TOW. ZACHĘTY SZTUK PIĘKN. W WARSZAWIE

PRZEWODNIK № 22

WYSTAWA
SZTUKI WĘGIERSKIEJ

KWIECIEŃ 1927 ROKU

The Evolution of Hungarian National(ist) Art Exhibitions in the 1920s

Samuel D. Albert[1]

Keywords:
Hungary; Art Exhibitions; Nationalism in Art; Horthy; Cultural Diplomacy

ABSTRACT:

This article focuses on the "Representative Exhibitions" organized under the aegis of the Hungarian government in the inter-war period, from the end of the First World War until 1930. It considers the underlying ideology and rhetoric of these exhibitions and how they both changed over time. In their fundamental organization the shows were quite similar and often contained the same art works, but how these exhibitions and their artifacts were introduced by the catalogue essay often changed over time.Immediately after the First World War in the aftermath of the Treaty of Trianon, the exhibitions were revanchist. As the decade progressed, they become more and more modernist and international. Ultimately, in the latter years of the decade, as with the 1927 Polish and 1928 German shows, they became catalysts for reintegrating Hungarian history into that of Western Europe.

L'articolo si concentra sulle "Esposizioni Rappresentative" organizzate sotto l'egida del governo ungherese nel periodo tra le due guerre, dalla fine della Prima guerra mondiale fino al 1930. Si esaminano l'ideologia e la retorica sottese a queste esposizioni e come entrambe si siano modificate nel tempo. Nella loro organizzazione sostanziale, le mostre erano piuttosto simili e spesso includevano le stesse opere d'arte, ma il modo in cui queste esposizioni e i loro manufatti venivano presentati nel catalogo cambiava frequentemente nel corso degli anni. Subito dopo la Prima guerra mondiale, in seguito al Trattato di Trianon, le mostre avevano un carattere revanscista. Con il passare del decennio divennero sempre più moderniste e internazionali. Alla fine degli anni Venti, come nel caso delle mostre in Polonia del 1927 e in Germania del 1928, esse diventarono catalizzatori per il reinserimento della storia ungherese in quella dell'Europa occidentale.

Opening Picture:

Wystawa Sztuki Węgierskiej/Exhibition of Hungarian Art, Warsaw, 1927. Catalogue Cover. (Image from Author's Collection).

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Samuel D. Albert

Samuel D. Albert is an Art Historian whose work focuses on art and architecture in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and its successor states, especially Hungary and Romania. His current, multi-year research project is "Austro-Hungarian, Austrian, and Hungarian Art Exhibitions Abroad, 1890-1940" of which this proposed paper is a portion. This work has been supported by a variety of sources, most recently the Frick Collection's Center for the History of Collecting, the Botstiber Foundation for Austrian-American Studies, and, in the Fall of 2022, a Fulbright grant to Hungary. Products of this project include "Hungarian Representative Exhibitions and the Rhetoric of Display in the 1920s" in Arts 2024, 13(1), 23 and "Austria and Hungary at the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair: A Hint of the End," Journal of Austrian-American History (2023) 7 (2): 109–137. He teaches at the Fashion Institute of Technology, Fordham University, and New York University, all in New York City, where he lives.

After capitulating to the terms of the Trianon Treaty and abandoning military solutions, the Horthy Regime began a new offensive, one of cultural diplomacy. Many of the objectives were similar to those of the military campaigns of the previous years: a revision of Hungary's borders was the goal. Unlike the pre-Trianon skirmishes, fought with guns and blood which sought to physically change the borders, this new campaign, fought with ink and paintbrushes, sought to change the international perception of Hungary and its treatment at the hands of the victorious Allies.

This task was given to a special desk within the Ministry of Religion and Public Education under the aegis of K. Róbert Kertész.[2] The Külföldi Művészeti Kiállítások Végrehajtó Bizottság/Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions, of which he was Secretary, was charged with organizing, curating, and promoting the Magyar Reprezentativ Kiállítás/Hungarian Representative Exhibition, a series of art shows. Actively displaying throughout the 1920s and continuing – though with seemingly less enthusiasm into the 1930s – the Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions organized exhibitions, which were usually bilateral. Around the time a Hungarian Representative Exhibition was shown in a particular country, an exhibition of that country's art would open in Budapest. Initially limited to European venues, beginning in the 1930s these shows expanded to include American venues. This article will explore the organization and implementation of these exhibitions in the 1920s.

Literature Survey

The interest in cultural diplomacy is an ever-increasing one. In the period under consideration, 1920-1930, in addition to the catalogues of the shows themselves, there were a number of publications about the concept.[3] The role of cultural diplomacy in the 1930s and 40s was noted in various publications.[4] Recent years have seen an increased academic focus, with Zsolt Nagy one of the leading American academics writing on this topic. While his major work is *Great Expectations and Interwar Realities*, he has authored several articles which focus on aspects of Hungarian cultural diplomacy activity.[5] The role of cultural diplomacy in the relationship between Hungary and Poland, especially in the interwar period has also been a fruitful field of study.[6] One of the key figures of Hungarian cultural activity at this time was the Minister of Religion and Public Education, Count Kunó Klebelsberg, whose life and activity and especially his ideas concerning cultural diplomacy and its implementation have been explored more and more.[7]

Methodology

This article is part of a larger project focusing on Austro-Hungarian, Austrian, and Hungarian art exhibitions abroad, 1890-1940. It is based on an examination and consideration of catalogues from Austro-Hungarian and Hungarian art exhibitions in the 1920s, especially those in which Hungarian National Fine Arts Council was involved. This is obviously a rather limited selection. While there are many other exhibitions and exhibition venues which might

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

be better known, such as the Venice Biennale[8] or World's Fair, the focus in the article is the activity of the Council as a cultural and political arm of the Hungarian government and the exhibitions the Council organized. In a larger, forthcoming work, more of the exhibitions will be considered.

This paper does not focus on nor consider individual works. One of the major quandaries facing this project is correlating titles in catalogues with images exhibited. While the name of the artist and of their work displayed are listed, scant visual documentation of the displays in question exists. More elaborate catalogues do include illustrations but never record the entire show; what images are included are only black and white and of low quality. Generalizations can be made about the works based on a knowledge of the artists and their career trajectories, but in the absence of good-quality color reproductions, any art historical or aesthetic analysis of the image would be ill-founded.

Greater reliance thus is placed on the text of the catalogues and published writing about the exhibitions rather than on the visual content of the exhibitions themselves. As this research is ongoing, it is hoped that in the future, a closer correlation between the works listed in the catalogues and the actual images themselves might be achieved.

Horthy Regime

To understand Hungarian cultural and foreign policy in the interwar period, a brief grounding the history and decline of Austria-Hungary and the emergence of Hungary is called for. What follows is a rather superficial description of that history.

Following the defeat of the Hungarian uprising under Lajos Kossuth, Austria brutally occupied Hungary, which it had ruled since the 1700s. In 1867, a compromise was reached between the Austrians and the Hungarian. In exchange for the Hungarians acknowledging the right of the Habsburgs to rule Hungary, the Austrians would grant Hungary a certain measure of autonomy. There would be three common ministries: the foreign ministry, the finance ministry, and the war ministry. All other ministries, such as religion and culture, or transportation, would be unique to an imperial half, either Austria or Hungary. The Habsburg ruler, in this case Franz Joseph I, would be crowned King of Hungary and the Hungarian government would rule in his name while he would be at the same time the Emperor of Austria. Thus, the Austrian Empire was converted into the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Following the Compromise, Hungary rapidly developed culturally and economically, but was still politically bound to Austria. Though both Vienna and Budapest were capitals, the weight of power lay with Vienna. Hungary sought other ways to assert and demonstrate its independence. One way was through culture: an opera, a national theater, and a dedicated art museum were all founded in this era and imposing homes for them constructed. In art production as well, Hungarians sought to differentiate themselves from their Austrian counterparts. This differentiation took form in education and production. As throughout Europe, Hungarian artists looked to

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

the rural as a source for forms and subjects. And despite Vienna's significance as a center of artistic education, Hungarian artists chose to study elsewhere: Munich, Berlin, or Paris.[9]

After the Austro-Hungarian defeat in the First World War, an independent Hungarian Republic was proclaimed, though it lasted only a short time. In March of 1921, a communist Hungarian Soviet, under the rule of Béla Kun emerged; it lasted 100 days. Throughout this period, Hungary was being assaulted with various degrees of success by the surrounding countries: Czechoslovakia, Serbia (aided by French troops), and Romania. Romanian armed forces penetrated far into Hungary, occupying Budapest in August of 1919.

When the Hungarian Soviet collapsed, right-wing[10] forces based in the southern city of Szeged coalesced around the figure of Miklos Horthy. Horthy, a naval officer who had risen from the rank of sub-lieutenant (the American equivalent is Lieutenant j.g.), serving along the way as aide-de-camp to Franz Joseph I. He ultimately attained the rank of Rear Admiral in the Austro-Hungarian navy. Conservative, well-bred, and dashingly handsome, Horthy was the perfect figure around which the right-wing forces could organize. Initially, Horthy was very much only a figurehead. Great violence by the reactionary forces, acting in his name but not under his direction, the so-called "White Terror" ravaged in countryside.

Horthy, at the head of the "National Army" entered Budapest in November 1919, just days after the Romanians had retreated from the city, though they would not retreat from Hungary entirely until the Spring of 1920. In March 1920, the national assembly reconstituted the Kingdom of Hungary, but rather than installing the Habsburg pretender, Charles IV, they instead choose Horthy to act as Regent. Thus, famously, "the Admiral without a Navy became the ruler of a Kingdom without a King".

This entire time, Hungary was beleaguered by foreign troops on almost all borders. Even though the War itself had ended, the final boundaries of the successor nations to Austria-Hungary were not fixed until the Treaty of Trianon, signed in June 1920. Hungary, in no position to contest the terms of the Treaty, emerged vastly diminished. Two-thirds of the land mass of prewar Hungary and a little more than half the population were assigned to other countries: Czechoslovakia, Ukraine, Romania, Yugoslavia, or Austria. Millions of ethnic Hungarians now found themselves living outside of Hungary. In addition to the economic devastation the dismemberment of Hungary caused – most of the territory removed was either very productive farmland or the sites of heavy industry and mining, there was a great social loss; the country was shattered. The Horthy regime used the revanchist dream as a rallying cry. Phrases such as "No, No, Never!" or "Rump Hungary is not a Country; Greater Hungary is Heaven" were found on posters, schoolbooks, and public documents.[11] Statues commemorating the lost lands and people appeared all over Hungary. It was within this social and economic milieu that the Horthy regime inaugurated the Magyar Reprezentativ exhibition series.

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Hungarian Representative Exhibition (1920)

The history of the Magyar Reprezentativ exhibitions has been previously discussed by me in a longer article which focused on the rhetoric surrounding the displays. This article, in contrast, will focus on the artists and materials displayed. However, a brief description of the program is called for; this brief description draws on that article.[12]

The origin of the Hungarian Representative Exhibitions, of which about 10 took place between 1920 and 1930[13] can be found in the diplomatic and cultural activity of Count Miksa Hadik (1868-1921), Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to Sweden, during the last years of the First World War. Hadik solicited Count Gyula Andrássy Junior (1860-1929) to organize a show of Hungarian decorative arts in Sweden. The stated goal was to build on the example of the so-called "Kriegsausstellung", exhibitions of artwork produced during the Great War. In Austria-Hungary, these exhibitions were coordinated by the Kriegspressequartier/Sajtohadiszallitas which during the War had enlisted artists to record the scenes of battle and its aftermath as well as the everyday humdrum of military life.[14] During the war, a number of exhibitions – at least three – of the office's works were organized. Hadik was particularly taken with the 1917 show in Holland and took that as the model.[15]

Even before his selection by Hadik, Count Andrássy had been involved in what would now be called "cultural diplomacy". He had long championed the display of Hungarian art as a means of promoting greater interest in and understanding of Hungarian culture. In a 1912 essay, he wrote:

> *And we could gain a lot especially through art. Our language is not understood in Europe. Our science and fiction are largely closed books to strangers. International influence, prestige and cultural weight can be gained most quickly and surely with our art. The language of art is a world language that everyone understands. The Hungarian personality could become known the earliest and most surely through the works of art.*[16]

Although the actual show envisioned and desired by Hadik was delayed because of the war, the idea lived on.

With the emergence of the Horthy regime, it revived. Gyula Pekár, Minister for Religion and Public Education, again sought out Gyula Andrássy for assistance. This renewed effort resulted in the creation of the Külföldi Művészeti Kiállítások Végrehajtó Bizottság/Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions, a desk within the Ministry of Religion and Public Education, which was tasked with organizing, coordinating, and promoting the shows. Little was written about the impetus for the Committee at the time of its creation, but in 1927, when the mandate of its bureaucratic successor, the Magyar Országos Képzőművészeti Tanács/ Hungarian National Fine Arts Council, was concluding, Béla Déry, a long-time member of both committees, recounted the founding idea for the Representative Exhibitions in his book, *Foreign Art Exhibitions in 1927: Warsaw, Poznan, Cracow, Vienna, Fiume*. At the time, the early 1920s he wrote, Hungari-

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

an art would only make an appearance and be judged if there were a World's Fair or similar large-scale international art exhibition. Hungarian art was not often invited to present itself abroad independently, so its development and high quality were unknown outside of Hungary.[17] The Representative Exhibitions were deliberately designed as a remedy to that foreign ignorance and provinciality. Additionally, the Horthy regime used the shows as a tool of cultural diplomacy and propaganda, working to deepen ties with friendly states, and, through the presentation of Hungarian art, to publicize Hungarian political discontents and aspirations.

The revived Committee initially organized an exhibition in The Hague and in Amsterdam. Further shows were already envisioned throughout Europe. As was reported in the newspaper "Világ" in February 1920:

> *On the initiative of State Secretary Gyula Pekár, there was a meeting in the Ministry of Religion and Public Education regarding traveling art exhibitions planned abroad, at which the Executive Committee of Foreign Art Exhibitions was finally established. Ministerial adviser Dr. Árpád Nagy, head of the art department, presided. The meeting determined the program of traveling exhibitions. These exhibitions will be held in Zurich, Bern, Basel, Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam, Gröningen, Stockholm, Copenhagen, and Berlin, and the exhibition material will be on its way by the end of March.*[18]

The shows' goals were clearly articulated by the organizers. When asked by the newspaper "Magyarország" as to what he expected from the exhibition, Count Andrássy responded: "One of the strongest weapons of Hungarian culture is fine art, not only because it is at a very high level in our country, but also because its language is international and can be understood by everyone.[19]" Andrássy acknowledged the economic aspect to the show, a reflection of the parlous state of the Hungarian economy at the time, saying that "[t]he economic importance of the exhibition is also very important and we can hope that our artists will get good foreign currency".[20]

This inaugural Budapest version of the Representative Exhibition was understood as a new chapter in Hungarian art diplomacy. It built upon but also expanded the work of its immediate precursor, the much smaller-scaled and focussed Kriegsausstellungen. János Bende, in a 5 December 1920 article in the newspaper "Ország-Világ" insightfully understood and articulated the goals of the show. Beyond simply presenting the Hungarian art of the day, the show was intended to have great international diplomatic meaning. As Bende wrote:

> *Participating in international exhibitions has always been a matter of first priority for individual nations and thus for Hungarians, and it is all the more important for us in the current circumstances. After all, now that all other*

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

> *weapons have been wrested from our hands, [exhibitions are] the only weapon we have in our culture with which we can gain recognition from abroad and prove the viability and historical vocation of Hungarians. And even among the intellectual weapons, fine art is the most important, because our language is not understood anywhere in Europe, our literature is a closed book to foreign countries, while fine art, which speaks the international language of colors, lines and shapes, is equally understandable everywhere and is therefore best suited to prove to the world the vitality and the will to live of the Hungarian nation sentenced to death with an exclamatory speech. This exhibition only partially meets this goal, as it lacks the greatest strengths of our fine arts.*[21]

The Budapest show, though clearly oriented to the Hungarian audience, was a grand success. Prince Castagnetto Castiglione, Minister Plenipotentiary of Italy, visited the show repeatedly; he so impressed with the material shown that he arranged for the Italian government to request a show of Hungarian art in Rome. He also organized an invitation for Hungary to the 12th Venice Biennale, already evidence of the effectiveness of the concept of cultural diplomacy.[22]

The inaugural show in Budapest presented approximately 170 paintings and 45 sculptures from a total of 85 artists: 61 painters and 24 sculptors. No written record of the arrangement of the pieces with the National Salon has been located. One of the few visual records is an image published in the newspaper "Ország-Világ".[23] This image, while it does present a view of the exhibition has as its focus visitors to the show, in this case, the English Admiral Trowbridge and his son, rather than the art displayed. Nonetheless, in the background, the hanging of the paintings is clearly visible.

The printed catalog of the exhibition gives no indication of the physical arrangement of the works, either room by room, by date, or by style. Works in the catalogue are grouped first by medium, then alphabetically by artist.

The catalog does not provide dates for the works shown, but it does provide life dates for the exhibited artists, which allows for a certain cursory analysis. The oldest artists, classified by the catalog as "the great masters of Hungarian painting": Géza Mészöly (1844-1877), Mihály Munkácsy (1844-1900), Béla Pállik (1845-1908), László Paál (1846-1879), and Lajos Bruck (1846-1910) were all born in the 1840s while the youngest artist displayed, Pal Udvary, was born in 1900, a range of some sixty years. A close examination of the birth decades of the artists furnishes some insight into their training and artistic pedigree. The single largest decennial cohort, with 21 artists, was the 1870s. The preceding and following decades 1860 and 1880, had 13 and 12 artists, respectively. This would mean that the earliest artists would, by necessity, have trained abroad, as the

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Magyar Képzőművészeti Egyetem/ the Hungarian Fine Arts University, was not founded until 1871. But the vast majority of those born in the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s, would have been able to train in Hungary, at initially, though the more successful ones might have studied further in Munich, Berlin, or Paris.

Also instructive and worth noting are the lenders to the exhibition. The provenance of 34 of the works displayed is listed. Thirteen of the displayed works were listed as belonging to the Hungarian Fine Arts Museum (Szépművészeti Múzeum tulajdona), the only public institution listed as lending to the exhibition.[24] The remain 21 works are from private collections. The largest group, 9 pieces, are from the collection of Gusztáv Sajóházi Schuller. Károly Horváth loaned 6 works to the show; Baron Adolf Kohner 3 works. Count and Mrs. Andrássy each had one work on display; they are listed separately as owners. Surprisingly, the well-known Hungarian collector, Marcel Jánoshalmi Nemes,[25] had but one single work on display. A possible explanation for this small number of works from such a renown collector is the First Show of Works taken into Public Possession/A köztulajdonba vett műkincsek első kiállítása of just a year earlier. Organized by the short-lived Hungarian Soviet led by Béla Kun, the show was the result of the government confiscation of private art collections. An extensive catalogue was produced, in which Nemes' name repeatedly appears.[26] It is well possible that there was either a reluctance on his part to lend to another show, even if this time voluntarily or the return of the works, which began with the ascension of the Horthy Regime, was slow.

The catalogue for this inaugural show featured a long essay by Károly Lyka, a leading art writer of the time. The essay, which is discussed at far greater length in my previous article, emphasizes the role of Hungary in the defense of Europe and the price it paid through the lack of cultural development:

> *Hungarian art has always been and still is an integral part of European art. Beyond the borders of Hungary built by nature, towards the East there is no European art, that is, there is no art that shared ideals with the art of Western European peoples. Beyond the Hungarian borders, the process of development stopped in the Middle Ages, and the art of Hungarians represents the last great belt in the south-east of Europe, on which Hungarian art has been continuously forming, organically changing and developing for many centuries.*[27]

Hungary, he declares, was the bastion again the Muslims in earlier centuries, just as it is again the bastion against the current threat from the East.

Hungarian Representative Exhibition: Holland (1921)

After the premier of the Magyar Representative Exhibition cycle in Budapest, it travelled to the Netherlands, where it was shown in

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Amsterdam and Gravenhage. The Dutch shows differed from the Budapest variant in organization and in presentation. A similar number of works were shown (173 paintings in Budapest; 195 in Amsterdam), but with significant differences in participants. About 30 artists (see appendix 1) exhibited in both shows, but which of their works were displayed and their provenances differed. As previously discussed, for 1920 show, few lenders were named. For the Amsterdam and Gravenhage versions of the show, no lenders at all were named. But, as the vast majority of the works are listed as being for sale, it is doubtful the works were either from Museum collections or private collectors.[28] With this show, as with almost all the shows discussed in this paper, a significant research obstacle clearly identifying precisely which works were shown. The Hungarian language poses a number of problems: in addition to the difficulty posed to foreigners by the larger number of letters in the Hungarian alphabet, the Hungarian pattern of family name preceding given name is also often further confused by the use of titles of nobility. While much of this confusion can be cleared up through recourse to lexicons and other reference sources to identify artists, the titles of artworks themselves present problems as well. The original Hungarian titles are sometimes oddly translated and more precise identification is often further complicated by the painting's generic titles – *Reclining Nude*, *Early Morning*, *Village Scene*. Although some of the catalogues do have illustrations appended, there are usually relatively few. In the absence of reliable visual documentation, it is almost impossible to determine if works of one exhibition with a similar title actually coincides with the image in a different exhibition. However, based on the uniqueness of the titles, it does seem that five images were common to both the Budapest show and the Dutch shows: László E. Baranski *Dredge*; Andor Basch, *Resting Woman*; Gyula Conrad, *Festa Veneziana*; Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch, *Self-portrait*; and Lajos Szlányi, *Winter Sun*. With the exception of Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch, *Self-portrait*, these four works, like of the works in the show, were for sale, a clear demonstration that Andrassy's idea that this cycle could generate foreign currency was taken seriously.[29]

The show's catalogue is very basic. It thanks the members of the organizing committee and then simply lists artist, work name, medium, and price, if for sale.

The Stedelijk Museum, the venue for the Amsterdam iteration of the show, has no archival material about the show, either documentary or photographic. Little of substance seems to have been written about the shows in the Dutch press. Most of the articles are simply announcements of the show or a report on the opening, which was notably attended by Queen Wilhelmina. One article, published in the newspaper "De Standaard", and found in the Stedelijk's archive, did engage with the aesthetics of the show. The author, who is not listed, was rather critical, asking if the work exhibited was really the best of Hungarian art and artists, or if perhaps the Dutch just did not understand Hungarian art. In any event, the author credits the Hungarians as "handsome figure-makers" continuing that the

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

"mood of variegated landscapes is a quality that few have in common with them".[30]

While the ideological origins of the show are reasonably well known, the actual organization of the show remains shrouded in mystery as does most of the work undertaken by the Ministry of Religion and Public Education. In 1956, the Soviets mistook the Hungarian State Archive building for a military installation and shelled it. Fire broke out and while much of the archival material could be removed and saved, the papers of the Ministry of Religion and Public Education were decimated. Only scattered bits remain, but it is often possible from other sources – published reports or newspaper reporting – to discern some of the activity of the Ministry, but the details of decision making contained in the archives are lost. Such is the case with the Hungarian Representative Exhibition in Holland. The catalogues from the shows are very basic with neither introductory essay nor illustrations. In later shows both would be present. In addition to Béla Déry, identified as "Referent" of the Executiv-Comité which was credited with organizing the show, a pair of well-known Hungarian-based artists are named as well: the painter Moric Góth and the sculptor Ede Telcs.[31] Also listed among the organizers, as the "Hungarian Government's expert in Holland," is the painter Oskár Mendlik. Mendlik (1871-1963) had studied in Budapest in the late 1890s; in 1898 he won a fellowship to Rome. From 1911 onward, he lived and worked in the Netherlands, specializing in seascapes; numerous exhibitions have been devoted to his work. His activity in the Netherlands on behalf of the Magyar Studio, a main organizer of the show, is not completely clear. Interestingly, despite his seemingly critical involvement with the show with his activity meriting enough attention to be credited as the Hungarian Government's specialist in Holland, he had no contributions to the show.

Hungarian Representative Exhibition: Finland and Estonia (1922)

In the following year, 1922, another iteration of the Hungarian Representative Show (possibly the fifth)[32] was presented in Finland and Estonia. This show marks the beginning of a change: there was a refocusing of the underlying exhibition ideology as well as shift in goals of the exhibition. While the same complaints about the iniquities of Trianon still surface in the catalogue, that is not the sole focus. It additionally focuses on Hungary's relationship with the host countries.

Opening on 15th of November 1922, the show consisted of about 180 paintings and 60 sculptures. Present were Kaarlo Ståhlberg, first President of Finland and patron of the show, as well as the Hungarian Minister Plenipotentiary, Baron Gyula Bornemissza, and Béla Déry, the principal organizer of the show. In addition to the physical show, Count Kunó Klebelsberg, the Hungarian Ministry of Religion and Public Education, commissioned Aladár Bán, a well-known Hungarian expert in Finno-Ugric culture, to present illustrated Finnish-language lectures about the development of Hungarian art.[33] Bán lectured in a several Finnish cities: Helsinki, Turku, Pori and Tampere.[34] While the contents of the lectures remains unknown,

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

it no doubt related to the exhibition with which it was associated.

Unlike the Dutch show of the previous year, where the catalogue had neither an essay nor illustrations, this version of the show, in its Finnish-Estonian dual-language catalogue, had both and essay and illustrations. The catalogue essay[35] is vaguely credited to the "Hungarian Committee for the Exhibition"[36] which does not narrow down the authorship, as the catalogue lists a total of 33 members of the committee.[37] While many of the committee members did participate in the Finnish show, it is more likely that the essay was written by one of the members who organized more than one show, probably Ervin Ybl, listed in the catalogue as ministerial secretary. He authored a number of essays for the Representative Show cycle.

The essay is quite similar to that of the 1920 Budapest show, though significantly shorter, only a page and a half, as opposed to 13 pages. Despite its brevity, similar complaints are still brought forth. The same rhetoric of Hungary as the self-sacrificing bastion of the West, preventing the Eastern hordes from destroying Western Civilization are still presented, but not at the same great length as previously. The argument is more refined and less inciting. The essay decries the misplaced Western belief, "the lie they have spread for decades, that our people have only ruled by brute force over foreign-racial peoples living in Hungarian territories".[38] The misconception is disproved "by the history of the development of our culture and our art" which "clearly proves that our people have not only been able to wield a sword, but also a pen, a brush and a knife, and have triumphed, not only through bravery, but also through civilization, over those peoples who have now usurped most of our country".[39] When describing the ideal and realization of this Representative Exhibition, the author evokes the mythic relationship between the Finns and the Hungarians:

> *Our exhibition as a whole gives a picture of development. It wants to show our northern relatives the degree of development of our art and its different directions. Our best artists take part in it with their most descriptive products. From their creative minds blow the whining breeze of the Hungarian plains, the colors of their paintings and the shapes of their sculptures conjured before your eyes the flourishing landscapes of the roads plundered from Hungary and the types depicting our people.*[40]

This evocation of the relationship between the Hungarians and the Finns had great currency at the time.[41] The 1920s and 1930s saw a rise in the popularity of "Turanism," the political and cultural ideology of the unity of the Ural-Altaic speaking peoples. In the late 19th century, its popularity in Hungary was widespread; it was perceived as an antidote to the then-surging idea of "Slavic Brotherhood" which was based on commonality in language as well. From 1913 until 1944, the Turán Society (Hungarian Asian Society) published a journal "Turán"

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

devoted to exploring and promoting this ideology. In the 1920s and 1930s Turanism experienced a mild revival, again, as an antidote to the cultural, political, and linguistic isolation of Hungary.[42] The evocation of the mystic chords of memory and fraternity are present in the closing of the catalogue essay:

> *But we must confess that we have come here not only out of artistic ambition, but also out of fraternal respect, and we know that fair criticism and understanding awaits us here. With this thought in our souls, we greet our art-loving brotherhood and express our heartfelt thanks in advance to all those who have worked kindly for the success of our exhibition!* [43]

The works shown were from a range of artists. Of the 73 artists exhibiting, 19 of them had participated in the Dutch show the previous year.[44] It is particularly striking that the artist Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch (1863-1920) had the largest contribution to the Finnish show, 12 works. One possible explanation is his close personal relationship with Akseli Gallen-Kallela, the renowned Finnish national artist who was also the Honorary Finnish supervisor of the exhibition. At the turn of the century Gallen-Kallela had travelled to Hungary where he spent time with Körösfői-Kriesch and others at the Gödöllő artists' colony, a Hungarian manifestation of the Morrisian art idyll and ideal.[45] After returning to Finland, he still maintained close ties to Körösfői-Kriesch. Given Körösfői-Kriesch's recent death (1920) it would not be surprising that his work was given such prominence by his colleagues and friends.

As with the Dutch shows, one of the stated goals of the Finnish exhibition was art sales, to raise hard foreign currency for both the empoverished Hungarian State and suffering Hungarian artists. While none of the financial materials of the exhibitions have been found, a report in the journal "Turán" does discuss the financial results of the exhibit and not in the most glowing of terms. Overall, it seems close to 12 million crowns were raised through the sale of material from and related to the show. It was reported though, that a travelling Hungarian salesman exploited the occasion of the show to peddle lesser-quality goods, particularly folk-art, claiming them to be from the show.

The Finnish show marked the beginning of a change in the tenor of the Hungarian Representative Exhibitions. While the shows would continue on in name until 1930 and beyond, and while the sponsoring organizer, the Országos képzőművészeti tanács, did remain in charge, a shift in what was shown and more significant, how the exhibitions were presented, what their ultimate goals were, did take place. Again, as the archival materials of the Ministry of Religion and Public Education are lost, it is impossible to know the precise machinations behind the changes, but they do coincide with the start of Count Kunó Klebelsberg's tenure as Minister, a position to which he ascended on June 16, 1922 and held until 1931, just before his untimely death at the age of 56.[46] Though by the time he began at the Ministry, it was prob-

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

ably too late for him to have any significant ministerial influence on the Finnish exhibition, as Minister he did commission Aládar Bán's lecture series, the organization and implementation of which require much less time and planning. The series also supported Klebelsberg's ideas on the renewal of Hungarian culture and the importance of cultural diplomacy were well known at the time.

A practical manifestation of Klebelsberg's recognition of and interest in the cultural diplomatic work of the Representative Exhibitions was his revival of the Országos képzőművészeti tanács/ National Fine Arts Council, which had been moribund since 1918. In November of 1923, Klebelsberg revived the Council, extending its bailiwick to include architecture. While the committee received a new name, its membership, its composition and its goals were similar to those of the now abolished Külföldi Művészeti Kiállítások Végrehajtó Bizottság/ Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions. Notably, K. Róbert Kertész remained as president of the Council, similar to his role in the previous Committee and Béla Déry remained as the main artistic organizer.

With the new name came an expanded remit. While the Hungarian Representative Exhibitions continued as free-standing undertakings, as they had before, the Council now also participated in foreign art exhibitions. While the works would be part of larger shows, they were still submitted and exhibited under the title "Hungarian Representative Exhibition". At the 1925 Great Berlin Art Exhibit, for instance, there was a distinct section of the show – and of the catalogue – devoted to Hungarian art. From the catalogue, it is not clear if the works displayed were actually shown separately within the general exhibition space or if they had their own distinct area, but within the catalogue at least, the Hungarian works are clearly differentiated from the German works. Credit for the organization of the Hungarian exhibition is given to the Ungarischer Landes Senat für Schöne Künste and the Comité der Ausländischen Ausstellungen.[47] This seems to be the first exhibition within an exhibition, a format which would coexist into the 1930s with the free-standing Hungarian Representative Exhibition.

By this time, well into his third year as Minister, it is highly probable that Klebelsberg had some hand in the organization of the Exhibition. The year of the exhibition, 1925, also saw Minister Klebelsberg take a culturally and politically significant trip to Berlin. Though his presence in Berlin, in late October 1925, did not coincide with the Exhibition, which ran from May 16 until the end of August 1925, the show, nonetheless, was a clear physical manifestation of his cultural diplomatic ideals.

In an address Klebelsberg read in the entrance hall of the Friedrich Wilhelm's University, which he himself had attended 30 years earlier, *Ungarische Kulturpolitik nach dem Kriege*, the Minister clearly verbalized the ideas and ideals undergirding his new cultural political program, especially its outward cultural-diplomatic aspect. Klebelsberg stated that the goals of his visit were two-fold. The first was to

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

"strengthen the spiritual ties that always united Germans and Hungarians" and the second was to "report on the tireless work we have done in Hungary after the collapse to save traditional Hungarian culture".[48] Lauding German culture, he continues that without German education, culture itself would be impossible and thus he had come to Berlin to announce the creation of a permanent cultural institution, the *Collegium Hungaricum*, to "give our spiritual cooperation an organic, that is, a continuous and living form.[49]

The Berlin Collegium Hungaricum was the second of the 4 such institutions which would be opened during Klebelsberg's tenure. The first, in Vienna,[50] opened in September of 1924; that of Berlin followed in 1925; and in 1928 the Rome Collegium (re) opened.[51] A number of Hungarian Institutes, seemingly smaller, less well-funded, and with more modest goals were also established in Madrid, Warsaw, Amsterdam, and Stockholm at the same time.[52]

The new tack in cultural diplomacy was implemented not just in Germany. In Italy as well, similar to the Grosse Berliner Kunstausstellung, within the Seconda Esposizione internazionle di belle arti dell citta di Fiume/ The Second International Exhibition of Fine Arts of the City of Fiume, was a separate section labelled in the catalogue as the Esposizione rappresentative del Regno d'Ungheri followed by listing of the Membri del Consiglio Nazionale di Belle Art.[53]

The show, an international exhibition, did have foreign displays: Yugoslavian, Czechoslovakian, Bulgarian, and Polish, but they were presented as inherent constituent sections of the show. The Hungarian section though was listed separately and it was given much more ink. It is not clear if the works were shown in their own, separate and distinct spaces, or integrated with the rest of the materials displayed.

The catalogue of the Fiume show also featured a four-page essay, by Béla Déry, one of the organizers and a key figure in the Council. Unlike the catalogue essays of previous exhibits, this one did not dwell upon the iniquities of Trianon or even mention it. It focused instead on the long-standing artistic and cultural relationship between Hungary and Italy.[54]

Within the Hungarian section were two separate displays. One was a selection of works, approximately 35, from the City Museum of Budapest, which had been collecting art since before the turn of the century.[55] The second portion of the exhibition was the Hungarian Representative Exhibition which, in addition to over 200 works of art, also had about 50 pieces of Herend porcelain.

Hungarian Representative Exhibition: Warsaw, 1927

While smaller versions of the Hungarian Representative Exhibition were often annexed to other art shows, the independent exhibit of the early 1920s did continue. In both cases, the organizers remained essentially the same, the newly minted Council having an almost identical composition to that of the Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions that it replaced. And both: the Council and Executive Committee for Foreign Art Exhibitions were under the Ministry of Religion and

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Public Education.

The year 1927, which saw the expiration of the enabling legislation of the Council, also saw an exhibition of Hungarian Art in the Polish capital, Warsaw. The exhibition then traveled to Poznan and to Cracow. In Vienna, and, as already mentioned, in Fiume, the exhibitions had Hungarian portions presented as part of the larger more general exhibition. In the case of Vienna, the Hungarian portion was curated by Béla Déry, as Royal Hungarian Government Commissioner, Béla Iványi Grünwald, painter, and Dr. Sándor von Jeszenszky, general secretary of the Szinyei Society. Whatever role the Council may have had is not noted, though presumably Déry used his position to his advantage.[56]

In 1927, as the mandate for the Council was ending, long-time Council member and director of the National Salon, Béla Déry produced a history of the Council and its activities, particularly focusing on those of the last year of its existence. His book *Művészeti kiállítások külföldön az 1927. évben: Warszawa, Poznań, Kraków, Wien, Fiume* includes Vienna and Fiume more for chronological completeness than for comparison as the two shows were not only rather small but, more important, were not free-standing shows organized by the Council alone; they were housed separately within the larger overarching show.

In many ways, the Polish show of the 1927 was the ultimate fulfillment of the Council's goals of cultural diplomacy and represented the zenith of its activity in form, in content, and in purpose. Though there were three different venues: Warsaw, Poznan, Cracow, and the contents of the three shows did not vary greatly, the success of each show in its respective venue did. As Déry relates, each venue posed its own unique political quandaries, especially Cracow, where the various competing local art societies –which controlled the desirable art venues-- were constantly feuding.

Déry places the origins to a show of Polish Graphic Art in Budapest in 1926.[57] The Polish Ambassador I.S. Michalowski extended an invitation to the Regent Miklos Horthy during the opening of the Polish show. Horthy accepted the invitation, then delegated organization of the show to the Fine Arts Council's Foreign Exhibit Committee. This committee, coordinating with the Council, named a larger committee to supervise both the organization and administration of the show.[58]

The exhibit itself consisted of 271 pictures and graphic works, representing about 90 artists. The works themselves were drawn from a range of sources, public and private. For the purposes of organization, the Director of the Budapest Fine Arts Museum, Dr. Elek Petrovic, was seconded to the committee. Through his connections, he seems to have been able to secure loans from a variety of private collectors, such as Marcel Nemes, Count Gyula Andrássy, Dr. Henrik Nádor, Baron Adolf Kohner, and József Wolfner. A number of Hungarian art societies, such as the Szinyei Merse Pál tarsasag/Pál Szinyei Merse Society,[59] the Képzőművészek Új/ New Artists Society, whose name is often abbreviated KUT,[60] as well as the Benczúr Tarsasag/ Benczúr Society also participated.

The first of the show's three stops

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

was Warsaw. As befit its political and cultural significance, this was also the most elaborate presentation of the works, within the building of the Towarzisztvo zachetny Sztuk Pieknich/Polish Society for the Encouragement of Fine Arts. The size of the Society's space allowed the organizers to allocate separate rooms for each of the participating societies. The entrance to each space was marked to indicate the society displaying within. As the work of the Benczur group was so small, it shared the same room as the historical exhibition. Déry notes, however, that the catalogue did not differentiate amongst the artists' associations, it simply listed the participants alphabetically.

The show's opening, as described by Déry, demonstrated the diplomatic and cultural significance the show represented. Nationally and locally significant Polish dignitaries, ranging from the President of the Polish Republic to the Foreign Minister to Mayor of Warsaw as well as numerous foreign Ambassadors: French, American, English, Austrian, Belgian, Italian, Dutch, Bulgarian, Danish, Brazilian, Estonian, Finnish, Romanian, Swiss, Norwegian, and Czechoslovak were all present. In addition to the Hungarian organizers who traveled to Poland, the Hungarian Ambassador Sándor Belitska, attended. Also present was Dr. Adorján Divéky, press attaché and Hungarian history and language lecturer at the Warsaw University, a post he assumed in 1917, after having spent two years at the University of Cracow as a lecturer in history. In 1935, when a Hungarian Institute formally opened in Warsaw, following several years of the existence of a Hungarian Library and Cultural Center, Divéky was named the first director.

After a four-week run in Warsaw, the show traveled westward to Poznan, where it was housed in the Greater Poland Museum/Wielkopolski Muzeum. While the Poznan opening was still festive, it was neither as grand nor as significant as that of the Warsaw opening. Local dignitaries, not national or international, comprised the audience. The show, which only ran for two weeks, seems to have had the same content as that of the Warsaw show.

The third, and final stop was the formerly Austrian controlled city of Cracow. A feud among the various artists' groups which controlled exhibition space within the city almost prevented the show from taking place. However, as Déry writes, it was only through the intervention of the Mayor of Cracow and the District Vojvoda, that for the duration of the Hungarian exhibition that peace was achieved between the parties, which had been feuding for years.[61]

In Cracow, for technical reasons, the planned reception for the invited guests from Budapest could not take place. The Hungarian Ambassador, Sándor Belitska, was present though, as were the leading cultural and intellectual figures of Cracow. The Cracow stop was, like that in Poznan, only two weeks long. A total of 7,141 visitors were recorded.

Déry's final accounting of the Hungarian Representative Exhibition in Poland shows that while the cultural-diplomatic aspect was important, as in the previous show, finances remained significant as well. As he sums up: total cost of transportation and installation for the 135 days the

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

show was up was 3025 pengő (and 61 fillér). The show was viewed by a total of 27,142 visitors, the vast majority in Warsaw. A happy result of the show was the sale of 47 works, of painting, graphic art, or applied art, for a total of 12,840 pengő, when the average laborer's income was 1,000 pengő a year.

The choice of Poland as the venue for this major demonstration of cultural politics was deliberate. Hungary and Poland have a long and intertwined history dating back to the 1300 and 1400s when there was a physical union between the countries through the ruler. The Polish-Hungarian relationship, though hoary, was also constantly renewed. In 1848, Bem József (Józef Zachariasz Bem) offered his services to Kossuth and his revolutionary army. Initially entrusted with the defense of Transylvania and subsequently with command of the Székely troops, Bem acquitted himself well. Ultimately leaving Hungary with the sundering of the 1848 Revolution and casting his lot with the Ottoman Turks (after accepting Islam) he is nonetheless well-remembered in Hungary, where he earned the nickname *Bem apó*/Grandpa Bem.

In 1925, the 75th anniversary of Bem's death, the Hungarian Polish Society commissioned a commemorative plaque for Bem in Budapest, which was dedicated the next year. The following year, 1926, saw the founding of a Polish committee to construct a monument and rebury Bem's ashes in his homeland. The next anniversary of his death, December 11, 1927, marked the 77 years since his death and to mark the occasion, the Hungarian Bem Society organized a commemorative "Bem Day". The following year, 1928, Bem's ashes were reinterred in Tarnow; the handling of them as they passed through Hungary was organized by the Bem Society.[62]

While that element of their common history fresh in mind, there was another reason Poland was the site of the great cultural diplomatic event. In the immediate post-war era, Poland was Hungary's nearest neighbor with whom they did not have a boundary dispute, even if Trianon and other post-war treaties had resolved the issue and fixed "new" boundaries.

The works displayed in the Polish exhibition were rather different than those of the Finnish/Estonian exhibition, the last free-standing Hungarian representative exhibition, as opposed to the Fiume, Berlin, or Vienna exhibitions where, while the organizer was the same, fewer works were displayed, but, more important, they were only constituent parts of a much larger exhibition.

Six of the artists of the Finnish exhibition were also exhibited in Poland: Gyula Batthyány, Gyula Conrad, István Csók, Aladár Edvi-Illés, Oszkár Glatz, and Kálmán Kato. More significant than the artists who had shown previously were the newer artists displaying such as Vilmos Aba-Novak, Istvan Bosznay, or Béla Iványi Grünwald, whose works represent a new trend in Hungarian painting. The Polish show, unlike any of the previous shows, organized display of the participants by the artistic group with which they were aligned. Three main groups were shown in Poland: The Szinyei-Merse Society founded in 1920; the Benczur Society founded

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

in 1921; and the Képzőművészek Új Társasága (KUT), the most modern of the groups. The artists exhibiting in Poland also represented a turn in Hungarian painting. While there had been a violently modernist tendency from the late teens until the crushing of the Hungarian Soviet, those artists who had allied themselves with the communists, such as Lajos Kassák, Róbert Bereny, or Sándor Bortnyik, were forced into exile. Kassák went to Vienna; Bortnyik to Weimar, where he was associated with, but not technically part of, the Bauhaus. With the general amnesty of 1925, they were allowed to return, though it was predicated upon abjuring political activity. While the artists returned, the styles that had forced them into exile generally remained abroad. They concretized their forced journeyman years in their work once they returned. Bortnyik for instance, adopted many of the pedagogical ideas of the Bauhaus and founded his own school, the Műhely/ Workshop, often referred to as the "little Bauhaus".[63]

But these were not the artists nor the art displayed in Poland. These "modern" works in Poland were still representational. Hungary displayed the modernism of Cezanne and the Impressionists, not the modernism of Picasso and Moholy-Nagy.

Exhibition of Modern Art: Nuremberg 1928

Similar to the way Bem bound Poland and Hungary, Albrecht Dürer bound Germany and Hungary. Dürer's father, Albrecht Senior, emigrated to Germany from the small Hungarian town of Ajtos. In Germany, his original Hungarian last name, Ajtosi (meaning from or of Ajtos) was translated to Türer or Dürer.[64]

The year 1928 saw the four hundredth anniversary of Dürer's death. A series of Dürer events were organized to celebrate that quadricentennial in Germany as well as in Hungary. Coordination though, was not between States, not between Germany and Hungary, but between Nuremberg, Dürer's hometown, and Budapest, though there was support from the Ministry of Religion and Public Education, both Minister Klebelsberg himself, as well as Kertész and Déry. While the Council does not seem to have been formally administering the exhibition, their presence and participation are apparent.

The Mayor of Nuremberg, Dr. Hermann Luppe, along with the Nuremberg City Council organized a series of celebrations of the great German Renaissance Artist and hometown boy. As part of this celebration, an exchange was organized between Nuremberg and Budapest. Nuremberg hosted a "Hungarian Week" while Budapest was the site of a "Nuremberg Week". In addition to concerts, operas, and dance performances, a series of exhibitions were organized. In Budapest these included a general exhibition, an exhibition of Nuremberg's Schools and Culture,[65] as well as an exhibition of "Old and New Art" which was shown in the Nemzeti Salon, premier art exhibition venue of the city.[66]

As part of the Nuremberg's Ungarische Woche, parallel events were organized: concerts, plays, and dance performances. There was also an art exhibition, the Ausstellung neuzeitlicher ungarischer Kunst/

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Exhibition of Contemporary Hungarian Art.[67] Organized by Professor Franz Traugott Schulz, the show was the product of a longer sojourn of his in Budapest, where he made contacts with various artist organizations, such as the Szinyei-Merse Society, the Benczur Society, and KUT but also numerous studio visits. While there was initial skepticism about a foreigner selecting Hungarian art for display abroad, it was overcome, and the show was ultimately embraced by Budapest's artistic community. Schulz's organizational work, in Hungary and in Nuremberg, was aided by Erwin von Körmendy (Körmendi-Frim Ervin, 1885-1939) a Hungarian painter then residing in Nuremberg who was also a member of KUT. As the title of the show indicates, the focus of the show was modern art, but as a prologue, there was a smaller retrospective portion of the show, organized by Dr. Alexius Petrovics, General Director of the Hungarian Museum of Fine Arts. This included works both from the Museum itself and from well-known private collections.[68]

A highlight of the commemoration was a visit by close to 600 of the leading citizens of Nuremberg. Arriving by chartered train, they first celebrated in Budapest and then travelled on a pilgrimage to Ajtos where a festive banquet was held. The significance of this visit – its political importance to Budapest and Hungary – can be seen in the commemorative medal produced at the time. Designed by the renowned Hungarian medal artist, József Reményi, on the obverse the medal shows a man wearing traditional Hungarian festive garb (Diszmagyar) holding a shield with the Nuremberg coat of arms, shaking hands with a German in medieval garb, holding a shield with the Budapest coat of arms. Encircling them is the phrase "The Capital City of Budapest Warmly Welcomes its Guests from Nuremberg".[69] The reverse has a traditionally-dressed Hungarian Huszar with a flag and shield on which is the date 8-15/9; to his left is 1929. Encircling him is the German phrase "Welcome in Budapest".[70]

The Germans produced several commemorative medals, but they were focused on Dürer, his achievement, and his Germanness, not the his relationship to Hungary.. One medal for instance, produced by the Bavarian State Mint, features Dürer's well-known self-portrait on the obverse, encircled by the caption "Albrecht Dürer-Jahr Nürnberg". The reverse has the door of Dürer's coat of arms and the so-called "small seal" of the city of Nürnberg below the phrase "Ehrt Eure deutschen Meister!" a quotation from Richard Wagner's opera, Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg. A number of similar medals seem to have been produced.

The intellectual product of the Dürer-jahr is extensive. In Hungary, a number of publications, dedicated to the commemorative year but also to underscoring Dürer's relationship with Hungary were produced: *Dürer-literature in Hungary, 1800-1928*, *Dürer on the Occasion of the Four- Hundredth Anniversary of his Death* or *Albrecht Dürer, 1528-1928: Also an Attempt at a Hungarian Dürer Bibliography.*[71]

The Hungarian art exhibition, housed in the Norishalle, consisted of about 420 works, divided into two groups. There was a small "Retrospective portion" of 65 objects

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

from 16 artists, with works of older Hungarian masters, such as Michael Munkacsy, Pal Szinyei-Merse, or Simon Hollosy, drawn from the collection of the Fine Arts Museum. But the main feature was the "Living Art" section, which, with slightly more than 100 artists exhibiting 400 works, constituted the bulk of the exhibition and was significantly larger than exhibitions of the previous years. Several of the artists had also exhibited in Poland[72] but there were also numerous artists for whom this was a first time showing in an exhibition associated with the Council.[73]

Again, the works of the exhibition are not profoundly abstract; there is the loose brushwork of modernism, the deliberate countervailing use of color, and a movement away from studio-bound history or religious paintings, but there are still clearly objects at the base of each image. A total of 18 works, painting and sculpture, were purchased by the Nuremberg City Museum.[74] With the exception of some confiscated in the 1930s as "Degenerate" and one lost during bombing in the War, they still remain in the City's Collection.

The Nuremberg show of contemporary Hungarian art was the last great such independent Hungarian show of the decade. At the time little was made of the exhibition in the Hungarian press; it is often only mentioned in passing. But it is precisely the mundaneness of the reception of this exhibit which demonstrates the success of the program of Hungarian Representative Exhibitions. No longer was Hungary an outsider, decrying the iniquities of history, but rather, it had taken its place among the nations of Europe as an equal. The pain of the forced border revisions continued – throughout the interwar period various groups advocated for changing the borders[75] – but the government shifted its focus to forging alliances rather than pushing complaints.

The theme of this issue is "Objects on the move". In the case of the Hungarian Representative exhibitions, the objects in motion are not necessarily individual paintings or sculptures, but rather, the concept of an exhibition. Organized by the same governmental ministry over the course of the two decades, the Hungarian Representative exhibitions' materials changed over time even as the format remained essentially the same. In the course of the 1920s, the focus, the ultimate theme of the exhibitions, changed from the painful national trials of Hungary under the iniquitous Treaty of Trianon, to the uniqueness of Hungarian art, to the role of art and art exhibitions as cultural ambassadors.

Through the 1930s, as Hungary tried to navigate between the Scylla of Nazi Germany and the Charybdis of Fascist Italy, this cultural diplomatic role of the exhibitions took on a greater and greater significance. This object that moved, the exhibitions, also branched across the Atlantic, finding a home in the United States. Beginning in 1930, a series of exhibitions, never as large as any iteration of the Hungarian Representative Exhibition of the previous decade, were held in venues across the United State. This was a clear demonstration of the Hungarian government's belief that it was not just objects that could be moved, but minds as well.

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Magyar Reprezentativ 1920 Catalogue Name	Holland 1921 Catalogue Name	Finland Estonia 1922 Catalogue Name	Warsaw 1927 Catalogue Name	Nuremberg 1929 Catalogue Name
			Wilhelm Aba Novak	Wilhelm Aba-Novak
		Ede Balló	Edward Balló	
László E. Baranski	László E. Baranski	László E. Baranski		
Gyula Batthány	Gy. Batthyány	Gyula Batthyány	Juljusz Batthyany	Julius Batthyány
Andor Basch	Andor Basch	Andor Basch		Andor Basch
Ernő Béli Vörös	Ernő v. Béli Vörös	Ernő Béli-Vörös		
Ágost Benkhard	Agost Benkhardt			
Géza Bornemisza	Géza v. Bornemisza		Géza Bornemisza	Geza Bornemisza
István Bosznay	István Bosznay		Stefan Bosznay	
			Rudolf Burghardt	Rudolf Burghardt
Gyula Conrad	Gyula Conrad	Gyula Conrad	Juljusz Conrad	
Dénes Csánky	Dénes Csánky		Dyonizy Csanky	Dénes Csánky
István Csók	István Csók	István Csók	Stefan Csok	István Csók
Jenő Csuk	Jenő Csuk	Jenő Csuk		
Béla Déry	Béla v. Déry	Béla Déry	Déry Béla	Béla Déry
Aladár Edvi Illés	Aladár Edvi-Illés	Aladár Edvi-Illés	Aladár Edvi Illés	Aladár Edvi Illés
		Adolf Fényes		Adolf Fényes
Károly Ferenczy	Karl Ferenczy			Károly Ferenczy
	Frigyes Frank	Frigyes Frank		Frigyes Frank
	Ferencz Gaál	Ferenc Gaal		
Oszkár Glatz	Oszkár Glatz	Oszkár Glatz	Oskar Glatz	Oskar Glatz
Ferenc Hatvany	Ferenc Hatvany			Ferenc Hatvany
Béla Iványi-Grünwald	B. Iványi-Grünwald		Béla Iványi Grünwald	Béla Jványi-Grünwald
				Péter Kálmán
Kálmán Kató	Kálmán Kató	Kálmán Kato	Kálmán Kató	
	L. v. Kézdi-Kovács	László Kézdi-Kovács		
Ervin (sic) Körmendi–Frimm	E. Körmendi-Frimm			Eugen Körmendy
Aladár Körösfői Kriesch	A. Körösfői-Kriesch	Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch		
	József Koszta			Josef Koszta
Gyula Kosztolányi Kann	Gy. Kosztolányi-Kann			Gyula Kosztolányi
	Géza Kövesdy	Géza Kövesdy		
	Lajos v. Kunffy			Lajos Kunffy
Cézár Kunwald	Cézár Kunwald			Caesar Kunwald
László Mednyánszky	L. Mednyánszky	László Mednyánszky		László Mednyánszky
Róbert Nádler	Róbert Nádler			Róbert Nádler
				Károly Patkó
				Isaak Perlmutter
István Réti	István Réti			Stefan Réti
József Rippl-Rónai	József Rippl-Rónai			József Rippl-Rónai
Gyula Rudnay	József Gyula Rudnay			Julius Rudnay
Lajos Szlányi	Lajos Szlányi			Lajos Szlányi
Ödön Szmrecsányi	Ödön v. Szmrecsányi			
				Péter Szüle
Elemér Vass	Elemér Vass			Elemer Vass
János Vaszary	János v. Vaszary	János Vaszary		Johann Vaszary
	István Zádor			Stefan Zádor

Appendix 01: Locations and date of Artists exhibiting in 3 or more *Representative Exhibitions.*

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Endnotes:

1 This project has been generously supported by the Center for the History of Collection of the Frick Collection, the Botstiber Institute for Austrian-American Studies, Fulbright Hungary, and the Fashion Institute of Technology.

2 For clarity and uniformity, Hungarian names will be presented in the traditional western format: first name, last name. However, names will not be translated, so Szinyei-Merse Pál will be presented as Pál (not Paul) Szinyei-Merse.

Kertész trained as an architect at Budapest's Technical University. At the turn of the century, he was best known for his work in researching foreign architecture, having travelled to the Far East during his student years. He produced articles and books about Ceylonese, Japanese, and Far Eastern architecture. He, along with Gyula Svab, collected plans for traditional folk houses. Kertész, Sváb 2011. His interest turned to national architecture in the late teens, when he authored Nemzeti epitoműveszet/National Architecture. He designed the objects and setting for the coronation of Karoly IV.: Kertesz 1917. Kertesz began working in the Ministry of Religion and Public Education in 1908 as a consulting architect; from 1922-1934 he headed the Fine Arts Section and served as State Secretary.

3 Déry 1921; 1927.

4 Nékám 1935.

5 Nagy 2011; 2015; 2017; 2021.

6 Gerencsér 2018.

7 Klebelsberg 1925; 1927; 1930a;1930b; 1930c; Glatz, 1969; 1971; Kiss 1998; Herzog 2003; Ujváry 2009; 2013; Klein, Huszar 2023.

8 Hungarian participation in the Venice Biennale has been well documented in: Bódi 2014.

9 This issue and the complex relationship among various constituent nationalities of Austro-Hungary is thoroughly and deeply discussed in: Clegg 2006.

10 Commonly referred to as "white" as opposed to communist "red" forces.

11 The pervasiveness of Trianon revanchism has been explored in: Zeidler 2002.

12 Albert 2024.

13 These are the representative exhibition I know of: 1920 Budapest; 1922 Amsterdam and Gravenhage; 1922 Stockholm; 1922 Finland and Estonia; 1924 Vienna (this is listed in the accompanying catalogue as the "Ninth" exhibition, but it is not clear if each individual showing of the exhibition, i.e. in two cities within the same country during the same tour, count as one or two exhibits for the organizers); 1927 Warsaw; 1929 Oslo.

14 The activity of the Kriegspressequartier or the Sajtóhadiszállás as the Austrian and Hungarian offices were, respectively, are dealt with is: Kollros, Pils 2014; Colpan et al. 2015; Reichel 2016. The work of Hungarian artists in particular is explored in: Róka, Szücs 2014.

15 *Tentoonstelling van werken…* 1917.

16 Déry, Bányász, Margitay, 1912. Foreward.

17 Déry, 1927, p. 3.

18 "Világ", February 14, 1920, p. 8.

19 Magyar kultúrának egyik legerősebb fegyvere a képzőművészet, nemcsak lázért, mert ez nálunk igen magas nívón áll, hanem mert a nyelve internacionális és így mindenki által megérthető. A kiállítás gazdasági jelentősége is igen fontos és remélhetjük, hogy művészeink jó külföldi valutához fognak jutni. Ami a magyar művészet nyugat felé való törekvését illeti, erről csak azt mondhatom, hogy ennek függetlennek kell lenni minden politikai orientációtól. Azt el kell ismerni, hogy a francia művészet kétségtelenül mindig

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

vezetője volt a modern piktúrának, de ebbe a művészeti motívumokon kívül semmilyen politikai. “Magyarorszag”, November 21, 1920, 5.

20 “Magyarorszag”, November 21, 1920, 5.

21 “Ország-Világ”, 40 (56), December 5, 1920, p.1.

22 Dery 1921 p. 10; Bódi, p. 15.

23 “Ország-Világ”, December 5, 1920, p. 585.

24 The current disposition of the pieces which, at the time, belonged to the Fine Arts Museum is not known.

25 While there is an extensive bibliography of works on the Andrássy family, grandfather, father, and son, it focuses more on their political activity rather than their collecting. Of the collectors listed here, Nemes was the best known, and to date the most studied. See: Sümegi 1975; Tüskés 2008; Németh 2011; 2012; Wéber 2013.

26 Műtárgyakat 1919. Further investigation of the show and its aftermath can be found in: Juhász 2019a; 2019b.

27 Lyka 1920, p. 11.

28 This article will focus primarily on the artists showing, not the works shown.

29 Little material about sales at the shows exists. Several articles do mention total overall sales but do not break it down to individual pieces.

30 “De Hongaren betoonen zich knappe figuurteekenaars en het in stemming brengen van bonte landschappen is een qualiteit, die slechts weinigen met hen gemeen hebben”; De Standaart, May 22, 1920, p. 3.

31 Listed as Maurus Góth and Eduard Telcs in the catalogue. *Catalogus*... 1921, n. p.

32 See footnote 13.

33 Ban later wrote a book on the Finnish-Estonian Hungarian relationship. Bán 1928.

34 Magyar művészeti kiállítás... 1922.

35 There is both a Finnish- and an Estonian-language version, as there is for every aspect of the catalogue, from title to organizers to the names of the works themselves. They seem to be identical.

36 Näyttelyn Unkarilainen Toimikunta/ Näituse Ungari Toimkond.

37 One of the more interesting members of the committee is the Finnish-born sculptor Yrjö Liipola. Having fled Finland to avoid conscription, he settled in Hungary, working as both sculptor and translator. In 1934, he returned to Finland, where he resided until his death in 1971.

38 *Unkarilainen*... 1922, p. 12.

39 *Unkarilainen*... 1922, p. 12.

40 *Unkarilainen*... 1922, p. 12.

41 A discussion of the long-term relationship between the Hungarians and the Finns can be found in: Numminen, Nagy 1985. See also: Richly, 2021. Also Egey, 2010.

42 The overall history of Turanism is dealt with in: Kessler 1967, particularly chapters 6 and 7.

43 *Unkarilainen*... 1922, p. 13.

44 The artists common to both shows were: László E. Baranski (2 works), Gyula Batthyány (2 works), Andor Basch (4 works), Ernő Béli-Vörös (2 works), Gyula Conrad (7 works), István Csók (2 works), Jenő Csuk (4 works), Béla Déry (4 works), Aladár Edvi-Illés (4 works), Frigyes Frank (1 work), Ferenc Gaal (2 works), Oszkár Glatz (1 work), Kálmán Kato (2 works), László Kézdi-Kovács (1 work), Aladár Körösfői-Kriesch (12 works), Géza

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Kövesdy (1 work), László Mednyánszky (2 works), and János Vaszary (4 works),

45 For a general history of Gödöllő see: Gellér, Keserü 1987. More focused studies of the work of Gödöllő are Keserü 1988; 1993.

46 Klebelsberg (1875-1932), a trained attorney, served as a member of Parliament, Interior Ministry (1921-1922), and for almost a decade, (1922-1931) served as Ministry of Religion and Public Education. During his tenure he instituted numerous educational reforms, both at the primary school level as well as at the University level, including instituting a system of scholarships for University students. A number of research and cultural institutions were called into being during his term as minister: the Biological Research Institute on the shores of Lake Balaton, as well as a series of Hungarian Collegia and Institutes abroad.

He is also considered the father of the *numerus clausus*, the limiting of the number of Jews in Hungarian higher education. See: Karády, Nagy 2012.

47 *Grosse Berliner* 1925, p. 83.

48 Klebelsberg 1925, p. 343.

49 Klebelsberg 1925, p. 344.

50 Ujváry 1994; 1998.

51 The Rome location had been the Fraknoi Historical Institute from its founding in 1894. In 1912, a newly constructed second building housed the Fine Arts Academy. With the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, use and possession of the buildings was disputed. In 1928, Klebelsberg acquired the Palazzo Falconieri, which became the home to the Royal Roman Hungarian Academy, which incorporated both the Fraknoi Institute and Pontifical Hungarian Ecclesiastical Institute in the City. For more on the history of the institute see: Ujváry 1995; 1996; 2008. Also: Molnár, Tóth, Campbell 2016.

52 There seems to be little mention in the Hungarian press about the institutes, as opposed to the larger Collegia, and when they are mentioned, it seems to be mostly in passing.

53 *Seconda esposizione…* 1927, pp. 64-71. The exhibition is briefly discussed in: Glavočić 2019.

54 Déry, 1927 p. 14.

55 Fitz, Földes, Mattyasovszky 2014.

56 The Vienna exhibition, 48. Jahresausstellung der Genossenschaft der Bildenden Künstler Wiens noted that the last exhibition of Hungarian Art in the Künstlerhaus, of 1924, remained well-remembered. *Grosse Kunstausstellung* 1927, p. 4.

57 Déry 1927, p. 9. The show to which he refers produced a catalogue: *Az első budapesten…* 1926.

58 The committee members overlap greatly with the membership of the Fine Arts Council: President:

Mr. K. Kertész Róbert State Secretary; Vice presidents: Oscar Glatz and Floris Korb; Council rapporteur: Dr. Lajos Tihamér; Foreign exhibition committee speaker: Dr. Aladár Haász; Member of the Council responsible for organizing: Béla Déry. Members of the foreign exhibition committee: Lajos Agotai, Edward Balló, Zoltán Bálint, Dr. Elemér Czakó, Ödön Faragó, Dr. Tibor Gerevich, István Gróh. Kálmán Györgyi, Rezső Hikisch, János Horvai, Dr. Jen Lechner, Miklós Ligeti, Dr. Pál Majovszky, Géza Maróti, Dr. Elek Petrovics, István Réti, József Rippl Rónai, József Róna, Miksa Róth, Zsigmond Kisfaludi-Stróbl, Ferenc Szablya-Frischauf, István Szentgyörgyi, Edward Telcs, István Tóth, János Vaszary, Gyula Wälder and György Zala. Déry 1927, p. 10.

59 A brief history of the Society and its activities can be found in: Vargyas 2021.

60 This acronym is a pun as well, Kut meaning well or spring. The history of the

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

group has been well-explored by Anna Kopócsy in a variety of works: Kopócsy 1997; 2015.

61 Már már lehetetlenné volt téve a magyar kiállításnak Krakkóban való bemutatása, amikor azonban Krakkó város polgármestere és a kerületi vojvoda komoly közbelépése a magyar kiállítás tartamára békét teremtett az évek óta harcoló felek között azzal a formulával, hogy a Sztuka igazgatója eltávolításával járó mozgalmakat a művészek felfüggesztik, de a magyar kiállítás összes szervezési, fogadási és installációs munkálatait a művészek maguk fogják végezni. Déry 1927, p.18.

62 The interest in Poland remained through the 1930s. Two volumes published in the 1930s demonstrate this continued interest: Kertész 1934; 1938.

63 For Bortnyik's own description see: Bortnyik 1928. For a more formal analysis: Bakos 2003.

64 Ajto is Hungarian for door; ajtos, an adjective would be "doorish." A loose translation to German would be türer. The interchanging of "T" and "D" is a common spoken German trope. Today, in Hungary, Albrecht Junior is still proudly referred to as Ajtosi-Dürer. Dürer's coat of arms features a door as one of the decorative elements.

65 *Nürnbergi* 1929.

66 Schulz *et al.* 1929.

67 *Katalog* 1929.

68 *Katalog* 1929, p. 5.

69 Budapest Székesfőváros Szeretettel Köszönti Vendégeit Nürnberg Városából.

70 Willkommen in Budapest. The medal can be seen on the site of the Hungarian National Gallery: https://mng.hu/mutargyak/82157/.

71 Hoffmann 1928; Várdai 1928; *Albrecht Dürer…* 1928.

72 Vilmos Aba-Novak, Ede Ballo, Gyula Batthyany, Geza Bornemisza, Desző Burghardt, Dénes Csanky, István Csok, Béla Dery, Aladár Edvi Illés, Oszkár Glatz, and Béla Iványi Grünwald.

73 A more complete history of the exhibition and Dr. Luppe's role in its creation can be found in: Curtius 2021, especially pp. 125-44.

74 As listed in the Museum's archive: Aurél (Aurel) Bernáth *Blumentopf*, 1928; Frigyes Frank, *Terrace*, 1928 (confiscated as Degenerate, 1937); Oskar Glatz, *Mädchen mit kleinem Huhn*, 1925; Peter Kálmán, *Familienkonzert*, 1928; Erzsébet K. Fejérvary, *Blumenstilleben mit chinesischer Vase*, 1918; Ervin von Körmendy, *Sonniger Weg*, 1929; Joset Koszta, *Vor dem Fenster*, before 1929; C. Paul Molnar, *Verkündigung*, 1927; Desider Orban, *Dom in Eger*, 1928 (confiscated as Degenerate, 1937); Karl Patkó, *Toilette*, 1928; Desider Pécsi Pilch, *Schloß in Fontainebleau*, 1927; Isaak Perlmutter, *Kinder in der Stube*, 1913; Imre Szobotka, *Selbstbildnis*, 1921 (confiscated as Degenerate, 1937); János Vaszary, *Mädchenkopf*, before 1929. The sculptures purchased were: Janos Pasztor, *Abschied*, 1906; Istvan Szentgyörgyi, *Brunnenfigur*, 1928; and Sigmund Kisfaludi-Strobl, *Mädchenakt (knieend)*, 1925 (destroyed).

75 The culture of interwar revisionism is explored in: Zeidler 2002.

References:

Albert 2024: Albert S.D., Hungarian Representative Exhibitions and the Rhetoric of Display in the 1920s, in "Arts", 2024, 13, 1, 23. DoI: https://doi.org/10.3390/arts13010023.

Albrecht Dürer… 1928: *Albrecht Dürer, 1528-1928: egyszersmind kisérlet egy magyar Dürer-bibliografiához*, Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár, Aktuális kérdések irodalma, Budapest, Székesfővárosi házinyomda, 1928.

Az első budapesten… 1926: *Az első budapesten rendezett lengyel representativ grafikai kiállitás katalógusa*, Budapest, Nemzeti Szalon, 1926.

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Bakos 2003: Bakos, K., *Bortnyik Sándor magániskolája, a Műhely 1928-1938*, in Köves S. (ed.), *Reform, alternatív és progresszív műhelyiskolák, 1896 - 1944*, Budapest, Magyar Iparművészeti Egyetem, 2003, pp. 71-76.

Bán 1928: Bán A., *Finnek, észtek: a magyarok északi testvérnépei*, Budapest, Királyi Magyar Egyetmi Nyomda, 1928.

Bódi 2014: Bódi K., *Magyar részvétel a Velencei Képzőművészeti Biennálén 1895-1948*, Ph.D. thesis, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 2014.

Bortnyik 1928: Bortnyik S., *Az „Iparművészeti" oktatás új útjai*, in "Magyar Grafika", 1928, 9, 9-10, pp. 199-202.

Catalogus… 1921: *Catalogus Hongaarsche kunsttentoonstelling*, Budapest, Magyar Studio Budapest, 1921.

Clegg 2006: Clegg E., *Art, Design, and Architecture in Central Europe, 1890-1920*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2006.

Colpan *et al.* 2015: Colpan S., Kerekes A., Mattl S., Orosz M., Teller K., *Kulturmanöver: Das k.u.k. Kriegspressequartier und die Mobilisierung von Wort und Bild*, Budapester Studien zur Literaturwissenschaft, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2015. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-04850-6.

Curtius 2021: Curtius A., *Luppes Galerie: die Kunstsammlungen der Stadt Nürnberg in der Weimarer Republik : eine Ausstellung der Kunstsammlungen der Stadt Nürnberg, Stadtmuseum im Fembo-Haus : Katalog*, Schriftenreihe der Museen der Stadt Nürnberg. Nürnberg, Museen der Stadt Nürnberg, Kunstsammlungen, Petersberg, 2021.

Déry 1921: Déry B., *Kultur-propagandánk a külföldön: A Külföldi Művészeti Kiállítások Végrehajtó Bizottsága … jelentése a Hollandiában rendezett képzőművészeti kiállításokról*, Budapest, Magyar Stúdió, 1921.

Déry 1927: Déry B., *Művészeti kiállítások külföldön az 1927. évben: Warszawa, Poznań, Kraków, Wien, Fiume*, [s.l.], [s.n.], 1927.

Déry, Bányász, Margitay 1912: Déry B., Bányász L., Margitay E., *Almanach (Képzőművészeti lexikon)*, A Nemzeti Szalon almanachja, Budapest, Légrády Testvérek, 1912.

Egey 2010: Egey E., *A két világháború közötti magyar-finn-észt kapcsolatok történetéből: társasági, diplomáciai, katonai együttműködés*, Specimina Fennica, Vol. XV, Savariae: Nyugat-magyarországi Egyetem, Savaria Egyetemi Központ, Uralisztikai Tanszék, 2010.

Fitz, Földes, Mattyasovszky 2014: Fitz P., Földes E., Mattyasovszky P., *A mecénás főváros: a Fővárosi Képtár = Budapest, patron city of the arts: the Municipal Gallery*, translated by Zsuzsanna Szegedy-Maszák, Fővárosi Képtár katalógusai, Budapest, Fővárosi Képtár, 2014.

Gellér, Keserü 1987: Gellér K., Keserü K., *A Gödöllői Művésztelep*, Budapest, Corvina, 1987.

Gerencsér 2018: Gerencsér T., *A két világháború közötti magyar–lengyel kulturális kapcsolatok története*, Ph.D. thesis, Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, 2018.

Glatz 1969: Glatz F., *Klebelsberg tudománypolitikai programja és a magyar történettudomány*, in "Századok", 1969, 103, 5-6, pp. 1176-200.

Glatz 1971: Glatz F., *Historiography, Cultural Policy, and the Organization of Scholarship in Hungary in the 1920s*, in "Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum", 1971, 17, 3-4, pp. 273-93.

Glavočić 2019: Glavočić D., *Le belle arti tra le due guerre a Fiume: (1920-1940)*, translated by Rodolfo Segnan and Helena Srakočić, Fiume, Comunita degli Italiani di Fiume, 2019.

Grosse Berliner 1925: *Grosse Berliner Kunstausstellung, 1925, im Landes-Ausstellungsgebaüde am Lehrter Bahnhof*, [Berlin], [Verein Berliner Künstler], 1925.

Grosse Kunstausstellung 1927: *Grosse Kunstausstellung, 1927: XLVIII. Jahresausstellung der Genossenschaft der Bildenden Künstler Wiens*, Wien, Verlag der Genossenschaft der bildenden Künstler Wiens, 1927.

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Herzog 2003: Herzog S. M., *Negotiating Modernity: Cultural Reform in 1920s Hungary*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2003.

Hoffmann 1928: Hoffmann E., *Dürer-literatur in Ungarn, 1800-1928*, Budapest, Kgl Ungarische Universitäts-druckerei, 1928.

Juhász 2019a: Juhász S., *Köztulajdonba vett műkincsek I. „Ilyen szép kiállítást még nem láttam…“*, in “Műértő: művészeti és műkereskedelmi folyóirat”, 2019, 22, pp. 12-13.

Juhász 2019b: Juhász S., *Köztulajdonba vett műkincsek, 1919*, “Magyar Művészet”, 2019, 2, pp. 25-31.

Karády, Nagy 2012: Karády V., Nagy P. T., *The Numerus Clausus in Hungary: Studies on the First Anti-jewish Law and Academic Anti-semitism in Modern Central Europe*, Research reports on Central European history, Budapest, Pasts Inc. Centre for Historical Research, 2012.

Katalog 1929: *Katalog der Ausstellung neuzeitlicher ungarischer Kunst Nürnberg 1929 in der Norishalle am Marientorgraben. 23. februar bis 14. april 1929*, Nürnberg, Fränkische Verlagsanstalt und Buchdruckerei g.m.b.h., 1929.

Kertesz 1917: Kertesz K. R., *IV. Károly apostoli magyar király koronázásának művészi és műszaki munkái*, Budapest, Hornyánszky Ny., 1917.

Kertész 1934: Kertész J., *Hungaria et Polonia: a magyar-lengyel kapcsolatok bibliográfiája*, Magyar-lengyel Könyvtár, Biblioteka wegiersko-polsko, Budapest, Kapisztrán Ny in Vác, 1934.

Kertész 1938: Kertész J., *Lengyelország a magyar sajtóban Magyar-lengyel bibliografia. Polska w prasie we□gierskiej. La Pologne dans la presse hongroise*, Budapest, Magyar Mickiewicz Társ, 1938.

Kertész, Sváb 2011: Kertész K. R., Sváb G., *A magyar paraszтház = Das Bauernhaus in Ungarn = The Hungarian Peasant Dwellings*, reprint. ed., Budapest, Terc, 2011.

Keserü 1988: Keserü K., *The Workshops of Gödöllő: Transformations of a Morrisian Theme*, in “Journal of Design History”, 1988, 1, 1, pp. 1-23.

Keserü 1993: Keserü K., *Finn-kép a magyar művészeti életben a századelőn*, in “Hungarologische Beiträge“, 1993, 1, pp. 209-17.

Kessler 1967: Kessler J. A., *Turanism and Pan-Turanism in Hungary: 1890-1945*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1967.

Kiss 1998: Kiss T. T., *Állami muvelodéspolitika az 1920-as években: Gróf Klebelsberg Kunó kultúrát szervezo munkássága*, Budapest, Mikszáth, 1998.

Klebelsberg 1925: Klebelsberg K., *Ungarische Kulturpolitik nach dem Kriege*, in “Ungarische bibliothek”, 1925, 5, 2, pp. 343-63.

Klebelsberg 1927: Klebelsberg K., *La Cooperazione intellettuale tra l’Italia e l’Ungheria*, Budapest, Tipographia Franklin, 1927.

Klebelsberg 1930a: Klebelsberg K., *Les fondements de la coopération intellectuelle polono-hongroise*, Budapest, Pester Lloyd-Gesellschaft, 1930.

Klebelsberg 1930b: Klebelsberg K., *Kulturelle Bestrebungen Ungarns : Von Graf Kuno Klebelsberg. (Vortrag, gehalten bei der Eröffnung der 10. Tagung der Gesellschaft für Verdauungs- und Stoffwechselkrankheiten in Budapest, 5. X. 1930)*, [Leipzig)], [Druck von: J B Hirschfeld], 1930.

Klebelsberg 1930c: Klebelsberg K., *Ungarns weltgeschichtliche Sendung und seine Kultur*, Budapest, Pester Lloyd-Ges, 1930.

Klein, Huszar 2023: Klein A., Huszar Z., *Die Bedeutung von Kuno von Klebelsberg als Minister für Kultur und Bildung (1922–1931) in der ungarischen Kulturpolitik*, in “Res Gestae”, 2023, 15, pp. 105-19. Doi: https://doi.org/10.24917/24504475.15.8.

Kollros, Pils 2014: Kollros E., Pils R., *Mit dem Pinsel an der Front : österreichische*

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

Kriegskartenmaler erleben den Ersten Weltkrieg, Literatur, Kunst und Musikalien, Weitra, Verlag Bibliothek der Provinz, 2014.

Kopócsy 1997: Kopócsy, A., *Képzőművészek Új Társasága, a KUT első korszaka (1924-26)*, in "Művészettörténeti értesítő", 1997, 46, 3-4, pp. 221-236.

Kopócsy 2015: Kopócsy, A., *Képzőművészek Új Társasága, 1924-1950*, Művészcsoportok, Budapest, Corvina, 2015.

Lyka 1920: Lyka K., *Magyar reprezentativ kiállitás: a külföldön bemutatandó: katalógusa*, Budapest, A Magyar Studio Kiadása, 1920.

Magyar művészeti kiállítás… 1922. "Magyar művészeti kiállítás Finnországban," *Turán. A Turáni Társaság folyóirata*, 1922, 5, pp. 210-211.

Molnár, Tóth, Campbell 2016: Molnár A., Tóth T., Campbell A., *The Falconieri Palace in Rome*, Budapest, Balassi Intézet, 2016.

Műtárgyakat 1919: Műtárgyakat Társadalmasító Bizottság. *A köztulajdonba vett műkincsek első kiállítása.* 2. kiad ed. Budapest: Műcsarnok, 1919.

Nagy 2011: Nagy Z., *National Identities for Export: East European Cultural Diplomacy in Inter-War Pittsburgh*, in "Contemporary European History", 2011, 20, 4, pp. 435-53. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960777311000476.

Nagy 2017: Nagy Z., *Great Expectations and Interwar Realities: Hungarian Cultural Diplomacy, 1918-1941*, Budapest, Central European University, 2017.

Nagy 2015: Nagy Z., *In Search of a Usable Past: The Legacy of the Ottoman Occupation in Interwar Hungarian Cultural Diplomacy*, in "Hungarian Studies Review", 2015, 42, 1-2, pp. 27-52.

Nagy 2021: Nagy Z., *The Race for Revision and Recognition: Interwar Hungarian Cultural Diplomacy in Context*, in "Contemporary European History", 2021, 30, 2, pp. 231-47. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960777321000011.

Nékám 1935: Nékám L., *The Cultural Aspirations of Hungary: from 896 to 1935*, Budapest, Central Committee of the Budapest Thermal Baths and Health Resorts, 1935.

Németh 2011: Németh I., *"Szerette, ha szerették, de még inkább, ha csodálták": Nemes Marcell, a műpártoló és az ember*, in "Forrás", 2011, 43, 5, pp. 81-88.

Németh 2012: Németh I., *Nemes Marcell a "marchand-amateur"*, in "Szalon, 2012, 16, 1, pp. 26-31.

Numminen, Nagy 1985: Numminen J., Nagy J., *Friends and relatives: Finnish-Hungarian cultural relations*, Budapest, Corvina, 1985.

Nürnbergi 1929: *Nürnbergi hét: Nürnberg város iskola- és kulturális kiállitása: kiállitási kalauz*, Nürnbergi hét Budapesten, Budapest, Nemzeti Szalon, 1929.

Reichel 2016: Reichel W., *"Pressearbeit ist Propagandaarbeit": Medienverwaltung 1914-1918: Das Kriegspressequartier (KPQ)*, Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs, Sonderband, StudienVerlag, 2016.

Richly 2021: Richly G., *A helsinki Magyar Kulturális és Tudományos Központ története, 1980-2020*, Budapest, Ráció Kiadó, 2021.

Róka, Szücs 2014: Róka E., Szücs G., *Művészet és művészek az első világháborúban*, Balatonfüred, Vaszary Galéria, Balatonfüred Kulturális Nonprofit Kft, 2014.

Schulz *et al.* 1929: Schulz F. T., Zahn A., Kiesel A., Országos Magyar Képzőművészeti Társulat, *Nürnberg régi és új művészeti kiállításának képes tárgymutatója*, Budapest, Országos Magyar Képzőművészeti Társulat, 1929.

Seconda esposizione… 1927: *Seconda esposizione internazionale di belle arti della città di Fiume : catalogo*, Fiume, La Vedetta d'Italia, 1927.

Sümegi 1975: Sümegi G.. *Nemes Marcell, a műgyűjtő: adalékok a magyar műgyűjtés*

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953

századeleji történetéhez, in “Cumania: a Bács-Kiskun Megyei Múzeumok közleményei”, 1975, 3, pp. 275-304.

Tentoonstelling van werken… 1917: *Tentoonstelling van werken van Oostenrijksche en Hongaarsche schilders en beeldhouwers in het Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, 14 oct.-15 nov. 1917*, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1917.

Tüskés 2008: Tüskés A., *La collezione di dipinti italiani di Marcello de Nemes*, in “Rivista di Studi Ungheresi”, 2008, 7, pp. 59-76.

Ujváry 1994: Ujváry G., *Tudományszervezés - történetkutatás - forráskritika : Klebelsberg Kuno és a bécsi Magyar Történeti Intézet megalapítása*, in “Levéltári szemle”, 1994, 44, 3, pp. 10-31.

Ujváry 1995: Ujváry G., *“Iskola” a határon túl: a Római Magyar Intézet története, 1912-1945*, in “Levéltári szemle”, 1995, 45, 4, pp. 3-37.

Ujváry 1996: Ujváry G., *Sok-sok út vezet Rómába: a Római Magyar Intézet története, 1895-1945*, in “Iskolakultúra: pedagógusok szakmai-tudományos folyóirata”, 1996, 6, 8, pp. 58-75.

Ujváry 1998: Ujváry G., *A bécsi Collegium Hungaricum*, in “Magyar iparművészet”, 1998, 2, pp. 72-75.

Ujváry 2008: Ujváry G., *Egy tudós kultúrpolitikus kalandjai Rómában és a magyar hivatalokban. Gerevich Tibor és a római Magyar Akadémia*, in “Történelmi szemle”, 2008, 50, 2, pp. 195-223.

Ujváry 2009: Ujváry G., *Klebelsberg Kuno és Hóman Bálint a két világháború közötti kultúrpolitikáról*, in “Rubicon”, 2009, 20, 1-2, p. 63.

Ujváry 2013: Ujváry G., *Klebelsberg, Hóman, Szekfű és Gerevich Székesfehérvár és a magyar kultúrpolitika a 20. század első felében*, in “Rubicon”, 2013, 24, 6, pp. 41-45.

Unkarilainen… 1922: *Unkarilainen representatiivinen taidenäyttely suomessa ja eestissä 1922 = Ungari representatiivne kunstinäitus eestis ja soomes 1922*, Hungary: s.n., 1922.

Várdai 1928: Várdai B., *Dürer: halálának négyszázéves fordulója alkalmából*, Budapest, Szent István Akadémia : Stephaneum, 1928.

Vargyas 2021: Vargyas J., *From a Company of Friends to a Network of Contacts. The History of the Pál Szinyei Merse Society 1920–1951*, in Hessky O. (ed.), *Canvas and Cult Pál Szinyei Merse (1845-1920) and His Art*, publications by the Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts, 2021, pp. 123-146.

Wéber 2013: Wéber K., *Ki volt Jánoshalmi Nemes Marcell?*, in “Hitel”, 2013, 26, 1, pp. 87-96.

Zeidler 2002: Zeidler M., *A magyar irredenta kultusz a két világháború között*, Regio könyvek, Budapest, Teleki László Alapítvány, 2002.

https://doi.org/10.60923/issn.3034-9699/22953