

Please cite the Published Version

Csepely-Knorr, Luca (2020) The artistic and social role of public gardens: Béla Rerrich and the renewal of public park design in early twentieth-century Hungary. *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 15 (1). pp. 54-67. ISSN 1862-6033

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/18626033.2020.1792654>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/624086/>

Additional Information: Author Accepted manuscript accepted for publication in *Journal of Landscape Architecture*. Published by Taylor & Francis.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

The Art and Social Role of Public Gardens: Béla Rerrich and the renewal of public park design in early twentieth century Hungary.

Abstract

As in many countries, renewing existing urban parks and reviewing the guidelines to create new ones became a central topic of civic and urban design in Hungary at the beginning of the 20th century. The design of public open spaces and the meaning attributed to them was influenced by political issues, relating to questions about tradition and modernity and to the art and social role of gardens. After the first World War a new political reality in Hungary brought about the possibility to create public parks that could break with the historicist tradition rooted in the English landscape garden and the work of Peter Joseph Lenné and Gustav Meyer. This article explains how English and German reform ideas influenced landscape design theory in Hungary in the first decades of the twentieth century by discussing the writings, designs and legacy of the architect Béla Rerrich who led the changes to create a new way of designing public green spaces.

Keywords

Public park design, Hungary, Bela Rerrich, urban open space

Introduction

The first decades of the 20th century witnessed significant debates about the modernisation of the design of both public and private green spaces. Questions of formality, planting, the meanings attributed to gardens, their social role and part in national self-representation were closely linked to and influenced by the social and political circumstances at the time. Although it was never in the forefront of debates about garden reform, these changes affected the Hungarian professional arguments as well. This period of landscape history has not yet attracted much scholarly attention, and previous research primarily focussed on private gardens and historical revivalism.¹ By focussing on the public sphere, this paper will present a novel direction of analysis. The architect, Béla Rerrich (1881-1932) played a crucial role in introducing new trends in landscape architecture at the beginning of the 20th century in Hungary both in terms of new aesthetic guidelines, the 'art' of garden design and in terms of the social role green spaces should play in cities. While important publications have previously analysed Rerrich as an architect or as a landscape architect, these have not discussed in detail his writings, his international links, or the influence he had on the development of public park design but rather focussed on individual architectural or garden

designs.² To develop a more detailed understanding of his work and legacy, this paper contextualises his work – and through this lense the Hungarian public park design of his time in general – in the international scene of landscape architecture and garden design. With this approach the paper places Hungary on the map of 20th century central European urban garden culture, and Rerrich within the network of landscape professionals.

Hungarian landscape architecture and its international connections at the turn of the 20th century

As Hungary had been part of the Habsburg Empire for over three centuries, the work of gardeners and landscape designers that came from and had been trained in the German speaking areas of the Continent prevailed throughout the 19th century. This phenomenon applied to both private and public gardens, and also accounted for the German mediation of international trends and ideas that arrived in Hungary.³ Yet, from the beginning of the 19th century, Britain had captured the attention of Hungarian travellers, primarily for its political system and industrial and agricultural reforms, but also because of its country houses, gardens and urban development. As a reaction to Hungary's subservient political situation in the Habsburg Empire, the English landscape garden became the symbol of freedom and equality of citizens, and a desired, less absolutistic, and more independent political system.⁴ However, direct links between British landscape design and Hungarian patrons and their designed landscapes remained scarce.⁵

The strong links to Germany are most evident in the case of public park design. The first public park in Hungary, the Városliget Park in Budapest, was designed by the German agricultural reformer Heinrich Nebbien in 1813.⁶ After the 1867 Compromise Act, when the Austro-Hungarian Empire came to existence, and the creation of the new capital Budapest out of the two former free royal cities of Pest and Buda and the town of Óbuda in 1873 the establishment of public parks in the capital became key factor in the urban development. Between 1892 and 1912 these works were led by Keresztély Ilsemann (1850-1912), Head Gardener and later Garden Director of Budapest. Ilsemann was born in Kiel in Germany, and was trained in Muskau, probably under Eduard Petzold (1815–1891) in the 1870s.⁷ Ilsemann's designs followed the Neoclassical style of German landscape gardening, most famously represented by the works of Peter Joseph Lenné (1789-1866) and Gustav Meyer (1816-1877). Meyer's book the 'Handbook of the Fine Art of the Garden' (*Lehrbuch der schönen Gartenkunst*) and his park projects in Berlin remained a key example for Hungarian landscape design.⁸ After Ilsemann's death in 1912, Károly Råde (1864-1946) took over the role of Garden Director of the capital. Similarly to his predecessor, Råde was born in Jessnitz, Germany, a village close to Bautzen, where he studied horticulture at the 'Obst- und Gartenbauschule für das Königliche Sächsische Markgrafentum Oberlausitz in Bautzen' (Fruit- and Horticulture School for the

Royal Saxon Margravate Oberlausitz in Bautzen). In 1893, he was invited to become Head Gardener of the Royal Horticultural College in Budapest and to design its arboretum.⁹ Råde's public park designs in the interwar years were very similar to Ilsemann's designs of decades earlier, prompting harsh criticism from a new generation of designers.

The first decades of the 20th century brought a renewed desire to create strong intellectual, artistic and architectural links with the United Kingdom, due to an increasing demand to achieve more political independence at this time within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This added to the already existing trend to create a 'Hungarian style', which would strengthen the national identity both in art and architecture. Theorists most committed to Hungarian independence in a cultural and political sense cited English and French examples as opposed to German and especially Austrian ones.¹⁰ The English Arts and Crafts movement and its ideological background by John Ruskin and William Morris gave a stable basis to these trends, and at the same time was used to legitimize the new tendencies.¹¹

Initially, Arts and Crafts architecture and theoretical writings arrived in Hungary through German periodicals such as '*Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration*' and '*Innendekoration*', and the first Hungarian translations of Ruskin's work were only published in the years immediately prior to 1900.¹² The growing importance of English art and architecture materialised through various exhibitions and publications, although these mainly remained in the realm of the applied arts.¹³ Hungarian horticultural journals barely mentioned English examples. Despite both Ilsemann and Råde having visited England, their travel diaries only mentioned Kew and other Royal Parks, and were mostly focussing on horticultural curiosities.¹⁴

The English influence in architecture, and especially in urban design and town planning became more important after 1905. The principles of Arts and Craft architecture gave a strong philosophical basis for the creation of the new 'national architecture', based on Hungarian rural precedents, and the idea of Garden Cities opened up new perspectives in the growing need for social housing. One of the most important sources of English architecture and landscape design was the book '*Das Englische Haus*' by Hermann Muthesius, published in 1904, which spread quickly in the German speaking countries,¹⁵ and a review was published in the Hungarian journal '*Művészet*' ('Art'), by Károly Csányi in 1905.¹⁶ Hungarian architectural writers such as Dezső Malonyai and Béla Málnai argued for the unity of the interior and the exterior (i.e. the garden), praised by Muthesius as one of the most important characteristics of the English country house.¹⁷ As member of the Hungarian Association of Architects and Engineers and other architectural societies, the architect Béla Rerrich was well aware of these international trends, and played a key role in translating ideas from architecture and other allied disciplines into landscape architecture.

Béla Rerrich, a few biographical remarks

As opposed to the majority of landscape designers, Rerrich (fig.1) was born and educated in Hungary, at the Archduke Joseph University (now Budapest University of Technology and Economics) where he also worked as a teaching assistant. Owing to his fluency in English, he was awarded a fellowship by the Ministry of Trade and Commerce in 1905, to travel to Britain and study the circumstances of workers' homes, that led to his deep interest in and thorough understanding of the British Arts and Crafts movement.¹⁸ Parallel to many other architects, associated with the Arts and Crafts movement, he became interested in the art of designing gardens as well, to create unity with the house.¹⁹ In 1906 the Ministry of Agriculture granted him another, two-year long fellowship to deepen this interest and study landscape design abroad. During this trip he attended the l'École Nationale d'Horticulture in Versailles in 1907 while working in the office of René-Edouard André (1867-1942). Later that year he enrolled in the Königliche Gärtnerlehranstalt in Berlin-Dahlem, to improve his knowledge of horticulture.²⁰ During his fellowship he also travelled to Britain once more, this time to work for Thomas Hayton Mawson, the most prominent landscape designer in England at the time. Rerrich most probably was working on details of larger schemes, such as a plan for a 'parterre' for a country house garden in England that he exhibited in Hungary in 1910 (fig. 2).²¹ Rerrich's decision to meet and work for Mawson was most probably strongly linked to the fact that he was the most important contemporary English landscape architect praised in Muthesius' book, well known to Rerrich due to his architectural education. (However, Mawson's work was not known in the horticultural circles of Hungary.²²) His international experiences influenced his understanding of both the formal solution and the social meaning of green spaces. Rerrich arrived back in Hungary in late 1908 to accept a lectureship at the Royal Horticultural College in Budapest from the spring semester of 1908/1909.²³ He was appointed to develop and teach two new units: Garden Art (covering the history and stylistic characterisation of gardens) and Garden Design (including the basics of building technology and dendrology). This was the first time, that questions of design appeared in the curriculum of the education of gardeners. He was later Director of the institution, between 1919 and 1923.²⁴ Rerrich worked as an architect and landscape architect beside his teaching role, and was also a prolific writer and advocate of new trends in landscape architecture. To reach the widest possible audience, he published his articles in journals such as 'Magyar Mérnök és Építész Egylet Közlönye' (The Journal of the Association of Hungarian Architects and Engineers), 'Művészet' (Art), 'Iparművészet' (Applied Arts) and even in the daily newspaper 'Pesti Hírlap (Pester News). He was editor of the main journal of the built environment professions, 'Vállalkozók Közlönye' (Chronicle of Entrepreneurs) and the key journal for gardening, 'Kertészeti Lapok' ('Horticultural Folios'). He had a

large professional network, and was a well respected member of both Architectural and Gardening Societies, the Hungarian Fine Art Commission and the National Committee of Monuments.

Rerrich, the writer

In line with progressive landscape architects at the time, Rerrich was arguing for the garden to be an extended living space of the house, designed in a strict formal style, that he called 'mértnai' (geometrical) garden.²⁵ Although he referred to the recent formal trends in Germany, initiated by architects, as an example to follow in garden design,²⁶ Rerrich's early writings were mostly influenced by Thomas H. Mawson. Similarly to the English designer, Rerrich also turned to Renaissance examples when defining the origins of the current, what he called 'modern', trends in garden design.²⁷ Following Mawson's ideas, Rerrich argued for not just the importance of the spatial and stylistic unity between the house and the garden but also between the house and the wider landscape. He argued for more formal solutions in case of small gardens, but similarly to Mawson he accepted the possibility of creating more informal arrangements in the case of large-scale parks to allow the garden to blend into the landscape – an idea that Mawson borrowed from Humphrey Repton. Rerrich's most comprehensive book on garden design, published as a summary of his theories in 1923 was a particular homage to Mawson, as he titled it 'A kert rendezésének mestersége és művészete': The Art and Craft of Garden Making: the same as Mawson's folio publication that established his career.²⁸

Rerrich's approach to public parks relied on Mawson's theories, published in his 1911 book 'Civic Art', where Mawson called for public spaces to be designed in relation to their architectural environment.²⁹ Consequently, he argued for a more formal arrangement of small green spaces in city centres, defining two stylistic categories, the hard-landscaped 'architectural' and the soft-landscaped 'formal' style. He also referred to German examples claiming that "on the Continent, town gardens are laid out in a more orderly manner than in Great Britain. They have borrowed much from us in the matter of park design, and we, in turn, must borrow from them the art which, in their town gardens, has been carried to such high attainment".³⁰ Although having never visited Budapest, Mawson cited the Hungarian capital, when referring to bad examples. He wrote that "In Buda Pesth and other Continental cities there has been an attempt to combine the English landscape garden with massive stone embankments, and the result is not very happy".³¹ The criticized open space in question was a small public park at the foot of the iconic Gellert Hill in Budapest, Döbrentei Square, designed by Head Gardener Keresztely Ilsemann that reappeared again and again in Rerrich's critical writings as well.³² (Fig 3) No doubt, Mawson must have heard and learned about this open space from Rerrich while the latter worked in his office.

Rerrich published his ideas about public parks in a pamphlet and a series of articles in April 1919.³³ The two publications, 'The playing area as a social duty in town planning and landscape architecture' and 'The social planning duties of contemporary town planning in the new society',³⁴ set up a new agenda for Hungarian urban design. In these most compound writings, Rerrich strongly disagreed with the design solutions of public parks in Budapest, based on the stylistic traditions of the Lenné-Meyer school's 'mixed style' that incorporated formal elements into the informally 'naturalistically' designed parks.³⁵ Public open spaces created in this fashion – argued Rerrich – like the parks of Paris designed by Alphand, the Türkenschanzpark in Vienna or the lowest part of the Gellert Hill parks at Döbrentei Square, could be great designs from the point of view of botany or horticulture, but are not works of art. His critique applied to the works of Károly Ráde as well, whose plans in the 1920s still followed these ideas. However, his criticism also highlighted that parks in previous periods were only created for decorative purposes and without being inclusive. According to Rerrich, public spaces need to be designed to meet a strong social and functional agenda. He claimed that the American examples were the first to fulfil these goals, and in Europe Germany took on the lead.³⁶ The pamphlet introduced various German theorists to the readers, and proved that Rerrich understood where he needed to combine Mawson's theories with others in order to approach public park design comprehensively.³⁷ Rerrich's call, and the language he used especially when he called for the urban open spaces "to become democratized: the beauties and pleasures of parks need to serve the widest range of visitors",³⁸ was in strong connection with Leberecht Migge's 1913 publication 'Garden Culture of the Twentieth Century' where Migge saw public open spaces as instruments in educating German citizens and in satisfying the needs of a wide range of users.³⁹ He argued that "the socialization of the public green is one of the most important tasks of our time; it is no longer to be delayed."⁴⁰

To strengthen his argument, Rerrich cited the two main categories of urban green spaces defined by the Austrian architect Camillo Sitte (1843-1903) in 1900, and emphasised that the 'decorative green' category should be overtaken by the importance of the 'hygienic green'.⁴¹ Sitte's theory was supplemented by an 1915 thesis by Martin Wagner (1885-1957) titled 'Hygienic Green in Cities, an attempt to Open Space Theory'.⁴² Wagner only discussed the role of 'hygienic' green spaces, and was not involved with the formal and aesthetic questions of design. He defined the term 'use value' (*Nutzwert*), which is the most important function of urban spaces besides being reservoirs for oxygen, and the value of open spaces was solely determined by their suitability for physical activities (*körperlichen Nutzung*). The 'use value' of green spaces was the "physical appropriation of parklands",⁴³ and it was expected to be realised in the forms of playgrounds and sport areas. Although he did not directly refer to Wagner, Rerrich also focussed his attention on the

functional layout and the 'use value' as the most important points in assessing the success of public parks, and called for a comprehensive system of playgrounds in the city for the benefit of the "children of proletarian mothers"⁴⁴ To achieve this ideal spread of open spaces, Rerrich referred to the minimum green space requirements in cities, originally defined by German city planner Josef Stübben (1845-1936), and the need for easily accessible open spaces in short "baby carriage" distances defined by the German architect Hugo Koch (1883-1964).⁴⁵ In terms of visual examples, Rerrich referred to Harry Maasz's (1880-1946) concept design for the public park in Hamburg's Heiligengeistfeld (fig. 4). This visual choice shows Rerrich's preferred park designs: the formal, monumental stylistic solutions,⁴⁶ that he followed in his own designs as well.

The timing of Rerrich's bold pamphlets was not by chance. It was published during the time of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic (also known as Commune)⁴⁷, that introduced both communist policies and social reforms such as free education for all.⁴⁸ From 1913 onwards Rerrich he was working on a scheme to create open school playgrounds, that would be open to the general public as well.⁴⁹ However, these could not be realised at the time, because the chief medical officer rejected the idea on the basis that freely accessible playgrounds would be 'infectious' for the children.⁵⁰ The decision to publish his plans during the time of the Commune and wide ranging social reforms, drawing attention to the social responsibility of landscape architecture in providing healthier places for the masses, put both Rerrich and his schemes into the forefront of future professional debates. Although the Hungarian Soviet Republic was dissolved soon after, his schemes became well known, and the idea of children's playgrounds became widespread. By the end of the 1930s nearly 50 playgrounds were built in and around Budapest. However, in the new, conservative political era Rerrich never again published such a bold statement. He became director of the Royal Horticultural College between 1919 and 1923 and maintained a successful design practice both in architecture and landscape that allowed him to test his ideas on large scale public projects.

Rerrich, the landscape designer

Rerrich's public park designs followed his devotion to formality. His first major public park was realised in the city of Szolnok at the banks of the River Tisza in 1926 (fig. 5). The park had two main parts, both of them organized by an axially symmetrical system. The axes were defined by two important public buildings of the area, the County Hall and the new public baths. The area in front of the County Hall was more delicately structured and included more ornamental details. The main area along the river, next to the new public baths, was a simpler design, organized by one main axis that was strengthened by different small architectural elements, and the gentle sunken surfaces made

the perspective and the spatial organisation of the plan even more interesting. The formal elements of the park were further emphasized by the geometrically shaped shrubbery along the sides. The park with its formal solutions reminded users of the French baroque garden, therefore the Tisza Park, as it was named, was often called the 'park according to the Versailles-style'. This shows a major difference between the understanding of formality expressed in the works of Migge and Maasz as opposed to Rerrich and Mawson: while Migge aimed to create parks that are not dependent on historic models, Rerrich and Mawson referred back to the historical examples of Renaissance and Baroque gardens.⁵¹ This also echoed the state of Hungarian architecture in the interwar years, when revival styles became popular in line with the Conservative turn in Hungarian politics.⁵²

The never fully realised urban open space design for the Kossuth Square in Budapest was Rerrich's most controversial and most often cited work. The square itself frames the Hungarian Parliament building, and therefore it was always in the focus of public thinking and professional debates. The creation of a public park there started at the turn of the 20th century following the designs of Head Gardener Keresztély Ilseemann, based on the stylistic solutions of the English landscape garden (fig. 6). The plan was only partially realised, for the constantly changing ideas about whose monuments should be placed on the square made it necessary to redesign it several times.⁵³ In 1926, the debates about the layout of the square gained significance again, and the statue of the leader of the 1848-49 revolution, Lajos Kossuth, was chosen to be placed there.⁵⁴ Rerrich created a design in collaboration with the architect and town planner Jenő Lechner (1878-1962), nephew of the arguably most relevant Hungarian architect of the Art Nouveau, Ödön Lechner (fig 7). Lechner and Rerrich declared that "the square of the Parliament needs a strict, architectural layout".⁵⁵ The main axis of the design ran parallel with the longitudinal axis of the Parliament, and was emphasised by two statues, as the monument of Francis II. Rákóczi (1676–1735), another Hungarian revolutionary hero but from the early 18th century, was placed opposite to Kossuth's.⁵⁶ Perpendicular axes linked the surrounding buildings with the square and with the Parliament, and car traffic was re-directed to give more space to the geometrically formulated green areas. The idea successfully resolved the urban design problem that the axis of the Parliament, the square and the incoming streets were not perpendicular to each other. Although Rerrich's layout, which shows similarities with his design for the Tisza Park in Szolnok, was approved, the Municipality of Budapest found the idea too expensive, and asked Garden Director Károly Råde to modify the designs. Råde created a "more practical and cheaper" version, which combined Rerrich's formal solutions with the existing vehicle traffic routes (fig 8). The main difference between the two plans however was their use of plants. While Rerrich aimed to use geometrically cut shrubbery to create mass volumes of

plants, Råde used individual shrubs and trees around the edges of the design, reducing the formal appearance of the square.⁵⁷ The altered scheme resulted in a public debate in a series of journal articles about the design of public spaces and what role architects and gardeners should play in it, with very similar arguments to the debate between William Robinson and Reginald Blomfield 2,5 decades earlier. Rerrich used this opportunity to argue for the importance of special education of 'garden artists' (that he provided at the Royal Horticultural College) who, by combining the knowledge of both architects and landscape designers, would have enough knowledge to create successful and aesthetically appropriate public spaces.⁵⁸

After the publication of Rerrich's plans for the Kossuth Square in 1926, the new formal design language started to gain more popularity. Two years after Rerrich's plans for the 'Main Square of the Country', as the Kossuth Square is sometimes referred to, were altered, he had the opportunity to design another Kossuth Square together with a remembrance garden called Heroes' Grove in the former holiday and villa resort Pestszentlőrinc, just outside of the capital, which is today part of Budapest (fig. 9). The growing town of Pestszentlőrinc needed a town centre, worthy of expressing the pride of the dwellers. The open spaces around the former Market Square were included in one monumental regulation plan, designed by esteemed town planner László Wurga (1878-1952), who was head of the town planning department at the Municipality of Budapest.⁵⁹ The selected design competition was announced in 1929, and besides Rerrich, the leader of a Horticultural School, Márton Varga (1886-1952), and a landscape gardener, Emil Kirchlechner were also invited. The announcement defined the main aim of the Heroes' Grove, which was to be a public park and a monument at the same time, with trees to commemorate every soldier from the town who died in the First World War. The idea of the Heroes' Grove came from Germany as well, where Willy Lange proposed in December 1914, that an oak tree should be planted for every fallen German soldier as a new type of war memorial, a 'heroes grove' (*Heldenhain*).⁶⁰ The panel suggested Rerrich's design for execution, which shows his formal and architectural understanding gaining momentum over more historicising and horticulture-driven designs. Construction works started the following year, and the Heroes' Grove was finished in 1930. The realised plan for the remembrance garden shows Rerrich's typical stylistic solutions: strict, symmetrical formal layout with geometrical grassy slopes. The main axis in the middle was designed to coincide with the main axis of the never realised Town Hall, creating the spatial and stylistic link between the built and open spaces that Rerrich had been arguing for. The stone vases in the middle of the central oval space, ornamented by flowerbeds, were intended to strengthen this axial symmetry.⁶¹

Rerrich's public park plans were true to his intention in establishing a new formal language in

Hungary that is in harmony with the built environment. As he phrased in a book about his oeuvre, “my artistic plan of growth lies in two directions, Architecture and Landscape Planning [...] It is after all one and the same thing – fashioning in space. The materials, and the method of carrying out are different, but the ideas and principles of development are the same. Building and landscape planning are architecture in the widest sense of the word.”⁶² His principle to link the built and open spaces together not just stylistically but also spatially created parks that successfully renewed previous trends in designing public spaces. From an aesthetic point of view, he translated his theoretical writings into successful spatial designs. However, he never achieved what Dorothée Imbert called the “decoupling of form and style”.⁶³ Despite his calls for ‘functionality first’ in his 1919 pamphlets, the elements of his designs – from the form of plants to the arrangement of functions – always remained organised following the expectations of the formal style, as opposed to the examples of the 1920s German *Volksparks*, where the arrangement of spaces happened according to the functional requirements, independent of an overall stylistic language.⁶⁴

Rerrich’s Legacy

Rerrich’s appointment as a lecturer in 1908 at the Royal Horticultural College changed the Hungarian professional scene entirely. His employment meant that the questions of design became an integrated part in the training of gardeners. His background in Hungarian architectural education and his wide-ranging international experience as well as his extended knowledge in the allied arts and disciplines opened up new avenues in the educational landscape. The outcome of the new design units was on display in 1910 at the International Gardening Exhibition in Budapest (*Exposition Internationale d’Horticulture*). Examples of the exhibited student work showed Rerrich’s deep influence both in terms of stylistic solutions and visual representation. However, Rerrich’s influence on his students was not only through his design style. He encouraged them to learn about wide range of ideas related to their profession, even if he didn’t agree with them.⁶⁵ He was responsible for introducing the basics of the idea of the ‘Nature Garden’ through Willy Lange’s theoretical writings, although he disagreed with Lange’s stylistic solutions, and he himself never used this approach.⁶⁶ He also invited influential external speakers from the art scene, such as Ede Thoroczkai Wigand, a main proponent of the ‘Hungarian garden style’ that was based on the traditional peasant gardens of the country, something that Rerrich also opposed. He also encouraged and helped his students to gain valuable experience in offices abroad. A key example is Károly Bossányi, who – with Rerrich’s letter of recommendation – worked for Harry Maasz in Germany and Thomas H. Mawson in England.⁶⁷

The impact Rerrich’s social agenda exerted on open space design can be measured by the

creation of a series of new playgrounds. According to contemporary statistics, nearly 50 new play- and sportsgrounds were opened between 1919 and 1935.⁶⁸ In the creation of new public parks, the socially inclusive approach gained more and more importance as the Garden Directorate of the Municipality of Budapest focused its attention on parks that fulfil the needs of the broadest possible range of visitors, so the public could feel at home in the newly built green open spaces. Beside aesthetic questions, the Directorate aimed to satisfy the needs of everyday life, therefore it constructed smaller play areas throughout the city that served the health and entertainment of younger generations.⁶⁹ Along with the creation of smaller play areas in the city centre, the construction of larger playing fields – following German examples – was also discussed in the professional press: medical statistics were used to strengthen the argument to use large scale, yet undeveloped, areas as playing fields.⁷⁰ The plan for a small playground by Dezső Morbitzer, later Garden Director of the capital shows that the formal arrangement of small urban spaces became the accepted design solution in case of playgrounds as well. (fig. 10)

Rerrich's long-term legacy can be summarised through the public park of an iconic urban development in Budapest, the so-called Szent István Park on the bank of the Danube in Budapest in a newly developed area called Újlipótváros.⁷¹ (fig 11) The area was one of the only two metropolitan districts of Budapest being built in the interwar period. The new development consisting of five or six storey tall buildings of rental apartments is a key example of early modernist architecture in the Hungarian capital.⁷² The park in the centre was intended from the outset to be a freely accessible open space and was crucial to this comprehensive development. The aim of the clients was to give it a formal layout to be in harmony with the surrounding buildings that were to be built in the 'modern style' (fig. 12).⁷³ The strict formal layout was defined by two perpendicular axes and geometrically shaped areas. The elements included large open lawns and geometrically cut mulberry trees. The park, designed by Károly Råde after Rerrich's death, was supposed to be built according to the style of the 'French Royal Gardens'.⁷⁴ In 1936, at the opening ceremony, the president of the Municipal Board of Public Works called the park the most important social and hygienic feature of the newly built residential area, rather than focusing on its aesthetic value. The park was further enriched with a large water pool and children's playgrounds that aimed to create a more inclusive area for all, offering a urban park that fulfils the role of public spaces Rerrich had called for in his 1919 publications. (fig. 13)

Conclusion

At the time of his sudden death in 1932, Rerrich was at the height of his career. He was key in organising the XII International Congress of Architects in Budapest in 1930, and after his success in winning the design competition to design the architectural ensemble around the Dom Square in Szeged, a highly important architectural project in the interwar period in Hungary, he was elected to be Honorary Corresponding Member of the RIBA and member of the Zentralvereinigung der Architekten Österreichs as well. His eminence in both architecture and landscape architecture made him an outstanding character in Hungarian architectural and landscape architectural history. His training in landscape practices such as that of Thomas Mawson and Sons in Great Britain or in the office of René André in France, and esteemed schools in Europe, such as Versailles or Berlin-Dahlem, meant that he had developed and taught an up-to-date understanding of landscape design. His role in introducing reform ideas to Hungarian audiences was of similar importance in Hungary as role Hermann Muthesius's in Germany.

His design practice introduced new formal solutions to Hungarian public park design, based on English examples. Although, by the late 1920s and 1930s, these designs were not in the forefront of progressive European design language anymore, his role in creating an alternative to the traditionalist formal language was undoubtful. The reasons for the continuing success of his formal designs in Hungary are manifold. Until the late 1920s revivalist architecture, linked to "the creation of an economically and politically conservative autocracy"⁷⁵ prevailed in Hungary, and parks that were influenced by historic examples fit with this agenda very well. It also proves that Hungarian landscape architecture – similarly to previous periods in its history – followed European trends, rather than being in the forefront of change. As debates were rare, the profession of landscape architecture was just about to be established, Rerrich's ideas remained unchallenged for a longer period of time.

Rerrich's work as a writer and his tireless campaigning however, changed the nomenclature from 'landscape gardener' to 'garden artist', that shows the success of his work in raising the recognition of the profession. Equally important to this were his writings calling for these social role of public parks: to become democratised spaces for the benefit of all, following influences by contemporary German writers, including Leberecht Migge, Hugo Koch or Martin Wagner.⁷⁶ As a lecturer he aimed to open up his students' interest towards other new ideas, such planting based on phytogeographic rules and more naturalistic gardens, that he himself never used. He tirelessly worked to create a library with the latest theoretical writings from abroad, and actively helped his students to gain experience abroad. By achieving a new recognition for the profession of the 'Garden Artist' and introducing the importance of the social role green spaces Rerrich's work paved the way for a new

generation of landscape architects towards the complex modernisation of landscape architecture and public park design.

Figures

Fig 1: Béla Rerrich (1881-1932), self-portrait, 1930s (published in: Béla Rerrich *Rerrich Béla. Mit einer Einleitung vom Künstler. With preface by the artist.* (Geneva: Meister der Baukunst 1930))

Fig 2: Rerrich's design for a parterre in an English country house garden (1908?). (published in: *Kertészeti Lapok* 26 (1911) 2 p. 88) The drawing was exhibited as part of Rerrich's other designs in 1910 at the 2nd International Horticultural exhibition in Budapest.

Fig 3: Public Park at Döbrentei Square, Budapest, criticised by both Rerrich and Mawson. (Budapest City Archives, HU BFL XV.19.d.2.b 456)

Fig 4: Harry Maasz's 1912 plans for the Heiligengeistfield play area near Hamburg published in Rerrich's 1919 pamphlet. (published in: Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat.* (Budapest: Németh József Technikai Könyvkereskedése, 1919) p.33

Fig 5. Rerrich's plans for the public park in Szolnok (1926) (Budapest City Archives, HU BFL XV.17.d.1514 / 12/45)

Fig. 6 Keresztély Ilsemann's plan for the Kossuth square in Budapest (1908) (Budapest City Archives, HU BFL XV.17.d.1514.a. 5/2.3.)

Fig. 7 Jenő Lechner and Béla Rerrich's plan for the Kossuth square in Budapest (1926) (published in: *Magyar Mérnök és Építész Egylet Közlönye*, 60.(1926), 34–37. 223.)

Fig. 8. Károly Ráde's altered plan for the Kossuth square (1927) (Published in: Ráde Károly: *Budapest Székesfőváros Kertészetéhez tartozó park-sétány kretek tervei.* Budapest: Budapest Székesfőváros Házinyomdája, 1929.)

Fig. 9 Béla Rerrich's plan for the Kossuth square and Heroes' Grove in Pestszentlőrinc (1929) (Budapest City Archives XV_473_c_544_4)

Fig 10 Dezső Morbitzer's plan for a small playground in Budapest. (1930) (Budapest City Archives, XV17.d.1514.a–10/6.1)

Fig 11 The new development of Szent István Park in Újlipótváros, Budapest in 1936 (Fortepan, 146124_Adományozó: Sattler Katalin)

Fig 12 Szent Istvan Park on an aerial photo in 1944 (Fortepan 109059 Adományozó: Magyar Királyi Honvéd Légierő)

Fig 13 Children's play area in Szent István Park in the 1940s (Fortepan_158283_Adományozó:LATIN)

¹ The most comprehensive analysis was published by Gábor Alföldy 'Historical Revivalism in Hungarian Country House Gardens between 1880 and 1930. An exploration and analysis' *Acta Historiae Artium*, 48 (2007) 115-189.

² For most comprehensive collection of Rerrich's work: Hajós György: *Rerrich Béla építész és kertművész élete és munkássága* (Budapest: Építésügyi Tájékoztatói Központ Kft, 2016) and Imre Jámbor 'A mértani kert Magyarországon és Rerrich Béla működése' *Tájépítészet*, 3-5 (2002) 3-8.

³ For more on German designers in Hungary see: Fatsar Kristóf, 'European Travellers and the Transformation of Garden Art in Hungary at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century' *Studies in the History of Gardens and Designed Landscapes* 36/3 (2016) 166–184.

⁴ Galavics Géza 'The 'English' Garden as a Political Symbol in Hungary' in: Ernyey Gyula ed. *Britain and Hungary, 2: Contacts in Architecture, Design, Art and Theory during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* Budapest: Hungarian University of Craft and Design. 2003. pp. 13-20.; Sisa, József 'The 'English Garden' and the Comfortable House' in: Ernyey, Gyula. ed. *Britain and Hungary: Contacts in Architecture and Design during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century*. Budapest: Hungarian University of Craft and Design. 1999 71-94.

⁵ Fatsar, 'European Travellers and the Transformation of Garden Art in Hungary at the Turn of the Nineteenth Century' op.cit)note 3)

⁶ For more details on the Városliget and Heinrich Nebbien see Dorothee Nehring *Stadtparkanlagen in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Landschaftsgartens* (Hannover: Patzer 1979); Dorothee Nehring 'The Landscape Architect Christian Heinrich Nebbien, and his design for the Municipal Park in Budapest' *Garden History* 5/3 (1985) 269-270.; Dick Knight 'Borrowed Language: Literary sources, foreign resources and private communications in the creation of an early nineteenth-century Central European landscape' *Garden History* 41/2 (2013) 177-195.; József Sisa 'The City Park (Városliget) of Budapest' *Centropa* 15/1 (2015) 23-33.

⁷ Sisa József 'Biographien europäischer Gartenkünstler: Keresztély Ilseman in Budapest' *Stadt und Grün*, 46/6 (1997) 411-413.

⁸ Erika Schmidt, 'Stadtparks in Deutschland. Varianten aus der Zeit von 1860 bis 1910' *Die Gartenkunst* 1/1 (1989) 104-124. For more information on the influence of Meyer in other German speaking countries see: Hajós Géza (ed): *Stadtparks in der österreichischen Monarchie. 1765-1819* (Wien-Köln-Weimar: Böhlau 2007)

⁹ Luca Csepely-Knorr and Máté Sárospataki 'A "Gellérthegyi Paradicsom" – A Budai Arborétum Felső kertjének

-
- építéstörténete a II. világháborúig' *4D Tájépítészeti és Kertművészeti Folyóirat (4D Journal of Landscape Architecture and Garden Art)* 4/14 (2009), 2-25., Lajos Für & János Pintér (eds) *Magyar Agrártörténeti Életrajzok* (Budapest, Mezőgazdasági Kiadó, 1987) 41.
- ¹⁰ Katalin Gellér 'Hungarian Art Nouveau and Its English Sources' *Hungarian Studies*, 6 /2 (1990), 155-165. 155
- ¹¹ Katalin Gellér 'Hungarian Art Nouveau and Its English Sources' op. cit (note 10)
- ¹² Sarolta Geöcze translated and published Ruskin's *The Stones of Venice*, and in 1903 a few other texts from *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* in her publication, 'Ruskin's Life and Teaching' Sarolta Geöcze, *Ruskin élete és tanítása* (Budapest: Athenaeum. 1903) Other publications, such as Aladár Kriesch's book 'On Ruskin and the Pre-Raphaelites' also translated crucial texts. For more information see: Katalin Keserü 'Art Contacts between Great Britain and Hungary at the Turn of the Century' *Hungarian Studies*, 6/2 (1990), 141-154.
- ¹³ See: Keserü Ibid 141-143
- ¹⁴ Károly Ráde 'Közletről és Távolról. Tanulmányút Németországon, Hollandia és Anglián át' *A kert* 4/6 (1898) 190-192. Keresztély Ilsemann: 'Uti Élmények. Anglia' *Kertészeti lapok* 16/ 3 (1901) 59-63.
- ¹⁵ Uwe Schneider 'Hermann Muthesius and the Introduction of the English Arts & Crafts Garden to Germany' *Garden History* 28/1 (2000) 57-72. and Uwe Schneider, *Hermann Muthesius und die Reformdiskussion in der Gartenarchitektur des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts* (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft 2000)
- ¹⁶ Károly Csányi 'Az angol ház' *Művészet* 4/1 (1905) 11-15.
- ¹⁷ For more information see István Gál 'Magyar-angol kapcsolatok az építőművészetben' *Magyar Építőművészet*, 12 /4 (1963) 58-59 and Keserü 'Art Contacts between Great Britain and Hungary at the Turn of the Century' (op.cit note 12.) On the links between England and Germany and the role of Hermann Muthesius see: Uwe Schneider, *Hermann Muthesius und die Reformdiskussion in der Gartenarchitektur des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts* op.cit (note 15)
- ¹⁸ Gusztáv Geday *100 éve született Rerrich Béla*: Lecture given for the Senate of the University of Horticulture, January 21, 1982. Typescript, Corvinus University of Budapest, Entz Ferenc Library and Archive. Imre Jámbor 'A mértani kert Magyarországon és Rerrich Béla működése' (op. cit note 2)
- ¹⁹ Joachim Wolschke Bulmahn *The Wild Garden and the Nature Garden aspects of the garden ideology of William Robinson and Willy Lange. Journal of garden history: an international quarterly.* 12 (1992) 3, 183-206. p. 192.
- ²⁰ Theodor Echtermeyer *Die Königliche Gärtnerlehranstalt in Dahlem. Denkschrift zur Erinnerung an das zehnjährige Bestehen der Anstalt in Dahlem* (Berlin: Verlagsbuchhandlung Paul Parey 1913): Rerrich was listed in here as attending the school in 1907, however he was never awarded any qualifications.
- ²¹ Mawson's importance both in the UK and abroad at the time was discussed in several publications, such as: Jan Woudstra *Park policy and design of public parks in London, 1900-1945. Die Gartenkunst*, 27/1 (2015), 119-138.; Gordon E Cherry - Harriett Jordan and Kiki Kafkoura 'Gardens, civic art and town planning: the work of Thomas H. Mawson (1861-1933)' *Planning Perspectives*, 8/3 (1993) 307-332. Janet Waymark *Thomas Mawson: Life, gardens and landscapes* (London: Frances Lincoln 2009) For more on Rerrich's studies: Jámbor 'A mértani kert Magyarországon és Rerrich Béla működése' (op.cit note 2)
- ²² Mawson's name only appeared twice in the contemporary journals: firstly in an obituary to young designer, Károly Bossányi, former assistant of Rerrich, who died in England during the First World War, while he was working in Mawson's office where he applied with Rerrich's recommendation. Secondly, Mawson's short obituary was published in 1933 but in this, the author misspelled Mawson's name to Nawson. Anon 'Halálozás' *Kertészet* 5/10 (1917) 162. and Anon 'Az angol kertészársadalom vesztesége' *Kertészeti szemle* 5/12 (1933) 341.
- ²³ Geday *100 éve született Rerrich Béla* (op.cit note 18) 2.
- ²⁴ Jámbor 'A mértani kert Magyarországon és Rerrich Béla működése' (op.cit note 2)

-
- ²⁵ It is important to mention, that Rerrich was writing about ‘gardens’ and ‘Garden Art’ throughout his career, however, parallel to Leberecht Migge’s understanding, it covered all various scales of open spaces, parks etc. For a detailed discussion of this see David Haney’s introduction in: Leberecht Migge *Garden Culture of the Twentieth Century* (Dumbarton Oaks: Washington DC 2013). His understanding was probably shaped by the work of Mawson, and Hermann Muthesius. Thomas H. Mawson ‘The unity of the house and garden’ *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 9 (31 May 1902), 357-378. For more on Muthesius see: Uwe Schneider ‘Hermann Muthesius and the Introduction of the English Arts & Crafts Garden to Germany’ (op. cit note 15) Béla Rerrich ‘A szép kertről’ *Iparművészet* 30/4 (1927) 69-70, 70; Béla Rerrich, ‘A kertek művészetéről’ *Művészet* 9/9 (1910) 382-387.
- ²⁶ He most probably referred to Lichtwark, Avenarius and Schulze-Naumburg as art theorists campaigning for the new style and Olbrich, Läger, Muthesius and Behrens as designers. Imre Ormos *A kerttervezés története és gyakorlata* (Budapest: Mezőgazdasági kiadó, 1955, 2000 (facsimile edition)); Béla Rerrich, *ibid.* For more on the contemporary German context see David Haney, *When Modern Was Green. Life and work of landscape architect Leberecht Migge* (London: Routledge, 2010)
- ²⁷ Thomas Hayton Mawson ‘English and Italian Garden Architecture’ *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* 15 (27 June 1908), 485-496.; Béla Rerrich *A reneszánsz és a modern kert művészete* (Budapest: Franklin Társulat 1909)
- ²⁸ First edition: Thomas Hayton Mawson *The Art and Craft of Garden Making* (London: Batsford, 1901) Rerrich Béla *A kert rendezésének mestersége és művészete* (Budapest: Légrády Testvérek 1923)
- ²⁹ Woudstra Park policy and design of public parks in London, 1900-1945 (op. cit. note 22) 5.
- ³⁰ Thomas Hayton Mawson *Civic Art* (London: Batsford, 1911), 111.
- ³¹ *Ibid.* 118.
- ³² Of course, this cannot be a coincident. For more details about the stylistic and theoretical links between the work of Mawson and Rerrich see: Luca Csepely-Knorr *Connections between the United Kingdom and Hungary in the Field of Urban Design with a Particular Emphasis on the Work of Thomas H. Mawson and Béla Rerrich* MPhil Thesis, Manchester Metropolitan University, 2012.
- ³³ Béla Rerrich, ‘A modern városépítészet szociális irányú kertművészeti feladatairól’ *Magyar Mérnök- és Építész Egylet Közlönye*, 52/16 (1919), 127- 133. 52/17 (1919), 135- 140.; Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat.* (Budapest: Németh József Technikai Könyvkereskedése, 1919)
- ³⁴ *Ibid*
- ³⁵ Stefanie Hennecke ‘German Ideologies of City and Nature: The creation and reception of the Schiller park in Berlin’ Dorothee Brantz and Sonja Duemplemann (eds) *Greening the City. Urban landscapes in the Twentieth Century.* (Charlottesville and London: Virginia University Press, 2011)
- ³⁶ Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat* (op. cit note 33) 20.
- ³⁷ Mawson was highly criticised for not approaching landscape architecture from a more social angle: as Cherry described “Mawson saw civic art as representing the aesthetics of town planning” and “he did not approach city planning through social reform” that later led to his ideas being forgotten. Gordon E Cherry - Harriett Jordan and Kiki Kafkoura ‘Gardens, civic art and town planning: the work of Thomas H. Mawson (1861-1933)’ op. cit (note 22)
- ³⁸ Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat* (op. cit note 33) 19-20.
- ³⁹ *Migge Garden Culture of the Twentieth Century* op.cit (35 34), 75-77.
- ⁴⁰ *ibid* 77
- ⁴¹ A recent translation of his article is ‘Greenery within the city’, in George R. Collins and Christiane Crasemann Collins, *Camillo Sitte: The Birth of Modern City Planning* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2006), 299-318.
- ⁴² Martin Wagner *Das sanitäre Grün der Städte, ein Beitrag zur Freiflächentheorie* submitted in 1915 at the Königlichen Technischen Hochschule in Berlin.

-
- ⁴³ Ludovica Scarpa 'Quantifying parkland: The standards of happiness in Socialdemocratic Berlin' *Lotus International* 30/1 (1981), 118-122, here 119.
- ⁴⁴ Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat* op. cit (note 33.)
- ⁴⁵ Josef Stübben 'Der Städtebau' in *Handbuch der Architektur, IV. Theil: Entwerfen, Anlage und Einrichtung der Gebäude, 9. Halbband*. 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: A. Körner. 1907); Hugo Koch *Gartenkunst im Städtebau* (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1914)
- ⁴⁶ Rerrich probably had the image from Maasz's book *The German People's Park of the Future*.
- ⁴⁷ The Commune only existed between 21 March and 1 August 1919
- ⁴⁸ András Ferkai 'Hungarian Architecture Between the Wars' Dora Wiebenson and József Sisa (eds) *The Architecture of Historic Hungary* London: The MIT Press, 1998 245-247. 245
- ⁴⁹ *Fővárosi Közlöny* (Capital Gazette) XXIV. (1913), 50., 1830-1832. and *Fővárosi Közlöny* (Capital Gazette) XXV. (1914), 54., 2110.
- ⁵⁰ Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat* and Béla Rerrich 'A modern városépítészet szociális irányú kertművészeti feladatairól' op. cit. (note 33)
- ⁵¹ The title of one of his books 'The Art of Gardens in Renaissance and Modern Times' shows this clear historic reference. Béla Rerrich *A reneszánsz és a modern kert művészete* op.cit (note 28)
- ⁵² Ferkai 'Hungarian Architecture Between the Wars' op. cit (note 50) 245.
- ⁵³ Luca Csepely-Knorr 'A múlt kérdései – a jövő válaszai: Budapest, V. Kossuth tér térépítészeti tervpályázat' *4D Tájépítészeti és Kertművészeti Folyóirat* 8 (2007), 3-25.
- ⁵⁴ The statue by Ferenc Horvai was originally designed in 1908, and a replica of it was reinstalled at the square in 2015 as part of the complex rehabilitation.
- ⁵⁵ Károly Ráde 'Az Országház-tér rendezése' *Kertészeti Lapok* 31/4 (1927), 61.
- ⁵⁶ Ervin Ybl 'A Kossuth-szobor helye az Országháztéren' *A Magyar Mérnök- és Építész-Egylet Közlönye* 1926, 222-224.
- ⁵⁷ Ráde 'Az Országház-tér rendezése' op. cit. (note 55)
- ⁵⁸ Károly Ráde 'Ki legyen kertművész: kertész vagy építész' *Kertészeti Lapok* 32/22 (1928), 309-310; Béla Rerrich 'A fővárosi és város parkok művészi megtervezésének biztosítása' *Kertészeti Lapok*, 32/22 (1928), 310.
- ⁵⁹ Gyöngyvér Szabó 'A Lőrinci Kossuth tér rendezésének története' in: Írisz Feitl & Zsuzsanna Heilauf (eds) *Mérlegen a múlt: Írások Budapest XVIII. kerületének történetéből* (Budapest: XVIII. kerületi Pedagógiai Intézet és Helytörténeti Gyűjtemény, 2010)
- ⁶⁰ Gröning, Gert 'Nature mystification and the example of the 'heroes' groves in early twentieth century Germany' in: Jan Woudstra and Colin Roth (eds) *A History of Groves* (London: Routledge, 2018)
- ⁶¹ Ráde 'Az Országház-tér rendezése' op. cit. (note 55) 61.; Raymund Rapaics *Magyar kertek* (Magyar Könyvbarátok Egyesülete: Budapest, [1940]) 280.; Ybl 'A Kossuth-szobor helye az Országháztéren' op. cit. (note 39) 223; István Sárkány 'A Kossuth-szobor elhelyezése' *Építő Ipar Építő Művészet* 1926. május 1.; For more details about the comparison of the various plans see: Aladár Pirovits 'A Kossuth Lajos-tér végleges rendezése és a Kossuth-szobor' *Vállalkozók lapja* (1927) 7-8. For the detailed history of the area see: Csepely-Knorr, *Barren Places to Public Spaces*, op. cit. (note 10), 97-101; For detailed analysis of the plans see: Csepely-Knorr 'A múlt kérdései – a jövő válaszai: Budapest, V. Kossuth tér térépítészeti tervpályázat' op. cit. (note 53).
- ⁶² The book about Rerrich's work was published in the 'Meister der Baukunst' series, and it contained English text most probably written by Rerrich himself. It is important to point out that he used the term 'landscape planning' although in our current understanding we would call it landscape architecture or landscape design. Béla Rerrich *Rerrich Béla. Mit einer Einleitung vom Künstler. With preface by the artist.* (Geneva: Meister der Baukunst 1930)
- ⁶³ Dorothée Imbert, *Between Garden and City. Jean Canneel-Claes and Landscape Modernity* (Pittsburgh,

- ⁶⁴ For more on the idea of the German Volksparks see: Heino Grunert 'Benutzbares Grün für eine moderne Stadt' Heino Grunert (ed) *Betreteten erwünscht. Hundert Jahre Hamburger Stadtpark.* (München: Dölling und Galitz Verlag, 2014) For the theoretical evolution of the Volksgarten idea see: Susanna Brogi *Der Tiergarten in Berlin – ein Ort der Geschichte* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann). Chapter 2.4 and 2.5 pp. 45-67.
- ⁶⁵ Imre Ormos 'A Kertépítés 100 éve Magyarországon' *Kertészeti és Szőlészeti Egyetem Közleményei* 28/1 (1964) 221-227 226.
- ⁶⁶ For more about the critical analysis of Lange's theories see: Joachim Wolschke Bulmahn *The Wild Garden and the Nature Garden aspects of the garden ideology of William Robinson and Willy Lange.* Op. cit (note 19)
- ⁶⁷ Bossányi was mentioned in Mawson's autobiography as the 'hardworking Hungarian'. He died in internation on the Isle of Man during WW1. Thomas Hayton Mawson *The Life and Work of an English Landscape Architect: An Autobiography by Thomas H. Mawson* (London: Richards Press. 1927) 244.
- ⁶⁸ Árpád Halász *Budapest húsz éve 1920 – 1939* (Budapest: Wolff Károly Emlékbizottság, 1939) 5.
- ⁶⁹ Dezső Morbitzer 'Az ötven éves székesfővárosi kertészet' *Független Budapest* 27/1 (1932) 5.
- ⁷⁰ Ernőné Bródy 'Parkok és játszóterek' *Esti Kurir* 5/55 (1927) 6.
- ⁷¹ The area was named New Leopold Town, referring to the area to the south from it that is called Leopold Town after the Habsburg Emperor and King of Hungary between 1790-1792.
- ⁷² Ferkai 'Hungarian Architecture Between the Wars' op. cit (note 50) 266.
- ⁷³ Vilmos Vavra 'Lipótvárosi park, egyesületi szemle' *Kertészeti Szemle* 5/5 (1933) 157-158; Kálmán Király 'Előterjesztés az V. ker. Lipótvárosi park átvétele ügyében' *Fővárosi Közlöny* 47/8 (1936), 193-194.
- ⁷⁴ László Siklóssy *Hogyan épült Budapest?* (Budapest: Fővárosi Közmunkák Tanácsa, 1931) 322, Vilmos Vavra *ibid*
- ⁷⁵ Ferkai 'Hungarian Architecture Between the Wars' op. cit (note 50) 245.
- ⁷⁶ Béla Rerrich *A játéktér mint szociális irányú városépítészeti és kertművészeti feladat* op. cit. (note 33) and Rerrich Béla *A kert rendezésének mestersége és művészete* op. cit (note 29)