

Nature and Intellect: the Ideas of the Emergent Hungarian Avant-Garde

Sylvia Bakos

“What we want in painting is not science, not the play of emotions, but intelligence, the disciplined work of the human brain.”

(Károly Kernstok, “Kutató művészet” [Explorative art], *Nyugat*, 1910.)

The Hungarian artistic avant-garde developed during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Its cradle was the Transylvanian artists' colony at Nagybánya (today Baia Mare, Romania), founded in 1896. The basis of the Nagybánya aesthetic was the lyrical contemplation and portrayal of the region's haunting mountain scenery. The art of Nagybánya combined the descriptive exploration of indigenous nature central to Impressionism with a sensitive and intuitive transcription of mood found in Romantic landscape painting. This well-known and successful school prepared the way for the keen interest in—and eventually, acceptance of—French artistic innovations which developed in Hungary during the early 1900s.¹ Almost all major Hungarian artists of the early twentieth century, including Károly Kernstok, Béla Czóbel and Lajos Tihanyi, spent some time at Nagybánya. The school's emphatic faith in nature as the best source of artistic subject matter continued to influence Hungarian artists for generations. This outlook determined in some measure the general reliance on the forms of nature that continued to temper the movement toward abstraction in Hungarian art up to 1919.²

From the ranks of the Nagybánya school emerged a group of young artists who visited Paris in the mid-1900s, and responded to the recent Post-Impressionist and Fauvist developments there by painting in a new, more abstracted style marked by heavy contours and heightened colour. Good examples of these new stylistic qualities are to be found in the paintings of Béla Czóbel, Vilmos Perlrott-Csaba and Lajos Tihanyi of around 1905–1907. They ex-

hibited their—for the time and place—radically new work at Nagybánya during these years, and earned the slightly derisive name “Neos” from the older artists. These paintings of Czóbel, Perlrott-Csaba and Tihanyi—as well as those of Károly Kernstok, Róbert Berény and others—constituted a radical break with Hungarian academic traditions, and it could be said that it was this body of work which initiated the modern movement in Hungarian fine arts. The “Neos” and other like-minded artists combined their own spirit and vision with the most up-to-date developments in Western European art: Fauvism, Expressionism and Cubism. They travelled widely throughout Europe, and during the first decade of the twentieth century, some of them studied with Henri Matisse in Paris, and exhibited with him and his fellow Fauves. In addition to Matisse, they particularly admired the work of the older masters Paul Cézanne and Paul Gauguin.

The early years of the twentieth century were characterized by a general cultural and economic upsurge in Hungary, to a large extent the result of the social and industrial progress following the political compromise reached with Austria in 1867. The Compromise resolved the problem of Hungary’s inferior position within the Austrian Habsburg dominions by giving her independence in internal affairs. The industrial revolution that followed the Compromise brought economic growth and increasing urbanization, resulting in the gradual replacement of the earlier semi-feudal economic system with an advanced capitalist one. Consequently, a modern urban bourgeoisie emerged, and by the turn of the century this new class constituted an important element in the country’s system of artistic patronage. The leading arts at this time were literature and music, but their patrons—motivated by wide-ranging interests and a desire for unity in the arts—also gave their support to the fine arts.³

This new lively, largely urban culture included major innovations in several areas of the arts. In music, the composers Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály found a new source for modernism in the methodical study of authentic folk music. In the realm of theatre, the experimental Thália Company brought the latest in international developments to the Budapest stage. In literature, the visionary poetry of Endre Ady (1877–1919), charged with a poignant concern for the fate of the nation, led the way for all the arts. Literary periodicals open to new ideas included *Huszadik Század* [Twentieth Century], founded in 1900, and *Nyugat* [West], founded in 1908. In art, the new urbanity is evident in the emergence of groups of radical innovators and

extraordinary personalities. The first group formed in the spirit of modernism was established in 1909, under the leadership of Károly Kernstok (1873–1940). They called themselves “Keresők” [Seekers], though they later became known as “Nyolcak” [The Eight].⁴ As a group they were active only until 1912, but their program and painting style provided a fruitful point of departure for the “Activists” who grouped around the poet-writer Lajos Kassák during the second half of the 1910s. In 1915, Kassák (1887–1967) founded the journal *A Tett* [The Deed], a forum for avant-garde literature and art. A year later, after *A Tett* was banned by the authorities for its pacifism, Kassák began publishing *Ma* [Today]. *Ma* developed into the best-known periodical of the Hungarian avant-garde, and appeared regularly until 1925. In addition to publishing them, Kassák also arranged for the exhibition of the work of Hungarian avant-garde artists in the galleries of the *Ma* group. The modernist artists and writers gathered around Kassák, his gallery, and *Ma* called themselves “Activist” because of their strong commitment to social change, and their support of radical action to engender such change.⁵

Extensive patronage, as well as the attention given by advanced journals to artistic events both at home and abroad, brought about a lively cultural climate. The opportunities to exhibit increased with the proliferation of galleries and museums. Besides the Műcsarnok [Exhibition Hall]—that bastion of tradition, conservatism and successful careers in the arts—the state also began sponsoring the Nemzeti Szalon [National Salon] in 1894. More open to innovation, this salon brought several large foreign exhibitions to Hungary. Foremost in importance among these were an extensive showing of French art in 1907 (with numerous works by Gauguin and Cézanne), and the travelling exhibition of the Futurists, Expressionists and Cubists in 1913. Private enterprises also promoted radical new work, and the avant-garde artists of the first decades of the twentieth century found opportunities to exhibit in the Ernst Museum, the gallery of the Könyves Kálmán Publishing Firm, and the Művészház [Artists’ House].

Frequent opportunities for exhibition, critical attention, and an effervescent cultural life brought extensive public exposure to artists. Thus, artists working in new ways became part of the social milieu, and were freed from the isolation experienced by their predecessors.⁶ Certain Budapest cafés became gathering places for the leading personalities of Hungarian intellectual life. The Japán café was the meeting place for modernist artists and critics, presided over by the two grand old men of Hungarian avant-garde art, the pioneering

modernist painter Pál Szinyei Merse and the innovative Art Nouveau architect Ödön Lechner. The poet Endre Ady—guiding genius of the Hungarian modern movement—favored the Három Holló [Three ravens], where he often met with his artist friends, including Károly Kernstok and the Hungarian Nabi painter and leading Post-Impressionist József Rippl-Rónai.⁷

Groups of young intellectuals, members of the urban bourgeoisie, gathered in friendly associations such as the “Galilei Circle” and the “Sunday Society.” These units of intellectual communality included now-famous philosophers and art historians such as György Lukács, Lajos Fülep, Frederick Antal, Arnold Hauser and Charles de Tolnay, some of whom took an active interest in contemporary art. They, as well as literary publications such as *Huszadik Század*, *Szabadgondolat* [Free Thought] and *A Szellem* [The Spirit] which published their writings, contributed to the development of a radical aesthetics, whose starting point was a rejection of naturalism, Impressionism and aesthetic liberalism.⁸ Such an anti-Impressionist stand had already been anticipated by the reaction against the Impressionist orientation of the Nagybánya school among the “Neos.” The interest in Post-Impressionist and Fauvist art, evident in the paintings of Béla Czóbel, Vilmos Perlrött-Csaba and Lajos Tihanyi executed during the mid 1900s, also exercised a decisive influence on the formation of The Eight. Thus, innovative artistic developments in Hungary were reinforced and validated by similar concerns in the radical aesthetics of the time. Between 1905 and 1907 some of the artists who were later to form The Eight, including Czóbel, Kernstok, Róbert Berény and Ödön Márffy were in Paris, as was the aesthetician Lajos Fülep. This circumstance led to a lively exchange of ideas among them.⁹

Besides Kernstok, its leader, The Eight included former “Neos” Béla Czóbel (1883–1976) and Lajos Tihanyi (1883–1923), as well as the highly original Róbert Berény (1887–1953). These artists sought to unite subject matter rooted in nature with deliberate, rationally-structured composition into monumental images of a harmonious and orderly world. Theirs was an intellectual approach to the raw material of visible nature. This program was stated in the catalogue of their first exhibition at the Kónyves Kálmán Gallery in December, 1909:

We are believers in nature. We do not copy it in the manner of the schools, We draw from its depths with intelligence.

In January of 1910 Kernstok further elaborated the views about art he shared with The Eight. In a lecture before the Galilei Circle

entitled “Kutató művészet” [Explorative art], and published in *Nyugat*, Kernstok discussed the relationship between nature and art. He stated that art originated in nature, but its slavish copying was not the artist’s goal, for he was not born with the photographic apparatus of a *camera obscura*:

True, we humans possess something of equal importance, and this is our intelligence.

This is the instrument we have with which to arm ourselves, this is that certain something one must take to nature when one wants to have nature’s help in creating. What we want in painting is not science, not the play of emotions, but intelligence, by all means, the disciplined work of the human brain... I consider the current turbulence in the arts to be a gigantic cleansing process, a liberation, as from a fever, from all those superficialities that still play an important role in today’s painting.¹⁰

Related ideas were expressed by the philosopher György Lukács (1885–1971) in his response to Kernstok’s lecture and to the exhibition of *The Eight* at the Könyves Kálmán Gallery. Entitled “Az utak elváltak” [The ways have parted], Lukács’s lecture was delivered to the same forum in January of 1910, and was later published in *Nyugat* as well. In *The Eight*’s intellectual approach to nature, and in their search for essential form, Lukács emphasized the desire for order and solidity, and highlighted their opposition to Impressionism, which focused on capturing fleeting atmospheric aspects of nature, dematerializing its substance and solidity. Lukács commended Kernstok and *The Eight* for their constructive reaction against the ephemeral, momentary subjectivity of Impressionism:

This art is the old art, the art of order and values, the art based on construction. Impressionism turned everything into a decorative surface... The new art is architectonic in the old, true sense. Its colours, words and lines are merely expressions of the essence, order and harmony of things, their emphasis and their equilibrium... This art of order must destroy all anarchy of sensation and mood. The very appearance and existence of this art is a declaration of war. It is a declaration of war on all Impressionism, all sensation and mood, all disorder and denial of values, every world view and art which writes “I” as its first and last word.¹¹

The Eight's program to select and organize the elements of subject matter derived from nature with intelligence and reason into images of monumentality and harmony finds exemplary expression in Kernstok's *Horsemen at the Water's Edge* of 1910. (Illustration) This monumental painting was one of the showpieces of The Eight's exhibition at the National Salon of 1911. Kernstok explored the theme of nude horsemen in landscapes in or near water in several compositions during the teens and early twenties. In his review of this 1911 show of the Eight, the critic György Bölöni wrote the following appreciation of *Horsemen at the Water's Edge*:

Kernstok threw off the habit of convention and strove for deeper understanding in his art. [In the contemporary French artists] he admired only their constructive abilities that enabled them to emphasize the essential elements during painting, as the movement of lines yielded a wondrously delicate and sensitive balance of masses. Thus, his pictures became hermetic constructions... Kernstok dissected man himself anatomically, and put him back together again. For years, he did nothing but these exercises in structure...

Horsemen are setting out for the Danube, a group of nude men, an army of bodies in various stages of motion and momentum; thus, innumerable movements are born, and numerous bodies and body parts swing into balance, linked by a surprising, broad rhythm. Károly Kernstok demonstrates his intentions in palpable pictorial form, and ever since I saw this picture, my thought has remained: behold, this is the most serious Hungarian painting...¹²

In paintings such as *Horsemen at the Water's Edge*, as well as in his writings of ca. 1910–1911, Kernstok asserted the primary role of the human intellect in artistic creation. The aim of his art was not imitation, but creation through the study and organization of visual phenomena, the elimination of extraneous elements, and the distillation of essential form and sovereign, self-contained composition from nature's raw material.¹³ In his essay "Explorative art," Kernstok also discussed his method of arriving at essential form:

Let us try to look at those ways and means that help us reach nature's meaning.

Let us cut ourselves off from all we know; let us put aside the isms...

Let us go before nature and look at a head, for example. We see, among other things, that it is round, that it has eyes, ears, a nose, a mouth, a forehead, a chin, etc., and, along with the neck, it grows out of the body....

I think we should look at that head,... and... consider its roundness, the cheekbones, the forehead, the chin to the extent that these may help us capture the essential idea. And, if the jaw helps me grasp the head mentally more than the nose, then I will emphasize the jaw at the expense of the nose, and vice versa... that is, [I will] always emphasize what I consider most important... In the expression of a body in motion, if the balance I want to convey requires a wider swing and consequent lengthening of the usual proportions of arms, legs or torso, or, if this balance can be obtained by placing stronger emphasis on one muscle or another... then I will use these means without hesitation, for the sake of the harmony of the whole.

The anti-Impressionist ethos of modernist Hungarian artists and aesthetes of the time was related to the general opposition among young intellectuals to positivism as well as to subjective philosophical and aesthetic concepts. In the meetings of the Sunday Society and later, in the short-lived but outstanding philosophical journal *A Szellem* (1911–1912), the philosophers György Lukács, Lajos Fülep and their friends turned to French and German metaphysical idealism.¹⁴ In 1917, Fülep also founded the Free School of the Humanities, which saw the road to spiritual fulfillment in scientific work and cultural investigation.¹⁵

Lajos Fülep (1885–1970) concentrated on the analysis of the contemporary state of the arts, in search of an alternative to the prevalent subjectivist-Impressionist point of view, and to move toward what he called the new “nagy stílus” [grand style] and a new world view. In the work of Paul Cézanne, Fülep found the elements of a viable new art with the power to counteract Impressionism and engender a dramatically new and meaningful point of view. Like Lukács, Fülep recognized in the endeavours of the young Hungarian modernists a decisive break with both academicism and Impressionism.¹⁶

This anti-Impressionist attitude first manifested itself in Fülep's articles about Cézanne, written in 1906–07. These represent the clearest and most favourable critical evaluation of the French artist's work anywhere up to that time.¹⁷ Fülep pursued the subject in several insightful essays between 1906 and 1916. Already in his first such article, a report on the 1906 Salon d'Automne in Paris, Fülep recognized Cézanne's art as a reaction against Impressionism and as an ethical, as well as an aesthetic ancestor of and exemplar for the younger generation. According to Fülep, the Impressionists divested art of substance and consequently, they reduced it to mere ephemeral, weightless effects and subjective impressions. Cézanne brought back to art that timeless strength and the harmony of matter and spirit that characterized all great art of the past.¹⁸ Fülep praised Cézanne's constructive power and the elemental strength, simplicity and conciseness of his broadly applied colours. He noted how Cézanne expressed the timeless and essential spirit within the raw material of nature, raising art once more to a level where it was able to communicate basic human experience:

Cézanne's still lives... are the single adequate expression in the fine arts of the religious experience of modern man, of his internal conflicts, his struggles, his thirst for perfection—of his isolation, his weakness, his self-torment. This life of the spirit is implicit in [Cézanne's] still lives and landscapes. Thus, in his paintings, matter comes to life... In the work of Cézanne, we recognize ourselves, the fate that is ours, the life we live.¹⁹

In short, Fülep saw in Cézanne's work the embodiment of a universal and complete world view that was based on balance and harmony.²⁰

This desire for order and deliberate composition was further elaborated on by Fülep in his essay "Az emlékezés a művészi alkotásban" [The role of memory in artistic creation], published in 1911 in *A Szellem*. Here Fülep emphasized the importance of memory as an agent of the selection and organization of raw sensory phenomena. Fülep was opposed to the belief in the supremacy of intuition in creation, central to the aesthetics of both Benedetto Croce and the Nagybánya school.²¹ Thus, Fülep attributed to art an intellectual faculty that strives for harmony. In his consideration of form, Fülep wrote that

form is not a matter of appearance, but the essence of things, that which is deepest and most permanent in them: the interrelationship of their components and their unity, the constructive factor... Inasmuch as art expresses the inner, constructive component or interrelationship of things, individuals and events, that is, the idea within them, it can express the idea in all life.

Kernstok's painting *Horsemen at the Water's Edge* embodies the artistic aspirations of the first two decades of the twentieth century not only formally, but also in a thematic sense. Paintings of horsemen in an outdoor setting, usually near water, belong to the larger thematic category variously called "the earthly paradise," the "Golden Age," or "Arcadia."²² Such paintings present the viewer with an idyllic harmony of man and nature, a mythic land where human beings live in the ideal state of nudity, free of the physical and spiritual fetters of modern civilization.

Essentially a product of Romanticism, and employed both in literature and the fine arts, this theme evolved in painting during the second half of the nineteenth century. At first, it was linked with the formal world of Classicism and with the literary and mythological themes of past ages. Central to the motif of a Golden Age is the concept of the eternal relation of man to nature on the one hand, and a stylistic standard of Classicism and monumentality on the other. In European art the major exponents of the theme were Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, Hans von Marées, Paul Gauguin, Paul Cézanne, and the Nabis. Examples of "Golden Age" paintings include Marées' *The Orange Grove* (1872-73), Gauguin's *Where do we come from? Who are we? Where are we going?* (1897), and Cézanne's *Bathers* (1898-1905). In works such as these, the artists were able to unite form and content, and distill the essential ideas of the theme: naturalness, harmony, order and monumentality.

If we abstract the idea of the earthly paradise from its literary and mythological settings and seek the common factors in its different manifestations, we shall find the following characteristics: a life dominated by... warmth of sensual perception, timelessness, permanence, the natural state, fellowship without effort or conflict—in a word, equilibrium.²³

This equilibrium found in portrayals of the “Golden Age” was based on an idealized view of nature and human existence, substituting monumental order, harmony and grandeur for the disorder, variability and triviality of real life.²⁴ In the 1910s, this quest for harmony and order characterized the art of Central and Eastern Europe, as evidenced by the preference for monumentally-sized paintings of “Golden Age” themes, in compositions of simplicity, order and grandeur reminiscent of the formal values of Classicism. The constructive, organizing impulse in the Hungarian Eight’s concept of “explorative art” has been mentioned above. Parallels to this ideal can be found especially in Czech and Russian art of this period: “In pictorial harmony and classical compositional formulas [they] seem to discover the artistic equivalent of a new intellectual universality.”²⁵

Around 1910, most of the artists of The Eight painted monumental compositions exploring the relation of man and nature and employing qualities of order, harmony and reason. Among others, in this context we may cite Tihanyi’s *Nudes* of 1908, Berény’s *Idyll* and Bertalan Pór’s *Sermon on the Mount* (both of 1911), as well as Kernstok’s 1912 designs for the stained glass windows of the Schiffer Villa and his mural *Mythic Hunters* of 1913.²⁶ In these works, the artists sought to compositionally unify the human figures with their settings. They show signs of having been receptive to the constructive compositional methods of Cézanne, the linear rhythms of Art Nouveau, and the simple classicism and grandeur of Marées. Themes that deal with the “Golden Age” were also painted by other major figures of the Hungarian avant-garde during the first decades of the twentieth century, particularly János Kmetty, Béla Uitz, Béla Kádár, and Gyula Derkovits.²⁷

The nude horsemen of Kernstok’s *Horsemen at the Water’s Edge* symbolize the quest for a harmonious, orderly world and the desire for the unity of man and nature inherent in all treatments of “Golden Age” themes. The subject of the horse and rider in an outdoor setting constitutes a subgenre of “Golden Age” painting in Central and Eastern European art during the first decades of this century. In Hungary, the horseman is a subject of intense interest in various fields of art. The world of ancient legends and folk art constitutes the roots of these motifs, which assume unique significance in the early twentieth century as symbols of timely content.²⁸

As early as 1908, the artist János Tornyai painted, in his *Sad Fate of Hungary, an Autobiography*, an exhausted horse in a stormy landscape as a personal metaphor for himself and the fate of his

country.²⁹ Among the avant-garde artists, the emblematic pair of horse and rider appears not only in the work of Kernstok, but also in that of Pór, Berény, and Kádár. In sculpture, Fülöp Beck explored the subject in a work such as *Scythian Archer* of 1913.³⁰ The theme of the horseman is also present in poetry; for example Endre Ady wrote a poem entitled *Az eltévedt lovas* [The lost rider]. The haunting refrain that begins and ends the poem presents us with a mythic horseman who has lost his way in the cold and ghostly autumn—as a symbol of the poet's profound concern for the nation's course and his deep sense of foreboding:

You can hear the heedless trot
Of an ancient, lost rider,
Chained spirits of past forests and old reeds
Tremble in sudden terror.³¹

In Kernstok's and the other avant-garde artists' use of the horseman motif, the juxtaposition of the nude rider and water is noteworthy. The horse and the nudity of the rider are appropriate to the exploration of the relation of man and nature, the thematic world of "Golden Age" painting discussed above. Water is the ancient symbol of life's ultimate source and of the processes of rebirth, renewal and purification.³² In Kernstok's images of horsemen, both horse and rider are powerfully built and charged with energy. Their athletic strength and robust sensuality contradict the pervasive narcotic sensibility and enervated eroticism that characterized the Art Nouveau style prevalent around the turn of the century.³³ Carrier of nature's primordial energy, the mighty horse that knows neither saddle nor bridle trots with its rider into the water, the ideal medium of rebirth and renewal. Thus, in the interpretation of the avant-garde artists, this particular "Golden Age" theme expresses not only the quest for order and harmony as static conditions, but also a dynamic process of purification and renewal.

In this sense, Kernstok's *Horsemen at the Water's Edge* may be seen as the direct embodiment in painting of his views about art as stated in "Explorative art": both his belief in the rational, constructive power of human intelligence to bring about order and harmony, and his interpretation of contemporary art as a "cleansing process," a purging of all unnecessary superficialities.

The Eight's interest in painting themes of the "Golden Age" constitutes the "Arcadian" branch of the Hungarian avant-garde, which was coupled with the interest in the machine, beginning in

1917–18. These two thematic concerns underlie Hungarian modernism in the twentieth century.³⁴

The major contributions of The Eight to modern Hungarian art were their constructive approach to composition and their desire to distill order and harmony from the raw matter of nature through intelligent selection and composition. Their work brought Hungarian art into the front lines of modernism, and it gave impetus to the later development of constructive trends in that art, particularly in the work of Lajos Kassák, Sándor Bortnyik, and László Moholy-Nagy. The oeuvres of these avant-gardists illustrate the definition of the artist's position espoused by Kernstok in "Explorative art":

The artist cannot be nature's mirror; however, to the extent that he is able to glean new values from nature, this very measure is the mirror of his intellect. And the social effect he brings about determines the intellectual standard of his time.

Notes

This article is the result of research conducted with the assistance of an IREX-Fulbright grant for doctoral dissertation research in Hungary. It is related to a Ph.D. dissertation entitled *The Emergence of the Hungarian Avant-Garde, an Examination of Publications and Art up to 1919*, currently in preparation at Rutgers University.

1. Lajos Kassák, *Képzőművészetünk Nagybányától napjainkig* [Our fine arts from Nagybánya to our day] (Budapest: Magyar Műkiadó, 1947), p. 8. See also Krisztina Passuth, *A Nyolcak festészete* [The painting of The Eight] (Budapest: Corvina, 1967), pp. 10–11.
2. The artists' colony of Nagybánya is discussed in this context in Júlia Szabó, *A magyar aktivizmus művészete 1915–1927* [The art of Hungarian activism 1915–1927] (Budapest: Corvina, 1981), pp.35–36.
3. Passuth, p. 16.
4. On The Eight, see Passuth.
5. They actually only began calling themselves "Activist" in 1919. On Activism, see Szabó.
6. On p. 17, Passuth refers to the situation of Pál Szinyei Merse as an example of isolation that no longer existed in the 1900s. A pioneer of Impressionism outside of France (he began such work in the late 1860s), Szinyei received no attention or support for his work in Munich—where he had studied—or at home in Budapest. When he exhibited his 1872 masterpiece *Picnic in May* in Hungary, no one defended him against attacks by the conservative critics, nor was there a communality of artists which would have mitigated his feelings of isolation. This lack of attention caused Szinyei to stop the painterly experiments that marked the style of *Picnic in May*.
7. Passuth, p. 17–22.

8. Ferenc Tőkei, "Fülep Lajos különös élete" [The strange life of Lajos Fülep], introduction to Lajos Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig* [From the revolution in art to the great revolution], Árpád Timár, ed., 2 vols. (Budapest: Magvető, 1974), vol. 1, pp. 5–17. See also Éva Karádi and Erzsébet Vezér, *A Vasárnapi Kör* [The Sunday Circle] (Budapest: Gondolat, 1974). For a discussion in English of contemporary philosophical currents and their effects on Hungarian art, see Szabó, "Ideas and Programmes: the Philosophical Background of the Hungarian Avant-Garde," *The Hungarian Avant-Garde, The Eight and the Activists*, exhibition catalogue (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1980), pp. 9–19.
9. *The Hungarian Avant-Garde, The Eight and the Activists*, p. 38.
10. Reprinted in Géza Perneckzy, *Kortársak szemével* [Through the eyes of contemporaries] (Budapest: Corvina, 1967), pp. 106–110.
11. Reprinted in English in *The Hungarian Avant-Garde, the Eight and the Activists*, pp. 106–108.
12. In *Aurora*, May, 1911, pp. 82–83.
13. About Kernstok's significance in this relation for the next generation of artists in Hungary, see Éva Körner, *Derkovits Gyula* (Budapest: Corvina, 1968), pp. 16–17.
14. Tőkei in Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*, 12–13.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. Charles de Tolnay, "Les écrits de Lajos Fülep sur Cézanne," *Acta Historiae Artium*, vol. 20, 1974, p. 105. All of Fülep's writings are reprinted in Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*.
18. Fülep, "Cézanne és Gauguin," *A Hét* [The week], May 12, 1907. Reprinted in Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*, pp. 448–454.
19. Fülep, "Mai vallásos művészet" [Today's religious art], *Élet* [Life], September–October, 1913. Reprinted in Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*, pp. 523–545.
20. Fülep wrote down these ideas in most complete form in his essay "Magyar festészet" [Hungarian painting], *Nyugat*, 1922. Reprinted in Fülep, *A művészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*, pp. 317–380.
21. Passuth, p. 20.
22. Werner Hofmann, "The Earthly Paradise," *Art in the Nineteenth Century*, transl. Brian Battershaw (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), pp. 363–402. "Earthly paradise" and "Golden Age" are Hofmann's terms. "Arcadia" is used by Éva Körner in "Az Arkádia festészet mint nemzetközi előzmény és kortárs" [Arcadia painting as an international antecedent and contemporary], *Derkovits Gyula*, pp. 48–53. For the idea of the connection between the horseman and the theme of "Arcadia"/"Golden Age," I am grateful to Dr. Éva Bajkay.
23. Hofmann, p. 382.
24. See Körner, p. 49.
25. Körner, p.50. In this context, Körner refers particularly to the Czech painter Bohumil Kubista's work around 1910, such as *Bathers* (Czech National Gallery, Prague), and to the Russian Kuzma Petrov-Vodkin's paintings around 1911, for example *Boys at Play* (Russian State Museum, Leningrad).
26. Tihanyi's *Nudes*, oil on canvas, 55 x 46 cm, is privately owned. Berény's *Idyll* (*Composition*), oil on canvas, 49 x 62 cm, and Pór's *Sermon on the Mount*, oil on canvas, 245 x 445 cm, are both in the Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest. Some of Kernstok's watercolour designs for the stained glass windows of the Schiffer Villa in Budapest are on view at the Janus Pannonius Museum, Pécs; they measure ca. 250 x 52 cm. Kernstok's *Mythic Hunters* mural is located in a

- school gymnasium, at 21 Dugonics Street, Budapest. All are reproduced in Passuth, plates 55., 59., 63., 64., 97.
27. On these artists see (in English): Lajos Németh, *Modern Art in Hungary*, transl. Lili Halápy (Budapest: Corvina, 1969).
 28. Géza Perneckzy, "A Vörös Lovas és ami utána következik" [The Red Horseman and what follows it], *Tanulmányút a Pávakerbe* [Study trip to the Peacock Garden] (Budapest: Magvető, 1969), p. 195.
 29. Oil on canvas, 111 x 150 cm, Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest. Reproduced in Zsuzsa D. Fehér and Gábor Ó. Pogány, *Hungarian Painting of the Twentieth Century* (Budapest: Corvina, 1971), pl. 13.
 30. Bronze, 22 cm, Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest. Reproduced in *Magyar művészet 1890–1919* [Hungarian art 1890–1919], Lajos Németh and Nóra Aradi, eds., 2 vols. (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981), vol. 2., pl. 893.
 31. Vak ügetését hallani / Eltévedt, hajdani lovasnak, / Volt erdők és ó-nádasok / Láncolt lelkei riadoznak. This poem is part of a group of fifteen—also entitled "The Lost Rider"—written in the early and mid-1910s.
 32. Perneckzy, *Tanulmányút a Pávakerbe*, p. 195. See also D.V. Sarabianov, "Kupanie krasnogo konia" [The Bathing of the Red Horse], *Russkaia zhivopis' kontsa 1900-kh-nachala 1910-kh godov. Ocherki* [Russian Paintings from the end of the 1900s to the beginning of the 1910s. Impressions]. (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1971), pp. 46–47.
 33. Tivadar Artner, *Ló és lovas a művészetben* [Horse and rider in art] (Budapest: Corvina, 1982), pl. 46.
 34. I am grateful to Dr. László Beke for this observation.



Károly Kernstok, *Horsemen at the Water's Edge*, 1910. Oil on canvas, 215 X 294 cm.
(Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest) (Photo, Hungarian National Gallery)