

Hungarian Folk Art Exhibitions in the USA in 1914

Zoltán Fejős

The March 7 issue of the New York Hungarian daily *Amerikai Magyar Népszava* [American Hungarian People's Voice] briefly announced that soon a Hungarian folk art exhibition will open in the city. What happened was that the National Arts Club had decided that the American public should become acquainted with the "wonderful products of Hungarian folk art that are admired world-wide." The announcement added that the exhibition will be held on the Club's premises from the 11th of March on. In charge of the event will be Sándor Konta, which in itself will guarantee the exhibition's excellent quality. This development, went on the news-report, was largely the initiative of J. Nilsen Laurvik who spent much time the previous summer in Hungary and acquainted himself with Hungarian folk art, in fact became "an instant admirer of it" and established a collection from its products.¹ The paper also informed its readers about the exhibition's opening day. Among those in attendance were several illustrious persons, including Geroge F. Kunz, the CEO of the Tiffany firm; Madame Gadski, the celebrated opera singer; Adolf Stern the textile manufacturer, and Géza D. Berkó, the *Népszava*'s editor. According to another newspaper report, a representative of the Tsar of Russia was also present, about whom more will be said later. The ceremonies were commenced by the orchestra playing the *Rákoczi March* and Hungarian orchestral works were featured throughout the evening. The exhibition lasted two weeks and was free to the public. The *Népszava* reported that beautiful products of folk art were exhibited but never went into detail in describing them neither in its report on the exhibition's opening nor at any time later.²

Another Hungarian-American daily, the *Szabadság* of Cleveland, also reported on the event. It emphasized that the exhibition

lauded the Hungarian people's tastes and skills in arts and that it let the American public know that there is a handicraft industry in Hungary whose products can be used to decorate elegant homes. The report was signed "Botond" — which was no doubt the pen-name of paper's New York correspondent. His article was clearer and better composed than those of the *Népszava* other journalists. He wrote more about handicrafts and consumer goods than folk art. He pointed out that the German-Americans were not organizing folk art exhibitions but imported million dollars' worth of handicrafts. The products they brought in for the Christmas market were largely the products of German handicraft industry resulting in profits for the craft-makers of the Grand Duchy of Baden, the villages in the neighbourhood Nuremberg — without having to leave their home country and emigrating to America. In contrast to this, the news-report went on, Hungary exports little to America and the products of the Hungarian crafts can hardly be found in America's retail outlets — in spite of the fact these crafts often surpassed in quality those of other nations. The reporter contended that an exhibition such as the one put on by the National Arts Club in New York and a similar one being planned for San Francisco, can only be moral successes especially for private entrepreneurs, and leave them without any profits. The promotion of Hungarian crafts on America's markets could only be done effectively through state-sponsored advertising campaigns. This journalist's message is undoubtedly practical, we might say "American": "A special Hungarian exhibition," he concluded, "which is well advertised and to which the masses of Americans can be attracted, can be not only moral but also monetary success. The millionaires would order items for their homes..."³ Botond evaluated the Hungarian exhibition not from the point of view not of folk art but from that of commercial possibilities. This latter viewpoint was hardly the original concept of the exhibition's sponsors, as we shall see later, who meant to emphasize the exhibited items' originality rather than marketability.

At the same time the article in the Hungarian paper made a valuable marginal note in that it pointed to two concrete cases — which it deemed examples of unexploited possibilities that might serve with information for the marketing of Hungarian needlework. "Not long ago," it can be read at the start of the article, "in one New York department store they were selling embroidery from Kalotaszeg, a notable regional folk art centre in Hungary (today in Romania). It was popular with the customers. They sold everything they imported. "The

store ordered more but on receiving the order the price was adjusted upward and the order was cancelled.” “I recall” — continued the article — “that a compatriot of ours wanted to import gilded embroidery from the Pozsony (today’s Bratislava) area, but the prices were so high that the items could only be sold at a loss. No one wants to incur losses because of patriotic feelings when doing business, and the importation of such embroidery fell through.”⁴

These two unrealized plans prove that in American-Hungarian commercial circles, as well as among American retailers, there was an interest in the importation of handicraft items from Hungary, and the planning of the exhibition by the art committee also suggest that such interest was there, but we have very few records as to the extent of such commerce and its significance is beyond the scope of our present inquiry.

The National Arts Club had been established in 1898 by Charles De Kay, poet, author, and art critic for the *New York Times*. His aim was to call American society’s attention to art and to popularise American art. By 1906 the Club was in possession of a substantial collection when it moved into its new premises, which continues to serve as its home. The building had been renovated by its former owner, New York Governor Samuel Tilden. It is located across from Gramercy Park on 19th Street, three blocks north of Union Square.⁵ In the years after 1900 the Club used to stage a dozen exhibitions a year playing a role in the popularisation of new branches of art, such as photography and decades later, video art. The exhibition it staged in 1914 about Hungarian folk art, more precisely peasant art, fitted into this programme of popularisation of novel art-forms. It was linked to the Club’s annual exhibition of “arts and crafts”, but even within this it was greeted by the press as a novelty. In 1913 the Club had staged an exhibition of German industrial arts. Right before the Hungarian exhibition, the Club had organized an exhibition of contemporary art that featured the latest experiments in modern art.⁶ It was in this connection that William B. McCormick, a *New York Press* art critic, wrote that the Hungarian art exhibition served as an excellent “rebuke” of the “collection of Modernist horror” of the previous exhibition. “The National Arts Club,” McCormick continued, “has never so nearly reached the implications suggested by its ambitious name as in its Hungarian peasant art exhibition.”⁷

The initiator of the “Hungarian Peasant Art” exhibition was Johan Nilsen Laurvik (1877-1953), the Norwegian-American journal-

ist, art critic, writer, translator of Ibsen, photographer, who in those times was NAC's Chairman of the Committee of Exhibitions. His name re-surfaced — also in a Hungarian context — above all in connection with the great Panama-Pacific International Exposition that was held in 1915 in San Francisco. Laurvik collected and researched the exhibition's European material. The Hungarian aspect of this affair casts a long shadow, for the paintings collected for it, creations of members of the Group of Eight, took most of a decade to be returned to Hungary — and some of them never made it home.⁸ But, this is another story.

At the National Arts Club Laurvik had been involved in exhibitions with a Hungarian theme before. In 1910 the Club had facilitated the exhibition of the works of the Hungarian painter Lajos Márk (1867-1942). For this occasion the painter himself had brought with him thirty-four of his works. In the exhibition's catalogue Laurvik remarked how little the works of East European artists were known in America. The exhibition was opened by László Hegenmüller, the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador to the United States. The audience at the opening ceremonies included the staff of New York's Austro-Hungarian Consulate, and the Hungarian flag was hoisted on the Club's building.⁹ The Hungarian organizers had intended the event to be a demonstration in which the joint Austro-Hungarian diplomatic apparatus — including the Ambassador — could serve Hungarian interests. This came in handy for the diplomatic corps, and countered the criticisms voiced in the Hungarian-American press that Hungarian interests took a back seat in Austro-Hungarian diplomacy. It is worth noting that Lajos Márk, who from this time on spent most of his life in America, became an instant success as a portrait painter. By March of 1913 his portraits were featured in the elegant Gallery Knoedler of Fifth Avenue.¹⁰ Artúr Halmi (1866-1939), another Hungarian artist and a good friend of Márk, was also successful in New York's social circles. His portraits were also exhibited by Gallery Knoedler. At the request of the Hungarian Republican Club Halmi painted a portrait of President Taft which achieved notoriety both in American and Hungarian-American circles.¹¹ The exhibition of the National Arts Club belongs in this artistic tendency that favoured painting and which made it possible for Hungary's cultural elite, together with the Hungarian-American community's leading elements, to build bridges to America's cultural elite. This nationalistic cultural propaganda was directed toward the upper layers of American society. Those in atten-

dance at the opening of the 1914 exhibition — on both sides — were people who “counted”.

In June of 1913 Laurvik travelled to Hungary as the reporter for several American periodicals to cover the proceedings of the 7th International Women’s Suffrage Congress. Folk art, which at the time was at the height of its popularity, attracted Laurvik’s attention. In this the congress’ general atmosphere played a positive role, as did several programs associated with the event. Many delegates to the congress appeared in folk costumes. Among other enthusiasts Jolán Ferenczi came to the gathering dressed as a Slovak peasant woman from Nyitra County — no doubt to advertise her own folk art and handicraft store among the suffragettes attending the conference.¹² In one of the congress’ localities there was an exhibition of Hungarian handicrafts¹³ at which, according to press reports, one American delegate spent a vast sum buying needlework and embroidery.¹⁴ A Hungarian-American merchant refers to this exhibition; subsequently he tried to import more Hungarian handicrafts to stores in California. “I was taken aback by the needlework’s rich colours, beautiful motifs, and artistic proficiency... I am convinced that they would also be a hit with [American] consumers.”¹⁵ The congress’s participants made it to a few locations in the Hungarian countryside. They made excursions to Lake Balaton, the Bend of the Danube, to Debrecen, Szeged and Szabadka (today’s Subotica in Serbia) and a group, made up of 60 to 80 people, visited the Tátra Mountains. On their way there they stopped over in Mezőkövesd, where they were greeted with a folk celebration and a casual exhibition of local *matyó* embroidery.¹⁶ There was a lot to see for the visitors both during the official reception and beyond the organized parts of the programme. The local paper reported on the event:

From the railway station [the visitors] were transported by privately-owned carriages and they had a lot to see already since this was also a day of a nation-wide market and the market-goers crowded the roadway... The visitors proceeded from the marketplace to the chapel where they attended mass and could admire the churchgoing crowd in their picturesque folk-costumes.... Afterwards the visitors returned to the schoolhouse on market square where they could admire the exhibit of folk-embroidery that was organized in their honour. From there almost every one of them departed with pieces of embroidery they had bought.¹⁷

All this must have been seen by Laurvik. He might have taken part in the excursion to Mezőkövesd — of which we have no record. But *matyó* folk art made up a substantial portion of the New York exhibition. It must be added that the atmosphere was ripe for the popularity of folk art everywhere in Hungary, as evidenced by the publication of the compendium *A magyar nép művészete* [The folk art of the Hungarian people] which had just published its fourth volume. Laurvik must have also been reading the 1911 Austro-Hungarian special edition of the renowned periodical *The Studio* with its spread on “Peasant Art in Austria and Hungary.” Among the advertisements in this publication was one placed by the Budapest downtown store of the National Association of Hungarian Home Industries, which included the address of its London agency: Baum, Straus & Co.¹⁸ Laurvik’s stay in Hungary probably also coincided with the preparation of the winter issue of *Magyar Iparművészet* [Hungarian Applied Art] which was dedicated in its entirety to folk art. The issue featured articles by prominent Hungarian writers and illustrations from the collections housed by the Ethnographic Department of the National Museum of Hungary.¹⁹ It is also possible that during his visit Laurvik also heard of the preparations for a folk art exhibition by the Művészház [Artist-house] that was to open in October.²⁰ All we know for sure that he spent six weeks in Budapest and vicinity,²¹ so he had ample opportunity to get personally acquainted with the folk art of the neighbouring villages and their handicrafts. He might have visited exhibitions of the latter. In June the Association of Kalotaszeg Craftsmen had organized an exhibition in the town of Kalocsa. We don’t know if Laurvik attended the affair but we know that he visited the exhibition’s agile organizer, Imre Bokor of Budapest, and that he probably paid a visit to the Kalotaszeg Association’s Budapest outlet. This venture featured goods not only from Kalotaszeg but also from other regions of the country.²² The embroidery section of the Association’s marketing program was directed by Bokor’s wife,²³ which suggests that Laurvik might have gotten information on this aspect of the organization’s activity first hand. In addition to all this, Laurvik had at his disposal the offerings of dealers in needlework with ample samples of the products of Kalotaszeg and northern Hungary.²⁴ Unfortunately for him, the crafts outlet maintained by the Museum of Commerce in Városliget was no longer open. The marketing of such products was theoretically taken over by the Hungarian National Bank, but only the most determined customers made it to the basement store of the building oper-

ated for this purpose on Vadász Street.²⁵ Perhaps Laurvik belonged to the few who did.

The shipment of products that eventually made it to the New York exhibition started to be collected by Laurvik, but for the continuation of this activity and the professional shipping of the collection became the task of Döme Koperly, the director of the Hungarian Home Industry Association. Koperly also wrote a short description of Hungary's movement for the promotion of handicrafts for the exhibition's catalogue. Its text was translated into English by Elma Pálos (1887-1970), the stepdaughter of the world-renowned Sándor Ferenczi.²⁶ Elma recalled later that in the summer of 1913 there was a congress of the international women's suffragette movement in Budapest at which she acted as an interpreter. According to Elma, Laurvik took part in the congress' proceedings, probably as a reporter for the *Christian Science Monitor*, the *Boston Transcript* and the *New York Magazine*. Not long after our first meeting, Elma reminisced, he proposed to marry me. We got engaged and a few weeks later he returned to the United States, after making a promise that he'll return a year later and we'll get married.²⁷

In the assembling of the collection then, Laurvik's future wife had also played a part. The significance of this development is that through her Laurvik made numerous and important artistic and social connections. As a result of his marriage he came into contact with new and different people than he had been connected to before. His interest was no longer focused on commercial painters, sculptors and purveyors of modern art.

It's not clear what might have been the role of Sándor Konta (1862-1933) in the staging of the exhibition. What did a New York Hungarian press report allude to when it claimed that Konta had been asked to organize the exhibition? There is no information on this matter either in the exhibition's catalogue or in other Hungarian-American press products. Sándor Konta had been an eminent figure of the Hungarian-American community. He was at once a banker, a brilliant journalist, a politician, a patron of the arts, translator, and a philanthropist, who on occasion got involved in controversies. He came to America as a young journalist and married the daughter of a fabulously rich beer-maker of St. Louis — whom he soon divorced — but not before making connections in various American circles. He moved to New York in 1901 where he first made a living as a banker and then the owner of a brokerage firm. In 1911 he established a historical society for the

preservation of relics of modern urban living: photographs, films and phonographs. In the midst of this he found time to stage the theatrical works of Ferenc Molnár. Alexander Konta as he was known in America, was frequent visitor at the homes and offices of America's highest elite, including in the time of President Woodrow Wilson, the White House. In American circles he was the best-known Hungarian. During the war, when Hungarians in America became enemy aliens, to demonstrate the loyalty of Hungarian immigrants to America, Konta organized the American-Hungarian Loyalty League.²⁸ He accepted several public roles and he was a member of a dozen artistic and scientific institutions: the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Natural History and the National Arts Club where he was for a while in charge of financial affairs. According to press reports he, along with Emil Zerkowitz, the New York representative of the Commercial Museum of Budapest, brought about the above-mentioned Lajos Márk exhibition.²⁹ It is quite possible that in connection with the peasant art exhibit he acted as liaison person between the National Arts Club on the one hand and the Austro-Hungarian diplomatic staff as well as the Hungarian Home Industry Association on the other.³⁰ He might have even extended a helping hand in the transportation of the exhibition's collections to America. He no doubt exercised his roles through his extensive contacts and he was the exhibition's organizer only in this sense, since the staging of the Hungarian Peasant Art exhibition was the work of Laurvik, who also launched its catalogue. He achieved all this even if there were Hungarian backers of the idea in Budapest as well as in New York.

In the preface of the exhibition's sixteen-page catalogue Laurvik emphasized that this is the first exhibition of its kind in America. It featured objects that had never been seen outside of Hungary. This business of "never before" and "never this kind" was accepted by the press.³¹ It might be worthwhile to take a closer look at these two closely-linked claims.

As far as the "never before" claim is concerned, we're confronted by a surprising fact. More precisely we are witnessing a forgotten fact. This can be ascribed more to the writing of the American art critic than his Hungarian partners. No one called Laurvik's attention to the fact that a decade earlier at the Universal Exposition held in St. Louis Hungarian folk art and handicrafts had been exhibited. It is a well-known fact that these items were featured, according to the plans of Pál Horti (1865-1907), in Székely-style courtyard built inside a

huge commercial arena. The building had four wooden turrets as well as wooden gate built in the Székely architectural style. This was the hallmark of the St. Louis Hungarian exhibition and there are many photographs of it. With the passage of time the memory of this building remained and the fact that the exhibition featured a great many samples of peasant art and handicrafts was largely forgotten.³²

The exhibitors received a substantial profit from sales during the exposition,³³ and several items as well as collections, including one from Kalotaszeg and another from Brassó (today's Braşov in Romania), got prizes for their artistic excellence. The Exposition's *Grand Prix* was awarded to the Izabella Handicrafts Association while the National Handicrafts Association received the gold medal.³⁴ Some items exhibited were not representative of peasant folk art but were included for other reasons as for example the permanence of their colours, or because they were the creations of known artists.³⁵

The vast majority of the items exhibited in the St. Louis exposition found buyers, and if similar articles appeared in America's art shops subsequently then the claim made in the catalogue of the New York exhibition that its collections were never before seen in America is certainly inaccurate. We have to acknowledge however, that there were hitherto unseen articles exhibited in New York. The fact that in Laurvik's catalogue a reference to the St. Louis exposition is omitted is made even more surprising since both events were the result of Döme Koperly's efforts. Laurvik perhaps did not know about the earlier exhibition or he did not mention it so that he could show the exhibition of the National Arts Club in a more novel light. Another consideration in this omission might have been the fact that Laurvik held "his" exhibition to be superior from the artistic point of view. In this light his reasoning that such material had never before been seen in America is only partially accurate and it is to some extent the consequence of his own prejudices.

The "art object" vs "handicraft" controversy reared its head also in the discussions concerning originality. Several press reports emphasised the novel nature of the exhibited material. Writing about the exhibition, Julius Krause, the editor of the largest German-American daily, remarked that now at last it is possible to get acquainted with the "real thing, the hand-made products of peasant arts, done in the old farm house during the long winter months" instead of "factory products, worked by machinery after old Hungarian patterns" which "are now offered for sale in big stores."³⁶ At the same time ac-

ording to sparse evidence, American merchants and stores were selling similar handicraft articles made in Hungary. There might have been differences in their quality but essentially they were the same type of merchandise. In connection with machine-produced Hungarian-like textiles raising the issue of “originality” is unfortunate since in these cases we can only talk of crude imitations. The periodical *Magyar Iparművészet* [Hungarian Applied Art] had the following to say about press reactions to this controversy:

[The press reports] emphasize that American department stores constantly offer Hungarian needlework and Hungarian-style art objects, but these are products of mass production and have nothing to do with authentic Hungarian folk art. In this exhibition Americans had the opportunity to get acquainted with the latter... and in the future they will have the means of differentiating between true and bogus merchandise.³⁷

This summary simply overemphasized accounts of the American press since at the time most American merchants were offering their costumers neither Hungarian needlework nor Hungarian handicrafts in big quantities. The purpose of the contrasting of mass-produced and authentic materials was to emphasise the originality of the exhibited items. The press sang praises of a class of materials that differed from mass-produced merchandise, but it defined this in a misleading fashion by the term “original”.³⁸

What items and collections did this Hungarian folk art or peasant art exhibition consist of? We have no accurate answer to this question but from a laconic catalogue, a few surviving photographs, and press reports we are able to get an idea of the exhibited materials’ attributes. In connection with the catalogue we should add that we’re not talking about a text that confirms to today’s standards. It contained two introductory sections as well as an enumeration of the exhibited material according to their category such as “embroidery” and “earthenware”. The descriptions of these were usually confined to telling which part of the country they came from. Despite this concrete place-names are few and far between. Examples of these vague geographic terms include Mezőkövesd, Slavonia, Transylvania... The text often selects a particular item and describes it in a little more detail but only very rarely offers information that would allow us to envision the object wholly. We should also add that the catalogue, which lists items according to where they were placed in the exhibition, starts the num-

bering of the items described anew. This has led to some confusion regarding the total number of items exhibited. According to the art journal *Magyar Iparművészet*, this number was 4,108.³⁹ In reality the numbers of exhibited objects was between 1,300 and 1330, which is a substantial number nevertheless.

Hungarian art historian Edit Pikler-Freund (1886-19??) who happened to have been in America at the time described the exhibition for the readers of the Budapest daily *Az Ujság* in friendly terms: “A first-time visitor looks around with pleasant feeling at this exhibition even if he or she happens to be not an American but Hungarian.... That is because natives of Hungary rarely have an opportunity to view the folk art of various regions in a well-ordered... exhibit such as this one.”⁴⁰ We’ll be quoting more from this author’s writing below, it being the only appraisal by a professional critic of the exhibition organized by Nielsen Laurvik.

As an overall generalization it can be said that the exhibition’s principal aim had been to present the great variety of regional folk art and to highlight the existence of relatively numerous categories of such art. The exhibition started with a collection of embroidery from Matyó numbering over 150. In the exhibition’s catalogue Laurvik wrote the longest description about this collection. For this reason we can suspect that he had visited Mezőkövesd. He wrote that here “inhabitants have continued to dress in such coloured costumes up to the present day.” He mentions aprons worn by men and women, and a shirt worn by men only. The collection also contained many cushion covers, embroidered chiefly on black linen or cloth, with silk or wool. The Matyó material also comprised of items made by home industry workshops for urban use, such as coloured embroideries for tea-cosies, curtains, bags, covers and even automobile overcoats. Laurvik praised the rich colours of the needlework, their colour-harmony and variety. He emphasized that every item is unique and differs from the others in its composition.

The richly decorated, wide-necked shirts and the aprons worn by young men were noted in some press-reports.⁴¹ The art critic of the *New York Herald* commented on the colourful embroideries on a black background and “the beautifully decorated drinking horns, made by herdsmen and shepherds whose only tool was a pocket knife.”⁴² Bull-horns “carved artistically by the herdsmen” were also Laurvik’s favourite — unfortunately he did not give their provenance. According to the catalogue there were other examples of sculpted items: a few

painted wooden boxes (perhaps matchboxes) and picture-frames. Some items were over a century old. Edit Pikler-Freund also commented on the great age of some of the exhibited items. Like “ancient linen runner from Kőrösfő ornamented with conventionalized lions” or white laces. On the whole, however, the great majority of objects exhibited were the products of contemporary handicrafts.

In the catalogue the term “Transylvanian” described about seventy items of embroidery. “The most interesting are the table-cloths embroidered, with white silk or wool, upon white or raw linen. Those tablecloths are worked in *raw* linen show perfectly the artistic taste of the inhabitants of Transylvania. They are worked for their own households.” The catalogue’s text obviously refers to the art of the Kalotaszeg region, but there were cushion covers and tablecloths from other regions as well. The catalogue also mentions needlework from northern Hungary possibly from the region known as Palóc. From Halas there were at least a dozen pieces of lace. The exhibition contained a wide range of samples of children’s and ladies’ blouses, collars from all regions of Hungary. There were also cups worn by peasant women and handkerchiefs. Also, aprons with golden embroidering from south Hungary — probably of South-Slav origins. There were also products of artistic embroidered leather works such as *kulacsok* (shepherd’s flasks) and *tarisznyas* (satchels). The exhibition did not feature complete outfits. The organizers illustrated the costumes of Hungary’s regions through dolls dressed in folk-apparel. This method of presentation represented a recently developed trend in the displaying of Hungarian handicrafts. The *New York Times* even featured a photo of a group of these dolls.⁴³ The exhibition’s catalogue identified each doll’s attire according to its region of origin.

The admiration of American press reports focused above all on the world of form and colour of the exhibited textiles. The *New York Sun* compared the colourful embroideries to the latest creations of futurists and declared that the carvings of the shepherds compared “favourably with the best work done by trained artisans.”⁴⁴ On another occasion the *Sun* wrote: “Mr. Laurvik and the others of the committee apparently have rightly regarded the textiles and embroideries with the seriousness of first rate works of art and the gala garments of the Hungarians have been as carefully placed upon the walls as paintings should be.”⁴⁵ The photographic evidence left by the exhibit underscores this suggestion.⁴⁶ The detailed account of the exhibition published by the *Evening Post* emphasised the “clean colours” of the ob-

jects exhibited, especially the needlework and the apparels. It noted the dominance of red, “sounds ‘Hungarian’ and ‘Hungarian’ looks like red”, which combined with other colours such as yellow, blue and green, created a lively impression. On the other hand this press report considered the pottery less interesting, precisely because of its “lifeless” colours. The daily cited Laurvik’s words from the catalogue to the effect that the “bright, vividly colored designs, executed for the most part in pure color ‘kaleidoscopic fantasies’ of the Futurists” are antedated.⁴⁷ These sentiments were echoed by the *New York Tribune* when it wrote that “The fount of the Futurist school of art has been found. It is the work of Hungarian peasants.”⁴⁸

Here we have to cite the views of the Hungarian art-critic who also reported on the exhibition and who also emphasized that the originality and the unusual nature of the colour-schemes impressed the exhibition’s visitors. She believed that the artistic impression left by the embroidery derived from their spontaneity. “The spontaneous love of colours, of the objects of nature, their whole existence exudes from the embroidered textiles. This is the secret of their effect. The art-critic cannot but view with amazement the decorative elements’ fineness and the richness that emanates from [this exhibition] of peasant art.” Following this, Pikler-Freund commented on the broader question of the relation of peasant art to Futurism. She deemed the *New York Tribune*’s view that there was similarity between Futurism and Hungarian peasant art a crude error. She explained that perhaps laymen in New York regarded all unusual art as “futurist” because they remembered the art that had been part of an exhibition of Cubist and Futurist art the previous winter in the city. Professional art critics however, in Pikler-Freund’s opinion, should know better and not link peasant art with Futurism which was an expression of artificial ideological processes. On the other hand Pikler-Freund hinted, the relationship between peasant art and Impressionism was more of a reality.⁴⁹

The New York exhibition’s setup included the idea that the extensive collection of the *matyó* material be counter-balanced by an art piece using the *matyó* embroidery colours and design. Closing this part of the exhibition was a “still-life picture of flowers executed in embroidery” by a peasant woman of Mezökövesd from a design made by the noted artist and writer Anna Lesznai (1885-1966). This was item number 4108 of the exhibition. “This piece affords an opportunity,” went the text of the catalogue, “to compare the design of a sophisticated trained artist with the work of the untutored peasants.” The

idea might have originated with Laurvik, although during his visit to Hungary he might have seen samples of such handicraft designed by Lesznai — especially pillow cases — since they were widely known. They had appeared at both artistic and home industry exhibitions in Hungary and abroad.⁵⁰ The inclusion of Lesznai's work in these exhibitions was most likely the result of the efforts of the artist herself. Throughout these times she lived in Paris where she promoted her artwork.⁵¹

The journal *American Art News*, which followed developments in art in the USA closely, also reported on the exhibition, albeit briefly. In its report it emphasized that the designs of items of everyday use were all the work of “untutored and uneducated country people.” The report's author also commented on the rich colours of the exhibited textiles which he attributed to Slavic influence.⁵² This surprising observation appears to be the result of being misinformed. Although the exhibition contained Slovak and South-Slav embroideries, the majority originated from Hungarian regions. But the question of “Hungarian or Slav?” did emerge in the discussion of the exhibition. The *Szabadság* of Cleveland reported the following incident: two Slovak visitors of the exhibition sought out its secretary. One of them, the editor of a local Slovak newspaper, protested the fact that the exhibition was called Hungarian “when the objects displayed were Slovak and their makers were Slovak too.” As proof he produced books published in Prague and Brno, which he borrowed from a public library, and which contained illustrations of Slovak peasant art. It so happened that also present at this discussion was a Hungarian architect who explained what was Hungarian about the exhibit and what was not. The report of the *Szabadság* does not explain what proof this intervener presented in support of his reasoning nor how he justified the inclusion in the exhibition of a collection assembled by the Izabella Home Industry Association of Pozsony (today's Bratislava in Slovakia) which included Slovak peasant embroideries and laces. The two visitors who protested the exhibition's name probably had this collection in mind in the first place. The press report does not tell which party the exhibition's official agreed with — he probably avoided siding with either.⁵³

This incident is further proof that a significant part of the overall exhibition was a collection of workshop mode embroidery sponsored by the Izabella Association of Pozsony. This fact is also suggested by other press reports, although the exhibition's catalogue doesn't mention this association by name. The reports explain that in

industrialized countries such home industry is maintained by the government through support for associations that foster and promote ancient handicrafts. This was the most important message of Döme Koperly's short writing in the catalogue. This emphasised the two purposes of such aid: the preservation of "old patterns and motives of the peasant art" and the provision of work for the people who cultivated it. A press report that appeared after the exhibition had closed stressed how the Austro-Hungarian Royal Court had fostered Hungarian peasant art, in particular the pro-home-industry activities of Archduchess Izabella (1887-1973).⁵⁴ Such support made the work of the peasants respectable and their products worth buying.

The Hungarian vs. Slovak controversy expresses the view characteristic for this age that every people, every ethnic group possesses a unique culture — in this case peasant art. The view that folk art is a carrier of national character was confounded by the multinational character of the Hungarian Kingdom and by the fact that the origins of Hungarians and of their Slavic neighbours differed widely. Both of these facts provided ample grounds for controversy at home in Hungary and on the other side of the ocean, especially for a public not very informed about European conditions, these facts confused those who adhered to the concept of "one people one culture". The debate was confounded by the competition between various art forms: whose art is the most beautiful and most valuable. Hungarian press reports, as might be expected, voiced the superiority of Hungarian folk art and craftsmanship. It might be mentioned in this connection that, according to contemporary press reports, Alexander de Yourevitch, a courtier of the Romanov family, was sent to America to gain the support of the Russian community there for Tsarist political aspirations. His plans included a deal with the National Arts Club to organize an exhibition of Russian peasant art.⁵⁵ The idea for this no doubt came from the Club's Hungarian exhibition, the opening of which the Tsarist emissary attended. (According to the records of the National Arts Club, the plan for the Russian exhibition never materialized.)

The Exhibition's After-life: The Exhibition in Newark

Subsequent to the New York exhibition — which was planned as a touring affair — it moved to the nearby New Jersey city of Newark. Its locale was the Newark Museum, more precisely the top floor of that

building. The opening day was Easter Sunday, April 11.⁵⁶ According to documentation held by the museum the Newark exhibition was organized and managed by Nilsen Laurvik who lived in the neighbouring city of Elizabeth. One document held by the Museum tells that 567 items were exhibited and were collectively valued at \$10,000. The Museum was rented for a \$350 fee for the week-long affair.⁵⁷

The name of the exhibition was, for local consumption, modified: *The applied arts of Hungarian peasants*. The reason for the change is not known, in any case the new definition better defined the nature of the exhibition than either the term “peasant art” or “folk art”. It also reflected better the concept that Anna Lesznai used in Hungary: “háziiparilag munkált népművészet” (folk art produced through home-industry).⁵⁸ The distinctions implied by these definitions probably meant little for contemporary American public consciousness. Not even Edit Pikler-Freund, the above-mentioned Hungarian art-critic, felt a need to comment on it. On the other hand it should be emphasized that the exhibition in Newark, in the realm of the presentation and acceptance of everyday culture and handicrafts by a museum, constituted a pioneering development.⁵⁹ In a speech given at the time, John Cotton Dana (1856-1929) explained that his ideal of the function of a museum was not marble corridors decorated by great white statues and paintings but a place where the “everyday work of the everyday people of the everyday city” is displayed and praised. Given such attitudes, it is not surprising that the exhibition from Hungary made it to the Newark Museum. This ideology was conceived in contemporary America’s liberal and reforming uterus, but it went beyond it in that it aimed to connect two seemingly opposing poles: culture and industry. The focal point of this aspiration was the elevation of the work of everyday citizens to valuable objects.⁶⁰ According to such interpretation the products of industry appear not as the opposite of art but the produce of peasant applied art and products of industry derive aesthetically from common everyday objects.

The exhibition in Newark filled two rooms. Because of local conditions more objects were placed in display cases than had been in the case of the New York exhibition. On the walls between the display cases needlework was featured or in one instance objects were placed on shelves. In connection with this it is useful to comment on the exhibition’s earthenware element even though without a catalogue with colour illustrations it is difficult to identify many of the objects displayed. What is sure is that the six objects featured in the catalogue

derive from very different branches of this art. The two *bokál*ys (a *bokály* is a wine-pitcher) are probably old, the products of folk pottery, unlike the plates displayed that were contemporary pieces. One of the *bokály*ys is from Szászkezd, the other is probably from Brassó or possibly also Szászkezd (today both in Romania). They were probably made during the first half of the 19th century. One of the plates is from Óbánya (today in Romania), its pair is evidently not a piece of folk art but the work of a highly-trained ceramist. Such objects, produced by trained master-potters and promoted by artists Pál Honti and István Gróh, had been featured in other contemporary expositions — and had proved very popular with the public.⁶¹

The Newark Museum Association, the civic organization that sustained the Newark Museum, sponsored the exhibition with an original idea. They utilized the slogan “bring us an object” and appealed to the city’s Hungarians to contribute to the affair with their own appropriate objects. This idea was not a fleeting concept but a fundamental part of John Cotton Dana’s theory about the role of libraries and museums in the education of America’s public. He saw the role of museums as means of bridging and overcoming differences in the cultures of a city two-thirds of whose population was made up by immigrants. The key word in this conception was cooperation. The followers of this ideology wanted to use both libraries and museums to demolish or at least to lessen class, status and gender differences. The great 1915 pottery exhibition put on by the Museum recruited objects from collectors, factories and women’s clubs and resulted in museum attendance reaching the same proportions as library attendance.⁶² The call for members of the public bringing objects for the exhibition was tried out in the 1914 Hungarian exhibition. Hungarians constituted only a small portion of Newark’s immigrant population, approximately 6,000, about 5.5 percent of the total.⁶³ Nevertheless the attention paid to them by the exhibition’s organizers demonstrates their determination to extend to everyone recognition and the chance of cooperation and inclusion.

The Newark Museum Association approached the city’s Hungarians to contribute to the exhibition by a letter. “Everyone can exhibit” wrote the local Hungarian newspaper *Newarki Híradó* “who has some unique Hungarian product.” The objects offered will be under the guardianship of the city. These objects will be received during the week before the exhibition’s opening. Each object will be documented. The newspaper understood the museum’s purpose and encouraged its

readership to offer as many objects as possible for the exhibition arguing that the exhibit's success was in the interest of America's Hungarian community. The *Híradó's* editor, Presbyterian minister János Dikovics (1875-1963) followed the preparations for the exhibition closely. "It's very praiseworthy," he wrote, "that the local Hungarian community brought... very beautiful objects for the exhibition." Dikovics mentioned that the exhibition had been advertised in all local English-language press products.⁶⁴ The *Newarki Híradó* reproduced almost in its entirety the news report the largest Newark daily, the *Newark Daily News*, published on the exhibition. This report extolled the quality and colourfulness of the exhibition and gave a not very well-informed historical introduction to the Hungarian nation, emphasizing the nomadic, "Turanian," origins of the Magyars.⁶⁵

In the name of the Newark Museum Association J.C. Dana had written a letter to Minister Dikovics, enclosing the Exhibition's catalogue and inviting the congregation's members to view the exhibition. He even suggested a "Hungarian evening" when Hungarians collectively could come to the museum, which in any case was free to attend for every citizen of Newark. In this letter Dana had high praise for Hungarian folk art. Not surprisingly Dikovics published Dana's letter.⁶⁶

The cooperation between the Museum and Newark's Hungarian community was successful. According to Hungarian press reports twelve local individuals contributed to the exhibition. From the exhibition's description we learn how the appeal for contributions was interpreted by potential donors, that is what objects local Hungarians considered worthy of lending to the Museum. These descriptions are also valuable in throwing light on what the material culture of Hungarian immigrants was at the time, on what objects they cherished and kept as newcomers, or produced in their new environment.⁶⁷

Who were the people who brought objects for exhibition and what can be said about the latter? The sources relating to this question are scarce but we have been able to get information on a few. About one person we are sure: Emil Germanus (1856-1925) was Newark's best-known Hungarian citizen — he had lived in the city for decades. He was a nationally-known banker, travel agent, notary public and a kind of master of all things. He was involved in municipal affairs and for years he did public service as a justice of the peace. To him can be attributed the fact — as had been done by the author of his obituary — that the Hungarian community was a substantial factor in Newark's

life. He was a member — and even president — of numerous associations, many of which he had founded. Among the latter was the city's Hungarian Reformed congregation. And he participated in the work of the self-improvement association and other Hungarian organizations. Being a well-to-do person, he often visited Hungary. And he travelled in other countries too, in the weeks after the opening of the Newark exhibition he went to Panama, Cuba and other Central American lands.⁶⁸ His nephew, who lived in Budapest, was the world-renowned orientalist, Gyula Germanus.⁶⁹

The *tulipános láda* (treasure chest) that Emil Germanus lent to the exhibition was an unusual object. It did not come from Hungary but was the product of local craftsmanship. We know that one of its creators was György Mihályi a master cabinet-maker who was a leading member of Newark's Hungarian Reformed congregation and a close friend of Germanus. He had been in America for over a decade and had taken part in virtually all Hungarian community undertakings.⁷⁰ Another person involved in the production of Germanus's treasure chest was Géza Dobossy, who was also active in Newark's Hungarian community. He was born in Keszthely, trained as a painter in Nagykanizsa and then concentrated as a commercial artist on painting frescoes in church buildings. He, along with his wife and two sons, settled in Newark in 1906. He played leading roles in several Hungarian associations, including the theatrical group and an amateur choir.⁷¹ He was responsible for decorating the treasure chest — in his new homeland, America.

Another person who lent objects for the exhibition, Samu Ax, was also a longstanding member of Newark's Hungarian community. According to a press report published at the time of the exhibition he had been living in Newark for three decades. He was born in Kassa (today's Kosice in Slovakia) a city which he visited in the spring of 1914. His daughter, Emilia Ax, was a well-known violin soloist. Ax himself was involved in all kinds of Hungarian causes.⁷² From another source we know that he operated a jewellery store in Newark.⁷³ This helps to explain the fact that he lent gold and silver objects, applied art pieces, for the exhibition.

About the others who lent objects it is not possible to know much. We know that Máthé István Nagy was warden of the Reformed congregation but we couldn't find any more information about him.⁷⁴ Pál Ádám, who brought an entire Hungarian outfit for the exhibition, had come to America in 1904, had three children and worked as a tan-

ner in a leather making factory.⁷⁵ The beautifully-carved model of a hay-cart that was lent by Imre Várady who had been born in Vásárhely. At the time of the exhibition he was thirty-six-years old and lived in Newark with his wife and two children.⁷⁶ The carving was probably his work. Géza Pritula who lent a Hungarian-style plate for the exhibition, was probably a factory worker. He had joined his brother in Newark in 1899. We also know that he was a member of Newark's Hungarian Roman Catholic parish.⁷⁷ About the other lenders of objects we know even less.⁷⁸

It is difficult to draw conclusions from such sparse records. They perhaps tell us that the offer from the Museum to gather exhibit items from the public had attracted the attention of those Hungarians who had roots in the city that is those who had lived there for a substantial time. We know about almost all of them that they had taken out American citizenship. Many of them belonged to the local ethnic elite, had leadership positions in the Hungarian community and were active in it. The desire to promote social integration, something that the Museum desired, worked in their case. Their cooperation found a receptive response in the outside society's outreach to them.

The object that can be most precisely identified among those that were lent to the exhibition came from Máthé István Nagy, the chief elder of the Reformed congregation. This was a beautiful table made by Zsigmond Oszterhuber in Keszthely. The maker of this object, as can be determined from the scarce sources, had an interesting history as an immigrant. Oszterhuber arrived in New York on March 21, 1905, on the ocean-liner *Ultonia* from the Austro-Hungarian port city of Fiume (today's Rijeka in Croatia). His arrival document states that he was born in Körmend, that he was 36-years old, that he was a cabinet maker, and that he wanted to join his brother Béla in Newark.⁷⁹ Within six months he was joined by his family: his 29-year-old wife Etelka, three daughters and 6-month-old son Zsignomd.⁸⁰ We have the impression that they came with the intention to stay in America. Soon, the family increased in size when twins were born.⁸¹ Zsigmond's brother Béla also lived with his family in Newark, he had arrived in 1901 to join the third brother, Géza, also a cabinet maker. The three brothers were followed by other members of the Oszterhuber extended family.⁸²

Where did Zsigmond live when the "beautiful" table lent to the Newark exhibition was made? How did the table get to Máthé István Nagy? These questions are not answered by the sources and we

can only guess as to what happened. It's notable that the city of Keszthely doesn't occur in the documentation of any of the Oszterhuber brothers. Perhaps the information that the table made there is erroneous and it was really made in Körmend. Its maker might have brought it with himself, and then sold it or gave it away when he, together with his family, contrary to his original intention of staying in America, returned to Hungary in 1912. This is the best explanation for the fact that after that year there is no reference to Zsigmond in American records while there is a reference to a "Zsigmond Oszterhuber" in a 1912 business directory of Vas County in Hungary that refers to him as a cabinet maker in Körmend.⁸³ If in spite the evidence presented above the table was made in Keszthely, there are two possibilities. One is that Zsigmond studied with a master cabinetmaker in that city and the table had been his master's project, and the other is that he, after his return to Hungary, temporarily put up shop there, made the table, and from here his acquaintance or friend Nagy brought it to the United States. The object's biography is evidently incomplete, nevertheless it still reflects in material form upon the complex nature of an immigrant family's — and community's — American experience.

The collection of exhibited objects that had gone from New York City to Newark was returned to New York in June. Despite plans for further exhibitions nothing was done in this respect for the time being. In July Nilsen Laurvik travelled again to Hungary where he, as he had promised, married Elma Pálos. He returned to New York in September bringing Elma with him. Subsequently he started preparations for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco. Plans for the Hungarian travelling peasant art exhibition now hit a snag. This plan was never really endorsed by the elite Hungarian circles of New York and they no longer helped Laurvik in his efforts. Despite this two more exhibitions were staged during the latter part of 1914 but these were not independent exhibitions but ones in which a part of the Hungarian peasant crafts items was displayed alongside other material. By this time the collection was not complete. Parts of it had made their way to various institutions and collectors. An inventory of the collection that had been made in Newark notes that some objects had been "sold".

Exhibitions in Chicago and Indianapolis

One of the places where such a diminished and modified Hungarian exhibit was staged was Chicago. It constituted a part of the 13th Annual Exhibition of “Industrial Art” of that city’s Art Institute and it consisted of about hundred pieces of embroidery, twenty-seven pottery products and a few carvings.⁸⁴ There is only one photograph of the exhibition in the Art Institute’s library, and it doesn’t depict the Hungarian collection, but from it we can conclude that the exhibition was probably presented in a professional art-type manner. “Hungarian peasant potters and weavers” were treated the same way as the annual art show’s trained artists.

For the sake of completeness it is worthy of mentioning that this exhibition had another Hungarian connection. In the section of the exhibition that presented industrial art there were items displayed by two artists who were related in a way to Hungarians: Edmund Bokor and Frances Barothy. From Bokor there were two jewellery pieces and from Barothy there were three Japanese-style objects.⁸⁵ Who were these artist? Edmund that is Ödön Bokor (1886-1979) was a silversmith from Budapest who in 1907, with his friend Ernő Gould, emigrated to America. In 1912 the two opened a jewellery store named Chicago Art Silver Shop. They won prizes, established other retail outlets and became a part of the city’s silversmith establishment. Ernő died in 1954 but Edmund continued to produce artistic creations into his 90s.⁸⁶ Painter Frances A. Barothy (1884-1957), born into a respected American family, was the wife of the noted Chicago Hungarian surgeon Árpád Baróthy (1870-1933). She was one of the Art Institute’s first graduates. Árpád’s father had come to America with Kosuth in the early 1850s but returned to Hungary after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. Árpád himself visited Chicago twice as a child. He also attended pharmacy school and completed his medical training there. He settled in the city in 1895. While his mother was alive he regularly visited Hungary along with his art-loving wife. Throughout their travels in Europe and the Americas the affluent couple accumulated a substantial collection of art.⁸⁷

The last known locale of the exhibitions put on by Lauvrik was in Indianapolis. In the John Herron Art Institute — which is now known as the Indianapolis Art Museum — the exhibition opened on the sixth of November. Here the Hungarian collection was featured as a part of the annual exhibition of the Society of Western Artists.⁸⁸

Without detailed information about this affair it is safe to assume that the Hungarian exhibition here was a repeat of the one that had been presented in Chicago. No information has been found so far as to what was the collection's fate after Indianapolis. Perhaps the National Arts Club safeguarded it for a while in the hope of further exhibitions. Perhaps it sold it or gave it away. One thing is sure: there were no plans to return it to Hungary. The Hungarian Home Industry Association "has put at the disposal of the National Arts Club" the collection, as its president, Döme Koperly penned in the catalogue, to give "to the people of the United States a perfect picture of the art activities of the Hungarian peasant." Perhaps if individual items made it to a museum, or a major private collection, these might re-surface eventually.

Conclusions

The story of the 1914 *Hungarian Peasant Art* exhibition has not been told by either by American or Hungarian historians of museum and exhibition activities — nor by ethnographers. Its significance can be deduced from several viewpoints. Firstly this exhibition carried to the New World again — after the Universal Exposition in St. Louis but with the experience gained in European exhibitions (in Brussels [1897], Paris [1900, 1912], Milan [1906], Berlin [1909] London [1911] and Scandinavia) a well-selected cross-section of Hungarian peasant arts and crafts in the form of home industry products. Here it was not a small part of an unfathomable world exhibition, as it had been in St. Louis and in some European cities, but it was an independent affair staged in a dedicated gallery whose leaders were full with fresh ideas. In this the 1914 exhibition resembled more those that had been staged in Paris and Berlin. But in Berlin the exhibition had been organized mainly through the efforts of a Hungarian artist couple who lived in the city, while in Paris it was the result of the work of a Hungarian countess and her aristocratic helpers. In contrast, the exhibition in New York was stage-managed by one of the noted institutes of American artistic life, or more precisely, the leader of that institute, even if he had the help of a few local Hungarians as well as experts from Hungary. Here the Hungarian collection was presented in a professional manner. All this contributed to the rise of contacts between American and Hungarian artistic institutions and movements. Al-

though these did not prove lasting, they played roles in the preparations for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco.

The exhibitions of 1914 helped to pave the road to closer cultural cooperation between the Hungarian immigrant community and American society. In New York, Newark, Chicago and Indianapolis the visitors to the exhibitions could look upon the embroidery, pottery, and carvings brought from Hungary as the artistic creation of a nation whose members were playing a significant role among the massive wave of “new immigrants” that was pouring into America. These newcomers were not received with understanding precisely because of their “newness”. The exhibitions contributed to the awakening and strengthening of the American public’s sympathy toward Hungarian immigrants. In Newark the visitors could perceive these sentiments even closer as their museum wanted to let them know how their city’s Hungarians valued their artistic heritage. The support for peasant art, or as Americans were inclined to call it “ethnic culture”, became a more important factor in the integration of immigrants during the World War and the early and mid-1920s.⁸⁹ The reception of the *Hungarian Peasant Art* exhibition in Newark and the opening to the public that accompanied it — in today’s parlance “outreach” — can be regarded as a precursor of the later and often repeated practice by museums to respond to newer and newer social situations. In today’s museum world the practice initiated by Newark’s public library and museum of basing exhibitions on social collaboration between them and the general public is considered to be one of the most innovative ideas in American museum management. By chance, in the birth and development of this innovation an American-Hungarian community played a part. And the prompting for this was provided by Hungary’s home industry whose support the Archduchess Izabella validated in a speech she gave on the occasion of her acceptance of becoming the patron of the Hungarian Home Industry Association: “We hope that we can preserve the connection to their ancestral roots of many people who have been forced to earn their living outside of their homeland. In this manner the Home Industry becomes a national enterprise.”⁹⁰

In addition to having outlined the background to the preparation of the *Hungarian Peasant Art* exhibition, the connection of the materials displayed to similar exhibitions held elsewhere, and their various contexts, it is worth describing the moment that greeted a visitor to the exhibition. As closing let us give the word to the Hungarian art-historian who has been quoted this study more than once:

It was Mister Lauvrik's considerate idea that the exhibition was opened to the tunes of the Rákoczi March and that [throughout the event] beautiful folk-songs were played by New York's Hungarian Gypsy musicians. Their *cimbalom* made special impression since many of those in attendance had never seen or heard such an instrument. The public listened to the strange but beautiful music coming from a unusual instrument and admired with astonishment the wonderful art that had come to them from an exotic environment. As they soaked up the strange sounds and as their eyes absorbed the strange colours and drawings, they found that the Hungarian music and Hungarian art expresses the same thing, they complemented and explained each other. Who knows to what extent this observation derives from emotions or from the truth?

But what is certain is that after the [exhibition's] opening ceremony in the imagination of many Americans a distant but beautiful country appeared whose unassuming people were capable of producing quite unique, almost exotic, rich and lively art and music.⁹¹

NOTES

A somewhat longer Hungarian version of this article, entitled “‘Újszerű mint a futuristák munkája’ Magyar népművészeti kiállítás Amerikában 1914-ben” [As Novel as Futuristic Work: Hungarian folk art exhibition in the United States in 1914] appeared in *Néprajzi Értesítő*, vol. 97 (2015), pp. 87-114. It was slightly abridged and translated into English by Nándor Dreisziger in consultation with the author.

¹ *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, 7 March 1914, p. 2. See also the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, 7 March 1914.

² *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, 12 March 1914, p. 1.

³ *Szabadság*, 21 March 1914, p. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.* The scarcity of documentation prevents us from identifying which department store was involved.

⁵ See <http://www.nationalartsclub.org>

⁶ Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institute, *A Finding Aid of the National Arts Club, 1898-1960*. Series 7.2.

http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/national-art-club-records-9697/more#section_7_2.

⁷ *New York Press*, 22 March 1914.

⁸ “The Panama-Pacific International Exhibition: The American Debut of Hungarian Art or its Bermuda Triangle?” *Centropa: a journal of Central European Architecture and Related Arts* 10, 3 (September 2010): 259–271; “A Debut of Hungarian Art in America,” in James A. Ganz, ed.: *Jewel City: Art from San Francisco’s Panama-Pacific International Exposition* (Berkeley – San Francisco, University of California Press – Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 2015): 325–335; Gergely Barki, “A magyar művészet első reprezentatív mutatkozása(i) Amerikában” [The first exposition(s) of Hungarian art in America], in *Nulla dies sine linea: tanulmányok Passuth Krisztina hetvenedik születésnapjára* [Studies on the occasion of Krisztina Passuth’s 70th birthday], ed. Ágnes Béres, L. Mária Molnár and Erzsébet Tatai (Budapest: Praesens, 2007), 99–113.

⁹ *Pesti Hírlap*, 15 Feb. 1910, p. 15. Anthony Geber, “Lajos (Louis) Márk: His Life and Art,” *Hungarian Studies*, 6, 1 (1993): 99–127, in particular p. 107.

¹⁰ *Uj Idők*, 22 Oct. 1911, pp. 281f, 380, 392.

¹¹ *New York Times*, 27 March 1912; in connection with the 1913 exhibition see Árpád Timár, “Magyar művészek grafikai kiállítása Amerikában, 1913-1914. A tárlat magyarországi sajtóvisszhangja,” *Ars Hungarica*, 40, 2 (2014): 247–256, in particular 252–253.

¹² *Uj Idők*, 29 June 1913, p. 9.

¹³ *Budapesti Hírlap*, 25 May 1913, p. 11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 20 June 1913, p. 7.

¹⁵ István Hollósy, “Amerikai ajánlat a magyar háziiparnak,” *Mezőkövesd és Vidéke*, 7 June 1914.

¹⁶ *Budapesti Hírlap*, 25 May and 21 June 1913. Re. the visit to Szeged see Edit Csizmadia, “A feminista Móra. Móra Ferenc és a feministák kapcsolata sajtócikkek tükrében (1908-1928),” in the *Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve*, 2 (2015): 295–296.

¹⁷ *Mezőkövesd és Vidéke*, 22 and 29 June 1913, p. 2.

¹⁸ Charles Holme, ed., *Peasant Art in Austria and Hungary* (London, Paris, New York: The Studio, 1911).

¹⁹ *Magyar Iparművészet*, vol.10 (1913).

²⁰ Judit Gömörly and Nóra Veszprémi, eds., *A Művészház 1909-1914. Modern kiállítások Budapesten* (Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galeria, 2009), 135-160.

²¹ *The Evening Post*, 14 March 1914, p. 2.

²² Kálmán Sebestyén, "A kalotaszegi faragás története," in *Korunk évkönyv*, 1978, p. 235.

²³ Kálmán Sebestyén, *Kőrösi Riszeg alatt: Egy kalotaszegi település évszázadai* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2007), 106.

²⁴ Mónika Lackner, "Budapesti kézimunka-kereskedők képes árjegyzékei," in *Életmód, szemléletmód és a módi változása a parasztság körében a 19-20 század fordulóján*, ed. Mária Flórián (Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutatóintézete, 2010), 321-322.

²⁵ Hollósy, "Amerikai ajánlat," p. 2.

²⁶ *The Evening Post*, 14 March 1914, p. 2.

²⁷ Quoted in Emanuel Berman "Sándor, Gizella, Elma: A Biographical Journey," pt. 2, *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 85 (April 2004): 489-520.

²⁸ See the article that appeared when he died: *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, 29 April 1933, p. 4. *New York Times*, 29 April, 1933, p. 13. See also the *Pesti Napló*, 12 Oct. 1912.

²⁹ *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, 13 Feb. 1910.

³⁰ The records of the consulate did not survive, and it was not possible to find information relating to the exhibition in the records of the joint Austro-Hungarian foreign ministry.

³¹ Touring Exhibition, *Touring Exhibition of Hungarian Peasant Art organized under the auspices of the National Arts Club of New York...* (New York: The Club, 1914), see the introduction.

³² Descriptions of this exhibition can be found in Pál Horti, *Magyar Iparművészet*, 1, 6 (1904): 249-313, in particular p. 302; Emil Zerkowitz, "Magyarország Amerikában," *Vasárnapi Ujság*, 51, 39 (1904): 661-663; and Miklós Székely, *Az ország tükre* (Budapest: Centart Egyesület, 2012), 162. See also the *Official Catalogue of Exhibitors, Universal Exposition St. Louis, U.S.A. 1904. Division of Exhibits* (St. Louis: The Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company, 1904), 109-110.

³³ *Magyar Iparművészet*, 2 (1905): 177.

³⁴ *Magyar Hírmondó*, 8 Dec. 1904, p. 1.

³⁵ *The St. Louis Republic*, 1 Nov. 1904, p. 7.

³⁶ *New Yorker Staats-Zeitung*, 18 March 1914. Hungarian Peasant Art exhibition papers, Newark Museum Archives, Newark Museum Archives, Newark, New Jersey.

³⁷ *Magyar Iparművészet*, vol. 11, no. 5 (1914): 225; for virtually the same report see *Budapesti Hírlap*, 7 June 1914, p. 18.

³⁸ On problems of originality or authenticity of contemporary peasant embroidery see Lou Taylor, "Peasant Embroidery: Rural to Urban and East to West Relationships 1860-1914," *The Journal of Decorative Arts Society* 14 (1990): 43-51.

³⁹ Touring Exhibition, *Touring Exhibition. Magyar Iparművészet*, 17, 5 (1914): 225.

⁴⁰ Edit Pikler-Freund, "Magyar parasztművészeti kiállítás New-Yorkban," *Az Ujság*, 19 April 1914.

⁴¹ *The Hudson Evening Register*, 17 March 1914.

⁴² *New York Herald*, 14 March 1914, p. 12.

⁴³ *New York Times*, 15 March 1914, p. 69.

⁴⁴ *The Sun*, 12 March 1914, sec. 1, p. 4.

⁴⁵ *The Sun*, 16 March 1914, sec. 2, p. 2.

⁴⁶ Archives of American Art, National Art Club, 7, 8 Album, 1910-1921; Hungarian Peasant Art. 1914 (Reel 4260, frames 87-90). One photo can be reached on the internet: <http://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/viewer/installation-view-hungarina-peasant-art-exhibition-national-arts-club-12086> A richly illustrated article about the exhibition is Zoltán Fejős, "Amerikába mentünk, Háziiparunk címere... Hungarian Peasant Art: Magyar népművészeti kiállítás az újvilágban 1914-ben," *Múzeumcafé*, vol. 9, no. 45 (2015): 37-48.

⁴⁷ *The Evening Post*, 14 March 1914, sec. 2, p. 2.

⁴⁸ *New York Tribune*, 12 March 1914, p. 7.

⁴⁹ As she wrote elsewhere in more detail: Edit Pikler-Freund, "Decoratív és realiztikus művészet," *Művészet*, 2, 12 (1913): 37-39.

⁵⁰ Petra Török, comp., *Sorsával tetováltan önmaga. Válogatás Lesznai Anna naplójegyzeteiből* (Budapest-Hatvan: Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum and the Hatvany Lajos Múzeum, 2010), the volume's preface, also p. 496, with illustrations on pp. 73, 77, 81 and 85.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 18-20, 496; Petra Török, *Formába kerekedett világ. Lesznai Anna művészete és hagyatéka...* (Hatvan: Hatvany Lajos Múzeum, 2001), 33.

⁵² *American Art News*, vol. 12, no. 24 (21 March 1914): 7.

⁵³ *Szabadság*, 25 March 1914, p. 2.

⁵⁴ "Hungarian Art Fostered by Royalty," *New York Press*, 26 April 1914.

⁵⁵ *New York Times*, 27 March 1914.

⁵⁶ Erza Shales, *Made in Newark: Cultivating Industrial Arts and Civic Identity in the Progressive Era* (New Brunswick – London: Rivergate Books, 2010).

⁵⁷ Hungarian Peasant Art exhibition papers, Newark Museum Archives, Newark, New Jersey. See also *The Evening Post*, 11 April 1914.

⁵⁸ Anna Lesznai, "Háziipar és népművészet," *Magyar Iparművészet*, 16, 9 (1913): 369-386, in particular p. 370.

⁵⁹ Shales, *Made in Newark*, pp. 182, 290. Shales describes other exhibitions featured by this museum that had similar implications. See *ibid.* pp. 153-220.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 80; 1-2.; <https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/danaj.htm> On J.C. Dana see Nicolas Maffei, "John Cotton Dana and the Politics of Exhibiting Industrial Art in the US," *Journal of Design History*, vol. 13, no. 4 (2000): 301-317. See also François Mairesse, "La belle histoire, aux origines de la nouvelle muséologie," *Public et Musées*, nos. 17-18 (2002): 33-56.

⁶¹ Elemér Czákó, "A torinói kiállítás," *Magyar iparművészet* 5, 4 (1902): 166.

⁶² Shales, *Made in Newark*, 161.

⁶³ Bureau of the Census, 1928, p. 758.

⁶⁴ *Newarki Híradó*, 28 March and 4 and 11 April, 1914.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 25 April 1914, p. 2.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 1.

⁶⁷ For a detailed list of these objects see Fejős, "Újszerű," p. 104.

⁶⁸ *Newarki Híradó*, 11 April and 9 May.

⁶⁹ *Amerikai Magyar Népszava* (obituary), 25 Nov. 1925.

⁷⁰ *Newarki Híradó*, various numbers, 1914.

⁷¹ *Amerikai Magyar Népszava*, 25th anniversary special edition, 20 April 1924.

⁷² *Newarki Híradó*, 2 May 1914. “U.S. Passport Applications, 1795-1925,” database, *Ancestry*.

⁷³ United States Census, 1910, database with images, *FamilySearch*, Samuel G. Ax, Newark Ward 3, Essex, N.J., ED 20, sheet 5B.

⁷⁴ *Newarki Híradó*, 28 Feb. 1914.

⁷⁵ United States Census, 1910, database, *FamilySearch*, Paul Adam, Newark Ward 12, Essex, N.J., ED 101, sheet 24A.

⁷⁶ New Jersey Census, 1915, database, *FamilySearch*, Emery Varyady.

⁷⁷ United States Census, 1920, database, *FamilySearch*, Geza Pretula, Newark Ward 13, Essex, N.J. sheet 8B. Also, *Newarki Híradó*, 18 April 1914.

⁷⁸ For a few details about them see Fejős, “Újszerű,” p. 106.

⁷⁹ <http://libertyellisfoundation.org>

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ The twins were named Augustus and Julius. New Jersey, Births and Christenings index, 1660-1931, database, *Ancestry*.

⁸² <http://libertyellisfoundation.org>

⁸³ Zoltán Nagy, *Körmend város kézművesei a XVII-XIX században* (Szombathely: Vas Megyei Múzeumok, 2004), 365.

⁸⁴ L. M. McCauley, “Industrial Art at the Art Institute of Chicago,” *Art and Progress*, vol. 6, no. 1 (1914): 28-29; *Thirteenth Annual Exhibition of Industrial Art including Hungarian Peasant Potters and Weavers* (Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago, 1914), 1128-1251.

⁸⁵ *Thirtieth Annual Exhibition*, nos. 123-124 (the jewellery), and 84-86 (the Japanese-style objects).

⁸⁶ Sharon S. Darling, *Chicago Metalsmiths. An Illustrated History* (Chicago, Chicago Historical Society, 1977), 91-94.

⁸⁷ Frances A. Barothy (obituary), *Chicago Tribune*, 14 Feb. 1957. On Árpád Baróthy see Kálmán Káldor ed., *Magyar-Amerika írásban és képen I-II* (St. Louis: Hungarian Publishing Co., 1937), vol. I, p. 139.

⁸⁸ WorldCat.org: *November exhibitions: Nineteenth Annual Exhibition of the Society of Western Artists, November 6 to 29; an exhibition of*

Hungarian peasant art ending November 29 (Indianapolis: John Herron Art Institute, 1914). See also *Indianapolis Star*, 15 Nov. 1914.

⁸⁹ Simon J. Bronner, *Grasping Things. Folk Material Culture and Mass Society in America* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986); and the same author's *Following Tradition: Folklore in the Discourse of American Culture* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1998) in particular chapter 9; Diana Greenwood, "'The Great Palace of American Civilization' Allen Eaton's Arts and Crafts of the Homelands, 1919-1932," *Contemporaneity: Historical Presence in Visual Culture*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2014): 98-115 (<http://contemporaneity.pitt.edu>); Zoltán Fejős, *A chicagói magyarok két nemzedéke, 1890-1940* [Two generations of the Hungarians in Chicago, 1890-1940] (Budapest: Közép-Európa Intézet, 1993), 153-158 and 205-215; Shales, *Made in Newark*, 189-320.

⁹⁰ Archduchess Izabella, "Izabella főhercegnő a háziiparról," *Magyar Iparművészet*, vol. 12, no. 2 (1909): 67.

⁹¹ Pikler-Freund, "Magyar parasztművészeti kiállítás." Patrons of certain Hungarian restaurants in New York and attendees at Hungarian peasant dances there must have been familiar with *cimbalom* music at least since the turn of the century.

