

našeho oboru do reality. Životní prostředí je v řadě zemí přirozeně vnímáno jako celek složený z prostředí přírodního a člověkem vytvářeného, nejčastěji uváděného jako „built environment“,⁶ tedy „vybudované prostředí“. Je to o to významnější, že například při Úřadu vlády ČR bylo zřízeno *oddělení pro udržitelný rozvoj* a otázky kulturního dědictví by se měly co nejdříve dostávat do popředí i v materiálech tohoto útvaru.

Studie CHCFE je v neposlední řadě doplňkovým pramenem pro oborovou angličtinu, užívanou při popisu obecných projektů a strategií. V analytické části přináší četné teze, které mohou pomoci vnímání pojmu a obsahu „kulturní dědictví“ v zahraničních materiálech. Text připomíná vývoj pojetí od pojmů dědictví hmotného k prolínání s nehmotným na pozadí klíčových dokumentů ICOMOS či UNESCO. I tím může být studie přehledným studijním materiálem pro zájemce o porozumění v posunech nahlížení na hodnoty památek ve společnosti nebo při přípravě materiálů určených i pro cizojazyčné uživatele. Upozornění na celý materiál zakončují aspoň pracovním překladem „desatera zjištění“, nazvaného „the 10 key findings“, jimiž je sumární resumé završeno.⁷

Deset klíčových poznatků (Desatero zjištění)

1. Kulturní dědictví je klíčovou součástí atraktivit evropských regionů, metropolí a měst a venkovských oblastí a podílí se na ní, a to jak z pohledu investic ze soukromého sektoru, tak tím, že rozvíjí čtvrti kreativní kultury. Tím přitahuje talenty a svobodné podnikání a zvyšuje tak i regionální konkurenceschopnost jak v rámci Evropy, tak v globálním měřítku.

2. Kulturní dědictví zajišťuje evropským zemím a regionům jedinečnou identitu, která vytváří podmanivé příběhy měst a zároveň buduje základ pro efektivní marketingové strategie zaměřené na rozvoj kulturního turismu a přitahuje investice.

3. Kulturní dědictví je významným tvůrcem pracovních příležitostí napříč Evropou, přičemž pokrývá širokou škálu typů zaměstnání a úrovně dovedností: od stavebnictví orientovaného na opravy a konzervaci přes práce spojené s cestovním ruchem až pro malé a střední podniky a „start-upy“, často v tvůrčích odvětvích.

4. Kulturní dědictví je důležitým zdrojem tvůrčího potenciálu a inovací, dává vzniknout novým myšlenkám a řešením problémů. Vytváří rovněž inovativní služby, jejichž rozsah sahá od digitalizace kulturních statků až k využití špičkových technologií na hranici virtuální reality – s cílem interpretace historického prostředí a staveb a jejich zpřístupňování občanům a návštěvníkům.

5. Podle dosavadních zkušeností kulturní dědictví umožňuje dobrou návratnost investic a je také významným zdrojem daňových výnosů pro orgány veřejné správy, a to jak z hospodářské činnosti sektorů

souvisejících s dědictvím, tak nepřímo prostřednictvím vedlejších účinků projektů orientovaných na dědictví, které pak vedou k dalším investicím.

6. Kulturní dědictví je katalyzátorem udržitelné regenerace založené na hodnotách dědictví.

7. Kulturní dědictví je součástí řešení výzev, které se týkají Evropy v oblasti změny klimatu, například prostřednictvím ochrany a revitalizace obrovského množství energie vložené v historickém stavebním fondu.

8. Kulturní dědictví přispívá ke kvalitě života tím, že poskytuje charakter a atmosféru městům a regionům napříč Evropou, a tím, že z nich činí místa přívětivá k životu, práci a návštěvě – tedy atraktivní jak pro obyvatele a turisty, tak pro představitele tvůrčích vrstev.

9. Kulturní dědictví poskytuje zásadní podněty pro vzdělávání a celoživotní vzdělávání, včetně lepšího pochopení dějin. Stejně tak přispívá k občanské hrdosti a pocitu sounáležitosti s místem a podporuje spolupráci a osobní rozvoj.

10. Kulturní dědictví v sobě spojuje mnoho z výše uvedených pozitivních dopadů na budování společenského kapitálu a napomáhá zajistit sociální soudržnost v komunitách po celé Evropě. Tím poskytuje rámec pro participaci a angažovanost a podporuje integraci.

Věra KUČOVÁ

■ Poznámky

6 *Built environment* jako doplněk k *natural environment* je komentováno např. zde: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Built_environment, Internetový slovník Univerzity ve Windsoru prohlubuje komentář i k výtvarnému umění, např. zde: <http://www1.uwindsor.ca/vabe/built-environment>; <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/the-built-environment>. Velmi široký výklad pojmu *environment* bez přívlastků zároveň dokládá, jak zúžené pojetí světa v ČR pokrývá působnost ministerstva životního prostředí – viz <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Built+environment>. Vše vyhledáno 5. 3. 2016.

7 Pracovní překlad V. Kučová; za nezištnou konzultaci některých složitých pasáží patří velký dík panu Bryci Belchevovi. Na webu konference uvedený v pozn. 3 je také dostupná jednoduchá prezentace s originálními teze v anglickém jazyce, a proto zde nejsou uvedeny: http://www.encatc.org/culturalheritagecountsforeurope/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CHCFE_Conference_Project_Presentation_June_2015_Oslo.pdf, vyhledáno 5. 3. 2016. Každá teze obsahuje konkrétní příklady, jež ji ilustrují a které jsou detailně rozvedeny právě v plné verzi studie CHCFE.

Two articles on the 20th anniversary of the declaration of the first village heritage reservations

The potential of valuable historical villages for heritage protection, and the application of zoning analytical material tools

Karel KUČA; Věra KUČOVÁ

The approach of the Ministry of Culture in declaring village heritage reservations and zones

Hana ŠNAJDROVÁ

Keywords: village heritage reservations and zones – overall heritage protection – potential for protection – heritage losses – Ministry of Culture – history of the emergence of village heritage zones and reservations

The year 2015 was a year of several major anniversaries for rural architecture. Twenty-five years have passed since the declaration of the first village heritage zones, and most significantly, this is the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of existing village heritage reservations. Two articles present this anniversary in a broader context.

In the first article, Karel Kuča and Věra Kučová contemplate the current potential and future overall protection of as-yet unprotected historically valuable rural aggregates, which, due to chaotic building development in rural settlements, is rapidly declining. The authors warn that there are about the same number of village heritage reservations and zones as there are urban, even though there are disproportionately more villages in the Czech Republic. At the same time, the village units here still have great potential which, unfortunately, has been rapidly disappearing in recent years both due to the gradual liberalization of building regulations as well as otherwise laudable grant programs such as the Green Savings (Zelené úspory) program that lead to the modification, thermal insulation, and the resulting destruction of valuable architectural complexes. In terms of urban structure, the increasing flow of people from the cities to the countryside is therefore a great risk, as is the related pressure to rebuild villages or build connected satellite centers. The authors call for the urgent verification of the values of the still surviving units and a search for ways to rescue them.

The article of Hana Šnajdrová maps the process of preparation and declaration of existing village heritage zones and reservations from the perspective of the Ministry of Culture. It recalls that the emergence of village heritage reservations made the Conservation Act of 1953 possible, even though the first declaration did not come until thirty years later. Preparations for the declaration of a larger set

of village heritage reservations began in the second half of the 1980s, when a systematic survey of villages was launched; the plan was finally completed by 24 May 1995 with Government Directive no. 127.

The emergence of heritage zones, finally anchored as a concept in the Heritage Act of 1987, took place more quickly on one hand, but in several stages. The first 20 villages in the South Bohemian Regions were declared heritage zones on 31 December 1990. More zones followed in 1991 and 1993, when several zones in villages connected to Prague were declared, then later in 1995 and 2004, when the next set of zones was created by a decree of the Ministry of culture. Currently proposals are under discussion for measures of a general nature on the establishment of Kačerov in the district of Rychnov nad Kněžnou, Příslop and in the Prachovice district, and Pavlovice in the Česká Lípa district as heritage zones, while the territories of Praha-Řepy, Třeština in the district of Šumperk, and Uhřetice in the district of Přerov are under preparation for general measures.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Valy (Česká Lípa district), one of many well-preserved wooden villages of the Lusatian Mountains; Fig. 2. Božanov (Náchod district), one of the unique Broumov villages with large brick classicist farmhouses; Fig. 3. Libědice (Chomutov district), despite some interventions, the village as a whole still retains an exceptional value; Fig. 4. Krtín (Tachov district), one of the villages of the Horšovskojsko and Stříbrsko areas with typical preserved character from the late 19th century or from the first Czechoslovak Republic; Fig. 5. Podeštiny (Prachovice district); unprotected and yet valuable South Bohemian village; Fig. 6. Dančovice (Jindřichův Hradec district), an example of a Western Moravian village with primarily a ground-floor eave brick structure; Fig. 7. Lubnice (Znojmo district), the village is characterized by a very impressive material composition in a valley terrain configuration; Fig. 8. Hrubá Vrbka (Hodonín district), the village is unique in its continuous rows of stone and brick barns preserved on both threshing grounds; Fig. 9. Odrlice (Olomouc district), one of the few well-preserved examples of a Hana village with a multi-storeyed eaves brick structure, often from cut brick or with Art Nouveau decor; Fig. 10. Hrávka (Frýdek-Místek district), a village rich in timber buildings located on the border of the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland as one of the few in the area preserved as a valuable heritage village aggregate; Fig. 11. Zvírotice (Příbram district), a unique example of the application of socialist realism in the 1950s in the construction of a new village; Fig. 12. Petrov-Plzeň (Hodonín district), renowned for its wine cellars, declared a village heritage reservation as early as 1983; Fig. 13. Hlavoňovice (České Budějovice district), a village heritage reservation and a UNESCO World Heritage Site; Fig. 14. Křenov-Jizerka (Jablonec nad Nisou district), a heritage protected village in the heart of the Jizera

Mountains; Fig. 15. Dobruška (Rokycany district), a heritage zone renowned for its timbered buildings; Fig. 16. Plzeň 8 – Černice, village heritage reservation with buildings from the 19th and 18th centuries; Fig. 17. Olešno (Mělník district), reservation renowned for its extraordinary concentration of valuable timbered buildings. Photo: Hana Šnajdrová, 2015; Fig. 18. Jarov (Plzeň-sever district), rural homestead no. 42, before and after the renovation carried out as part of the Program of care for rural heritage reservations and zones and landscape heritage zones in 2014.

Pavilions transferred from nationwide exhibitions from the end of the 19th century

Šárka KOUKALOVÁ

Keywords: Transferred pavilions – Jubilee exhibition – Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition – suburban towns of Prague – folk style furniture – Jan Vejrych

At the end of the 19th century, one of the paths in the search for the “National style” was inspiration gained from folk village architecture. In the Czech cultural environment, an interest in domestic folk architecture began to emerge relatively late, in the early 1880’s, in comparison with the more developed countries of Central Europe. Nationwide exhibitions, held in Prague in the 1890’s, primarily played an important role in promoting folk architecture. Many professional studies have devoted well-deserved attention to the exhibitions themselves and their significance, even in 2015 with the commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition.

Although the exhibition pavilions were demolished after the exhibitions and after 1900, some patriots bought parts of selected pavilions from the General Jubilee Exhibition and the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition and brought them into the countryside, especially to emerging villa sites near Prague (Černošice, Senohraby). These structures were then rebuilt into villas or village dwellings or were modified and placed in residential areas and settlements (Ondřejov, Obříství). Pavilions from the nationwide exhibitions were mostly acquired by important Czech patriots (Josef Jan Frič, Svatopluk Čech) and successful entrepreneurs (Antonín Šimek). They became a kind of fashion custom of Czech society which itself was witnessing a huge national surge in the aforementioned exhibition events. In addition to the pavilions, folk style furniture sets were being brought to the newly built villas at the residential areas near Prague, furniture for which a certain connection with the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition may be assumed. The furniture could have been created from a design

for the ethnographic exhibition and which was subsequently intended for series production. All three examined furniture samples (Senohraby, Dobruška) evidently come from the same workshop, about which so far no information has been traced.

The intention of this article was to present newly discovered information on the preserved remains from two nationwide exhibitions in the 1890’s and to highlight this remarkable phenomenon in the Central Bohemian Region. Given the lack of written and archival documents on this issue (particularly in the evaluation of furniture design), this contribution may be considered to be the beginning of further research.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Černošice, Reinwart Villa no. 141, date unknown; Fig. 2, 3. Černošice, villa no. 277, main facade and detail of draft from 1908; Fig. 4–6. Pub Na větrníku at the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition; Fig. 7. Hrusice, villa no. 72; Fig. 8. Senohraby, villa no. 410, 411 (originally no. 37), photo from around 1913; Fig. 9. Pavilion of Count Jaromír Černín of Chudenic at the Jubilee Exhibition; Fig. 10. Pavilion of the Hynek Gottwald company at the Jubilee Exhibition; Fig. 11. Dining room design by Prof. Jan Koula for the Exhibition of Architecture and Engineering in 1898; Fig. 12–14. Senohraby, villa of Hynek Votoček, folk style furniture; Fig. 15, 16. Senohraby, villa in the upper colony from around 1895, folk style furniture; Fig. 17. Jevary, farmhouse no. 39, “granny house”; Fig. 18. Jan Vejrych, proposal for a farmhouse from around Turnov for the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society from 1895, Jan Vejrych (archive collection of the ethnographic department of the National Museum in Prague); Fig. 19. Jaroměř cottage at the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition; Fig. 20. Obříství, timbered parlour of the house of Svatopluk Čech no. 83.

Land books as a source for understanding the nature and form of local development in Český Brod and elsewhere

Vladimír Jakub MRVÍK

Keywords: Folk architecture – economic and social history – rural history – early modern period – Český Brod – Kostelec nad Černými lesy – patrimonial management

Land books are a valuable and essentially irreplaceable source primarily for analyzing the historical development of individual homes and other issues of historical topography and for analyzing the social and demographic image of the investigated location. Land books often contain more than simply dry legal and financial data, especially containing comprehensive descriptions (“sacuíky”) of buildings that were part

of the disposition of the respective property. For the Český Brod area (resp. the former estate of Kostelec nad Černými lesy) and the adjacent areas we can thus comprehensively reconstruct the character and form of local development at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries for entire villages.

The territory defined as the historical court district of Český Brod has always been very fertile and in folk architecture can be characterized as an area where the construction of the “Middle Elbe House” was applied. The older Middle Elbe House was timbered. The timbered perimeter walls of an Elbe House were usually equipped with a fireproof and insulating layer of clay screed spread from the outside (aka “House in Fur”). In the Český Brod area, the chamber type of house was fully applied. The second type of house, known as the “cowshed” type, according to the aforementioned descriptions of settlements in the land books from around 1800, would be found around Český Brod in only a few cases (e.g. Žhery no. 17) at the lowest social rural strata.

“Šacuňky” (pl.) embodied in land records are not only a valuable resource for understanding the form and character of rural development, but also for structures in small towns and villages of agrarian and semi-agrarian character, since this kind of settlement combines the issue of both urban and rural topography basically in their entirety. As specific examples in the text, the author mentions discovered “šacuňky” from the 18th century for the town of Kostelec nad Černými lesy which is located in the historic Český Brod district, both for the outskirts of the urban area and directly on the square. They clearly demonstrate a representation of a wide range of housing development in semi-agrarian settlements concerning the applied building material as well as in terms of layout – timbered and stone houses are both typically found here (and combinations thereof), but with half-timbered floors (although here it was an ethnically pure Czech region), structures of classical chamber arrangement and their variations in the form of a three-spaced double-tract.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Hořany, village square with belfry (demolished in 1896) on a picture from 1891; Fig. 2. Mochov, village square with the church of St. Bartholomew on a picture from 1891; Fig. 3. Tismice, built-up area on the edge of the town on a picture from 1891; Fig. 4. Konojedy, entrance into a farmhouse, around 1955; Fig. 5. Starý Vestec, entrance into a Rustic Baroque style farmhouse from 1839 on a picture from 1957; Fig. 6. Tucharaz, entrance into a farmhouse on a picture from 1914. Photo from the Podlipany Museum in Český Brod; Fig. 7. Rostoklaty, cottage no. 26, dated to 1819. The structure is “in fur”, i.e. the core is timbered and the top is

plastered; Fig. 8. Vitice, picture of a no longer existing half-timbered multistoried granary, probably from the 18th century. The picture is from the middle 20th century; Fig. 9. Layout scheme of a no longer existing residential tract of farmhouse no. 7 in Masojedy, situation in 1960. A representative of typical rural structures in the former estate of Kostelec nad Černými lesy; Fig. 10. Masojedy, detailed picture of a cottage with gables, no. 2 (from 1914). Another example of the use of the “in fur” building technique, quite extended throughout the Český Brod area; Fig. 11. Dobročovice, village square with Baroque chapel of St. Isidore on a picture from 1891.

Timbered granary house near Boskovice and its heritage protection

Jiří POKORNÝ

Keywords: timber house of the late medieval period and early modern times – single-storey chamber – granary – ethnographic subregion of Malá Hana – Moravia – heritage protection

Near the town of Boskovice in northwestern Moravia, several timbered granary-type agricultural houses have survived to this day. Around Boskovice, this type of house is characteristically positioned with its eaves side to the municipal (village green or street) area. Typologically speaking, this is an archaic variant of a tripartite house layout with an upper-floor chamber in the third part, typical for the Middle Ages and early modern period. This tripartite layout may be more complex with an additional functional articulation, as evidenced by archaeological excavations of extinct medieval Czech villages and by the last standing examples of these buildings in the Czech Republic.

The article primarily outlines the monument protection of the granary house near Boskovice from the early registration of these cultural monuments from the late 1950s to the present. It briefly describes the individual protected buildings, including some previously protected and no longer existing. Some buildings, still unprotected, and their valuable timber parts are also described. Given the already small number of surviving granary houses around Boskovice that hold links to their medieval and early modern architectural traditions, their historical architectural documentation is important. With the extinction of several valuable monuments in the second half of the 20th century, despite their earlier heritage protection, it appears necessary to extend such protection to other standing and identified buildings that represent significant comparative material of national importance.

One of the most valuable timbered granary buildings near Boskovice is the hitherto unprotected homestead in Šebetov, composed of the main farm residential building, no. 38, and the former cottage with today's building, no. 113. The high degree of preservation of the timber construction, the layout, and the vertical articulation of the entire structure conceals a first-category heritage monument. Dendrochronological dating of the timber structures also suggests that today's no. 113 was built in 1541 as a separate two-storey chamber – a granary, which was until probably adapted into a residence in the early 19th century. The entire homestead thus represents one of the oldest and very well-preserved agricultural units of this type in the Czech Republic.

Illustrations: Fig. 1, 2. Šebetov, timbered farmhouse no. 12 – original condition and preserved timbered main room; Fig. 3. Knínice, timbered farmhouse no. 116, condition in the 1960s; Fig. 4, 5. Velké Opatovice, timbered farmhouse no. 1, condition in the 1960s and after its demolition in the 1980s; Fig. 6. Sebranice, timbered farmhouse no. 34; Fig. 7. Knínice, timbered farmhouse no. 34; Fig. 8. Knínice, timbered farmhouse no. 20; Fig. 9. Boskovice, Sušilova Street, timbered farmhouse no. 943; Fig. 10, 11. Knínice, timbered farmhouse no. 112, condition just before disassembly and transfer to the Living Museum, with view of the interior; Fig. 12. Knínice, timbered cottage no. 19; Fig. 13, 14. Šebetov, timbered farmhouse with main structure no. 38 and cottage no. 113; the last surviving intact timbered granary house in Boskovice.

Folk architecture in the historic cultural landscape. Article on learning about the development of a residential aggregate through the example of the Plasko cultural heritage zone

Karel FOUČEK

Keywords: Cistercian monastery – historic cultural landscapes – manor development in the 19th and 20th centuries – rural architecture of the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries – landscape potential

Plasy is located approximately 20 km north of Plzeň in a distinctive landscape with the deep Střela River canyon. Before the mid-12th century, a monastery was founded here by King Vladislav II that existed until the middle 1780s. In the first third of the 19th century, the estates of the abandoned monastery were purchased by the House of Metternich, who developed intense agricultural activity and supported the demographic and urban development of their seat. The Metternich family also shaped the surrounding landscape, transformed a large meadow into a natural landscape park,

established a fishpond here, and landscaped the immediate vicinity of the monastery into a park. Even during the time of the Cistercians, the beginnings of a future village began to form east and south of the monastery which over the years transformed into a town. Plasy has preserved a remarkable collection of historic buildings which, together with the adjacent cultural landscape, supported the declaration of the landscape heritage zone of Plasko in 1996. This is immediately adjacent to several historical villages such as Babina, Horní Hradiště, and Žebnice where a number of remarkable examples of folk building culture can still be found similar to those in Plasy. The protection of the historical cultural landscape through the institute of landscape heritage zones is one of the forms of care not only about the area as such, but its landscape backdrop as well, defined here by the Sřela River valley and the urban area of the surrounding communities. The quality characteristics of the former estate of the Plasy Cistercians are significant and deserve extensive protection. One of the possible forms of care is the extension of the existing landscape conservation zone of Plasko to include the adjacent communities and the Sechutice courtyard with its nearby provost in Mariánský Týnec

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Map of the Plasko landscape heritage zone; Fig. 2. Plasy on a stable cadastre map from 1839; Fig. 3–5. Plasy, Cistercian monastery complex; Fig. 6. Plasy, pond southeast of the monastery, part of the Metternich activities from the middle and later part of the 19th century; Fig. 7–9. Plasy, construction from the 19th century from the circle of folk architecture preserved in the vicinity of the monastery; Fig. 10, 11. Construction on the street K Letišti. This area along the old path to the pond was architecturally formed from the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries; Fig. 12. Plasy, Hutní Street with rowhouses from before 1839; Fig. 13. Plasy, southwest part of the town providing evidence of the penetration of new Plasy buildings with older; Fig. 14, 15. Babina, historic center of the village; Fig. 16, 17. Žebnice, Church of St. Jacob the Greater and farmhouse no. 34.

Contributory granary in Chudenice

David TUMA

Keywords: Chudenice – outbuildings – granaries – contributory granaries – contribution – contributory granary funds – historical trusses – building documentation and evaluation – cultural properties

The village, later town, and today the township of Chudenice is located in the Klatovy district in southwestern Bohemia. Since 1996, Chudenice

has been part of a heritage protected area – the Landscape Heritage Zone of Chudenicko. The article is devoted to the building of the contributory granary in Chudenice, founded in 1819. The granary's establishment was preceded by frequent years of poor harvests, to which Emperor Joseph II responded from 1788 by ordering the construction of such granaries throughout the Czech lands. The surviving building plans from 1818 show that the author of the granary in Chudenice was Anton Stolle, builder and master mason for the nobility. It was designed to occupy the center of the large estate of the noble Černín family of Chudenice. Its facades are distinguished only by austere expression (plastic chambranles on the granary windows, cavetto geisons, plastic fabion frame on the upper edges of the gables), thereby demonstrating the particular importance of the functionality of this monobloc building. The structure, however, presents one of the largest granaries in the region, still in its originally preserved layout with its interestingly designed central passage and symmetrically placed straight staircase to the second floor. The granary is the urban landmark for the township of Chudenice and has been preserved without significant secondary structural modifications: This is why the Heritage Authority (NPÚ ÚOP) in Plzeň filed a proposal in 2014 to have it declared immovable cultural heritage. The Ministry of Culture decided against such a declaration in 2015 also due to the poor structural and technical condition of the structure caused by many years of neglect.

The article deals in detail with the broader circumstances and the phenomenon of the emergence of these structures throughout the Czech lands, including the historical reasons for building the Chudenice contributory granary, also providing a current description and analogies of other contributory granaries in the Plzeň Region. It examines the oldest contributory granary of the Plzeň Region in Chocenice from the 18th century as well as the sample designs of granaries by architect J. P. Joendl from 1826 and 1829. The article also deals with the transformation of architectural means of expressions through the facades of granaries in the 19th century using the examples of granaries in Žichovice and Klenová.

Illustrations: Fig. 1 and 3–8. Chudenice, contributory granary, Anton Stolle, 1818–1819; Fig. 2. Anton Stolle, plan for a newly built granary serf in Chudenice, 1818, colored drawing; Fig. 9. J. P. Joendl, Sample proposal of a contributory granary; Fig. 10. Žichovice, contributory granary, 1st half of the 19th century; Fig. 11. Klenová, contributory granary, 2nd half of the 19th century, view from the south.

An unexpected meeting with the Baroque in the works of Bohuslav Schnirch

Kateřina ADAMCOVÁ

Keywords: Havlíček Orchards in Prague – Bohuslav Schnirch – sculptures of the 19th century – neo-Baroque – Gianlorenzo Bernini

Last year saw the completion of the reconstruction of the Havlíček Orchards (Havlíčkové sady) in Prague which also included the restoration and replication of a central statue known as “Neptune’s Grotto” by Bohuslav Schnirch from the 1870s. The article summarizes the lessons learned during the restoration and attempts to present a detailed evaluation of the work and consider its basis from the of personality of the sculptor Schnirch.

The overall concept of Neptune’s grotto in literature is rightly associated with the late Italian Renaissance and with mannerist gardens such as the Boboli Garden complex in Florence, the Bomarzo Garden near Viterbo, and the Villa d’Este in Tivoli, near Rome. Likewise, the work of Bohuslav Schnirch has always been considered to be largely inspired by the artists of the high and late Renaissance – Raphael, Michelangelo, and Sansovino. The statue in the Havlíček Orchards, however, reveals another source of inspiration which usually is not associated with Schnirch’s work. The Prague statue of Neptune holds its immediate inspiration in the work of the famous Roman Baroque sculptor Gianlorenzo Bernini. A striking similarity in the modeling of the figure, the work with shape exaggeration, and the overall expression can be seen, for example, in the Fountain “del Tritone” in Rome’s Piazza Barberini – this statue, among others, demonstrates that the theme of Schnirch’s work is not Neptune, but Triton, Neptune’s subordinate deity. This is testified both by the legs in the form of tentacles as well as the service function of the “carriers” that are not associated with Neptune as the master of the seas. Bernini’s influence on this work by Schnirch is also evident from a comparison with other major parts of the Roman sculptor (the prophet Daniel in the Chigi chapel in the church of Santa Maria del Popolo, Triton from the Fountain del Moro on the Piazza Navona, etc.) including the non-figural elements (rock on the fountain of the four rivers on the Piazza Navona).

This comparison demonstrates three key facts. One, that during his documented visit to Italy, Schnirch intensively perceived not only the Renaissance classics, but also the great works of Baroque artists which left a strong inspiration on him. Secondly, the tradition held since the early 20th century, which evaluates Schnirch as a skilled,

but “dry” and “bloodless” academic who lacked the vibrancy and modeling capabilities of J. V. Myslbek, does not apply. The Vinohrady Neptune proves that Schnirch was able to compose a comparatively full-blooded, dramatic, and imaginative modelled figures – in short, that he was simply an excellent sculptor. Finally, this statue, created between 1873–1875, is an interesting example for the history of the reception of the Baroque. Here, Schnirch the sculptor leads a lively dialogue with the Baroque age, i.e. an artistic style that would be rehabilitated by professional historiography after nearly half a century. Like, for example, the neo-Baroque projects of F. Ohmann, Schnirch's figure of Neptune/Triton is an interesting example of a case in which immediate artistic intuition was able to precede a rational professional reflection of art historians.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Antonín Barvitiús, Josef Schulz, Bohuslav Schnirch, Prague 2, Havlíček Orchards, Neptune's Grotto, the 1870s; Fig. 2. Detail of a replica of the statue (Vojtěch Adamec, Aleš John 2012–2014), condition after installation the replica and completion of the plumbing; Fig. 3–6. Statue of Neptune from Neptune's Grotto from B. Schnirch in deposit, before restoration; Fig. 7–13. Statue of Neptune from Neptune's Grotto from B. Schnirch in the restorer's studio, condition after completion of modeling; Fig. 14. Jeroným Kohl, Leopold's (Kohl's) Fountain on the second courtyard of Prague Castle, detail with a pair of Tritons; Fig. 15. Gianlorenzo Bernini, Fontana del Tritone in Piazza Barberini in Rome, 1643; Fig. 16. Gianlorenzo Bernini, Fontana delle Api in Piazza Barberini in Rome, 1644.

Dispute over confiscated property

Kristina UHLÍKOVÁ

Keywords: Zdeněk Wirth – Václav Wagner – history of heritage preservation – confiscation of property after World War 2 – protectorate

During the Protectorate, Czech preservationists gradually split into two increasingly antagonistic factions. The impetus for this split became appearances by the head of the State Heritage Office Václav Wagner in lectures in the former Masaryk Academy of Labour in the artists' club and in professional journals in the years 1940–1942 with a new theoretical concept of the heritage protection of properties that he henceforth proposed to consider more as full-fledged works of art than as properties of the past (i.e. a synthetic approach). After these lectures, a gradually increasing aggravated exchange of views followed between Wagner and representatives of the older generation, Zdeněk Wirth and Karel Guth. Wirth may have also been bothered by Wagner's junctures with so-called creative monument care (schöpferische Denkmalpflege), which had gradually been promoted in Germany from the end of the 1920's, while most of its leaders openly sympathized with the ideology of National Socialism.

In the end, however, it apparently turned out to be mainly a generational dispute. On one side stood the older generation led by Wirth and the Club for Old Prague, on the other hand stood the State Heritage Authority under Wagner's leadership and a younger generation of art historians. After the war, the struggle between the warring factions erupted fully, focusing primarily on securing nationalized monuments.

If we compare Wirth's and Wagner's plan for managing and using nationalized historic buildings, both are apparently in agreement

concerning obtaining the monuments into state hands. Since the French Revolution, monuments had been increasingly regarded as public property, with the owners rather becoming their managers. Removing historical buildings from private hands was not, therefore, regarded as something outrageous or surprising by most of the professional and general public, but was rather seen as the culmination of a process initiated much earlier. The difference between Wirth's and Wagner's concept can be primarily seen in the issue of the further use of the confiscated buildings. Wagner did not concretely specify their use by the wider public, his priority being the representation of the state. For Wirth, the clearly most important objective, besides the professional maintenance of the buildings, was to make them available to the public in a way that would be “instructive”. At the time, focusing on educating again became societally very desirable.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Photograph of Cyril Merhout and Václav Wagner together, probably taken in Vojanovy sady when Merhout retired in 1940 (Literary Archive of the Museum of Czech Literature in Prague, Václav Wagner estate); Fig. 2. Zdeněk Wirth at the session of the plenum of the Czech National Council during the Prague uprising in May 1945. From left Gustav Beneš, Ladislav Machoň, Josef Kubát, Josef Kuřfner, Vladimír Koutný, Zdeněk Wirth, Jaroslav Nebesář; Fig. 3. Report no. 2 on the work of State Heritage Office Commissioner in Liberec Jaroslav Dédina, 24 June 1945; Fig. 4. Protocol of the Securing Committee of 25 May 1945 on securing and sealing the museum in Frýdlant; Fig. 5. Interior of the castle Doksy, photo from the early 20th century; Fig. 6. Castle Hrádek u Nechanic, view from the south, photo from the early 20th century; Fig. 7. Castle Kozel, terrace, photo from the early 20th century; Fig. 8. The interior of the castle Slatiňany, photo from the early 20th century.