentation of various critics. For me, this is important not only for an early interpretation of the genre but also – as each critic sets out from the generic denomination of folk drama – a tool useful in the interpretation of the concepts of folk, popular (folk) character, folk genre and drama as such.

The trajectory in the second half of the 19th century of the prestige, generic connotations of and expectations from folk drama was dependent not only on the contemporary meanings of the concept of folk, and its role played in national representation. The set of expectations implemented within the critique and interpretation of folk drama was closely related to the

---

2János Erdélyi, *Egy századnegyed a magyar szépirodalomból* = Erdélyi János, *Irodalmi tanulmányok és pályaképek*, Ilona T. Erdélyi (ed.), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1991., 183–225., here: 233.

3János Erdélyi, *Egy századnegyed...* 235.

4János Erdélyi, *Egy századnegyed...* 237.

function and place of folk drama within the literature of the age. Writing on the literary network of the 1860s, Mihály Szajbély notes how two of the most powerful mid-nineteenth century canons and the related literary texts are moving towards two entirely different functions: while popular literature (literature for the masses) produces a national representation mostly meant to entertain, the elite canon attempts a criticism and betterment of national characteristics and undertakes thus a rather didactic role within the literary representation of the nation. If we analyse, taking into consideration the viewpoint offered by Mihály Szajbély, the discourse on folk drama by a few significant critics of the age, it turns out that viewed from the elite canon, folk drama appears as a go-between genre with criticised features linking it to the popular canon.

Analysing the genre of folk drama and the related 19th century discourses from the viewpoint of the functions of the two significant canons of the 1860s as sketched by Mihály Szajbély, it turns out that representatives of the elite canon kept trying to assign meanings to certain popular features of the genre that would comply to the values and norms the elite canon. They are, in other words, trying to domesticate genetic connotations, in order to have a well functioning genre fill certain lacks within their own system. At the same time, in order to be able to integrate the genre within the system of their canon, they simply rejected all generic features that did not seem to fit within that system, either recommending other, accepted features or interpreting them as failed attempts in implementing an elite literary norm. I will list a few examples for the functional flexibility of this genre and its many interpretations possible in the age. Let us first examine the way the most important critics of the age defined the generic aim of folk drama.

Writing of the stage performance of *A lelenc* (The Waif) by Szigligeti in 1863 on the pages of the review Koszorú, Pál Gyulai notes that folk-bent literature needs to be interpreted as a significant trend of the Hungarian national poetry of the age, with folk drama as a genre in the making: “Folk drama appeared on our stage as an outcome of democratic trends in our political life. [...] National poetry in development turned with pleasure toward folk art, partly out of a democratic instinct and partly out of artistic reasons.”<sup>5</sup> We can see how the author perceives both the genre and the folk paradigm as politically determined. It is an essential characteristic of Gyulai’s concept that both in this piece of criticism and in his writing published ten years later, in 1873 and entitled *Szigligeti és újabb színművei* (Szigligeti and His Latest Plays) he traces the genre of folk drama back to Hungarian literary antecedents giving little emphasis to foreign literary models.<sup>6</sup> He merely touches upon the effect of French vaudeville, seeing it at work only in the mode of orchestrating the action in dramatic pieces by Szigligeti,<sup>7</sup> forgetting to mention the possible effect of the German posse altogether. As we will see, contrary to his approach, Ferenc Salamon sets a non-Hungarian lineage for the genre of folk drama, constructing a tradition in universal literature within which the genre in question acquires quite different connotations and needs to comply to quite different requirements.

Even though Gyulai mentions political determination, he considers that folk drama still fails to legitimately take up the social direction it should, as the genre that successfully meets those requirements is actually the novel.<sup>8</sup> The writing *Szigligeti és újabb színművei* also shows why the author adopts his stance. Gyulai considers the denomination of folk drama

---

5Pál Gyulai, *A lelenc* = Pál Gyulai, *Dramaturgiai dolgozatok*, vol. I., Budapest, 1908. 569–584., here: 571.

6Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb színművei* = Pál Gyulai, *Dramaturgiai dolgozatok*, vol. II., Budapest, 1908. 395.

7Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 399.

8 “Our folk drama cannot take up the strictly considered *social direction* either; as compared to drama, the novel has a much more suitable form in this respect.” (Pál Gyulai, *A lelenc...* 572–573.)

linked not to the fact that it mainly represents popular topics (while he thinks this is valid for all the other folk genres), but to the receptors of folk drama postulated as “folk”. We will see how Salamon is quite clear about defining folk drama as drama with popular topic. According to Gyulai on the other hand, the syntagm “folk” in folk drama designates that this drama is “written for the folk, for the greater audience while the stance of the poet is not exactly folkish naivety. [...] The folk character resides not so much in the content as in the concept of such dramatic pieces.”<sup>9</sup> Folk drama in his view speaks not *about* but *to* folk. This is why it fails to act as propaganda for any social stratum ranked as folk, as instead of the group whose attention it should call to injuries brought to the folk, it turns toward that very folk. Simultaneously, he thinks that well written folk drama offers an authentic representation of Hungarians. This is to say they provide a national representation within which the targeted folk can genuinely interpret itself, its own place and its own role in society.<sup>10</sup> Under this light it is no surprise that for Gyulai when writing about plays by Szigligeti the greatest difficulty resides in aspects such as the sacrifice of authentic representation for the sake of theatrical aplomb.<sup>11</sup> Gyulai rejects all attempt by Szigligeti at achieving greater stage effects he thinks that the plays are loosing in depths and content this way: “As an actor, director and playwright, Szigligeti had every day experienced it how beautiful language, lyrical monologues, deep thoughts and witty monologues are of absolutely no effect upon audiences when compared to action.”<sup>12</sup> – meaning that bent on meeting the expectations of the audience and reaching theatrical success, with a quickening drive of action Szigligeti offers his audience something else than he really should. Gyula considers that Szigligeti is only offering his audience pieces of interesting action, and he is discontent with the lack in Szigligeti’s plays of proper concern with a perfectionist and elitist representation of Hungarian language. As it turns out from his text, Gyulai attributes the effect of the plays written by Szigligeti in this respect to the popular implementation of a stage technique but he considers this method the lowering of dramatic art by means of stage tricks: “instead of a study of life and history, his play seems to be offering a study of the audience and the stage”.<sup>13</sup>

In his criticism, Ágost Greguss resents as a negative feature of the plays the fact that Szigligeti is exceedingly bent on achieving stage effect and by this adopts the spectacular and the comic as elements of his folk drama plays. In 1856, writing about the Szigligeti play *Dalos Pista* (Singing Pista), Greguss notes the following: “Outside of the stage he [Szigligeti] knows perfectly well the majority of the Hungarian audience that finds itself, so to say, within the first moon-quarter of being cultured, and the tastes of which still decide the success of a given stage performance, and he consequently adjusts his plays to fit the tastes of the said group”.<sup>14</sup> In a piece of criticism on the play *Pál fordulása* (Paul’s Turn) he comments: “There is nobody but Szigligeti to better formulate can the principle of lighting a candle for the devil. By devil here we understand the tastes of the general audience while the candle would be anything comical and spectacular. This play also contains music, songs, dance.”<sup>15</sup> As we see,

---

9Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 435.

10 “Hungarian folk drama is born with a seat of main features: a dramatic style with indeterminate form, democratic spirit, genre picture of Hungarian life in content, with tragicomical accents accompanied by folk music and folk song.” (Pál Gyulai, *A lelc...* 571.)

11Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 400.

12Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 398.

13Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 400.

14Ágost Greguss, *Febr. 22. Dalos Pista, népszínmű 3 felv. Írta Szigligeti = Ágost Greguss, Tanulmányai II.*, Published by Mór Ráth, Pest, 1872. 35–44., here: 36.

15Ágost Greguss, *April 27. Pál fordulása, színmű 2 szakaszban. Írta Szigligeti = Ágost Greguss, Tanulmányai II.*, Published by Mór Ráth, Pest, 1872. 73.

the opinions of Greguss and Gyulai are roughly similar as to scenic effect, but they give different interpretations to the phenomenon. Gyulai rejects the method as he considers that the heightened role of scenic representation weakens the authenticity of representation, so the expected message of the play turns out to be more shallow. According to Greguss on the other hand, artistic quality suffers as under such circumstances no works requiring solid cultural knowledge can be written. To a certain extent he ranks folk drama among the less demanding, lower genres of elite literature, having their limits shaped by the limits in culture of the audience. The difference between the line of thought of the two critics is quite characteristic and also telling: while Gyulai points out certain limits to the content expressed by the play, Greguss resents other limits determined by the level of culture of the audience, limits thwarting artistic and aesthetic values within the play.

An analysis of the same matter but offering a wider perspective is the one provided in a earlier critical text by Zsigmond Kemény around the year 1853. In his essay *Színművészetünk ügyében* (On Our Dramatic Art) he considers the possible differences in interpretation between written/read and performed plays not only as a special matter of folk drama, but as a general issue pertaining to the whole of dramatic literature. In his view, the sad outcome for drama of the appearance of the novel in Hungarian literature is that as the former audience gradually turned to read novels, it ceased to be as powerful as written drama: “I think the main damage brought by the popularity of novels to drama literature, and which can hardly be righted during our current civilisation, is that the novel has definitely *robbed drama of its reading public*. / Drama belongs now among the worst works sold by booksellers. [...] Consequently the playwright, having lost its reading public, can only count on the audience in theatres; and as he will receive honours and money only from theatre audiences, it will only take that into consideration when shaping and moulding his plays.”<sup>16</sup> This is how he conceives of the matter discussed by the above two critics in relation to plays written by Szigligeti. In 1853 Kemény senses plays written for the stage taking over from plays written to be read and considers the event to lead to a decrease in quality and a shift of the genre in the direction of the popular. Nevertheless he does not see this as a result of a compromise reached by playwrights in order to breed greater success as he conceives of the stage performance as of a basically popular event: “The readers of a play are reaching for joy directly through the play as it is. Otherwise why would they read it? In such a situation paying attention is the norm. / Nevertheless the theatre-goer simply seeks entertainment, partly by hearing out the beauties of the play, but also by people-watching, by chatting with familiar figures, by scenic spectacle, costumes, ornaments, music, songs and dances.”<sup>17</sup> Thus for him drama can become part of elite literature only in its form intended for reading, while stage performances and works written directly for stage performance can only rank among popular works.

As Gyulai sees folk drama as a genre linked to lower and less cultured layers of society, an expectation appears with him that had also featured in the concept of folk literature established by Arany and János Erdélyi in relation to other popular (folk) genres, and that is the circulation of texts among people and their survival in popular (folk) conscience<sup>18</sup>: “His

---

16Zsigmond Kemény, *Színművészetünk ügyében* = Zsigmond Kemény, *Élet és irodalom*, Szépirodalmi Kiadó, Budapest, 1971. 283–306., here: 288–289.

17Zsigmond Kemény, *Színművészetünk ügyében...* 294.

18Thus texts of popular literature can be authenticated if they manage to stay in the memory of the people, so if a text enters the realm of folk art and is circulated among people, this is a direct demonstration of its genuine value, even despite the specific pragmatism of this environment. This norm of the age is not mere philosophy but a set of strict rules (in compliance to the norms of public poetry), and this is demonstrated by Rumen István

folk plays reflect Hungarian society much better than his comedies do, the comic genre figures in the former are often more rounded than the main characters in the latter. They are much more likely to remain in our memory and several of their ideas tend to breed sayings.”<sup>19</sup> It is important that even though Gyulai considered folk drama to be a genre targeting wide social strata, he still ranked it among elite literary genres, expecting works of comply to the norms of the canon and determining the ideal through listing classics of world literature and comedies written by William Shakespeare.

He writes about the dramatic technique of Szigligeti thus: “he understands the logical continuity of plot, he knows how to keep the interest rising, but does not depict the evolution of passion step by step, does not reveal the deep vertigo of the heart nor the innermost content of character.”<sup>20</sup> – Gyulai sees the success of dramatic representation as lying first of all in psychologic authenticity, so in case of a text meant to represent the nation he is looking for an authentic representation of national character and not a set of ethnographic features.

Mór Jókai interprets the popularity of works by Szigligeti and his ambition to create popular plays differently. In his opinion, owing to their popularity, these plays fulfilled two important roles. On one hand they helped attract the audience and they also helped widening the audience of Hungarian drama both in the direction of lower social strata and the aristocracy: “His folk drama swept weak comedy and awful horror drama off from the stage, emanating a live and strong trend, authenticity, truth, true morality and a love of man; through these plays, our folk songs reached salons and comptoirs and the rooms of noblemen and tradesmen previously closed to such sounds; later on they opened the road for our artistic and literary interests as well and this is how they become a genuine capital of Hungarian theatre with extremely high moral and material interests.”<sup>21</sup> Jókai thinks these works played a significant role in spreading national literature written in Hungarian in the widest circle possible. The topic behind here is the conviction that theatre is home to the representation of true and clear Hungarian language. As the quote demonstrates it, folk drama for Jókai has a different meaning than it has for Gyula. Folk drama as a genre here is not necessarily a tool for national representation, or if it is, it has in any case a different interpretation than with Gyulai. In the view of Jókai, folk drama is not above all meant to represent Hungarian national features or Hungarian character as Gyulai holds. In this case the genre is supposed to offer moral truth and moral example to the audience.

The frequent preference on the part of most of the critics for character and national representation is intriguing, as through this the interpretation of the subject matter becomes secondary, and very few critics think plot strategies are meaningful and important. For Salamon the priority of plot in folk plays by Szigligeti is a genuine problem, to which he links the faulty representation of character. In his writings he several times hints at the fact that the way in which Szigligeti depicted Hungarian folk failed to meet his expectations especially as these plays lay emphasis on plot instead of an authentic representation of folk endowed with national character. Jókai stresses that in these plays Szigligeti offers an authentic representation of the recent past (he interprets folk drama as a mimetic genre, too), he considers these plays are simultaneously “true to life” and “poetic”, as authenticity for him

---

Csörsz in his essay *Pönögei Kis Pál, avagy Petőfi és a közköltészet* (Pál Kiss Pönögei or Petőfi and Public Poetry). (Rumen István, Csörsz: *Pönögei Kis Pál, avagy Petőfi és a közköltészet* = Márton Szilágyi (ed.), *Ki vagyok én? Nem mondom meg... Tanulmányok Petőfiről*, PIM, Budapest, 2014. 203–226)

19Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 424.

20Pál Gyulai, *Szigligeti és újabb...* 404.

21Mór Jókai, *Szigligeti* = Mór Jókai *összes művei*, Dénes Lengyel – Miklós Nagy (ed.), *Cikkek és beszédek*, vol. IV, 1850–1860., Györgyi H. Törő (ed.), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1968. 367–370., here: 369.

resides first of all in the expressed moral truth, in the authentic and credible representation of the moral and not in the precise, authentic representation of outer features of the nation.<sup>22</sup>

László Szentgyörgyi mentions it in relation to several plays by Szigligeti that his designations of genre are whimsical, as sometimes he terms his works folk drama, at other times comedy. Indeed, Szigligeti frequently modifies the genre specification of his plays while the criticism is also at loss when applying generic denomination and meaning. Folk drama and comedy as terms often overlap. Most of the time Szentgyörgyi reaches the conclusion that beginning with the 1850s, these plays are increasingly referred to as folk drama, and this is how posterity will tackle them.<sup>23</sup>

Based on his statements in the book *A dráma és válfajai* (Drama and its variants), Szigligeti considers popular (folk) representation acceptable only in mixed-type drama and accompanied by a representation of more cultured social strata: “The simple-minded and limited individuals in natural environment, with their innocent character, direct ways and overall naivety, treated without any company of more intelligent and civilised characters would soon become monotonous and even boring; they could be featured though in poems or shorter plays, nevertheless they are perfectly unable to fill the space of a three-hours serious drama. Idealisation cannot solve this problem either, because it might easily lead to sort of a rococo-idyll, totally out of good taste due to its unnatural and sentimental character. I cannot think of even one successful serious play made up entirely of peasants: because in such a construct spirit would travel either unnaturally high or unbelievably low.”<sup>24</sup> The folk-concept developed by Szigligeti is significantly different from the ones stated by Gyulai, Salamon or Arany. As we see, folk representation in this case has very little to do with any representation of national character. Szigligeti basically interprets and evaluates works within the dichotomy of interesting/boring, and this is where he sees the chief challenge of popular (folk) literature. All this influences his concept of folk drama in a most significant way. This influence is visible in the way in which he refrains from considering his own works featuring only popular (folk) characters true instances of folk text, in the sense that the real challenge of these pieces is not in their folk but in their comic character. Because, as we have seen it, he considers plays featuring only popular figures and attempting only folk representation boring, while such plays might become interesting through a shift of emphasis toward comedy and the comic drive in characters. The case is slightly different for folk drama, as here the challenge is the scenic representation and interpretation of folk features, but the method for Szigligeti here lies neither in conveying content, nor in matters related to message or morality, but in the description of stage and representation techniques that would guarantee success with the audience and subsequent popularity of the play. In this case, popular (folk) theme is important as it might attract huge audience provided it offers proper representation.

The opinion of examined critics on the aim of folk drama, its function and meaning differs significantly and it also differs from the opinion expressed by Szigligeti. Their failure to discover in Szigligeti’s works the aspects they are searching for is thus not surprising at all, while they resent the presence of elements there in which he sees the very clue of folk drama. Probably the sternest opinion regarding the evolution of the genre of folk drama is the one expressed by János Arany in his essay *Népiességünk a költészetben* (Folk Character in Poetry): “drama. Folk drama is other than what is currently termed as such. These plays

---

22Mór Jókai, [no title] = Mór Jókai összes művei, Dénes Lengyel – Miklós Nagy (ed.), *Cikkek és beszédek*, vol. IV, 1850–1860., Györgyi H. Törő (ed.), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1968. 524.

23László Szentgyörgyi, *Szigligeti népszínművei*, Budapest, 1910. 21; 39; 40.

24Ede Szigligeti, *A dráma és válfajai*, Budapest, 1874. 413–414.

should rather be national plays depicting the folk in its own true image.”<sup>25</sup> This is a comment-like hint at the fact that similar to other critics discussed above, Arany is dissatisfied with the lack of proper national representation, with a representation of folk endowed with authentic national meaning in harmony with the specific features of the people.

The differences in thought on folk character, folk drama and drama of the mentioned critics are quite significant as they might uncover differences in principle, in ethical or political views. In our case these differences can become markers signalling the way in which these thinkers manage to integrate the outcomes of the professionalisation of the literary system into their own system, also showing how they were able to relate to this process at that moment, and unveiling the way in which each critic was able to interpret the process looking out from their own specific system of criticism.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Erdélyi János, *Egy századnegyed a magyar szépirodalomból* = Erdélyi János, *Irodalmi tanulmányok és pályaképek*, Ilona T. Erdélyi (ed.), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1991., 183–225.
- Greguss Ágost, *Febr. 22. Dalos Pista, népszínmű 3 felv. Írta Szigligeti* = Greguss Ágost, *Tanulmányai II.*, Published by Mór Ráth, Pest, 1872. 35–44.
- Greguss Ágost, *April 27. Pál fordulása, színmű 2 szakaszban. Írta Szigligeti* = Greguss Ágost, *Tanulmányai II.*, Published by Mór Ráth, Pest, 1872.
- Gyulai Pál, *A lelenc* = Gyulai Pál, *Dramaturgiai dolgozatok*, vol. I., Budapest, 1908. 569–584.
- Gyulai Pál, *Szigligeti és újabb színművei* = Gyulai Pál, *Dramaturgiai dolgozatok*, vol. I., Budapest, 1908. 395–442.
- Kemény Zsigmond, *Színművészetünk ügyében* = Kemény Zsigmond, *Élet és irodalom*, Szépirodalmi Kiadó, Budapest, 1971. 283–306.
- Szontagh Gusztáv, *Blair Hugo rhetorikai és aestheticai leckéi*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 19. 305–310.
- Szontagh Gusztáv, *Eposi és drámai kor. Drámai literatúránk jelen állapotjáról, D. Schedel Ferencnek igazolásul*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 23. 379–383.
- Toldy Ferenc, *Eposi és drámai kor. Drámai literatúránk' jelen állapotjáról. Szontagh Gusztáv ellen*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 21. 345–348.
- Toldy Ferenc, *Végszó az eposi s drámai korról és drámai literatúránkról*, Figyelmező, 1839. no. 24. 394–399.

---

<sup>25</sup>János Arany, *Népiességünk a költészetben* = Arany János, *Tanulmányok és kritikák*, Pál S. Varga (ed.), Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó, Debrecen, 1998.