

Theses of the doctoral (PhD) dissertation

Forms of the Self on the Treshold of Modernity—Subjectivity and
Reflective Poetics in Endre Ady’s Lyrical Poetry

Ákos Herczeg

Dissertation director: Dr. Péter Szirák



UNIVERSITY OF DEBRECEN

Doctoral School of Literature

Debrecen, 2014.

Objectives of the dissertation, delimiting the subject

The dissertation attempts to reinvigorate—if not shed new light on—the oeuvre of Endre Ady, a key figure of early Hungarian modernism. In this case, rereading might be too ostentatious a term, as the author of the dissertation heavily relied on the reviving Ady reception at the turn of the twenty-first century in terms of his analytical perspective, direction of inquiry, and methodology. This new phase of reception had already dislodged some of the no longer readable poems from their state of suspended animation, which they were relegated to by institutionalized interpretations of a fundamentally ideological nature. There is still much at stake in the investigation at hand, however, as the mostly inspiring studies of the so-called “rereading” volume¹ seem now, from the perspective of more than a decade, a series of promising, individually highly thought-provoking analyses rather than an attempt at systematic reinterpretation. This assessment is reinforced by the fact that the Ady poetry has generated little interest in shifting canonical readings in the past few years: instead of further actualizing the extensive oeuvre and revising inherited interpretations, most new publications are focused on keeping the Ady legend alive and hitherto undisclosed biographical trivia. This tendency would be no problem if it was not burying again those secrets of this poetry which had been previously concealed by overly popular ideological interpretations, once again ignoring a fundamental principle of modern poetry, namely that the life of the artist (and his biography) is not continuous with his art. This inquiry presupposes that, although one cannot be mapped onto the other, the two are still related. When investigating Ady’s originality and significance in Hungarian literary history, it is worth focusing on how he reconsidered the relationship of art(ist) and the individual work of art, the role of the artist, and how these reconsiderations are manifested in the poetic structure. In this respect, the question of subjectivity, that is, the different versions of the poetic persona are inescapable: for the first time in Hungarian literature, Ady not only suppressed the subject-dependency of the utterance with various techniques but systematically criticized the pragmatic position of the century-old naïve-sentimental diction of Romanticism by disconnecting the voice heard in the poem from the biographical author. He achieves this while keeping the hypertrophic positioning of the utterance with respect to the rhetoric of the poems unquestionable. But the issue of how the

¹ *Tanulmányok Ady Endréről* [*Studies of Endre Ady*], Ed. KABDEBÓ Lóránt, KULCSÁR SZABÓ Ernő, KULCSÁR-SZABÓ Zoltán, MENYHÉRT Anna, Anonymus Kiadó, Bp., 1999.

author is “present” in the poems must be faced, and it can reveal the partially undeciphered secret of Ady’s poetry. The contradiction just mentioned—that is, the fact that the magnified “I” continuously dismantles the possibilities of his own recognizability—is a significant principle for the author: the consistent rewriting of the persona’s ascertainability seems to be a valid point of departure for a systematic inquiry that might clarify the role of the author in shaping Modernism.

Delineating the methods

For this enterprise, at least a referential comparison with earlier dictions seemed to be in order. In what ways does Ady’s art continue or transcend the often disregarded fin-de-siècle poetry, which is alternately considered transitory, dead-end or “nameless”? The dissertation includes a brief outlook on the poetry of János Vajda, Jenő Komjáthy, and Minka Czóbel, which makes Ady’s “modernity” more visible. This modernity is characterized by making the poem’s rhetorical structure a question to reflect on, programmatically rewriting the personification of the lyrical utterance, and making the determination of the persona an interpretive challenge. A brief survey of the exceeded early volumes (*Versek, Még egyszer*) might prove to be an important supplement in this respect by virtue of demonstrating the shift. These new perspectives enable us to see the innovation of Ady’s poetry more clearly, delineating more precisely the kind of lyrical context into which *New Poems* arrived in 1906. From this basis the investigation focuses on the configurations and medium-related events through which the tradition of confessional poetry is evoked and the self-creating diction is decomposed, from making the poetically and anthropologically conceived past legible (written), through such rhetorical borderline situations of the persona as in the case of love poetry or the “kuruc” role, all the way to the various signals of the subject turning into a linguistic phenomenon. If we are seeking the reason for the withdrawal of the assertive modality in the poems after 1912 with reference to the poetic language rather than the cataclysm of the Great War, the viewpoints described above can constitute a starting point towards a new Ady image. What this new image can make manifest is the process whereby the persona of the textual construct that continues the romantic tradition on the level of rhetoric and tropology becomes, from the volume *New Poems*, a “textual element” of the playing field that he believes to control. And if the construction of the poetic “I” depends on

the particular act of reading rather than on the creator, thus relegating the interpreter to listening for a continuously reconstituting voice and perceiving an emphatically visual text, then the poems leave behind not only the obviousness of a univocal poetry-based-on-experience but also the Romantic ideal of the self-sufficient work of art.

Therefore the dissertation has a twofold objective. On the one hand, it volunteers to rescue the most widely known poems from the unproductive state of critical habits and oversimplifying biographic interpretations by analyzing the varied, poetically relevant articulation of the lyrical voice and to address hitherto uncanonical pieces by focusing on the textual realization of the figures of “I.” On the other hand, it strives to assess—from this modified perspective—the literary-historical significance of the oeuvre by taking into account the surrounding formations of lyrical language. Consequently the methodology of choice is similarly twofold: in order to overwrite the ideological nature of ossified meanings, it simultaneously attempts to scrutinize the texts’ indeterminacies and tropological-rhetorical paradoxes and maintain the contextual and biographical determinacy of the poems as factors in the creation of meaning by consciously playing art and biography into one another. This unusual joint application of these two methods yields a number of fresh insights in the Ady reception.

Achievements and results

As I also considered Ady’s role in the shift from Romanticism to Modernism, it seemed natural to foreground the dichotomy of tradition and innovation, the poetic encounter with literary and cultural conventions, with especial regard to the contemporary context in which the volume *New Poems*—which was retrospectively considered to have ushered in a new era—was born. Instead of an all-encompassing philological excavation, in this respect I contented myself with a broad overview of the modern-conservative clash (of which the poet himself was a major exponent), as the primary goal was to complicate the inherited modern status and to acknowledge Ady’s ambivalent relationship with the periodical *Nyugat* and modern authors. This much, however, was inescapable, not only because the poet and his volume became an issue in contemporary cultural politics, thus this collection of poems became inseparable from the context in which he started out, but also because with the

inherited interpretive schemas it is difficult to account for Ady's tendency to preserve conventions and his manifesto-like, simultaneously innovative and retrograde poetic debut. Without considering the social embeddedness of literature and its context, Ady's programmatic poem *Góg és Magóg fia vagyok...* is difficult to understand, although the motif of looking west is not necessarily arranged into a coherent structure in the poem. It is precisely this lack of a synthesizing interpretation, the ambivalence of the simultaneous attraction of east and west (and poetically that of Romanticism and Symbolism) which characterize the poem I first turn to: the gesture of self-proclamation is always also invalidated by the parallel presence of these two polarities, while an important innovation of Ady's poetry is manifested, that is, the conscious malleability of poetic tradition. The part of the confessional subject is transposed by the language-based memory of the historical past, and in a way that the notion of controlling language is no longer attached to the poetological principle of the traceability of a single subject, but this ideal dissolves in the multiplicative artistic play of "self-definitions bound to Hungarian language and history." The formation of the poem's meanings is largely determined by the construction and deconstruction of these tradition-defined first person positions, which are endowed by faces and voices and, in turn, are determined by the inescapable attraction and repulsion of the past, while the poem also infers the recognition that the past cannot be made identical, it cannot be acquired, it can be repeated only as non-identical. The first larger bloc of the analysis thus perambulates poetic articulations of the spatial fixity of the past, the attraction of a similarly non-identifiable future, the constructive and destructive nature of tradition in signification, and the poem's indeterminacies following from all the above, while it also shades the modernity of *Új versek*.

The inquiry subsequently focuses on the Paris and Hungarian poems, considering the more important pieces of the volume with respect to the simultaneous attraction and repulsion that guided the analysis of the poem mentioned above. A significant move in this respect—demonstrating the indivisibility of the Ady oeuvre, poetry and journalism—is introducing a famous early article entitled *Korvin-kódex margójára* into the analysis of the group of poems: the fictional play of the unusual piece that originates itself from King Mathias's scrivener and is not devoid of temporal paradoxes and the motif of oscillating between two different shores should not be ignored when reading the poems that destabilize the territorial determinacy of self-identity. It is exactly these paradox potentials for meaning encoded in the poems that open up the perspectives of this unconventional piece of writing, which, in turn, are reflected, determining the reading of this volume of poetry. The schematized allegoric interpretation of

backwardness—which served as a basis for charging Ady with abusing the Hungarians and worshipping the West and which the article already calls into question—proves to be too narrow in the case of such “text-book” examples as *A magyar Ugaron*, *Lelkek a pányván*, and *A Hortobágy poétája*. In the case of the last one, the analysis achieves the displacement of the established landscape-interpretation by recognizing the acquirability of Petőfi’s legacy: the Romantic attitude of poetry-based-on-experience is only a distant memory that the central figure cannot identify with; from this perspective, his unproductive musing becomes the home of the man who strives to be himself (that is, an artist in a Nietzschean sense), and here he is forced to make his mode of expression identical by going beyond inherited behaviors (e.g., the poetic soaring of the soul). In *A magyar Ugaron*, allegorizing similarly inhibits the exploration of the poem’s layers. For decades the ideological load of the Hungarian words “dudva” and “muhar” has suppressed the poem’s rich Secessionist system of reference, which could enable a diametrically opposite interpretation of the text. From this perspective, the self entwined by tendrils (a topos in Secessionist art) is much more the allegory of being absorbed in the reality of art: thus the wild land facilitates the identification of the persona and takes him to its undecipherable layers (the intoxicating experience of art). Instead of losing oneself, the poem can activate the meaning of finding oneself through art, and this way around 1905-1906 Ady gets much closer to understanding the ambition of creating a new, autonomous world whose roots cannot be severed from (the Hungarian) reality but neither can they be regarded as its extensions any more.

Paris, which is commonly considered the idyllic home of (modern) poetry, is mainly foregrounded in poems that place at least as much emphasis on the unattainable strangeness of the metropolis as on its attractiveness. This recognition afforded me the opportunity to read such less-known poems *A párisi hajnalon* or *Este a Bois-ban*, while well-known yet little analyzed pieces (*Páris, az én Bakonyom*, *A Szajna partján*) also fell into the scope of analysis. In effect, all of them express the desire for being touched by what is foreign and the unrenounceable default setting of the familiar in different ways, but *A Szajna partján* gives the most original answer. If we start out from the Nietzschean idea that the excessive rush of vitality, manifested in Dionysian ecstasy, is a crucial component of the modern concept of poetry, then the positive-negative hierarchy in favor of Paris can be made relative. The different, contrapuntal territorial determination of self and other stages the self’s experience of dividedness in a way that signals of the radical otherness of the two kinds of self originate from the essential sameness of these two figures. This also means that instead of two

independent selves who live separate lives, the poems feature two inverse variants that mutually include each other. *A Szajna partján* can be a significant poem because the dividedness resulting from the simultaneous attraction to East and West is not merely a cultural-political but also an emphatically artistic dilemma in it, and in such a way that the poem stages—in the foreground of the Nietzschean model—the ambivalent formula of the self “living one life in two forms,” heading towards assimilation and fusion, with the conscious operation of poetry’s own devices. It is an exciting structural solution from Ady that only the clear territorial assignments refer unequivocally to one pole in the “rejoining” sections, and in their absence only the interpretive schemas fixed in the second stanza (that is, the Seine is associated with fundamentally positive values, while the Danube is negative) govern the references of the adverbs “here” and “there,” although from a pragmatic standpoint these cannot be attached to either of the poles because of the reduplicated perspective of the self, or rather they can be assigned to both at the same time. From the beginning the semantic-rhetorical structure of duality overwrites the poem’s meaning-in-formation, and as a result of this interpretive dilemma, the reader is charged with the task of deciding it stanza by stanza. And if the opposite poles cannot be unequivocally associated with one of the selves, then the divisibility and distinguishability of the latter is also called into question, demonstrating the original affinity, essential sameness of the two kinds of self (the one living in a blissful dream world and the one determined by its coarse corporal reality).

The duality recognized in relation to art evidently led to a similar investigation into the famous “grand scene” of *Az ős Kaján*. Its parallel with *The Birth of Tragedy* is reinforced by the philosophy of art expounded by Ady in a series of articles (*A magyar Pimodán*) around the time of writing the poem, which can be characterized by such catch phrases as the artistic revelation of perception altered by drinking, the desire to grasp extraordinary, extraperceptual reality, or the artist as medium. Focusing on the creative energy resulting from the battle of Dionysus and Apollo (who symbolize the opposing notions)—the condition of which is the loss of the individuum, its annihilation is a state of abandon—can productively reposition the poem’s allegorical interpretation (which identifies the Kaján as a malevolent demon) by making it the point of departure for declaring a new type of role for the artist. The analysis follows the process whereby the persona gradually recognizes his own vigorless, trampish image in the mirror of the Other in such a way that the Kaján-as-mirror also shows the lost identity. Thus what this duel-like “tournament” actually stages is the alienation of the self (upon facing the devaluation of his own standards) and the fight of gradually acquiring the

ecstatic faith (also in an artistic sense) represented by the Kaján: the transformation of the self from imitative artist to creator. From this perspective the defeat at the end of the poem is also a victory: the ars poetica that triumphs is the one that is able to become an identical, autonomous artistic position by striking a new note. This is why I can risk the assertion that this poem might be the symbol of the process whereby the author of *Versek* and *Még egyszer* explicitly matures to be the creator of “new poems.” Reading *Az ősz Kaján* as the mythical battle scene between two definitions of poetry (the contemplative Apollonian, which fixes its own and the work’s boundaries, and the transgressing Dionyssian, which grants the ecstatic experience of dissolution), the poem seems to stage the significant insight of Nietzsche’s works that nothing new can be created without “internal struggles and external fights, that is, »some hidden heroism«”²

Ady’s love poetry has a special place in the transition from Romanticism to modern notions of language and subjectivity. Not only for the obvious reason that the volume *Új versek* starts with the cycle *Léda asszony zsoldárai*, but also due to the fact that Ady initiated the revision of the self-stating poetic practice with emphatically preserving-and-reforming this cultural-poetic topos of the previous century. Although his supposedly scandalous language of love, with which he replaced the classical naïve-sentimental narration of love, does not stand out from its context of contemporary amorous poetry with its radicality, it is indisputable that Ady successfully exceeded the commonplace solutions that unambiguously present emotional involvement. The specific experiential background not only dissolves due to the markedly artistic alienation and aesthetization of the scenes, as the direct appeal to the other and the other’s access to the self’s emotions also lose the well-known traits of poetry-based-on-experience, but even their evident anthropomorphization is called into question. In addition to reshaping the inherited devices of this traditional poetic form by choosing not to narrate the usual experiences (the dichotomy of longing and joy) and featuring the loved one increasingly as an apparition, tormenting or tormented creature, Ady also noticeably withdrew the explanatory part of the subject. The typically short, elliptical structures objectified by symbols leave the enigmatic contours of the world surrounding Léda, the female figure created from flesh-and-blood and mythical elements, thus the emotions cannot be communicated or thematized: the self does not rule the elements of the markedly

² Völker GERHARDT, *Friedrich Nietzsche*, Trans. CSATÁR Péter, Latin Betűk, Debrecen, 1998, 107.

not verisimilar scenes, he does not fill the space of the poem with his own presence, but he comes into existence and attains a voice through this space.

The early poem *A vár fehér asszonya* became conspicuous precisely because its textual indeterminacies, the several options for coding its tropological-rhetorical structure does not allow us to read the conventional metaphor of intimacy (the soul), and, through it, the part of the self as the confession of a fixable subject; that is, it transforms the recollection of love poetry in such a way that the poem ceases to be the medium of overhearing an identifiable emotion. The analysis takes stock of the statements of the structure that repeatedly resists pinpointing the self; the poem's diction consistently unsettles these statements from the opening metaphorical identification ("Lelkem ódon, babonás vár" ["My soul is an ancient, superstitious castle", translation mine]), sometimes by the parenthetical parts, which break up the coherent interpretation and lend complexity of perspective to the poem, other times by the images (soul, castle, window, white woman), which can support several readings. If the thesis gives prominence to the reinterpretation of the role of the muse—with respect to the modernization of the forms the self takes—then it also has to pay special attention to the poems that spectacularly dismantle the heritage. The chapter that treats the poems *Elbocsátó, szép üzenet* and *Valaki útravált belőlünk* is practically first in the criticism to re-examine the common interpretation of these pieces as poetry-based-on-experience; most importantly it acknowledges that the poem is not just the vehicle of a previously coded message but the space where meanings are in formation, where the speaker does not control but rather suffers this process. By rethinking the poems that stage the termination of the Ady-Mrs. Diósy affair, it becomes possible to narrate the event of the breakup in its literary-historical significance: quitting the muse can be considered an important move from Romanticism in the direction of Modernity. Thus the analysis proceeds from the biographical interpretation towards one that upholds the periodical interfaces, based on the consideration that the moralizing reading (the poem in question is unanimously considered to be one of the "most unjust") misses the rhetorical construction that counterweighs it and which can express the very interminability of togetherness through the prevailing uncontrollability of the other. The conclusion of the inquiry (the world-creating dominant position of the self is revealed to be illusory) is an integral part of the dissertation's further proceeding, marking the way towards a more precise contextualization of the self-deprecatory techniques, which are unusual in comparison with Ady's early poetry but become more and more common after 1912.

A critical work that focuses on the various modes of eliminating and camouflaging the lyrical self evidently gives special attention to one of the most typical groups of Ady's dramatic monologues, the kuruc-themed poems, also including other texts that feature historical (not necessarily kuruc-era) persons, if they enrich the theoretically significant horizon of the role's readability. Pieces that undermine the Romantic encoding of appearance and more or less complexly stir the cultural tradition, such as *Esze Tamás komája*, *Bujdosó kuruc rigmusa* or *Az utolsó kuruc*—beside serving as examples of the pliability and applicability of the tradition, thus enhancing the complexity of the poem's pragmatic relations—also prepare the context for the interpretation of perhaps the most layered piece of this type of poetry, if not the entire oeuvre. *Síjja régi babonának* illustrates how a vaguely disguised public utterance cannot be fixed as a political statement due to the poetic events that undermine identifiability. The analysis gives special consideration to the multiplication of meanings by the paratexts (title and subtitle) and the ensuing pragmatic complexity, that is, the interference of the effect of being quoted—which results from the peculiar rhetorical situation („Bujdosó kuruc énekli” [“Sung by exiled kuruc”—translation mine])—and the part of the persona; in addition, I also address the far from unproblematic mediality of the “whistling” that infiltrates the poem's space. The importance of the kuruc theme is especially apparent from the perspective of further research: it reveals a poetically rich space which, in the foreground of the dissertation, has become the repository of Ady's modernity through those further modes of masking that overwrite the tradition of confessional poetry.

The last longer section undertakes to question the complicated intertwining of art and life, so that the reader may reach the poetically often reflected recognition that the poet's word does not equal confession in Ady's poetry. From the beginning, the poet does away with the Romantic fantasy of displaying the self using varied techniques, but it is apparent that the diction that simultaneously asserts and refutes the illusion of a unique voice and thus creates the impressions of personalness and impersonalness at once more and more often operates various ways of self-thematizing from the second or third volume, for instance, the inscription of the proper noun, or the specific conjuration of the authorial self. In this manner, this phase of the oeuvre inserts the creator in the series of the poem's fictional elements, thereby expressing—with unusual radicality in the era—the self-evident theoretical insight that the speaker of a poem cannot be identical with its recorder. The introductory poem of the volume *Szeretném, ha szeretnének* is a significant chapter of the investigation because—while it seemingly “rehabilitates” the tradition of confessional poetry by eliminating the distance

between the empirical and lyrical self—the very act of self-revelation, the reflected failure of manifesting oneself through poetry reinforces the poetics of creating (consequently, hiding) the self. The subchapter systematically attempts to transcend the anthropologically motivated interpretive commonplace of the individual suffering from loneliness, the identifiability of the self that seeks to manifest itself in vain, and in such a way that, while keeping in mind the fundamentally confessional modality, it shades the speech situation of the speaker as the citer or reciter of various Ady poems, or it calls attention to polysemic, ambiguous textual elements, taking stock of their potential functions. Consequently the fact that the biographical and the lyrical self are emphatically not identifiable unambiguously in Ady's poetry once again becomes problematic. In the perspective opened up by the poem, the speech of the human subject suffering from loneliness can simultaneously point to the differentiated, mysterious, unrecognizable poetic subject (because he is always wearing somebody else's mask), thus the poem, beside expressing the desire for objectivity, can be, on the contrary, the space for stating the companionless, haughty poetic consciousness. In a peculiar way, these two contradictory interpretations both fit into Ady's poem, which forces us to fundamentally re-think the received critical notions about the author's speech. The insights of the analysis also answer the question about the nature of Ady's modernity, if we notice that the poem includes the Romantic self-declaration in the spirit of replacing it, which is a significant development of the reception history of Ady and his age. The end of the analysis compares Ady's text to the Babits poem *A lírikus epilógja* (written earlier than the former but also published in 1909), differentiating the two poetic attitudes, which is also a new development in the criticism. The same can be said of the interpretive attempt to expand the referentiality of the famous poem *Kocsi-út az éjszakában* and its line „Minden Egész eltörött” [“All wholes have broken”—translation mine], which has been inaugurated as the automated expression of the modern attitude to life. Beyond revealing that the landscape and the subjective emotion are not necessarily reconcilable on the basis of the poem's text, I attempted to counter the critical commonplaces that look at this piece as poetry-based-on-experience by shedding new light on the experience of fragmentation expressed in the poem primarily within its rich intertextual system of references, initiating dialogues with such poems as *Hiába hideg a Hold*, *Jó Csönd-herceg előtt*, *A menekülő lovas*, but also with texts from the Romantic period, such as Petőfi's *A négyökrös szekér*.

The last section surveys Ady's middle-to-late period (between 1910 and 1916), which shows the gradual disappearance of Ady's characteristic self-declaratory linguistic behavior. I

attempted to complicate the critical claims about the fading of the “Symbolist Ady’s” voice by seeking an explanation for the often whimsical (with the term of an Ady poem, “undeveloped”) poetic production in the poetic phenomena of self-deprecation instead of the biographical experiences of the Great War. In these few year Ady’s poetry slowly modulates from the declarative (assertive) modality to the well-known self-ironic passages of the 1916 *Nem feleltem magamnak*, where the persona directly conveys the uncontrollability of the poetic language. The dismantling of the anthropocentric perspective through the sonority and incalculable event-like nature of the poetic language is a special stage of Ady’s poetry, which is a significant antecedent of the lyrical formation known after Attila József and Lőrinc Szabó and labeled as late Modern, and to which a number of important but so far less studied poems can show the way. The chapter follows the destabilization of the lyrical self’s dominant position and its poetically relevant events. From the speech situation of the poem mentioned above (which turns assertivity into self-directed irony), other texts were recognized to be important, such as *A Szerelem époszából* (1910), which showcases the peculiar mixing and inseparableness of biography and fiction, or the verse novel *Margita élni akar* (1912). Can remembrance play a role in identification, or the nonunique nature of memory (love is, after all, a familiar emotion for all of us) resists such a self-definition? Such questions arose in the analysis of the 1914 poem *A hosszú hársfa-sor. A föltámadás szomorúsága* (1910) reckons with the poetically important event of losing face and the failure of self-recognition also with reference to remembering, but in the foreground of the textual tradition it evokes (the Bible). Finally I address some undeveloped questions that the criticism has already touched upon, such as the (self-defiguring) experience of being seen. This thematic concern afforded me the opportunity to analyze several compatible poems (*Az idegen arcok, Akit egyszer megláttunk, Az elrejtett arcok, A békés eltávozás*), which is also a significant development in signaling the faltering of a persona whose omnipotence seemed to be unbroken and in complicating the received assumptions about Ady’s poetry.

Publications and studies accepted for publication on the subject of the dissertation:

1. *Construction and Deconstruction: Readability of the Self in Endre Ady’s A vár fehér asszonya* = *Alföld*, 2010/10, 59–74.

2. *Intertextuality and Subjectivity in Ady's Kocsi-út az éjszakában* = *Irodalomismeret*, 2011/3. 60–67. Kötetben: Füzfa Balázs (szerk.) *Kocsi-út az éjszakában*, Savaria University Press, Szombathely, 2011, 174–185.
3. *Rewriting the Tradition on the Treshold of Modernity: Endre Ady's Góg és Magóg fia vagyok én...* = *Tiszatáj*, 2012/12, Diákmelléklet, 1–11.
4. *On the Way to the Status of "the" Modern Hungarian Poet: To the Social Background and Perspective of Új versek* = *Irodalomismeret*, 2013/1, 42–51.
5. „*New and Hungarian*” – *The Unfolding of a Modern Concept of Art on the Basis of the So-Called Hungarian- and Paris-poems of Új versek* = *Alföld*, 2013/9, 60–89.
6. *The Readability of the Lyrical Voice on the Frontier of the Self and the Individuum: Confession and "De-human-ization" in Szeretném, ha szeretnének* = *Tiszatáj*, 2014/3, 73–82.
7. „*Sometimes a Catch*” (*The Withdrawal of the Assertive Language Use in Ady's Poetry between 1910 and 1916*) = *Alföld*, 2014/5, 78–102.
8. *This Side of the Role of the Muse and Beyond* (Elbocsátó, szép üzenet, Valaki útravált belőlünk) = *Prae*, 2014/1 (accepted for publication)
9. *The "Instrument" of the Tradition: Generic Remembrance, Allusion, Rhetoric (Endre Ady: Sípja régi babonának)* = *Palócföld* (accepted for publication)

Other publications:

Studies:

1. *The Self and the Other: The Tropology of Love in János Pilinszky's Poetry* = Szótér. *Az Alföld Stúdió antológiája*, alföld alapítvány, 2008. 67–77.
2. *The Place of the Work of Art in the Consumer Society. I–II*, = *Partium* 2009/tél, 78–85, *Partium* 2010/tavaszi, 44–51.
3. *The Other as the Relationship to the Infinite: Lévinas's Language and Proximity* = *Szkholion*, 2010/2., 53–56.
4. *Seeking a Way – Finding a Way: Some Thoughts Concerning the Tendencies of the Hungarian Literature of the New Millennium* = *Prae*, 2011/4, 70–81.

Reviews:

1. „Az ember leül egy törött padra s még remél” [“You sit down on a broken bench and still hope”] (Aczél Géza: *(szakma)alkony*). = Debreceni Disputa 2005/11–12, 88–91.
2. *The „Borrowed Warmth” Finally Moves in-and-out(?)* (Lackfi János: *Hóvesztesség*). = Alföld 2007/1, 103–108.
3. „Az élet elsötétülő sfumato” [“Life is a darkening sfumato”](Filip Tamás: *Rejtett ikonok*). = Alföld, 2008/4, 103–107.
4. „Játszani is engedd” [“Let Him Also Play”] (A *Használati utasítás* című versantológiáról). = A Vörös postakocsi, 2008/tél, 107–110.
5. *Storytelling Closed Eyes* (Balázs Imre József: *Vidrakönyv*). = Új hegyvidék 2008 tavasz-tél, 213–217.
6. *Krasznahorkai Has Been Down There* (Krasznahorkai László: *Seiobo járt odalent*). = Szkhion, 2009/tavasz, 31–36.
7. *On This Side and Beyond the Sad Leprechauns* (Háy János: *Meleg kilincs*). = Alföld, 2009/4, 119–127.
8. *From the Butcher’s Counter to the Pasture* (Krusovszky Dénes: *Elromlani milyen*). = Alföld, 2009/12, 146–151.
9. *Selected Anxieties* (Bajtai András: *Betűember*). = Debreceni Disputa, 2010/3, 39–41.
10. *Midfield* (Mizser Attila: *Köz*). = Új hegyvidék, 2009–2010, 1–4, 118–123.
11. *The Poetics of Decay* (Filip Tamás: *Saját erőd*). = Alföld, 2010/5, 124–127.
12. *Song of Selves* (Szálinger Balázs: *MI/M7*). = A Vörös postakocsi, 2010/nyár, 118–121.
13. „A pompa ez, részvételen, derült” [“This is the splendor, uncompassionate, cheerful”] (Mestyán Ádám: *Az együttérzés tökéletes hiánya*). = Csillagszálló, 2010/12, 22–24.
14. *Hereditary Foreignness* (Ayhan Gökhan: *Fotelapa*) = <http://kulter.hu/2011/02/oroklott-idegenseg/>, 2011, február 4.
15. *The Art of Passing Away* (Michel Houellebecq: *A térkép és a táj*) = <http://kulter.hu/2011/07/az-elmulas-muveszete/>, 2011. július 19.
16. *The Grammar of the Body* (Borbély Szilárd: *A Testhez*) = Alföld, 2011/9. 102–105.)
17. *Approaches to the Transcendent* (Takács Miklós: *Ady, a korai Rilke és az „istenes vers”*) = Alföld, 2011/12. 121–124.)
18. *The Story of a Reading, the Reading of a Story* (Kulcsár-Szabó Zoltán: *Tükörszínhátéka agyadnak*) = Alföld, 2012/3, 118–123.
19. *Stations of a Creation* (Mezei Gábor: *függelék*.) = Alföld, 2012/11, 120–125.

20. *Leaving a Trace in the World* (Oravecz Imre: *Kaliforniai fürj*) = <http://www.avorospostakocsi.hu/2014/01/17/nyomot-hagyni-a-vilagban/>

21. *The Ruins of Our Days* (Térey János: *Moll*) = Alföld (accepted for publication)