

summary

The renovation of the Museum of Fine Arts' Romanesque Hall directed attention to the plaster casts stored there. Several planning processes aimed at settling the situation of these replicas and the rehabilitation of the collection were launched from the early 2000s. This was facilitated by an international trend, which had brought renewed appreciation for plaster casts from the 1980s onwards. Copies were already made of the most important sculptural works at art academies in the 18th century but the golden age of collecting plaster casts and exhibiting them in museums only came in the second half of the 19th century. In the early 20th century, art historians questioned the need for these collections, thus the museum profession noticeably turned towards the acquisition of original artworks. This shift in the concept of museums resulted in countless collections of replicas becoming neglected and partly or fully destroyed. Such collections were in a peculiar situation in the USA as they were the most affected by the change in the museum approach in the 1920s and 1930s: a great number of institutions tried to get rid of their 'useless' plaster casts. Although many American universities established collections of copies in the late 19th century, only a few of these have survived. The three most prominent museums – the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston and the Art Institute in Chicago not only owned plaster copy collections but based their entire collections on them; yet, none of them have these now. The radical termination of plaster cast collections in the US is partly linked to the museums' having changed their approach to copies already from the 1910s – they increasingly viewed replicas as unnecessary pieces not suitable for exhibition – and to the emergence of wealthy patrons taking an interest in the arts and having the required funds to purchase them. European collections had a slightly different story. The Victoria & Albert Museum in London is regarded by today's museologists as a model institution; its rearranged exhibitions in the past one or two decades serve as examples to be followed by all museum experts. The museum's plaster cast collection is not only impressive thanks to its size but also because it was assembled by Henry Cole, the man who did the most to promote the cause of such collections. He was the initiator of the agreement signed in 1867, which increased the popularity of plaster casts in Europe and provided access for them. The permanent exhibition displaying the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts' collections of copies of antique, medieval and Renaissance sculptures will open in 2019 in the Csillagerőd (Star Fortress) in Komárom. It will be one of the few institutions built solely on plaster copies; indeed, the idea of establishing such museums spans the entire history of plaster copy collections.

According to plans, the Humboldt Forum in Berlin will open with a slight delay, at the end of 2019. The budget of Germany's largest-scale cultural project of recent years will amount to 620.5 million euros, out of which a hefty 92.5 million comes from the direct contribution of taxpayers, making it the biggest community project of all time. The twin towns of Berlin and Cölln II, situated on the two banks of the River Spree, owe their ascent to Frederick II ("the Iron"), prince-elect of Brandenburg, who started the construction of the new Hohenzollern residence by the Cölln bank of the river. It was prince-elect Frederick III (King of Prussia from 1701 as Frederick I), who commissioned court architect Andreas Schlüter to rebuild the residence into a royal palace, or *Schloss*. Schlüter's palace had a square plan, with some of the old buildings on the bank of the Spree functioning as the eastern wing. He applied a unified style to the entire inner courtyard as well as to the southern, western and northern street facades. Schlüter was relieved of his office in 1706 and the project was taken over by Johann Friedrich Eosander, alias von Göthe, who doubled the basic area of the complex by attaching another court towards the other branch of the Spree. He used Schlüter's basic forms on the exterior facades, while building a triumphal arch-like main gate on the new, western main facade. The complex, completed in 1716, only received its crowning element, already envisioned by Eosander – the dome above the main entrance – much later, in 1845–1853, when it was implemented by Friedrich August Stüler based on Karl Friedrich Schinkel's design. The Schloss was devastated by the bombing of Berlin, and in 1950 the communist party ordered the blowing up and clearing away of the ruins upon the personal command of Walter Ulbricht. The only part preserved in its original material was gate IV, from the balcony of which, as legend has it, Karl Liebknecht declared the republic in 1918; this section was built into the State Council headquarters, erected on the adjacent plot (1962–1964). The GDR's new parliament building was constructed from 1973 to 1976. The Palast der Republic, symbolising a break with the past even in its name, was not only home to the national assembly: the modern glass façaded building also operated as a conference and entertainment centre. Following the change in the political system it was closed and became unusable. The German parliament enacted the rebuilding of the Palast in 2002. It was finally demolished in 2008, and many ideas arose for its future function; the winning concept was a complex cultural programme called the Humboldt Forum. The new building will house two museums: the Ethnological Museum and the Asian Art Museum. Its operation will be managed by a foundation; the Stiftung Humboldt Forum im Berliner Schloss, which will co-ordinate the work of the autonomous institutions.

THE TOWN THAT NEVER WAS

(a Jewish quarter is not Disneyland)

Péter György

p. 91

What a Jewish quarter is is an unanswerable normative question that critical social science avoids answering for good reason. The concept, which requires a delicate historical approach, was introduced in Hungary in recent years by people with the conviction – respectable but not necessarily to be acted upon – that the essence of the Jewry that penetrated historical space can and should be translated into cultural spaces. In the meantime, the followers of *social constructivism*, i.e. the users of notions dependent on *chronotopes*, learnt a lot from urban historians about the fact that conceptual history, which follows conceptual changes and creates new meanings, made the dramatic differences that existed in regard to expectations and experiences between the 17th–18th centuries and the 19th century as well as between the various regions of Europe visible in the urban space. Belonging to social classes, regions and districts impacted the representations of identity as much as the image of the eternal Jew, the myth of the permanence of the Jewry, and the imprints of observing religious ordinances in the urban space. What happened until 1938 might be a closed chapter of history but making it non-existent in retrospect is a logical absurdity. We are affected by every event that happened, every deposited stratum, even if we do not wish to be, even if others see us different and differently: i.e. not as Jews but an individual who in a certain context could even be regarded a Jew, but this alone has no real meaning or significance. It might also be the case that the contemporary use of the term ‘Jewish quarter’ – i.e. its new conceptual history – is not linked to unbiased descriptions but is fundamentally connected to the idea of ‘redeeming’ the *unredeemable* Holocaust in the politics of remembrance, virtually and morally. The symbolic reconstruction of the architectural environment once also inhabited by Jews, or more accurately by residents who, by the end of their lives, were ‘turned into Jews’ despite what they had believed to be their own history is – should be – addressed *not* as an issue of those who were ousted from the nation but that of the entire Hungarian society. The question is ‘merely’ this: what can we do and when do we act right if we want to make visible all that was made invisible by state socialism after the Holocaust, when cultural and political identities were exiled from the public sphere for decades: dead and living Jews alike. There are many urbanistic solutions that can be used in the politics of remembrance to act on the moral command of a symbolic redemption of wrongs: such examples include Günther Demnig’s Stolperstein project – the stumbling stones placed in the living tissue of Berlin and creating a map of commemoration – and the minimalist historical and symbolic reconstruction of the mass grave in the garden of the Synagogue in Budapest’s Dohány Street.

Museums are pseudo places to start with. Places that *ab ovo* create pseudo reality. At an exhibition the museum and the visitor enter into a contract, according to which both parties know that a chair on display is not an ordinary chair but a chair in a museum, and as such is stripped of many of its functions – it is not for sitting on for example – and it is given many new attributes, such as it cannot be sold and converted and it must be protected against any form of damage... etc. Both parties are mutually aware of all this and thus jointly sustain the appearance of a pseudo reality. The pact is in effect up to the point when one of the parties terminates or starts thinking or stating that the museum narrative is reality itself or that the basis of the museum narrative is not reality but a fiction. The Anna exhibition staged by the Hungarian National Museum in 2017–18 stretched the limits of the above-described pact to extremes. It was built on a story with a biography invented by the curators and presented as if a woman shared the story of her life. She talked about the 20th-century life of Sekler women in the first person singular, as if it was her own reality. Her story suggested that women were vulnerable in the face of events. The exhibits provided the pseudo background for this story. The exhibition posed the question: what would happen if we could live our lives twice. As if in the final judgement it could be asked: what would have happened if a mother had decided differently about her child-to-be and it could all be started again from scratch. However, it is as if the two live stories had reached the same destination. This fictitious story was part of the 'museum pact' and it was easy to imagine as if it had actually happened. In historical museums history is related mostly through objects. The selected objects are assigned meaning and function as proof and testament to a constructed history, which creates order and hierarchy and establishes continuity between past and present. History substitutes the place of missing objects, it fills the gaps and bridges the hiatus. In this regard, the Anna exhibition was a historical exhibition, although it included ethnographic artefacts too. It conveyed a clear narrative, assisted by objects that fit the exhibition concept. The historical narrative of the Anna exhibition was built on the historical and ethnographic practice in which the narration of a life's story is used as an illustration: as if the individual is needed as a vehicle to narrate the story with. The story is fully credible, realistic – yet fictitious. The option of posing the question "what if..." was built into the exhibition experience, giving visitors the opportunity to stop at the end of the narrated life story and return to the crossroads to walk along another possible life path.

Fashion brands and museums are built on the logic of medial mass culture, which had amalgamated by the 19th century, and their similar modus operandi includes numerous shared components such as world fairs, urban spaces, spectacular mass-scale events etc. This question also has several contemporary manifestations. Firstly, there is the case of contemporary art museums as well as art and cultural centres financed by fashion brands. The first important example of this model was the *Fondation Cartier pour l'art contemporain*, established in 1984 by Cartier, the French luxury brand specialised in accessories. The foundation opened on the outskirts of Paris, and in the early 1990s it started to look for a location in Paris: they moved into a newly opened spectacular building, designed by Jean Nouvel, in Montparnasse in 1994. Cartier thus created the first example of a type of museum whose aim is to provide patronage for contemporary art; the venues for these institutions are mostly buildings designed by star architects. Also forming part of the contemporary landscape of the meeting points between fashion and museums are exhibitions dedicated to fashion designers and those curated by fashion designers. This 'trend' had reached its prominence by the late 2000s with paradigm-setting examples such as the Jean Paul Gaultier exhibition in 2011 in the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, which toured six cities in six years to return to Montreal in 2017. The history of fashion entering the museum scene was opened by an iconic journalist for Harper's Bazaar and then that of Vogue, Diana Vreeland, who became the curator of the Costume Institute of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. The exhibitions she mounted were praised for elevating fashion to the rank of high art and ushering discussion about fashion designers into the context of art discourse. The process of the 'artification' of fashion designers began in the late 19th century and resulted in a new phenomenon: similarly to the stars of other fields of cultural production, individual fashion designers had museums dedicated to them. These memorial houses pose many questions similar to those emerging in the case of exhibitions centred on geniuses in other areas: To what extent can an individual's life be turned into a show? Can the trap of creating a biographic illusion be avoided? At what point does the display of personal relics reach the limit of profanation? How can personality be exhibited? Fashion undoubtedly models late modern, visually oriented 20th-century cultural consumption but it also uses many valid curatorial logics borrowed from other cultural industries. Its cult-building and model of authenticity confirm the inspiration of literature and the highly canonised art scenes, while the presentation of fashion designers in museums also follows the content-making strategies of historical and social scenes, and does so in the spirit of hybridisation and re-aesthetisation.

Ethnographic literature uses the term *rapsic* for lonely poachers of fish and game. Poaching, or *rapsicing*, used in the everyday use of the word meant illegal, unlicensed hunting and fishing. Borrowing this term, the phrases cultural and heritage rapsic have been coined to refer to collections that cannot be squeezed into the conceptual framework of either official or amateur museums. My writing will discuss those collections with a basically ethnographic theme that cannot be regarded as museums yet often use the term when referring to themselves. The last decade has seen a mushrooming of institutions – virtually all tourist attractions and ensembles of objects displayed to the public are ‘exhibition’ venues – that advertise themselves as a kind of museum, this in most cases only being a marketing ploy. The definition of what a museum is internationally accepted but it can also be clearly defined based on Hungarian regulations too. A museum is not an authoritarian entity but a syncretic institution realised with the involvement of the public; it is a venue for aesthetic contemplation and entertainment, the appreciation and consumption of art, an individual and communal place. I could say: the institutions satisfying these criteria are the professionals. In recent years, participation and participative museology have come to the fore in Hungarian museum discourse. It is often a challenge to curators to adapt to a new approach when the existing museum structures are decades old and to change the MUSEUM’s declarative, frontal role into an inclusive attitude that generates a dialogue. The public has been able to visit more and more ethnographic and local history collections in past decades; these institutions mostly define themselves as village or local museums. They are the result of the decades long collecting efforts of passionate local historians and amateur researchers, often providing the imprints of the material heritage of the local communities. Village and local museums were typically operated and maintained by the county museum network up until the 1990s, when the small local museums were returned to the municipal maintenance of settlements, often without experts being involved in the professional work of the institutions. This unfortunate situation was realised by the founders of the Hungarian Association of Local Museums, a civil organisation providing professional help for collections. A separate directorate, set up within the Open-air Museum (Skanzen), has coordinated and supported these small collections since 2017. Another group of *rapsic* museums are collections created by enthusiastic private collectors of a certain type of object or period who make their collections accessible to the public. We have been witnessing the emergence of doll, toy, radio and television ‘museums’ and retro ‘collections’, many of which are clearly tourist attractions.

Pseudo: something that is fake, sham, not authentic but appears to be so. This term has been used in the museum field for centuries along with its application to artefacts. Pseudo, or ‘appearing genuine’ but not so and in some cases the reproduction of old, authentic works generally appeared in European cultural history in the mid-18th century, from which time there was an increasing trend of publications with illustrations of historic artefacts. Although the original works were not accessible to many, the later replicas were available to all and these were later widely used as ‘authentic’. Public discourse in regard to the original and its ‘re-make’ started to change in the late 19th century; the professional-academic views on this subject ranged from rejection through reservations to acceptance. This is exemplified, for example, by the shift in attitude museums took to the use of replicas with the aim of completing their collections. ‘Perfect series’ were needed when it came to paintings too; hence, well or lesser known artists received commissions in the 1880s to make copies of Hungarian masterpieces included in collections abroad so that the presentation of the masters of our national history in the Hungarian National Museum could be made complete. In the data submitted in 1893 for the government’s report on the state of public education, the museum’s director, Károly Pulszky, mentioned the completion of the museum’s copies, which were made of “artworks whose originals cannot be acquired for our collection...”. The above was not the only case when pseudo artworks were regarded on a par with originals in order to complete a collection. Indeed, the above late 19th-century story was repeated in the early 21st century in the national museum of a country with a special history. The National Museum of New Zealand in Wellington, called Te Papa Tongarewa – which the public simply refers to by its Maori name “Te Papa” – hosted an exhibition series from the first decade of the 2000s with the aim of presenting the nation’s migrant groups. But let us put aside our European attitude to migrants: in New Zealand ‘migrants’ are the majority of the current population who once arrived here, when the land was inhabited by the indigenous Maoris. The exhibitions devoted to the Indian, Asian and later European migrant groups included a controversial one about Scottish migrants, in connection with which the curator called attention to the importance of the authentic and the pseudo in exhibitions of art and history. In the latter case, he said, the objects at our disposal are used to tell a story; in other words, artefacts should not be adjusted to the story but they – which the migrant predecessors found important to preserve – should be the basis for telling a story.

The place of replicas in museums is not a newly emerged question but with the changes in the general approach and the attitude to visitors' needs that have taken place in public collections in recent years, the function of authentic replicas has also been modified. They have an ever-increasing role in resolving the conflict between the various roles of museums, namely conservation, exhibition, education and entertainment. In reconstructions of artefacts the emphasis is on the application of old techniques and materials used for the original items since concrete information is provided to museum visitors about their weight, texture and operation on the captions in the showcases or placed next to the exhibits. The situation is entirely different in the case of 'tangible' replicas specifically made to facilitate understanding or access, and those available in museum gift shops. There is an online business, for example, that sells 3D, holographic and classical copies of the Rosetta Stone. One such replica is found in the British Museum, where the original is also preserved: a tangible authentic replica of the Rosetta Stone – whose original is displayed here alongside Egyptian statues – is included in the exhibition devoted to the Age of Enlightenment in the former Royal Library. These are only a few examples of replicas displayed in museums, but a plethora of reasons and objectives justify the inclusion of replicas among authentic artefacts and artworks. This solution has become completely accepted in the case of fragile and vulnerable objects for the reason of conservation, similarly to cases when replicas are used to illustrate technical solutions and the skills of old masters during experimental archaeological and restoration projects. When the ambition of presenting a full collection of system arises, the missing items are frequently substituted by replicas too. At the same time, it is common practice that museums ask themselves certain questions when contemplating the inclusion of replicas. Up to what point is a replica authentic and from what point is it not? Are the criteria always the same? What distinguishes a replica from a fake? What is more important: to present or to preserve the original? Do reconstructions reduce the value of the originals and the authenticity of the museum environment? The use of replicas in historical exhibitions is unproblematic as long as the institution clearly states that the exhibits are not the original objects. This completely changes in the case of art museums since reproductions do not convey the same emotive context as originals artworks do. The digital databases of the largest museums do include replicas; their strategies validate the use of this object type.

The museological analysis of stadiums and sports venues is a relatively new phenomenon, yet has been generating significant literature: numerous theoretical and practical texts address the issue of sport(s) as a cultural heritage. More and more attention is devoted to the identity-forming role of 'stadium tours', which exist in many branches of sport worldwide, as well as to the marketing function of sports museums. In the literature produced so far, stadiums with a historical past *are not pseudo* but they are *the thing*, i.e. museum-like sites, akin to parliament buildings, cemeteries and churches. The article first discusses London's Wembley Stadium, which does not have an 'exhibition' in the classical sense of the world, understood as a national memorial site. This will be followed by Budapest's Groupama Arena (first named after Flórián Albert and now after its sponsor) with its exhibition documenting the story of the FTC, the most popular and successful Hungarian sports club of all time. Finally, the buildings and exhibitions of the Puskás Academy and the Pancho Arena in Hungary will be surveyed, these being new buildings, not distinguished by a historical heritage but memorable for their architectural solutions and private collections. Today sport is clearly seen as part of our universal and national cultural heritage; thus sites and institutions such as 'walls of fame', sports museums and stadium tours are not only attractions but also cultural venues and events, which generate profit on the side. Stadiums also form part of our cultural heritage and follow ancient Greek models in many respects: their designs and scale are steeped in the traditional system of sports, while their unique grand stands and service facilities, often virtuosic architectural details as well as compelling interaction of forms and colours cater to contemporary needs. Stadium tours typically focus on scale, mobile solutions and special architectural elements, sending the message that each stadium has its own architectural character and technical parameters. Stadium tours have undoubtedly become rivals to museums in cities. This is especially true for Barcelona, whose Camp Nou stadium is the most frequented museum (functioning as such when no matches are played), beating the Picasso museum for example: the FC Barcelona Museum attracted only 20 thousand visitors in the year of its opening, 1984; this increased tenfold in the following year and now nearly 2 million tourists flock here every year to view the relics from the 120-year-old club. Clubs also play a strong branding role, thus stadium tours and museums often (also) function as brand museums: loyalty to a given club (=brand loyalty) attracts visitors, while going on the tour and seeing the exhibition strengthen the identity and commitment of the fan base.

A new feature of contemporary museums and exhibitions is their growing focus on international migration. Besides thematic historical, artistic and ethnographic exhibitions, 'museums of migration' have been emerging in the last decade or so with two main types dictated by the nature of migration: those dealing with emigration and those focussing on the issues of immigration. Examples for the latter can be seen in the big 'immigrant countries', i.e. the USA, Canada, Australia and Brazil, Argentina. More recently, exhibitions with migration as their theme have also appeared in Europe, alongside programmes aimed at openness to migrants and refugees and trying to facilitate their social integration, while scientific and museum centres of migration were established in France, Italy, Scandinavia and Germany. In parallel with this, and based on a history of 150-200 years, new exhibitions and museums of emigration have been established across Europe, and the older institutions have mostly reinterpreted their mission. The history of overseas emigration from European countries can be most spectacularly presented in museums in sea ports, whose renovated and reconstructed old buildings provide an authentic venue. The museum experience is created here by focussing mainly on the conditions of travelling by sea and the hardships along the way and the emphasis is on personal life stories, i.e. the individual experiences, struggles and successes of emigration and integration. The concept of new museums and exhibitions is based on the issue of migration (emigration and immigration) and place less focus on the diasporas that come into being as a result. The waves of emigration that took place in the former Soviet bloc countries after 1945, as well as the periods of the issue of Eastern European refugees are far less researched than the great economic migration. This is also true for Poland, Croatia, Slovenia and Lithuania, where research linked to emigration, migration and foreign diaspora communities have been carried out within an institutional framework for decades; a relatively low number of exhibitions have been based on these findings, and even the history of migration is not presented by the museums of our region. An exception to this is the exhibition organised a few years ago by the Warsaw History Museum, devoted to the 50-year history of the Polish émigré government in London. Also, the Lithuanian Emigration Institute, operating in Kaunas since 2004, has been mounting smaller exhibitions on emigration; however, the history of the most important period of Lithuanian emigration after 1945 from refugee camps to the United States was not organised here in 2014 but in the *Balzekas Lithuanian Museum* in Chicago. The Polish Emigration Museum in Gdynia was the first to act in this regard too: its permanent exhibition includes the history of the forced mass emigration from Poland during the period of political emigration and state socialism.

"THE GREAT PLAIN SANG THROUGH HIM"

Béla Endre died 90 years ago

Veronika Szabó

p. 221

Those who ever dealt with Béla Endre's painting have all called attention to the scarcity of the written and pictorial representation of his art. This article, lent special topicality by the 90th anniversary of the artist's death, seeks to amend the conventional art historical approach that tends to place Béla Endre in the shadow of János Tornyai. Its emphasis will not be Endre's pictures but much rather the analysis and presentation of the man who created them. The artist's life and work unfolds not only through his paintings and studies written about him but also his extensive correspondence, in which letters to János Tornyai, Ervin Ybl, János Esperit, Jenő Barcsay, Géza Szász, Gyula Rudnay, János Pásztor, Lajos Kiss and Zsigmond Móricz, among others, as well as his own family members (his wife, father, aunt and daughter Sára) have survived. Béla Endre was born on 19 November 1870 as the only child of a wealthy middle-class family living in the Black House (Mayer mansion) in Szeged. He often accompanied his father, an engineer at the Flood Control Company, to the River Tisza. After completing his primary and secondary education, he enrolled in the Technical University of Budapest – driven by his father's ambition – in 1892. During the two years he studied there his artistic talent soon manifested in his drawings and caricatures. One of his fellow students, János Zsebők, and other friends encouraged him to change his course and, upon his father's consent, he left the university and embarked upon the path of becoming a painter. His studies were enriched by a one-year trip to Rome in 1895. After returning from Rome, Béla Endre went to paint the willows on the bank of the Tisza several times; it was then that he became captivated by the beauty of the landscape and the idea grew in him to pursue his art here. He mainly stayed in Hódmezővásárhely, where he settled, and in summers he went to the village of Mártély. In January 1898 he travelled again to Italy for a short vacation and photography emerged as his new passion. In summer 1898 Endre met János Tornyai, who, as a member of the older generation of painters, had already experienced the art patronage of Paris. The young Endre travelled to Paris in autumn 1898 and enrolled in the Académie Julian, which he included in his autobiographical novel. He kept up regular correspondence with his father; the legacy preserved in the Hungarian National Gallery, contains ample written material attesting to their relationship. The friendship that developed between Béla Endre and János Tornyai lasted all his life, and the two artists regularly participated together in exhibitions. Béla Endre devoted most of his time to landscapes. It was the tranquil landscape of Mártély that drew the painter in 1928, when, ten days before his death, he retreated to the weir keeper's house to get away from the daily rut and the anxiety of future plans. It was here that his dead body was found.

THE METABOLISM OF BUILDINGS

Post Otto Wagner. *Von der Postsparkasse zur Postmoderne, Vienna, MAK*

Zuh Deodáth, *Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences*

p. 233

The dual meaning of 'Post' in the title of the seasonal exhibition on architectural theory and the history of ideas staged by the Viennese *Museum für Angewandte Kunst* (MAK) may well puzzle the public. *From the Post Savings Bank to the Postmodern*, reads the subtitle, added with the intention of clarifying the main title. Did the organisers wish to pay tribute to an era, perhaps even a critical assessment? Or did they want to say something novel and fresh about the relationship between premodern and postmodern architecture? The panel by the entrance with an excerpt-like summary accurately states that viewers are not about to see a monographic exhibition providing an overview of works by Wagner, his followers and critics accompanied by architectural issues and – most often – clichés linked to them. Regrettably, however, it fails to mention what visitors are in for. It actually is a *conceptional exhibition, and one of the better kinds*. It does not seek to make ideas its subject instead of buildings represented by chairs, plans and mock-ups and using artefacts only to point out that the exhibits are actually ideas. On the contrary, it argues that without conceptional knowledge we cannot understand objects and buildings that we praise or criticise. Some architects (with Wagner being an emblematic figure) give us the necessary tools to help us make sense of the facades, roof structures, walls and household objects that surround us in our everyday lives. Concepts – which these architects followed in their design activity – are the key to understanding. Serving as basic inspiration for Wagner and his contemporaries were those ideas and emphatic statements, whose formulators they often liked to enter into debate with. The most grandiose exhibit of the show is the mock-up of Wagner's Post Savings Bank in Vienna, bedecked with archival documentation. Familiar Hungarian faces emerge in several places: Ödön Lechner, and, most importantly, the Wagner-student István Medgyaszay. However, Hungarian references are only significant in that they illustrate the central idea of the exhibition: truly innovative architects were those who not only discovered that already existing techniques could be transferred to other materials too but also backed it up with a theoretical explanation as to what can be expressed through such a transfer. Although not explicitly stated, there is another intention that spans across the entire exhibition: to demonstrate how architects thought in terms of *total artworks*, which in this case primarily means the constant interdependence of applied art and architecture. The exhibition also devotes serious attention to the architectural and philosophical heritage of prominent students of Otto Wagner, including the Slovenian Jože Plečnik and the Italian-Yugoslav-German Max Fabiani, while unfolding the network that built up around Wagner.

WHAT? TO WHOM? WHY? HOW?

In conversation with Annamária Vígh about Hungarian museum regulations

Ágnes Karácsony

p. 253

Historian Annamária Vígh joined the Budapest History Museum and became the head of its Modern History Department as a museologist. She then started working at the Ministry of Culture in 2000. She was first placed in charge of the museum department and then, until May 2018, of the Public Collections Department, which extended to all Hungarian public collections. After more than 17 years at the ministry, she is now the deputy general-director of the Museum of Fine Arts. She has launched several nationwide museum programmes during her career, and in this interview she helps readers understand what can be regarded as a museum, what is 'only' a public collection, and what we mean by 'pseudo museums' – local museums and collections, teddy bear museums, bicycle museums, clock museums, lamp museums and many more – most of which she actually sees as important parts of the rapidly adapting institutional system of museums. Hungarian museum legislation takes a positively traditional approach. While regulations clearly define the requirements of gaining museum status, it flexibly provides the opportunity for the internal development of the system. The fundamental issues – What? To whom? Why? and How? – have not changed in regard to public collections (i.e. collections created for the public) and form the foundation of today's museum affairs too. This permanence is coupled with the sector's duty to be open to change, thus creating stability for museums in every corner of the world at any time. Hungarian law strictly forbids collections that are not museums to call themselves as such, although there are not sanctioned if they do. They might use the term in their name but, according to the regulations, they have no right to do so as they do not have a license to operate as museums, thus they do not have to comply with strict administrative requirements and opening hours, to mention the most obvious ones; these are not only duties, however, but would also grant countless opportunities, such as participating in tenders. Annamária Vígh is not rigorous in this matter. She feels that in many cases institutions use the term 'museum' out of a sense of pride: to have prestige. Moreover, many substantial collections eventually become real museums. A few 'pseudo museums' might slip into the mix – which would ideally be good to avoid – but it is hard to take action against them. While collections may be given museum status, they can also be stripped of it: there have been many examples of this happening. In some cases, this decision was temporary and the museum rank was restored to the institutions upon the fulfilment of the given requirements. Theoretically speaking, national museum could even lose their museum status if they do not satisfy the legal criteria but there has been no such case so far.



Fotó: Májnik Zsolt

TBarátok örökre – ez volt a mottója az idén 25. alkalommal Százhalombattán megrendezett Summerfest Nemzetközi Folklórfesztiválnak. Augusztus 12. és 22. között 19 ország mintegy 900 táncosa találkozott, hogy ízelítőt adjon egymásnak nemzetük értékeiből, népük kincseiből, hagyományaiból, mintha egy-egy képzletbeli gyűjteményt, múzeumot mutatnának be. A Magyar Fejlesztési Bank – amely a rendezvényhez hasonlóan ugyancsak negyedszázados jubileumot ünnepel az idén – támogatásával segítette a Magyarok Öröksége Alapítvány által szervezett rendezvény megvalósulását. A folklórfesztivál sajátossága, hogy a külföldi táncosok százhalombattai családoknál laknak a rendezvény ideje alatt, és szinte az egész várost lázban tartja, kihez milyen nemzetiségű vendégek érkeznek, és hogy hány barátság születik a tíz nap alatt.

¶ Az idei fesztivál díszvendége Kárpátalja volt, ami meghatározó a fesztivál jövője szempontjából, hiszen ettől az évtől Kárpátalja mindig jelen lesz a fesztiválon. A nyitó ünnepségen a Magyar Állami Népi Együttes lépett fel *Megidézett Kárpátalja* című műsorával, majd a rendezvénysorozat ideje alatt bemutatkozott a beregszászi Illyés Gyula Magyar Nemzeti Színház és a Kárpátalja Táncegyüttes is. Az idei Summerfestre az Amerikai Egyesült Államok Idaho államából, Bolíviából, Észak-Ciprusról, Dél-Koreából, Észtországból, Franciaországból, Jakutföldről, Kirgizisztánból, Oroszországból, Tatárországból, Mexikóból, Panamából, Paraguayból, Tahitiről, Tajvanból, Thaiföldről és Törökországból érkeztek együttesek, tagjaik – érdekességképpen – összesen 195 ezer kilométert utaztak, mintegy 276 millió forintért vásárolták meg a menetjegyeket, és 36 tonna jelmezt és hangszer hoztak magukkal öt kontinensről. A fesztivál lebonyolításában majdnem száz önkéntes vett részt.

¶ A legtöbb programelemet a korábbi években már megszokott nagy érdeklődés kísérte: sokan vettek részt a fesztiválklubon, a kiemelt koncerteken és a gyerekeknek, családoknak szóló programokon. Csaknem 80 ezren voltak kíváncsiak Boban Marković és zenekara koncertjére, és óriási volt az érdeklődés az Aranyszív gála iránt, amelyen sérült fiatalok a százhalombattai Forrás Néptáncegyüttesel karöltve léptek fel. A záró ceremónia egyik legkülönlegesebb előadása a világzenekar játéka volt. A részt vevő országok valamennyi zenésze saját, autentikus hangszerével állt színpadra: tizenkilenc ország 117 zenésze adta elő Berlioz *Rákóczi-indulóját* Pál Lajos vezényletével. (x)

múzeumcafé 67

2018/4. szeptember-október

www.muzeumcafe.reblog.hu

www.facebook.com/muzeumcafe

www.muzeumcafe.hu

Szerkesztőbizottság: Baán László, E. Csorba

Csilla, György Péter, Martos Gábor,

Rockenbauer Zoltán, Török László

Főszerkesztő: Gréczi Emőke

Szerkesztő: Basics Beatrix, Berényi Marianna,

Karácsony Ágnes, Magyar Katalin

Lapterv, tipográfia: Pintér József

Fotó: Szesztay Csanád, Szilágyi Lenke

Korrektor: Szendrői Árpád

Angol fordítás: Sarkady-Hart Krisztina,

Adrian Hart

E számunk szerzői: Basics Beatrix, Berényi

Marianna, Fejős Zoltán, Gréczi Emőke,

György Péter, Herczog Noémi, Karácsony

Ágnes, Keszeg Anna, Kovács Dániel,

Kómár Éva, Kuti Klára, Magyar Katalin,

Sári Zsolt, Szabó Veronika, Sz. Fejes Ildikó,

Szőcs Miriam, Zuh Deodáth

Szerkesztőség: 1068 Budapest, Szondi utca 77.

E-mail: muzeumcafe@szepmuveszeti.hu

Kiadó: Kultúra 2008 Nonprofit Kft.,

1146 Budapest, Dózsa György út 41.

Lapigazgató: Lévay 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 árusítóhelyek: 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

2018. 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.