

summary

The area by the Danube embankment at Szőny, which is part of Komárom to the north-east of Budapest, although known by archaeologists for a long time and a protected archaeological site, has never received very much attention in the course of research connected with the Roman settlement of Brigetio. One reason for that is its location – the riverside with its bushes and weeds was considered as being on the edge of the ancient town. Another is that both the legionnaires' camp and the civilian town of Brigetio provided plenty of archaeological work in recent decades. That situation changed in the summer of 2014 when work got underway between Komárom and Almásfüzitő within the framework of a specially identified flood protection project. The difficult terrain, where even the earlier above-ground finds didn't promise much, was part of the densely built Roman town, with its well-preserved buildings of Brigetio. Walls, floors, remains of floor and wall heating, threshold stones, water courses and fresco fragments were mixed with tombs embedded in buildings of the late Roman era across a total area of around 10,000 square metres. One large building, covering about 1000 square metres, has been identified as a baths complex. The current laws allowed us a total of 60 days for trial and preliminary archaeological excavation. However, the discovered buildings covering an area of several thousand square metres fell under the concept of a built cultural heritage to be protected, so from the professional point of view one possible solution came to the fore: protection of the site and modification of the line of the proposed dam. Rarely can we speak of a heritage protection or archaeological success story, but in this case we arrived at a situation which was beyond our hope. As a result of exemplary cooperation between the planners, those implementing the plan and the different authorities and offices, as well as state support, following the excavations, which began in August 2014, already by October an agreement was reached to modify the line of the dam, which in the end avoided the Roman site, thus allowing for further excavations to be undertaken. In the summer of 2016, with further support from the prime minister's office, we were able to continue exploring the Roman baths. Thus an area covering 1500 square metres of the originally larger building was uncovered. Despite the fact that in medieval times and in the modern era the Roman walls of Brigetio were methodically exploited, we unearthed many building elements in an outstanding condition. What can be regarded as the real sensation, however, was uncovered last year with the discovery of an eight-square-metre section of fresco and stucco decoration. The excavated Roman baths on the Danube embankment make it possible for a long-envisaged visitor centre and archaeological park to be established in Komárom.

FLASHES OF BURNING QUESTIONS

Pilla – Conversations on Museum Theory

by Benedek Varga, director of the Hungarian National Museum

p. 49

It is perhaps curious that while museums are more than 100 years old, museology as a scholarly discipline has a history of barely two decades. Perhaps the most obvious reason is that the difference in qualifications and background of the collections' keepers and the multiplicity of collections didn't make it perceptible that numerous strands come together in museums. The different types of museums fail to notice their similarity and confine themselves to research in their narrowly defined specialities. This has resulted not only in the weak professional museological identity of museum staff, but at the same time in the course of museum work the practical experience accumulated in one speciality and the general thinking have only slightly touched on the profession as a whole. It is still characteristic at museum conferences for people to separate into their different specialities. The ethnographer doesn't exchange thoughts very much with an archaeologist, nor the art historian with a medical historian, a technology specialist with a literature specialist, and so on. Many people in principle doubt that there can be anything considered common in art, historical, archaeological, natural historical and technical historical museology, though it is recognised that there is an inventory and storeroom, restoration and exhibitions practically everywhere – and ideally, of course, there are visitors. This minor phenomenon, *the visitor*, more precisely the intention of reaching out to the visitor has dislodged museology out of its divisions. This has initiated the strengthening of the museum professional identity. Meanwhile, however, the staging of exhibitions has continued to quietly take it for granted that, due to the completely different matters to be presented, we work with incomparable means, and thus mutually beneficial experience does not exist. Thinking about such matters in Hungary didn't begin with the Pilla series of presentations. Similar aims have been involved with the Pulszky Association, Museum May Days and Museum Nights, *magyarmuzeumok.hu* and *MúzeumCafé*, just as the specialised departments in different ministries have done much in recent decades in the interest of a common museum identity and the promotion of museums' interrelatedness. In this connection, the Pilla series has been based on one simple, though consistently applied approach – the aim has been to create a professional forum where museologists from different backgrounds can conveniently exchange ideas about exhibitions and museum work, in brief about their own occupation. Of course, other considerations have been involved with the selection of speakers. Every year the organisers have invited those they consider to be the most distinguished. These were the considerations on the basis of which in autumn 2012 the Semmelweis Museum of Medical History initiated the series about museum theory.

THE CULT OF RELICS VERSUS VISUAL DESIGN

Reconstruction of Listed Buildings – Principles and Practice

by Judit Jankó

p. 61

December 2016 saw the appearance of a new, modified decree in connection with the National Mansion and Castle Project, according to which in the forthcoming years 40 billion forints of EU money is designated for development and reconstruction in 40 locations. Once again a dispute has flared up concerning what kind of perspectives can be employed when dealing with listed monuments. Below we focus on the principles and practice of reconstructing such buildings, with particular reference to the Castle Project. Among the topics of discussion appearing in recent decades we aim to highlight two different approaches with the help of István Feld, assistant professor of medieval archaeology at the Institute of Archaeological Science of Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), and Gergely Buzás, director of the Hungarian National Museum's King Matthias Museum in Visegrád. We spoke to them separately, allowing them to present their own ideas without their precise formulations being put under pressure by the heat of debate or unsettling counter arguments. We were curious as to what constitutes the main differences in their opinions.

IF: Certainly we have often been placed at two extremities, hence I think it's fortunate if there are separate discussions, without any constraint on presenting our thinking. And first of all I'd like to stress that too many emotions have been generated about the matter.

MC: *I'm glad you have started with that, since when I was waiting for you here in the university corridor I was thinking that we should start by deciphering the reasons for the high level of emotions surrounding the subject. Then I changed my mind, partly in order to allow professionalism to take first place, and partly since I didn't want to raise an easily misunderstood, suspiciously condemnatory issue right at the start. But as you mention it, let's begin there. Why is there so much emotion attached to a professional issue?*

IF: I myself don't understand it, since I have never been disheartened if, in a professional matter, someone represents a standpoint differing from mine. I teach medieval archaeology at the university, but I also regard myself as a historian, which means that I approach current issues as such, namely in a non-political manner. Of course, I am not naive. I know that politics makes use of everything. That's what it has to do. I see one of the reasons for the emotional charge is that there are people who cannot be reconciled with the fact that part of Hungary's historical buildings have been destroyed. They think that if we recall the past we have

redeemed something. The other factor behind every disputed issue is money. Whoever participates in the realisation of a project will be literally rewarded. This is OK, but where money is involved there is also emotion. As for myself, in every aspect of life I start off with the view that people act on the basis of their convictions, that what they do, their activity, is motivated by conviction. I know that Gergely Buzás is never motivated by money, his point of view and his activity is based on his view of history.

MúzeumCafé spoke with Gergely Buzás the following day and began by asking him about the reason for all the emotion and passion, but he preferred to initially talk about concrete matters and deal with the issue at the end. Hence the second conversation instead of principles, began with matters of practice, specifically with Visegrád.

GB: The castle at Visegrád has been the focus of a cult since the 18th century, but the existence of the palace was unknown until 1934. Medieval sources refer to it, but their authenticity was often called into question. For example, Elemér Varjú, the outstanding 1920s castle researcher wrote that there was no and never had been a royal palace in Visegrád, in reality the sources referred to the castle. It was a great surprise when, on New Year's Eve 1934, János Schulek discovered the palace remains at a depth of 8-10 metres, covered by its own fallen masonry. Excavations began and in effect have continued up to today, naturally with varying intensity. However, scholarly analysis of the uncovered finds didn't keep in step with the work on the site. Thus when I came here in my first year as an archaeology student the then director, Mátyás Szőke, said: "Look Gergely, here are a lot of carved stones." And he showed me a huge pile of stone fragments in the museum courtyard. "Appraise them and you'll have your archaeology degree." So I started to finely sketch the stones. From the fragments the stone structures emerged – the façades, halls, courtyards, and finally a definable building.

I said I would return to the emotions at the end, but I have to mention them now. It's not true that István Feld and myself are at the two extremes of the debate. Rather Ernő Marosi is at the other extreme. My professional studies didn't only concern archaeology. My thesis on art history was also about Visegrád. Ernő Marosi was my teacher and when I showed him the stones which had been found he remarked how exciting it would be to see for once what the Visegrád palace looked like, since by then all you could make out were ruins. In fact it was he – though perhaps today he would deny it – who persuaded me to prepare a reconstruction drawing for the entire palace. He initiated this kind of thinking, then later he became my greatest opponent.

MC: *It would be worth clarifying who understands what by the concept of reconstruction.*

IF: Reconstruction is a very broad concept. Almost everyone in every specific case understands something different. If the question concerns the reconstruction plans relating to the Castle

Project, I cannot say, since in reality it hasn't yet got underway. The castles the reconstruction of which is debated today – Nyírbátor, Diósgyőr or Füzér – were not included in this project. Nor do we know the plans. For the time being, the Castle Project comprises lists and negotiations, but I only hear of these from colleagues. I am not participating directly. And I am not saying that you shouldn't reconstruct – why shouldn't you? In the course of researching one of the remaining halls of Gyula Castle, I came across the location of some late medieval wooden panelling. All I know is that there was wooden panelling, nothing more. In its place, admittedly on the basis of Tyrolean examples, wooden timbering was inserted, denoting the former paneling. However, this isn't the same as when nothing remains of a wall and one or more storeys are built. In both cases the term reconstruction is used, though they signify different things.

MC: Several problems are involved here. The issue of monument protection, which is constantly changing, and the linked tourism and related financial questions. Then there is the analysis of the past. How can an archaeologist take a stance regarding this complex set of problems?

IF: Everybody can say something in relation to the professional issues of their own speciality. Gergely Buzás has things to say as both an archaeologist and an art historian. As director of the museum in Visegrád, he surely wants to see an enjoyable sight for visitors. Fortunately for me, I don't have any such direct obligation, although I spent decades in a museum and in practical monument protection, and I am not denying that I approach the issues only from the scientific side. In the past opinion has been sharply divided over numerous questions, only now it's the Castle Project which has inflamed the debate.

GB: One of the biggest disputes has concerned reconstruction of the loggia in Visegrád, where, however, I could justify it with information and facts. Only in that way could you put together the structure from the stones discovered in the courtyard. And that's how we did it. I worked with archaeological logic. Conclusions were drawn from fragments, measurements, the ruins, the logic of the structure and from studying the details. Then naturally the art historian's mind looked for similarities, but I don't agree with the art historical approach which starts out from the preconceptions of "what is characteristic for a Renaissance master". The 16-metre-high late Gothic oriel window, which I excavated with my former head Mátyás Szőke, has the same history in small scale as the palace itself has on a large scale. That is to say, how can a building be comprised of formless, barely understandable stone fragments? We found several thousand fragments of carved stone, since in the 18th century the oriel window was blown up, and from these, working with restorers, we started to put together the parapet, the window sills and the vaulting, and then the façades, the interior and the whole thing. A plaster model combined with the fragments and a computerised reconstruction of the oriel window can be seen in the palace exhibition. A book was published about it and authentic rebuilding in its original place is hindered only by the lack of finance.

The career of the highly renowned restorer Ernő Szakál began in Visegrád more than 50 years ago. In the 50s and 60s he restored the wells. His method involved first drawing, making a model and then a copy as the main steps. Thirty years later I followed in his footsteps. But there were also lots of other tasks. In the mid 1990s we established a large research team with many young archaeologists, architects and art historians, and we began to analyse and write about the excavated material. An entire series was published covering a range from the ceramics to the carved stone fragments. In scholarly terms, the Visegrád palace became one of Hungary's best analysed medieval archaeological sites. Meanwhile, the building was increasingly quickly falling into ruins. Around 1995 we reached the point such that certain parts had to be closed due to their dangerous condition. We started to think about renovation. The professional literature describes the Visegrád palace as a Renaissance, terraced palace, but in the course of scholarly analysis we realised that was not the case. It was a Gothic complex with an enclosed inner courtyard, with only a few, relatively insignificant Renaissance elements. According to the reconstruction philosophy initiated in 1995, we wanted to protect from further destruction every original wall and stone remnant in its original material, but not simply physically. Our aim was for our annual 100,000 or so visitors to gain an understanding of our work. And, even if it was possible to enclose the ruins with a glass cover and thus preserve them in an unchanged state for posterity – which, of course, is nothing more than utopian – seeing all the ruins the visitor could justly ask why this was done and why public funds had not been spent on something more sensible. We wanted reconstruction which would enable the visitor to understand how people lived in medieval Hungary. Apart from the building, the exhibitions were created with this in mind. There is a classical archaeological exhibition, with broken tiles, bones and rusty ironwork, which archaeologists found in the earth, and which quickly begin to bore the average visitor, who rushes through the display. Yet we hoped that if we presented a reconstructed room as it would have been around 1400, and the princely accommodation with furnishings from the era of Matthias, then the connection between the archaeological fragments in the neighbouring room and an authentic reconstruction displaying a former lifestyle can be understood. In this way the archaeologist generates understanding, which otherwise would only be the strange mania of enthusiasts. However, it was equally important that with the covering the medieval walls would be physically protected. Without that every year a certain proportion of the medieval stones would have to be changed, since water and frost erode them, and if that were to be done over a long period the original stones from the medieval palace would disappear. There would be a copy, but we would have lost the original for good. In so far as the ruins are covered, plastered and heated, namely we are turning them into a building again, the original parts will survive. The Hercules Well is a good example of how we interpret reconstruction. In a nicely protected exhibition hall we set up the discovered remains of the red marble well in such a way that we didn't add anything. The supporting elements made of white stone are used only to have the

fragments in their original position, but they clearly appear as not being original themselves. On the other hand, a functioning copy of the fountain was created in its original place, thus showing its original effect.

On this point I speak as an art historian. The broken, damaged angel's head from the original well is not itself a work of art, but a fragment of such. When creating the work the sculptor Giovanni Dalmata had a fountain well in the centre of a courtyard in mind and not a fragment of an angel's head. Our reconstructed well is obviously not the original work. That is already irretrievably lost. But it is a reproduction of the work similar, for example, to a photograph of a painting in an art album, the existence of which is not questioned. The details, the texture and the fine quality can only be seen on the original, and thus also on its fragments, but the reconstruction presents a picture of the former, now lost, whole. It reflects the atmosphere of the former work.

IF: The most important basic principle, namely not to destroy the original, is too often broken. In relation to building, however, taking things apart is often inevitable. Original, remaining roofs usually cannot cope with a new level currently prescribed as appropriate, but in the case of characteristic 1960s monument protection involving concrete it often happened. It's a fact that the more additions are made the more the original deteriorates. But how a ruined level or façade can be reconstructed is also open to question. Only if I know its structure. In the case of medieval churches the structure was unambiguous. However, castles and secular buildings are not regular. They were always constructed to fit the given location. You cannot employ comparisons. Every castle is different, but you can reconstruct only a regular structure. I would repeat myself, I am not saying that you shouldn't reconstruct or rebuild, but in each case it should be made clear what you are doing and what the aim is. If maintaining the original is the essence, then cover it and put something functioning inside. That's fine. In contrast, I feel it is problematic if you reconstruct something and only then hope to find a function, something seen as a tourist attraction. These days I encounter as the most stated principle that we are returning the former glory to what has been ruined. But is it really worthwhile spending so much money on an illusion, often accompanied by historical falsification? For me, for a historian and archaeologist, these elements are important historical sources. They are relics of our past even in the condition left to us.

Often reconstruction is based on a hypothesis, but the trouble is that whoever has one can be mistaken. Reconstruction involves incredible costs. So it's only worth thinking in terms of what amount is available for what. I very much like computerised presentations of reconstruction, since they help us understand what the entirety used to be like. In the summer I visited Cluny, where there has been no question of rebuilding the monastery's fantastic ruined church. Instead, thanks to modern technology, visitors can see a three-dimensional presentation of its former state.

MC: Has a scholarly analysis of the castles featuring in the Castle Project taken place?

IF: To answer I would have to be familiar with the precise list, but too much information based only on rumour is circulating. But the question is what do we mean by that. In Diósgyőr, for example, during the 1960s there were serious excavations, but the idea of researching the still-standing walls was not raised at the time. The noted monument protection specialist Mihály Détsky apparently said that you could truly get to know a building if you methodically demolished it. Of course, that's just a saying, but it indicates that you can never know everything about a historical building. Yet at the same time we have to conduct our examinations as thoroughly as possible. To this day we don't know whether this was done in Diósgyőr, but it seems that the system of tender competition with its own constraints is not suitable for the appropriate exploration of treasures. One thing is certain – the basic excavation of these castles, their documentation using all the possibilities of modern technology and the publication of the results would certainly be necessary. This is a fundamental condition for getting to know their past, their history, but it is also an important starting point for the future. Perhaps it's not even an exaggeration to say that if this happened, it is almost neither here nor there what the architect does afterwards with the building.

GB: Today I still come across museologists who think that if you display the stone fragments the visitor will be able to imagine the column capital, or even the entire basilica of Székesfehérvár. This is not serious. It underestimates our profession, as if a life's acquired knowledge were unnecessary, since without it the fragments of the past would be perfectly understandable for anyone. Previous generations were drawn to museums because they thought the period of the objects was fascinating. The Visegrád palace, as a garden of ruins, was able to attract 100,000 visitors because people were convinced that King Matthias trod on its stones and that provided enough experience. Today photography, films, computer games and virtual reality have changed people. They are confronted by powerful images and visually they have become much more demanding. Today the exhibition graphic designs of the 50s and 60s appear charming, or rather ridiculous. This new type of visual demand is particularly valid for architectural relics. During a conference discussion, my architect colleague Zoltán Deák, with whom I completed the reconstruction in the 90s, answered the question of why there was the desire to reconstruct the palace. His answer was: "Because I was curious about what it used to be like." I very much agree with him. I can't say anything else other than I wanted to know what the atmosphere was like when entering the courtyards, the halls and the gardens.

MC: But if I correctly understand the other side, Professor Marosi's objections, we can't really know and accept that our knowledge is fragmentary. According to Professor Feld, however, it is dangerous to mix our existing knowledge with fantasies and similarities.

GB: Yes, there are those who say that's not our job to become familiar with the past, rather to create scholarly studies and write dissertations from the fragments of the past. Complex cognitive processes can never be complete and perfect. In a scholarly study the researcher formulates a range of hypotheses, but only for a narrow professional elite, because he thinks that they don't belong to the public, who would misunderstand them. I believe that, in contrast, the duty of museum specialists is to place what is known before everyone. Not everyone can read and understand a scholarly report, but we have tasks in relation to them. In fact our obligations are even more serious in this regard.

MC: *And what is the task for monument protection? Something relatively new? While earlier the old buildings were reconstructed without hesitation, today there is confusion regarding the tasks of protection.*

GB: First of all, the monuments have to be physically protected. We mustn't allow the remaining walls, stones, frescos and plaster work to be ruined. But in itself it is not enough to make sure the stones aren't damaged by frost, that the plaster doesn't peel off. Preservation of society's consciousness of values is also a related issue. If a listed monument loses its status, it has to be given back to it. Let's be aware that in the 21st century ruins in themselves are no longer a treasure in the eyes of society. This was the case in the 19th-century romantic way of thinking, but no longer.

The authenticity of an art object and a monument depends on two factors, its physical nature and genuineness of form. In European culture the sanctity of old objects has been important since ancient times. There was even a cult of relics, in that the object had to be protected, even venerated, since a saint once touched it. It wasn't the same everywhere. In Asia the authenticity of form was worth more and the accessories were changed without any bother. In our globalising world these two attitudes are starting to complement each other. In Europe the authenticity of form will be as equally important as the physical aspect, and this has to be taken into consideration in relation to monument protection.

MC: *The cult of relics versus visual design – with this have we arrived at the essential core of the dispute?*

GB: In my opinion physical authenticity and that of form cannot be separated. Fragments are still not genuine objects simply due to their material, only documents of those. The authenticity of form is in itself a trifle, but it recalls the former whole entirety and facilitates its interpretation. Both must be handled together, and the modern museum and modern monument protection can be the appropriate arenas for this.

IF: We certainly have to decide what the role of monument protection is today. I think one of the most important issues would be to subject the different projects to transparent professional

discussion. The frequently incomprehensible planning councils and consultations, often organised along personal connections, are not appropriate for this. Recently I spoke at a conference about how we should thoroughly examine matters on the basis of all the sources, what we know for sure, what we are uncertain about and what we don't know anything about, and only then decide about development and reconstruction. It wouldn't even be a problem if the plan supported by the profession was not realised but the public would know that there had been a debate. For example, the plans for the realised reconstruction of the Diósgyőr or Füzér castles could not be known in advance. The interesting thing about the matter is that the ground plan for the reconstructed Füzér castle, which was used by the designer, Mihály Rudolf, has so far only appeared in a publication edited by myself.

MC: There was already a castle project which ran from 1957 to the 1970s. At the time, in socialist Hungary, why were castles important?

GB: That was the great period of Hungarian monument protection and at the same time scholarly examination of the Middle Ages in Hungary got underway. Modern Hungarian medieval archaeology began after World War II with the excavations in Buda and renovation of the ruined Buda Castle. A formerly completely unknown medieval royal centre came to light, which captivated everyone. László Gerevich, who headed the excavations, assembled a team of talented specialists. Imre Holl, Emese Nagy, Katalin Gyürky and the others laid the foundations for a truly serious, European-standard branch of science. It was mainly his students who after 1957 as young archaeologists became part of the then being formed National Monuments Inspectorate. They made the scientific method learnt during the excavations of Buda Castle a general practice and this became widespread across the country with castle excavations. In many places, for example Nagyvázsony and Diósgyőr, castle ruins had already been tidied up and opened explicitly for tourism. The intention was for them to be excursion destinations for working people. Subsequently, castle excavations and renovation began on a scholarly basis.

Modernist Hungarian monument protection appeared in the 1960s, primarily thanks to János Sedlmayr, who played an important role in Visegrád. Those involved had been influenced by Le Corbusier and the Modernist architecture of the 30s and 40s. In the 60s and 70s in the period of pre-fab panels, previously used modern architectural concepts could only be tried out in monument protection. It's a strange paradox, but when it became increasingly important to display an outwardly modern, enlightened country image, in the interest of that a lot of money was pumped into monument protection. The symbol of this became the 1964 renovation of Solomon's Tower in Visegrád, which was a very divisive story. Sedlmayr told me he had placed picnic benches and an open fireplace on the roof terrace of Solomon's Tower because he very much liked Le Corbusier's Marseille building and he wanted to design something similar.

It wouldn't have been possible to do it with a housing estate block, hence he used the tower. The Saint George Chapel in Veszprém, however, got a reinforced concrete cupola because the structure excited Ferenc Erdei and he had enough money for the chapel. Thus the cupola appeared.

Sedlmayr was very knowledgeable about architectural history, too. As a first step he always prepared a reconstruction drawing for a building, but as he said himself, only so that by chance he would not design it as it used to be. According to him, a historical building lives on if new, contemporary elements (cast iron, glass, steel) are added to it, which deliberately don't match the historical form. He interpreted a historical monument like a completely new, modern artistic creation. He was a very good specialist, but there was one matter in which I was not and am still not able to agree with him – his relation to the original remains. In an article written in 1973 about the reconstruction of Eger Castle, he acknowledges that he is aware of the fact that when you place a cast-iron structure and artificial stone additions on carved Gothic walls they actually ruin them, since the new covering with harder material traps the water in the softer original stone, which with freezing breaks it up. He suggested continuously changing the Gothic stones for artificial ones. The form of the stone was more essential for him than the material. In Visegrád, as in other places, he had the weaker, original walls pulled down and then replaced with new, stronger walling, rather than engaging in preservation. I don't think this should be allowed for monument protection, or elsewhere.

From the 1980s, alongside the modernist architects the other, primarily art historian tendency appeared. Its advocates proclaimed that nothing should be tampered with. Everything which exists is good. At most, you can examine ruins in the interest of scholarly research, but you must not engage in restoration, rather rebury them. However, this means that the ruins are going to decay. You can't conserve ruins, even with reburying them. Ruination is not a state but a process, which continues up to complete annihilation. I represent a third viewpoint, that of the restorer. Let's preserve the building's original parts and display all that we know about it.

MC: If I understand correctly, the endeavour is to present the former effect.

GB: For me it's important that a monument is interpretable as a work of art, as a building. A building lives in its space and its mass. If these are lacking, we can no longer speak of a building. Ruins are simply the documents of a former building, hence they are very important, but if you don't restore them they are finally going to disappear.

IF: Undoubtedly, Matthias didn't reside in ruins reaching the knees, but it's hardly deniable that in most cases we can only create hypotheses. This is a costly game, not only the building work involved, but also the maintenance. And what is it that is built up? No one is going to answer

this question. For me as a professional the determination of that causes difficulty in terms of what type of castles were built in which era, and what was characteristic, given that they are all so different. Furthermore, the end results of restoration are tied up with tourism considerations and expectations about tenders. There is one approach which aims to make a hypothesis into something material, but I ask: why? Because everyone who has a hypothesis may be wrong. Yet if a building already stands and it turns out that the hypothesis was mistaken, its not going to be pulled down. We have to be aware that these buildings are relics not only of the medieval era but also of the given time, in the way that Solomon's Tower as a memento demonstrates what professionals thought about monument protection in 1964. The Füzér building, however, speaks about ourselves, our times, and it will eventually be a 'monument' of that, not the 15th-17th centuries.

GB: Museologists live in these buildings and use them. Making them function and receiving visitors is part of their life. If the building is leaking, I have to deal with it. If the wall falls down, that's my responsibility. Every year many hundreds of people are given guided tours. I pay attention to their reactions. I know what interests them. In universities, the Academy and scientific institutes professors are familiar with a different, professional audience comprising scholars and students. And their tasks are different. They are not familiar with museum visitors, nor with the problems involved with maintaining a listed building. They would like to comply with the academic community. For them a monument is nothing other than an important source. This explains why I regard the dispute insolvable. Their viewpoints, aims and narratives are different.

It's not only in relation to preservation that we have a different approach to art objects, but in research as well. Recently an article by Professor Marosi about the restoration of the Füzér chapel appeared in the weekly *Élet és Irodalom*. With brilliant penmanship he wrote about how awful it was that an adapted model of the Kisszeben altar was placed in it. Yet at the same time he didn't note that it wasn't a carved copy which appeared there, but a mounted photo, because, as it happens, the painted altar destined for there wasn't completed. Professor Marosi wrote a critique on the basis of a photograph, namely he hadn't visited the place. This in effect reflects the accepted art historical practice. The appearance of photography in art history was an important milestone at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. Up to the second half of the 20th century, art history in the main was involved with questions of styles and masters. That generation was brought up with this and within it the photograph was an essential means for them, since it provided the possibility of making a detailed comparison of works of art which were far from each other. It didn't crop up that objects had to be literally taken in hand and looked at in order to determine, for example, what kind of joints there are on the rear side of a panel. Old school art historians had nothing to discuss with restorers, and they didn't handle the works. In contrast, we raise other questions about works of art, for which the answers

require other methods. We examine the original context of artworks and thus for us the technical details are important, for which, in turn, it is essential to examine the object directly. It follows from this that it is also essential to preserve the original material.

Now I will answer the initial question concerning why the debate has turned personal and passionate. It's because for those of us who are disputing matters monuments are important. Temperatures are also raised when we use hard words in order to make our opinions more clear. Yet this is not necessarily a problem. On the other hand, if the dispute calls into question the other's relevance, then that's tragic. Background intrigues and hindering others lead nowhere. The demand for reconstruction of what the public would like to see in terms of what the castle was like in times past is not going to go away, but if specialists with determining influence are not prepared to accept the reason for the existence of scientific reconstruction and try to question its professionalism, then non-professional restoration will appear with unauthentic falsifications, which is bad for everyone. A good example of this is the current situation of archaeology. With power struggles within the profession and the use of politics it has by now been possible to make the country believe that archaeologists are only digging in the area of a future motorway in order to gain as much money as possible, and that is the reason why the investment is made increasingly costly and slower. This game should not be repeated with monument protection on the pretext of the Castle Project.

IF: I am sceptical. In my opinion the castles are in danger and we professionals have to pay attention, since if we lay our hands on too many castles too quickly many things can be destroyed. At the same time – allow me to be optimistic – the support offered gives the opportunity for new research and the publication of new results to appear. The case of the Füzér castle is at the same time an example of how, with its type of reconstruction, we are retrospectively building a more beautiful past for ourselves than what actually existed. Of course, such pseudo castles can be very appealing to tourists – not only in Hungary, but in western Europe as well. I know of a project in Burgundy where an essentially tourist attraction is being built in the form of an ideal castle of around 1200, but as a greenfield investment, not on the remains of a medieval fortress. In Hungary castles have become comparable with thermal water. Construction brings money and offers the possibility for a locality to get into one or another category of provincial development, perhaps build a hotel and create employment. But is this good?

I also have an ethical question. If I know that a given building could have originally had a form different from how I would like to reconstruct it, but I keep quiet about it in order to get a building permit easily, then what do I tell visitors later? Do we keep quiet about our doubts, or do we say, like the architect of the 19th-century rebuilding of Cologne Cathedral apparently said: “Ah, what did they understand about Gothic in the past?”

MARVELS, FORMULAS, ANOMALIES

Museums and Architecture – Bilbao, Berlin and Paris

by Dániel Kovács

p. 89

It is now twenty years since the opening of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao. Beyond the fact that with its architecturally milestone building and world-standard exhibitions it draws a million visitors annually, the Guggenheim has also played a key role in the emergence of Bilbao as a 'Mecca of urbanisation' and is a textbook example of urban development based on culture. Yet can a single museum redeem a city? In the past two decades the majority of cities trying to apply the Bilbao formula haven't achieved that – so much so that according to one early critic it would be better to employ the word 'anomaly' rather than 'effect'. That is to say, successful adaptation means more than a good architect and a trendy museum. For that it's worth studying not only the lessons of Bilbao, but also two other examples: Berlin's Jewish Museum and the modern expansion of the Louvre. In recent centuries museums have greatly evolved: from repository of curiosities via a collection point of national values and specialised institutes for preservation and analysis, to today's multifunctional centres applying cultural communication moulded to consumption habits. In recent decades, however, the pace of change has accelerated in response to the expansion of the welfare state, global tourism and digitization. It is not only the structure, strategies and staff of institutes which have to comply with that. The change itself engenders a modification of the concrete physical frameworks. Museums across the world have reacted to the growth and diversified mass of visitors with new architectural approaches, using the phenomenon of 'star architecture' developed in recent decades and the 'brand name' of its leading figures. Architectural space has become diversified and within it the role of the arts, while hierarchical relations have been put into question. This has led to results which give much food for thought, such as the new entrance block of Amsterdam's Stedelijk Museum, the 'Bath Tub', the profanity of which, to say the least, strikes at the world-standard status of the collection, or the new museum building in Ordos, China – the building, due to its badly chosen location and timing has no collection and thus stands empty. Writing about museum architecture, Andrew McClellan notes that it depended on your point of view whether the opening of Frank Gehry's new Guggenheim Museum in 1997 was the best or worst thing to have happened in the arts during recent decades. Gehry and Bilbao shocked and dynamised the thinking about museums. The past two decades, however, have demonstrated that the Bilbao formula is quite complex. Apart from many carefully worked out factors, the fascinating story of Bilbao can also be attributed to a fair amount of luck. In short: for the success of an architect, a museum can be enough, but for that of a museum a good architect is certainly not enough.

ON THE TRAIL OF STAMPS

Forty Years of Regions – Eras – Museums

by Marianna Berényi

p. 129

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the Regions – Eras – Museums (REM) movement, which continues to function successfully with its own website, Facebook page, clubs, excursions and publications. The number of stamp-issuing places involved with the movement continues to grow year by year, and now stands at over 3100. The latest to join the network is Budapest's Rock Museum – Hungarian Rock Hall of Fame. Information about natural sights, listed monuments, churches, museums, galleries, zoos and botanical gardens is provided by REM's standard-format pocket booklets, of which so far over 840 have been published. They contain summaries or full versions in foreign languages. For many people REM is a prototype of a nostalgic, successful model of cultural tourism. The inexpensive, high-standard booklets contain not only texts by prominent professionals, but also maps, ground plans and pictures. The series, conceived by István Éri, at the time director of the Museum Methodology and Restoration Centre, provides information about many hundreds of monuments, museums, collections and treasures of nature. In addition to spreading knowledge, the booklets have also played a role in academics' writings, and its authors have proudly included them in their lists of publications. It's no wonder that they have been reissued many times, occasionally with texts in English, German, Italian, Romanian, Slovak and Turkish. In the first 36 years 11 million copies were printed. They are still sought after today, serving as a substitute for guidebooks and guides, as well as facilitating advance preparation or as a means of recalling experiences. Teachers use them when preparing children for a school trip. Many factors played a role in REM quickly becoming a mass movement. The first and possibly most important is that right at the start the organisers presented to the public a well worked out project. Immediately more than 100 noteworthy sights were involved, and the list was continuously expanded. Towards the end of the 1980s, the many times published catalogue referred to 1400 stamping checkpoints. Today that figure is 1700. Another reason for success involved the then strengthening museum institutional structure, the public and state support for nature and monument protection, as well as scholarly research. Thirdly, the increase supported by the ideology of the party-state would have been in vain if the project had not addressed and reached the social strata of society which by then had more free time and were becoming more financially secure, from whose members the Kádár system expected socialist patriotism. All this served to strengthen identity and develop domestic tourism. People purchasing maps could not but marvel at how many sights there were in Hungary, and to a certain degree that compensated them for the fact that they couldn't travel abroad as they pleased.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES AND MUSEUMS

Archaeological Parks

by Loránd Olivér Kovács, archaeologist

p. 141

First, one issue has to be clarified – what is an archaeological site in Hungary? Strictly speaking, the matter is defined by law, but in everyday language, everything pre-dating 1711 which is a product of human endeavour and which is below ground, together with its environment remaining in an original condition. There are many archaeological sites in the Carpathian Basin, though those which can at least partly be opened to the public are far fewer. Characteristically, territories after periods of major constructions using lasting materials remained here, namely from the Roman and the medieval eras, and thus the majority of Hungarian presentation sites relate to those periods. A special category of these sites – which essentially identifies only a given archaeological site's presentation – is the relatively new Archaeological Park, although in effect they have existed in Hungary a long time. What does that mean? From a museological perspective the notion has existed for just a couple of decades. There is currently no accepted Hungarian or international definition. In fact, in the case of Hungary legally there is no such museum institute. Considering the situation across Europe and Hungary, the picture is very mixed. The spectrum ranges from a simple garden of ruins to a wellness hotel, and they are often mixed up – even by specialists – with theme parks, which in reality don't contain original elements and can much rather be considered historical Disneyland. Between the two there is a very narrow boundary and archaeological parks try to introduce theme park attractions, of which perhaps the best-known example is Carnuntum (Bad Deutsch Altenburg, Austria). Highlighting the common elements, in Europe today the following define an archaeological park: it is situated in the area of a significant archaeological site; the site's relics which can be displayed (mainly built, protected elements) are prominent and are its main characteristic; the affected area is landscaped, occasionally with the landscape reconstructed; a degree of intervention (protective roof, exhibition, reconstruction, etc.) can be found in the area; its legal status is that of a museum or it is an affiliate of one, or a museum monitors it professionally; apart from culture, other possibilities for relaxation are available (a park and a play area, wellness facilities, etc.). A few words are required about its formation, since only then can the differing circumstances, development and potentials of the locations and institutes be comprehended. Most commonly, the characteristic origin of almost all older archaeological parks was a garden of ruins. The other type is clearly represented by Pompei in Italy and its opening to the public in 1763. In actual fact, these two types of origin with different degrees form the basis of all currently existing archaeological parks.

In Hungary there is no 'official' definition of a visitor centre. According to Wikipedia, a visitor centre is a physical location that provides tourist information to visitors who tour the place or locality. What does 'the place' actually mean? It means anything of special interest – a 'tourist attraction', namely a museum, national park, forest, etc. A visitor centre provides information, maps, printed materials and educational exhibitions, in addition to using the media and films to promote the place. It's not simply that visitor centres are only a doorway to something, recently they have been transformed into places of experience presenting a location's history, and many have turned towards goals of independent tourism. This description highlights how the role of these centres initially dealing simply with information has changed over time. Visitor centres outside Hungary are rarely connected with museums, and though their exhibitions reflect a museum function, those are only part of what they have to offer. In Hungary visitor centres have multiplied, thanks to the existence of competitive tenders. In view of the lack of other resources, their establishment has provided an opportunity for museums to be upgraded and expanded. Accordingly, the museum function has received a much stronger emphasis, such that it is not unusual for a visitor centre itself to be, in effect, a museum or exhibition space. Using the tender opportunities to the greatest extent, visitor centres of ecclesiastical institutes have made innovations which, apart from their potential to attract tourists, in reality expand their museum function with permanent exhibitions based on archaeological, art historical and general historical research, as well as continuously changing temporary exhibitions. The result is of some consequence – previously neglected elements of Hungarian museum practice have experienced significant development. The arguably disadvantaged position of the natural sciences in Hungarian museum life can be said to have stimulated the appearance of an increasing number of themed visitor centres, providing an alternative possibility for displays which previously couldn't be presented in a museum building. Alongside these developments, historical 'adventure parks' or 'theme parks' have appeared. Many of them are similar to fun fairs in their function (after all, they also had a 'Little Venice', mock mansion or maze), but there are also some whose creation has been inspired by a city's history. Visitor centres are thus important elements of 21st-century, cultural-tourism development. Yet while elsewhere they function as parts of memorial places, listed building complexes or simply monuments which draw tourists, so far in Hungary they have had an important role in the museum sphere or even in a new, independent museum role, as well as being similar to centres found elsewhere.

I Dezső Szeben, one of several children in a Jewish family, was born in 1895. After studying at the Budapest Lutheran Grammar School, in 1913 he registered at the Legal and Political Science Department of the Hungarian Royal University of Humanities and Sciences. In 1920, now a director of the Central Credit Bank, he married Erzszi Glücksthal. Later he traded in agricultural products, was president of the National Federation of Corn Merchants, a member of the board of the National Association of Corn Exporters, a councillor of the Budapest Commodity and Stock Exchange, and director of the Danube Corn-Trading Company. He also participated in the boards of directors of other companies. His interest in collecting art was possibly stimulated by his father-in-law, the lawyer Samu Glücksthal, whose collection contained mainly works by Hungarian painters. Szeben similarly purchased paintings by Hungarian artists, but Italian and Dutch paintings were his favourites. According to contemporary newspapers and official reports, in 1938-39 he resigned from numerous positions, in which the Anti-Jewish Laws clearly played a part. It was probably in 1940 that he left Hungary for England, where in the second half of the following year – when Hungary entered the war – he was interned as a citizen of an enemy country. After the war he settled in London, where in 1947 he remarried. In the same year, through a Budapest lawyer he made a declaration about his works of arts which had gone missing during the war to the Ministerial Committee for Works of Art Taken from Public and Private Collections. In the early 1950s he was the manager of a company dealing with automobile spare parts and later one involved with real estate. As soon as his financial situation allowed, he returned to his passion for collecting, mainly buying old Italian paintings. He died in 1974 in Monte Carlo, leaving his collection to a foundation supporting medical research, which he himself had established. Personal documents relating to Dezső Szeben's Budapest collection have still not turned up. Hence it is only from the aforementioned declaration and a number of exhibition catalogues that we know about the works, which formerly adorned the walls of his flat in Lendvay Street. What we mainly know about his collection is based on reproductions. Among works by Hungarian painters Szeben owned several by Rippl-Rónai and one each by József Borsos and Károly Ferenczy. Some of his works of art were deposited with the Pest Hungarian Commercial Bank, while others disappeared from his flat. In March and April 1943, eight wooden boxes containing paintings were deposited with the bank. They clearly belonged to Szeben's collection. In early 1945 members of a Soviet Army economic commission plundered the bank's safes and a large part of the booty, including many of Szeben's paintings, was taken to the Soviet Union.

MUSEUM RESTORATION AND STORAGE CENTRES

by Beatrix Basics

p. 198

Almost all museums struggle with problems of restoration and storage, and these have now become urgent issues requiring resolution. The construction of modern storage facilities was linked with restorers' workshops and studios. Then came the planning and realisation of complex buildings such that besides the two initial tasks they also serve exhibition and research. Recent years have seen the birth of such institutes, while others, including the Budapest National Museum Restoration and Storage Centre, are being built or in the planning stage. **WORLD CONSERVATION AND EXHIBITIONS CENTRE – BRITISH MUSEUM** The British Museum's new unit, with its state-of-the-art equipment and services, is open for those interested in restoration, scholarly research and the management of collections. The renowned Rogers Stirk Harbour + Partners (RSHP), advocates of sustainable architecture, in the course of establishing the architectural technology employed both passive and renewable energy sources, involving less consumption and fewer harmful emissions. **LIÉVIN – LOUVRE** The changes effecting major museums have also reached the Louvre. Here RSHP was also commissioned to design its new storage and restoration centre. Its location, however, is the city of Liévin, 200 kilometres to the north of Paris, not far from Louvre-Lens. Completion of the project is expected for 2018, while moving the collections is anticipated to be finalised in 2023. **MOSCOW – PUSHKIN STATE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS** According to plans, by 2019 the interior and exterior of the Pushkin Museum will be almost entirely transformed. The plans have been drawn up within the framework of a new 'Museum City'. They include the construction of additional underground galleries. As a result of the 'Museum City' project, the floor space of the Pushkin Museum will double, and the museum management hopes that this will lead to a tripling of the annual number of visitors. It is clear that storage and restoration centres are increasingly needed for the successful functioning and development of museums. Yet the reasons for their establishment are not always similar. The aim can be to transform an old listed museum building in order to accommodate new tasks (British Museum), or, in contrast, to transfer as many objects as possible from an old building, which can no longer be developed, to a large external location (Louvre-Liévin). The latter can understandably generate opposition in the profession, but in the absence of other solutions it has to be accepted. The new centres can justly be perceived as innovation centres in the museum world. What will be involved besides storage and restoration is different in each case. For the most part it will be research and exhibiting. However, one thing is certain – these centres represent the most significant development in 21st-century museums and are examples of producing the most results and innovations.

WHO TELLS THE STORY OF TÚRÓ RUDI?

Conversation with László Puczkó, Tourism Consultant

by Péter Hamvay

p. 207

“I don’t believe that in the constant competition you can gain the attention of young people with more gadgets. Rather you have to encourage the museum visitor to leave behind the everyday treadmill.” So says tourism and experience consultant László Puczkó. For almost 20 years László Puczkó has been concerned with the process whereby visitors can be provided with lasting experiences. We seek sights and experiences in our free time or as tourists. At university it became clear for him that he would like to be engaged with these areas, which are challenging and require creative thinking. Cultural and heritage tourism can be considered the link between tourism and museums, since public and private collections in many towns are main elements of tourism. László Puczkó graduated from Art and Design Management studies at the Hungarian University of Art and Design, since the cultural and creative fields appeared appropriate alternatives, and it was apparent that a business background can be well combined with the fields of culture and art. Museums were not created with tourism in mind, nor is that the primary concern today. They exist in order to preserve, to understand and to present something which represents a part of culture. The perspectives of tourism at most come to the fore in the manner of presentation. The same theme has to be explained differently to a Japanese tourist, to the average Hungarian visitor, to a child and to the X and Y generations. You have to decide whether to present a short-term, funfair-like experience or something lasting, involving the acquisition of knowledge. Clearly a museum aims to offer the latter. People are looking for stories in a museum. Regarding the professionalism of exhibitions, naturally specialists have to be involved, but the script doesn’t have to be prepared by them alone. The same principles have to be employed as are used with any film or series, such that it is precisely known at what minute attention begins to slacken, when a new thread has to be introduced to the story, what kind of characters appeal to people. It is not necessary to present a soap opera in a museum, but it should be clear that the thinking of children and today adults, too, is defined by films and internet content. Thus if you want to reach them you have to employ similar approaches. Very few people set out on a journey simply to view an exhibition. You can learn a lot from, among others, the Austrians. Of course Mozart – with not only the music but primarily the story – can be offered to the public more easily and more broadly than Bartók. You would have to decide what the Budapest experience comprises and build that up. Take, for example, the alcoholic drink Unicum, which is relatively well-known but which still doesn’t have an exciting presentation. Or maybe the chocolate-covered curd cheese snack Túró Rudi could have a visitor centre.

“I SHOULD DO EVERYTHING MUSEUM SPECIALISTS DON’T DO”

Conversation with Márta Lovas about the Beginnings of Museum Education in Hungary

by Ágnes Karácsony

p. 213

Márta Lovas was one of the founders of Hungary’s modern museum education. She headed the National Museum’s education department from 1976 until her retirement in 1997. With her colleagues she organised specialist activities in Hungary, namely museum education and museum marketing. At the time a single concept covered the related tasks – public education. Each of their projects – e.g. the Museum Play Day and the Museum Historical Playhouse – was based on a pedagogical method they devised. Two years ago Márta Lovas was presented with the Museum Education Lifetime Achievement award. Now in her 75th year, *MúzeumCafé* spoke with her. She graduated from university in pedagogy and Hungarian language and literature, then worked for ten years in the 19th district dealing with public education. With her experience of event organising, editing and press relations, she applied to head the National Museum’s public education department. Her tasks were summarised by ‘do everything the museum specialists don’t do’. In the 70s the Museum’s exhibitions were staged with educated adults in mind, employing strictly professional considerations. Yet this didn’t generate enjoyment. To fully get to know the institute, she spent a week in each department. She talked with colleagues, became familiar with research techniques, the collections and museological work. She had to make herself accepted. Without trust in her, later her ideas would not have received support. When museum education was launched there was still no professional literature about it in Hungary. At the time it was known as public education and embraced what is now called museum education, marketing and andragogy. It included editing publications, planning catalogues, organising openings, and maintaining relations with the press and public. In the event, from the end of the 70s other museums also started to employ people for such activities. Every year the Museum Restoration and Methodology Centre organised three-day training sessions. Participants learnt a lot about museums’ public education from each other during their discussions. Somehow, what should be done was in the air. A project series about the Reform Era was jointly established with the Fine Arts Museum and the Museum of Ethnography. With the same triple cooperation archaeology-oriented projects were also organised. All this was before the appearance of playhouses in Hungary. It wasn’t a case of giving visitors, mainly young people, instruction about the profession, rather using experiences to present the main processes of the historical periods. The idea was that adults would become frequent museum visitors if as children were accompanied by their parents to exhibitions. Hence family projects such as Museum Morning and Museum Play Day were considered very important. With these there was an interactive experience, which parents and children could discuss.

Ladies, Gentlemen and Colleagues, This year the winner of the *MúzeumCafé* Award was chosen for a lifetime's achievement. I can truly say that there was little dispute among us as to who should receive the award. The staff of the editorial office and the members of the editorial board are all partial to Csilla E. Csorba. She has turned a literary museum into a well liked, well visited cultural centre with incredible endurance, hard work, imposing stamina and enviable creativity. She has done it at a time when teachers and parents are looking for the key as to how classical Hungarian literature can be made readable and enjoyable. Let's face it, if literature is not someone's profession, Jókai will not become part of their life. In their free time they won't read ballads by Arany or the diary of Illyés, nor will they quote from poems by Gyula Juhász or see plays by Madách and Molnár— only rarely is that the way of spending leisure time. A literary museum must start from there. It has to deal with and present writers' careers in such a way that visitors would become motivated to visit an exhibition or a memorial museum. Today an interest has to be cultivated in relations to writers and poets, as well as the museum – this has proved possible in the case of the Petőfi Literary Museum, which has several branch institutes and small museums which it monitors. I am sure the fact that a professional, an art historian and an expert in the visual arts, has been in charge of the museum for more than a decade has largely contributed to the museum's renewal, with the result that the visual design and aesthetics of exhibitions overwriting the earlier text-centred traditions of literary museology have become especially important. It is very difficult to find the right ratio in which visual design does not become sensationalist, does not disguise the absence of content and message, and where the curators do not pass the burden of staging an exhibition on to the visual designer. Yet visitors are not forced to read through a huge amount of text in order to gain sufficient information. Previously *MúzeumCafé* has expressed how highly we regard the Petőfi Literary Museum's endeavour to renew and sustain memorial houses. The project that Csilla Csorba perhaps considers as one of the most important of her achievements has clearly rescued quite a few small museums, together with writers' oeuvres, from an undeserving future and probably from complete oblivion. I must stress that in making the award we do not believe that the success of the museum is due only to Csilla Csorba. Some of those in charge of collections and some among the chief curators started together with her in the museum, and were followed by other generations of literary historians and art historians who have contributed to the experience, such that openness as well as an endeavour for constant renewal have defined the museum's projects and image.

"I CANNOT START A COMPLETELY NEW LIFE"

Conversation with Csilla E. Csorba, this Year's Recipient of the MúzeumCafé Award

by Emőke Gréczi

p. 213

ICsilla Csorba is the retiring director of the Petőfi Literary Museum (PLM) and the recipient of the award established by *MúzeumCafé*. We asked her about, *inter alia*, her early museum experiences, literary museology and exhibiting, and her future plans. When Csilla Csorba joined the museum her colleagues were its founding, older specialists. From the foundation of the PLM in 1954, and even earlier, exhibitions were organised in Petőfi House and other related museums in connection with the then current ideology and the deposited estates. There were exhibitions about Petőfi, Jókai, Radnóti and Attila József, partly in places such as the National Széchényi Library and the National Museum. As a result of reprisals following the 1956 revolution, some people were sent to the museum. Ferenc Jánosi, Imre Nagy's son-in-law was its director from 1955 to 1957. One of those directed there was Dezső Baróti, a French literary history specialist, who when rector of Szeged University had led a demonstration of students in 1956. Despite good relations between the Party leadership and those managing cultural policy, he was given a prison sentence, and although that was later reduced, he was subsequently not permitted to teach. He was sent to work in the museum. Later several noted literary historians helped develop literary museology, textology, critical publications and the database. Many creative specialists work in the PLM – literary historians, librarians and art historians. An exhibition is not prepared on the basis of a script which is given to a designer, rather it's a process in which everything is worked out jointly. The curators present numerous ideas in advance about what they'd like to see, what should be stressed and what the exhibition could be like visually. They explain what they envision, even if they don't know exactly how it all could be realised in practice. The exhibition department has developed the museum's brand. Over the years, the staff have developed the not-so-easy genre of a literary exhibition. The mode of exhibiting is sometimes criticised, though many of its elements are starting to appear in historical and art exhibitions (colouring the walls, texts as elements of design, the importance of the typography, etc.). With the use of performances, visual design, typography and its special interpretation of space, the literary exhibition is a truly multi-arts genre. There is no area of the arts which doesn't relate to literature. What was done in the PLM a long time ago has now become fashionable, namely contemporary writers reflect on the works displayed. Today many galleries invite writers to act as guides. They express things well and have something to say, and they can also explain in another language what is visibly perceptible. Now, Csilla Csorba hopes to have more time to finish her already started work and to continue with her research.



IHa tél vége, akkor busójárás – az álarcos felvonulók minden februárban ellepik Mohács főutcáit. A kifsarsangtól (farsang utolsó csütörtöke) húshagyó keddig tartó, az MFB Magyar Fejlesztési Bank Zrt. által támogatott rendezvénysorozat egyik legfontosabb célja, hogy bemutassa a hagyományőrző népszokásokat, és ápolja azokat. A busók felvonulása nemcsak a télbúcsúztatáshoz-tavaszköszöntéshez kapcsolható, hanem a törökűzés legendájához is, amikor a Mohács-szigetet övező mocsarakba menekült őslakos sokácok a mondák szerint hangoskodva és álarcokkal kizavarták a városból a törököket.

¶ A busójárás Közép-Európa egyik legnagyobb szabadtéri farsangolása, amely már 2009 óta szerepel az UNESCO az emberiség szellemi kulturális világörökségének reprezentatív listáján, és a Magyar Országgyűlés döntése értelmében bekerült a hungarikumok közé.

¶ Idén februárban több mint harminc helyszínen, mintegy nyolcvan programmal várta az érdeklődőket az önkormányzat és a Közkincs Művészeti és Kulturális Közhasznú Egyesület. A hagyományos busóprogramok mellett számos kulturális rendezvényt és műsort kínáltak a szervezők: koncertet adott Szörényi Levente és a Vujicsics Együttes, Herczku Ágnes és a Banda, valamint Versendi Kovács József, a népművészet mestere. Délszláv táncbál, busóavatás, népművészeti és kézműves vásár, valamint a busó ízek bemutatása is színesítette a programot. Nem maradhatott el a kifejezetten az MFB által visszahozott hagyomány, a Nemzetközi Farsangi Dudástalálkozó sem, amelyet már tizedik alkalommal szerveztek meg, és amely a régi busójárások alkalmával fontos, majd elfeledett dudások szerepét állítja vissza. Ilyenkor rendezik az Országos Népzenei Tehetségkutató Versenyt is, amely ugyancsak az MFB támogatásához köthető állandó programmá vált a mohácsi busójáráson.

¶ A busójárás kitüntetett fő napja mindig a vasárnap, az idén ezerháromszáz jelmezes, álarcos vonult végig a Széchenyi térig, hogy aztán estefelé meggyulladjon a máglya a főtéren, majd a látogatók és a helyiek együtt búcsúztassák a teltet. A turisták száma az utóbbi években már meghaladta a százezer főt, közülük is egyre több a külföldi, akik mindannyian kíváncsiak a magyar népszokásokra és hagyományokra.

(x)

múzeumcafé 58

2017/2. április-május

www.muzeumcafe.reblog.hu

www.facebook.com/muzeumcafe

www.muzeumcafe.hu

Szerkesztőbizottság: Baán László, György Péter,
Martos Gábor, Rockenbauer Zoltán,
Török László

Főszerkesztő: Gréczi Emőke

Szerkesztő: Basics Beatrix, Berényi Marianna,
Jankó Judit, Magyar Katalin

Lapterv, tipográfia: Pintér József

Fotó: Szesztay Csanád, Szilágyi Lenke

Korrektor: Szendrői Árpád

Angol fordítás: Bob Dent, Rác Katalin

E számunk szerzői: Bartus Dávid, Basics
Beatrix, Borhy László, Berényi Marianna,
Gréczi Emőke, Hamvay Péter, Jankó Judit,
Juhász Sándor, Karácsony Ágnes, Kovács
Dániel, Kovács Loránd Olivér, Magyar Katalin,
Számadó Emese, Varga Benedek

Szerkesztőség: 1068 Budapest, Szondi utca 77.

E-mail: muzeumcafe@szepmuveszeti.hu

Kiadó: Kultúra 2008 Nonprofit Kft.,
1146 Budapest, Dózsa György út 41.

Lapigazgató: Lévy Zoltán

Lapmenedzser: Bacsa Tibor

bacsatibor.hatvan@gmail.com

Szerkesztőségi koordinátor: Sarkantyú Anna

Nyomdai munkák: EPC Nyomda, Budaörs

Felelős vezető: Mészáros László

ISSN szám: HU ISSN 1789-3291

Lapnyilvántartási engedély száma:

163/0588-1/2007

Terjesztés: A Lapker Zrt. országos hálózatán
keresztül a Relay és az Inmedio kiemelt
üzleteiben

További árusítók helyek: Szépművészeti Múzeum
– Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, Magyar Nemzeti
Múzeum, Ludwig Múzeum – Kortárs Művészeti
Múzeum, Néprajzi Múzeum, Magyar
Kereskedelmi és Vendéglátóipari Múzeum,
Múcsarnok, Magyar Fotográfusok Háza/Mai
Manó Ház, Fővárosi Állat- és Növénykert,
Ferenczy Múzeumi Centrum (Szentendre),
Művészetek Palotája, Kieselbach Galéria,
Kogart, Írók Boltja, Rózsavölgyi Zeneműbolt,
Kódex Könyvárúház, Fuga Budapesti
Építészeti Központ

Kedvezményes előfizetési díj

2017. évre lapszámonként 990 Ft,
az elofizetes@muzeumcafe.hu
e-mail címen.

Lapunk a terjesztési hálózaton belül
1390 Ft áron vásárolható meg.

Tilos a kiadvány bármely fotójának, írott
anyagának vagy azok részletének a kiadó
írásbeli engedélye nélküli újraközlése.