Beyond the Leitha

In the archives of the Museum of Eastern Slovakia in Košice there is a letter from Rudolf Eitelberger to Imre Henszlmann. It is undated, but its text allows us to date it to early March 1863. It reads as follows:

My honoured friend

Today I assumed the directorship of the Austr[ian] Museum for Art and Industry; an I am asking for your advice and support, especially with regard to Hungary. My priorities are:

1. that the Museum should come into contact with those men who have made an outstanding contribution to art and art industry in Hungary;
2. to exhibit in Vienna those branches of Hungary’s art industry in which either individual men excel, or where it will be useful for Hungarians to exhibit their objects in Vienna.

[ ... ]

Hoping that your support will not fail me, and that I shall succeed in bringing you into constant contact with the institute.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Eitelberger’s hopes were not fulfilled. While he paid constant attention to the development of art and design in Hungary, the events of the following years, in particular, the Ausgleich and its consequences, meant that Hungarian designers and artists made increasingly little reference to Vienna. Indeed, once the Museum of Applied Arts was founded in Budapest in 1873, they had their own institutional framework, and so the ‘constant contact’ between Budapest and Vienna did not materialize in the way Eitelberger envisaged it.

Nevertheless, the letter is significant, as it gives a sense of Eitelberger’s beliefs, values and aspirations; in particular, it shows Eitelberger to be the loyal Habsburg subject who took seriously the idea of unity of the Austrian Empire and, later, of Austria-Hungary. What I wish to do today, therefore, is explore Eitelberger’s attitudes to towards the Habsburg Empire, and in particular, to examine them in the light of his political commitment to Liberalism. I wish to argue that in order to understand Eitelberger, we have to consider his place in the wider economy of Liberal thought *across* the Habsburg state, and to explore the common beliefs and attitudes that tied Eitelberger to others across Austria-Hungary, starting with Henszlmann.

I am not sure how well known Henszlmann is, so I shall start by sketching out a few details. For Henszlmann was, in many respects, Eitelberger’s Hungarian counterpart. He was one of the most important early art historians in Hungary – he was appointed professor of Art History at the University of Pest in 1872 - and he played a major role in monument conservation and protection in Hungary as well as being a pioneer of medieval architectural history. Henszlmann was a native of Košice, at that time the Hungarian city of Kassa; he was supposed to have grown up in the shadow of its most notable landmark, the **[Figure 4]** Gothic cathedral of St. Elizabeth, which already featured in the second volume of the *Mittheilungen* of the Central Commission in 1857, but, more importantly, it was the subject of what is now agreed to have been one of the first works of art historical writing in Hungarian: Henszlmann’s **[Figure 5]** *The Churches of the City of Kassa in the Old German Style*, which he published in 1846.[[2]](#footnote-2) Henszlmann’s interest for us today lies in the fact both that he was heavily involved in the founding of the Museum in which the letter from Eitelberger is to be found, and also that he was a longtime friend and associate of Eitelberger.

The Museum in Košice was originally founded as the Museum of Upper Hungary (Felsőmagyaroszági Múzeum) in 1872, and although it conformed to the more traditional notion of the Landesmuseum - a significant proportion of its early collections consisting of geological specimens and other examples of natural history – it had a separate department of art and design. Like Eitelberger, Henszlmann had an active interest in art education; one of his earliest publications was a book on the topic: *Parallels between old and modern artistic and educational views, particularly with regard to the artistic development in Hungary* that appeared in 1841.[[3]](#footnote-3) This convergence of interests between the two thinkers was no accident, for both were members of the Böhm circle, and like Eitelberger, Henszlmann clearly saw Böhm as a crucial formative influence on the development of the scientific study of art.[[4]](#footnote-4) Böhm’s preference for medieval art was clearly influential, for it dominated Henszlmann’s interests, to the extent that when it came to the debate about conservation of the cathedral in Košice, Henszlmann proposed the idea of a ‘medievalising’ restoration.

This intellectual importance of Böhm for Eitelberger (and Henszlmann) has been well documented, but alongside such connections, there was also undoubtedly a personal affinity, for Böhm, too, was a native of Upper Hungary, or eastern Slovakia. Specifically, he grew up in the German speech island of **[Figure 6]** Wallendorf (in Hungarian: Szepesolaszi / in Slovak: Spišské Vlachy), only 60 or so kilometres northwest of Košice. Indeed, this has led some Hungarian commentators to claim Böhm as one of their own, in one sense an absurd argument, of course, but for reasons that will be apparent later, not quite as absurd as one might imagine.

Henszlmann had other things in common with Eitelberger for, like many educated members of the middle classes, he was a political Liberal and this meant an enthusiasm for the revolutionary events of 1848. Indeed, he was much more drawn into politics that year than Eitelberger, whose involvement was limited to a few editorial articles in the *Wiener Zeitung*. Henszlmann, in contrast, worked for the foreign ministry of the revolutionary government of Kossuth, and when the Hungarian bid for independence was finally defeated by Habsburg and Russian forces in 1849, Henszlmann found himself imprisoned for 8 months, first in Vienna and then in Sopron. Like many other Hungarian revolutionaries, he then spent a period of exile in London, where he met another figure who had been associated with the Böhm circle and was crucial to the development of museums in Hungary: **[Figure 7]** Ferenc Pulszky. Shared personal circumstances are again worth noting: like Henszlmann and Böhm, Pulszky was also a native of Upper Hungary; he grew up in **[Figure 8]** Eperjes (now Prešov) which is only 36 kilometres north of Košice.

Mid-nineteenth-century London was an important centre for Hungarians in exile, who idealized its constitutional and political arrangements, but who also had a notable presence in its intellectual life. Pulszky lectured on the Society of Antiquaries in London – giving an important early lecture on his vision for a universal museum – while Henszlmann lectured to the Royal Institute of British Architects. One might mention here a third figure, Gusztáv Zerffi (1820-92), a journalistactive in the Hungarian revolutionary army and who ended up in London lecturing on decorative arts at the National Art Training School, alongside spying for the Habsburg government on the activities of Hungarian exiles.[[5]](#footnote-5) Indeed, while Zerffi has disappeared from the Hungarian historical record, it is notable that he makes an appearance in histories of the Victoria & Albert Museum.

So far I have just provided what might seem little more than a set of anecdotes about who knew whom and where they were at the time. I would like to suggest, however, that their significance runs deeper than being ‘mere’ biographical facts, for they cast a light on Eitelberger’s formative social, cultural and intellectual milieu and, consequently, they also help us understand the ideological motivations of his work.

One striking thing that Eitelberger, Henszlmann and Böhm had in common was that they were the products of German linguistic islands. Henszlmann and Böhm grew up as German speakers amongst Slovaks and Hungarians, while Eitelberger grew up in Olmütz, an island of Germans – by 1900 some 75% of its inhabitants were still German speakers - in a Moravia in which Czech speakers were becoming increasingly prominent. This presented a complex arena for negotiation; how one identified oneself linguistically had wider political ramifications, and one might interpret the political affiliations of Eitelberger and Henszlmann in particular as a consequence of the way they navigated their way through the terrain of national and linguistic identity.

We can start with some basic points: Eitelberger’s early acquaintance with Böhm and Henszlmann (the details about Pulszky are less clear, for the latter was only briefly in Vienna before 1849 and was then in exile until 1866) may explain his willingness to accept the invitation of the Central Commission to undertake two topographical tours of Hungary in 1854 and 1855.[[6]](#footnote-6) In the Report that he later published he complained about the absence of reference to Hungary in any of the standard works on architectural history and singled out Henszlmann’s study of Košice cathedral as a notable exception. One of his purposes was therefore to put Hungary on the art historical map.

Undertaken only 5 to 6 years after the war of independence, this was in certain respects an audacious move, for Hungary was still viewed as a backward place. In his *Memoires* of 1897 Jacob Falke, for example, recalled travelling through Hungary in 1854, visiting the ‘underdeveloped urban culture’ (‘unentwickelte Kulturstadt’) of Pest and experiencing the bucolic charms of the countryside where old habits and customs were still preserved.[[7]](#footnote-7) Indeed, Eitelberger was himself not immune. As he noted in the Report: ‘The traveler must … wander through long stretches of land little touched by culture before he reaches a monument of any interest.’[[8]](#footnote-8) Yet his account provided an important corrective to widespread myths about Hungary. First, that it had nothing of any historical note following the invasions of the Mongols and the imposition of Ottoman rule after the Battle of Mohács and, second, that whatever existed was essentially Byzantine. Hungary was in fact rich with historic architecture, Eitelberger contended, and its early medieval monuments were clearly in the mainstream of the western architectural tradition. For, he noted, ‘They have a decisive relationship to work in the neighbouring German crownlands of the imperial Austrian state.’[[9]](#footnote-9)

This was a familiar rhetorical ploy; to advance larger political claims in the guise of arguments over *cultural* affiliation, and Eitelberger would later do the same with Dalmatia. In the case of Hungary this move was undoubtedly informed, too, by his personal acquaintance with Henszlmann and others. For he saw in them kindred spirits who were members of the same social and civilizational order that transcended national and linguistic differences. But we should be careful not to misinterpret the nature of this report. Eitelberger was a Liberal, and he embodied the kind of compromise that Austrian Liberals made in the years after 1848; their political aspirations having been stifled by the forces of reaction, they came to an accommodation with the Habsburg regime, and developed what Pieter Judson has referred to as an instrumental attitude towards it. In other words, they remained loyal since it still permitted them to pursue their goals of economic, social and (even) political rationalization and modernization.

Eitelberger’s report was thus not a *championing* of Hungary or of Hungarian independence, even if his 1848 articles for the *Wiener Zeitung* expressed sympathy for the aspirations of the differing ethnic groups of the Habsburg state. Indeed, in his later archaeological report for the Commission on Dalmatia, Eitelberger was critical of Hungarian rule of the province; its policy of Magyarisation was counter-productive, he argued, for it led to resentment among local Croats and Serbs and encouraged them to turn to Russia as their would-be protector. Eitelberger was thus concerned with the *integrity* of Austria-Hungary, and his aim was to promote that sense of unity by enhancing knowledge of the Empire’s lands. A similar tactic was employed 30 years later by Crown Prince Rudolph when he sponsored the multi-volume *Austria-Hungary in Word and Image* (*Österreich-Ungarn in Wort und Bild*). The idea was that increased mutual understanding of the various peoples of the Empire would create a sense of shared identity and community.

Let’s turn back, briefly, to Henszlmann. In the early 1840s, Henszlmann published the short-lived **[Figure 9]** *Vierteljahrsschrift aus und für Ungarn*. Its objective was to promote the Hungarian demand for cultural and social autonomy. On the one hand it seemed like a deliberate provocation, for it purposely agitated for the superior status of Hungarians over other groups, and this view was not unique to Henszlmann. He approvingly cited a comment by Ferenc Pulszky, namely, that:

The Slavic people … where I live and in the surrounding region is on the lowest level of civilization, the nobility is Hungarian, the city burghers take much pride in appearing German, even if they are both Slavs.[[10]](#footnote-10)

This comment, republished from an original correspondence between Pulszky and Graf Leo Thun, prompted the appearance of a polemical pamphlet **[Figure 10]** *Vertheidigung der Deutschen und Slaven in Ungarn. Die Kehrseite der Vierteljahresschrift aus und für Ungarn* in 1843 which levelled numerous accusations against Henszlmann for the factual inaccuracies as well as his general political outlook. Yet despite the apparent chauvinism of his comments, they were not expressions of the nationalism so often associated with nineteenth century Hungary, but rather of a Liberal view that saw Hungarian national culture as having the same civilizational mission that Austrian liberals held to be true of German culture. As Henszlmann himself noted:

Seldom will the measure of Liberalism not also be that for nationality itself, and the more often a formerly Slav county votes in the Diet with the Party of Progress, then the more it must have adopted a Hungarian identity.[[11]](#footnote-11)

The ugly chauvinism of these assertions can be countered by the fact that for Henszlmann and others, it was possible to *become* Hungarian. Being Hungarian was not a matter of biology or of destiny, but of *choice*. Indeed, as an assimilated German, Henszlmann was himself testimony to this idea. As such, this paralleled the view of Austrian Liberals, including Eitelberger, for whom German was a common supra-national language of culture and science. The basic failing of this idea, of course, was a total blindness to the perception of others, to the possibility that German (and Hungarian) would not merely be seen as the non-national *lingua franca* of the Habsburg state, but also as the language of a specific advantaged group *within* the Empire.

*II*

I have tried to suggest, therefore, through comparison with Henszlmann that one can speak of Eitelberger’s transnational Liberal outlook as the product of his upbringing in Moravia and the social and intellectual circles he inhabited in his formative years, in which he saw himself as part of a Liberal intelligentsia that spanned the Empire. Eitelberger, Henszlmann, Pulszky and others saw themselves as members of a civilizing culture that was open to all who sought it, and which could bind the disparate parts of the Empire together. As early as 1866, even before the Ausgleich institutionalised the separation of Hungary and Austria, Eitelberger expressed his anxiety concerning the fact that different groups did not hold to this ideal:

Just as artists in Bohemia place themselves ever more in the direction of Czechoslavism, and Hungarians have been standing up for national separatism for more than a decade, so in artistic circles in Austrian Poland a great indifference towards Austria has become evident, a decided sympathy for what in political circles is termed the idea of a Polish future. In Prague there was only one period when the idea of being part of Austria was adopted with any enthusiasm in the field of art.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Eitelberger’s views were, of course, central to his activity not only as a scholar but also as museum director, and this brings us back to his letter to Henszlmann. For it is clear that at its very foundation, he viewed the Museum for Art and Industry as an imperial institution that would encompass the creative activities of all peoples of the Empire, and it stayed broadly loyal to this mission, long after Eitelberger’s death. The pages of the *Mittheilungen* (and its successor from 1898, *Kunst und Handwerk*) are full of reviews and reports not only on major international museums and exhibitions, but also on often quite minor and provincial towns across the Austrian crownlands. Indeed, museums should be the showcase for a universal art and culture spanned national and ethnic differences, and he was explicit in his criticism of those who did otherwise. In 1872, for example, in an article on the reform of regional museums (the reform should consist, he argued, in making them more scientific), he voiced a trenchant criticism of the use of museums to promote discrete national cultures. Referring to this as driven by the political programme of ‘federalism’ he argued that:

Federalism is based on very different elements: on the romantic ideas of High Tories **[**Hochtories], on the skewed views of historians and archaeologists whose politics seek restoration of the past, and it gains the applause those nationalist attackers, who use democracy as the basis for seeking to unhinge the old principal of the Austrian state by recourse to ideas of the nation.[[13]](#footnote-13)

This had consequence for how museums developed. In1818 Miklós Jankovich (1772-1846), a prominent aristocratic scholar and patron of the arts in the early 19th century, argued that the newly founded Hungarian National Museum should focus on antiquities glorifying the achievements and history of Hungary.[[14]](#footnote-14) 30 years later the Hungarian Academy of Sciences made a similar argument in its ‘Call in the Matter of Hungarian Monuments to All Hungarians Concerned about National Honour’.[[15]](#footnote-15) And yet Jankovich, who donated many artefacts to the Museum, did not define Hungary in ethnic terms, but in territorial terms, and in addition, he collected and donated objects from across the German-speaking world. As Gábor Ébli has argued, the notion of a national collection was not seen as in conflict with Enlightenment ideas of universal culture, for the National Museum was ‘national’ in terms of being *for* the imagined community of the present Hungarian nation.[[16]](#footnote-16) The obvious point of comparison here would be with the British Museum, which can hardly be said to be ‘about’ the history of Britain.

For present purposes one of the most important figures in which one finds this combination of values was Ferenc Pulszky, author of the dismissive comments about the Slovaks, and who would come to play a central role in the later nineteenth century as director of the National Museum. In 1838 he published an article, ‘On the Use of Art Collections,’ that echoed Jankovich’s emphasis on national collecting, yet at the same time he criticised as ‘narrow-minded’ the idea that these were the *only* artefacts worth collecting; later in 1851 he would deliver the lecture in London: ‘On the progress and decay of art; and on the arrangement of a national museum’, in which he laid out his vision of an institution that would, very much like the British Museum, be universal in its scope. In a still later article of 1875, ‘On Museums’, he would criticize those institutions that were instrumentalised purely to serve ‘national vanity.’[[17]](#footnote-17) In 1872 Henszlmann expressed virtually exactly the same sentiment in the pages of the *Pester Lloyd* in which he argued that the National Museum should not restrict itself to merely ‘provincial’ concerns but should aim to represent the history of art ‘in general.’[[18]](#footnote-18) Henszlmann’s article followed the recent purchase by the Hungarian government of the Eszterházy picture collection, so such ambition was not unwarranted, but it shows, too, how for Henszlmann, as well as for Pulszky, how he envisaged the goals of the Museum.

Such parallels between Hungary and Austria serve as an important corrective, therefore, to the distinction that is sometimes made between the nationalism of one and the cosmopolitanism of the other.

Hungarian museums were just as cosmopolitan in their outlook as their counterparts in Vienna; Lechner’s design for the Museum of Applied Arts may have been a showcase for turn of the century ideas of Hungarian national identity, but the collections of the museum were drawn from across the globe, from Britain to Japan. One can gather a similar picture from lesser known museums in Hungary; Lajos Pákei’s exactly contemporary design for the much less well-known **[Figure 13]** Museum of Industry in Cluj / Kolozsvár is indicative of a conception of the museum that was closer to Vienna, and while the few surviving **[Figure 14]** photographs of the interior suggest a preoccupation with folk design – something of central significance in Hungarian visual culture – the museum likewise collected Japanese, Chinese, English, German, Scandinavian, Finnish, Italian and French ceramics, glass and textiles

.

We might perhaps begin to organise this patchwork of observations into a more coherent argument. Specifically, Eitelberger was of a generation that grew up with Liberal visions of culture and politics that were shared on either side of the River Leitha. It was based on the idea of an imagined community that transcended local identities and differences, including those of class. As Eitelberger stated: ‘die Kunst ist nur eine … Es gibt nicht eine Kunst für die Armen und eine Kunst für die Reichen.’[[19]](#footnote-19) He shared this view with his counterparts Henszlmann and Pulszky, and museums as tools of mass communication – particularly museums of design - had a central role to play in promoting this. Not merely the museums in Vienna and Budapest, but also by the **[Figure 15]** network of museums in major centres across the crownlands of Austria-Hungary. These were arguably *more* important than those in Vienna or Budapest, for it was in *these* institutions that a vision articulated in the metropolis was most likely to be disseminated across the crownlands of Austria and the counties of Hungary.

And yet while the accusation that Hungarian liberal intellectuals were overly nationalistic is incorrect, it does highlight an uncomfortable truth about the blindness of their ideological outlook, one which they shared with counterparts such as Eitelberger. I have so far mostly spoken about Hungary, but I now want to turn to an illustrative example that is much closer to where we are today: the Moravian Design Museum in Brno. It is an instructive case study both because Eitelberger advised on setting it up and also because the city of Brünn was geographically and culturally close to Vienna.

Founded in 1873, the Museum followed a pattern laid out by Eitelberger; it had an international collecting policy and organised a number of ambitious exhibitions of Asian and global art. Its building **[Figure 16]** building owed much to the design of Ferstel’s museum design on the Ringstrasse. The organisation of the displays also mimicked those in the Museum für Kunst und Industrie, following a Semperian programme prioritising *medium* over period or geographical origin.

Yet at the same time the Museum became entangled in the culture wars of the following decades between Czech- and German-speaking inhabitants of the city. Embracing the idea of German as the universal culture of learning, the Museum made very few concessions to the Czech-speaking population; the Regional Museum in the city, for example, published catalogues in both languages, whereas the Design Museum’s publications were *only* in German. The Museum did engage to a *small* degree with the Czech-speaking population, but this was limited to a few exhibitions of work by the **[Figure 17]** *Vesna* girls’ design school for Czech-speaking girls, but its temporary exhibitions were heavily oriented towards Vienna or the wider German-speaking world. Indeed, the Vesna show was met by complaints in the German press about it being misused for Czech propaganda. More importantly, its third director Prokop was drawn into the project for the establishment of a German cultural centre, the so-called **[Figure 18]** Deutsches Haus. This was a purely partisan project led by the industrialist Friedrich Wannieck, better known outside of Brno as the sponsor of Guido von List (1848-1919) who promulgated the pagan creed, Wotanism. The Deutsches Haus was perhaps a reaction to the Czech cultural centre, the so-called **[Figure 19]** Besední Dům, built by Theophil Hansen, yet where the design of the Besední Dům suggested a desire on the part of the Czech community merely for a more part in an essentially Habsburg civic order, that of the Deutsches Haus, adopting the language of the northern European Renaissance, was consciously meant not to fit into the city. Prokop not only used the Design Museum to exhibit the competition entries for the Deutsches Haus, he also allowed Wannieck and other members of the Deutsches Haus Verein to deliver lectures on the project and on the city’s German heritage. Indeed, Prokop had also designed the **[Figure 20]** Brno Turnhalle in a northern Renaissance style, which, before the Deutsches Haus had been the primary meeting centre of German clubs and associations.

One can gain a sense of the contradictions of the Liberal position in the pronouncements of the Brno Gewerbeverein, which had overseen the development of the Museum. Its 25th anniversary Festschrift of 1886 pronounced:

Der Mährische Gewerbeverein und die von ihm geschaffenen Unternehmungen sind eine Schöpfung deutscher Bürger der deutschen Stadt Brünn, deutscher Fleiss, deutsche Gesinnung, deutsche Thatkraft und deutsche Zähigkeit haben ihn geschaffen.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Moreover, it went on, if it was open to other citizens, regardless of their nationality, this was a further sign of its German character. Germans were the non-national nationality. It was others who were guilty of particularism. A similar view pertained in Hungary with regard to Hungarian national identity in relation to the Slovaks, Romanians and others.

Prokop’s successor, Eduard Leisching, retrieved this situation and turned the Museum into an important venue for the exhibition of modern art and design in the early twentieth century. Yet by then the damage had been done. The Czech press had looked dimly on the opening of the Deutsches Haus, dismissing it as nothing more than a ‘Jewish pub,’ and while the architect Dušan Jurkovič moved to Brno in 1905 to promote his folkloric brand of Slavic architecture, many other Czech-speaking artists and designers withdrew from the city and set up their own Artistic Association and artistic centre in the southern Moravian town of Hodonín.

Set against Eitelberger’s vision of what the design museums should achieve, the Moravian Design Museum failed, once it rubbed up against the realities of cultural difference in the later 1800s.

Despite the flaws in his vision, his inability to understand why not all might have embraced his cultural and political values, his blindness to his own class identity, Eitelberger comes across as a sympathetic figure. I would like to finish with a comment he made in 1871:

Die Zeiten sind vorüber, wo gebildete Völker und gebildete Menschen glauben können, sich von ihren Nachbarmenschen und Nachbarvölkern abschliessen zu können. Am allerwenigsten ist dies auf dem Gebiete der Kunst und Kunst -Industrie, am wenigsten in Oesterreich möglich. Der Künstler gehört heute der Welt ebensogut an, wie seiner Nation, und der Industrielle muss immer den Weltmarkt und die Anforderungen des gebildeten Geschmackes der Welt vor Augen haben. Das Rufen nach Prohibitivmassregeln, nach Ausschliessung der Ausländer, erinnert an die Zeiten, wo man statt zur Selbsthilfe zu greifen, nach Polizei und Censur gerufen hat.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Published 146 years ago it has a horrible resonance for the present; Eitelberger was on the losing side of the debate *then*, and I fear that contemporary versions of that sentiment may well be on the retreat today, too.

1. Hochverehrter Freund! Mit dem heutigen Tage habe ich die Leitg des österr. Museums für Kunst u Industrie übernommen; u bitte um Ihren Rath u Ihre Unterstützung, ganz besonders Ungarn gegenüber. Mir liegt daran, 1) daß mit dem Museum jene Männer in Ungarn in Verbindung kommen, die sich um Kunst u Kunstindustrie verdient gemacht haben; 2) daß jene Kunstindustriezweige Ungarn's in Wien zur Ausstellung kommen, in denen entweder einzelne Männer in Ungarn excellieren [?], oder wo es den Ungarn nützlich ist, daß in Wien ihre Objekte zur Ausstellung kämen [ ... ] Hoffend, daß Sie mir Ihre Unterstützung nicht versagen werden u daß es mir gelingen wird, Sie mit dem Institut in dauernde Verbindung zu bringen, [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Henszlman, *Kassa városának ó-német stylű templomairól* (Pest, 1846). See, too, K. Weiss, ‘Der Elisabeth Dom-Kirche zu Kaschau in Ungarn’ in *Mittheilungen der Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale* 2.9 (September 1857) 236-245 and 2.10 (October 1857) 275-78. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Henszlmann, *Párhuzam az ó és uj kori müvészeti nézetek és nevelések közt, különös tekintettel a müvészeti fejlődésre Magyarországban* (Pest, 1841). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. # ‘The annuals and reports of the Vienna Central Commission for Archeology can not only compete with any similar German ventures, but - in the period when they were edited by two of Böhm's excellent students, Heider and Eitelberger - they also surpassed similar publications in the other German lands; and why? because they mostly built on Böhm's teachings; they started out from his principles and set the practical, individual study of objects as the primary task and the clear drawing up of chronological development as the surprising result, and as soon as archaeology and art criticism rejected lofty and obscure arguments based on the "beautiful" and the "ideal", and started to love and explain artistic character by using Böhm's principles as a starting point, it could, firstly, explore history, and, secondly, improve taste, so that in Vienna nowadays it is not just the scholarly study of history that has risen to a much higher level than previously, but the newly established museum of art and industry, headed by Eitelberger, also has a huge influence on the improvement of industrial products.’ Henszlmann, ‘Böhm Dániel József’ in Henszlmann*, Válogatott képzőművészeti írások* [Selected Art Historical Writings] (Budapest, 1990) pp. 220-25

   [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. On Hungarians in London see Katalin Keserü, ‘Art Contacts between Great Britain and Hungary at the Turn of the Century,’ *Hungarian Studies* 6.2 (1990). On Zerffi see Tibor Frank, *Ein Diener seiner Herren: Werdegang des österreichischen Geheimagenten Gustav Zerffi (1820-1892)* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2002). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Eitelberger, ‘Bericht über einen archäologischen Ausflug nach Ungarn in den Jahren 1854 und 1855*.*’ *Jahrbuch der k.k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale* 1 (1856): 91–140. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Jacob von Falke, *Lebenserinnerungen* (Leipzig: Georg Meyer, 1897) pp. 92-93. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. ‘Der Reisende muss … weite von Cultur noch wenig berührte Strecken durchwandern, bevor er an ein interessantes Denkmal gelangt.’ Eitelberger, ‘Bericht über einen archäologischen Ausflug nach Ungarn in den Jahren 1854 und 1855,’ p. 93. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. ‘Sie haben eine entschiedene Verwandtschaft mit den Werken in den benachbarten deutschen Kronländern des österreichischen Kaiserstaates.’ Ibid, p. 94. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. ‘Das slavische Volk … wo ich wohne, und in der Umgegend, steht auf der untersten Stufe der Civilisation, der Adel ist ungarisch, die Bürger setzen ihren Stolz darein, selbst wenn sie geborne Slaven sind, Deutsche zu scheinen.’ *Vierteljahresschrift* I (1843) p. 65. This was part of an exchange in response to Thun’s pamphlet *Die Stellung der Slowaken in Ungarn* (Prague, 1843). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. ‘Selten wird daher der Massstab für den Liberalismus nicht auch der für die Nationalität selbst sein, und je öfter ein früher slowakisches Comitat auf dem Reichstage mit der Partei des Fortschrittes stimmt, desto mehr muss es sich ungarisiert haben.’ *Vierteljahresschrift*, I (1843) p. 46 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Rudolf Eitelberger, ‘Eine österreichische Geschichtsgallerie’ (1866) in Eitelberger, *Gesammelte Kunsthistorische Schriften 2: Oesterreichische Kunst-Institute und kunstgewerbliche Zeitfragen,* 73. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Eitelberger, ‘Zur Reform der Landesmuseen in Österreich’ (1872) in *Gesammelte Kunsthistorische Schriften*, vol. II, 243-44. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
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