

RESUMÉ 5/2016

v minulosti stalo důvodem vzniku a leitmotivem využití řady zámeckých budov, což otvírá perspektivní téma pro budoucí možné způsoby jejich odborného využití i koncepčněji pojaté propagace (např. v již zavedeném cyklu celoročních prezentací *Po stopách šlechtických rodů*).

V některých případech byla maliřská díla vytvářena v symbióze s projektováním architektonické podoby budovy, pro niž byla určena. Za exemplární příklad nám může sloužit právě lovecký zámek Ohrada u Hluboké, kníže Schwarzenberg totiž Johanna Georga de Hamiltona zaměstnal zejména proto, aby vytvořil rozměrná plátna pro jeho hlavní sál, který dostal proporce zohledňující jejich pohledově dominantní roli. Dnes v tomto exkluzivním prostoru obrazy chybějí⁷ a výjimečný *gesamtkunstwerk* fatálně oslepl. Co mělo původně pouze dotvářet hlavní vjem (zejména krby a supraporty), se tak shodou okolností stalo jeho hlavním motivem. Ve spolupráci Národního památkového ústavu a Národního zemědělského muzea se proto zrodila nanejvýš chvályhodná iniciativa vedoucí k alespoň částečné rehabilitaci jednotného účinku interiéru této cenné stavby. Díky příslibu finanční spolupráce těchto dvou státních institucí a vstřícnosti současného soukromého majitele obrazů bude možné zhotovit jejich kvalitní fotokopie tištěné na plátně. Pokud by byly zasazeny do původních rámců (nalezených na půdě zámku) a zavěšeny do původních pozic ve velkém sále, bude možné znovu vnímat původní koncepci památkového skvostu, na jehož adresu bylo již na počátku 20. století trefně poznamenáno, že „jest jihočeskému baroku tím, čím Kratochvíle renesanci“.⁸

Martin Gaží

■ Poznámky

7 Po dobrodružné eskapádě jejich převozu krátce před obsazením českých zemí nacisty a následném putování přes Jižní Afriku a Kanadu do schwarzenberského zámku Murau ve Štýrsku bylo osm z deseti pláten zapůjčeno do expozice Loveckého muzea ve Stainzu.

8 Josef Braniš, *Obrazy z dějin jihočeského umění*, Praha 1909, s. 90.

The castle garden in Ostrov as the eighth wonder of the world. Protecting the historic elements of water systems

Lubomír ZEMAN

Keywords: Ostrov – castle garden – park – Prospect Wall – water distribution – water systems – canals

The castle garden in Ostrov (Schlackenwerth), during the course of the more than three and a half centuries of its existence, has undergone four developmental stages – from the mannerist early Baroque gardens of the 1640's, through the Baroque era in the 1660's, through the grandiose High Baroque garden of 1690–1715, to the natural landscaping of the early 19th century. At the time, the garden, with its many water elements and rich sculptural decoration, had no equal in the Czech lands and therefore was referred to as “the eighth wonder of the world”. The authorship of the individual stages, however, was shrouded in mystery until recently. Equally mysterious was the phenomenal work's method of operation. For a long time, it was not even believed that the garden depicted on numerous period engravings had even ever existed, and it was considered that the individual components were not actually implemented and that the set of engravings was used only to represent some idealized existence. Archaeological research, however, was able to prove that the structures depicted in the engravings really did exist. In 2003 and 2005, archaeological research by the Karlovy Vary Museum discovered the remains of the “Long Channel”, a billabong of the Bystřice River that ran in parallel with the facade of the castle buildings. The garden and other castle buildings, as well as the town itself, was fed by a supply of sophisticated water distribution. The Bystřice River flowing beneath the fortification walls of Ostrov provided plenty of water, but it could not flow to the fountains and houses of the higher-lying town. This was resolved by the flow of the Jáchymov Creek above the town, also known as the Veseřice, from which water could be led to the town and lower-lying gardens by gravity alone. The water supply was led through an open canal along a path from Ostrov to Jáchymov. The water flowing from the Mill Canal was used for the castle garden. In the Prospect Wall (“Prospektmaur”) of the castle grounds, which was built in 1691–1711 before the medieval fortification wall, it flowed sharply down in cascades in the grotto of the “Large Man Tower” before flowing into a large pool. During the extensive adaptation of the Ostrov Castle into municipal offices in 2012–2015, other important findings also revealed elements related to the technological operation of the garden – the remains of the water systems. Archaeological research revealed five canals with a single support canal that brought water to the fountains of the northern part of the garden. All canals were in a preserved state but led to a large central canal which had previously

been sunken and partially filled in. Stopping the flow of the water, as well as its retention in the damaged sections, brought considerable technical problems to the restored buildings. Drawing on the experience and advice of the recovery of the Kroměříž Flower Garden, the castle park in Ostrov was able to save the majority of its original water systems as an important witness to the technological equipment of the Baroque castle gardens.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Z. Lesche, *Veduta of Ostrov*, 1642; Fig. 2. M. Merian, *Veduta of Ostrov*, 1650; Fig. 3. J. M. Sockh, *Veduta of Ostrov*, 1716; Fig. 4. J. M. Sockh, *Prospect Wall in the castle garden*, 1715; Fig. 5. J. M. Sockh, *Princes' Palace*, 1715; Fig. 6. Anonymous, *Veduta of Ostrov*, 1726; Fig. 7. W. Pelikán, *Map of the castle garden in Ostrov, idealized reconstruction*, 1812; Fig. 8. W. Womaczka, *Ostrov – perspective map of town and garden*, 1814; Fig. 9. F. Weppel (?), *Map of the converted castle garden in Ostrov into a park, before 1811*; Fig. 10. A. Pucherna, *view onto the Princes' Palace with remains of the water parterre pools*, 1808; Fig. 11. J. Stern, *water supply schemata in the castle garden*, 1799; Fig. 12. *Ostrov on imperial print of the stable land register from 1842*; Fig. 13. *Ostrov, castle, Baden Palace after restoration*; Fig. 14. *The same, Prospect Wall after restoration*; Fig. 15. *The same, runoff from the “Large Man Tower” cascades*; Fig. 16. *The same, a view into the large central canal at Prospect Wall*; Fig. 17. *The same, view into the large central canal at the Prospect Wall*; Fig. 18. *The same, the canal in the Prospect Wall*; Fig. 19. *The same, sluice gate in the garden grotto*; Fig. 20. *The same, survey of the Prospect Wall and canals*; Fig. 21. *The same, canal west of the Summer Palace*; Fig. 22. *The same, schematic drawing*.

Pheasant house and game preserve at the Kozel u Štáhlav hunting lodge

David TUMA

Keywords: pheasant house – Czernins of Chudenice – riding trail – hunting landscape – game preserve park – par force hunts – Štáhlavy – Wallensteins – Kozel castle

The article presents the hunting landscape of the Štáhlavy area, formed by the Černín family of Chudenice from the 18th century, who used the older hunting grounds of the Kokořovec family of Kokořov. The landscape was later also significantly modified by the Wallenstein family, who acquired the estate in 1816. The central building of the Štáhlavy dominion became the Kozel hunting lodge, set amidst a greatly modeled landscape, around which a large buffer zone was declared in 1994. The lodge occupied a dominant position on the eastern side of the vast forest enclaves, divided by the meadow valley of the Úslava River and the residential area with fields and meadows to the west. The hunting landscape of the Kozel lodge was supplemented by a game preserve and a pheasant house. The article also focuses on the riding trail that originated in the 19th century through the gradual transformation

of the game preserve back into an area for free (open) hunting. The article tries to deepen the understanding of the development of the site and to determine the cultural-historical value protected zone as to the hunting facilities, which have become an integral part of the planned construction of the hunting seat. The development of the local landscape was analyzed and evaluated through a comparison of cartographic sources from a timeframe of 1764 to 1950, using written sources and field surveys. The combination of these methods resulted in the reconstruction of the extinct hunting landscape and an understanding of its development. The field survey (reconnaissance) showed the current state of the hunting facilities (former game preserve and pheasant house) and the riding trail. An understanding of the values of the area will ideally lead to better protection of this cultural heritage and will become a tool in applying the conditions of the established protective zone of the hunting lodge.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Kozel hunting lodge near Štáhlav, current condition, view from the south; Fig. 2. Excerpt from the first military survey from 1764 to 1768 and from 1768 to 1768 (rectification) showing the Štáhlav cultural landscape; Fig. 3. Excerpt from the second military mapping of 1836–1852 near the Kozel u Štáhlav hunting lodge; Fig. 4. Map of the Štáhlav game preserve from 1816; Fig. 5. Imperial print of the stable cadastre map (mapped 1836); Fig. 6. Layout of the Štáhlav pheasant house, undated; Fig. 7. Map of the Štáhlav district – pheasant house, author unknown, 1791; Fig. 8. Pheasant house at Štáhlav, current state of the bulwark of the lower dam of the pond; Fig. 9. The same, current state of the bulwark of the upper dam of the pond; Fig. 10. The same, course of the bulwark of the upper dam of the former pond, current state; Fig. 11. The same, former structure belonging to the gamekeeper's house, later the pheasant keeper's house, current state of building no. 65; Fig. 12. The same, lidar data of an elevation model SMO-5 of Plzeň BLOV 50 and map sheet ZM 1:10,000; Fig. 13. Riding trail in the Kozel forest, plan and cross-section of the riding trail in the best-preserved section under Neslůvský Pond; Fig. 14. The same, view of the line course of the trail below the dam of Neslůvský Pond, current state; Fig. 15. The same, view of the riding trail to the east beyond the dam of Neslůvský Pond, current state; Fig. 16. Overall map of the Kozel forest area with a map plotting the observed phenomena. The red dashed line indicates the riding trail, the blue intermittent line shows current or extinct sections of the southeast part of the game preserve.

Set of memorial and directional stones in the park of the state castle in Hradec nad Moravicí and the artwork from abroad that inspired them

Petr HAVRLANT

Keywords: Hradec nad Moravicí – English park – Lichnovský – Brotherhood of St. Hubert – Záhaň – memorial stones

The article deals with the history of a unique set of memorial stones placed from 1843 to 1910 in

the grounds of the castle park of the castle in Hradec nad Moravicí. The article also highlights the establishment of the English park in Hradec nad Moravicí as well as its direct source of inspiration from abroad – the park in Polish Záhaň, from where the custom of naming park still lifes, sightseeing spots, hills, and meadows, and of planting these places with memorial stones spread into the park complex in Hradec nad Moravicí. The article devotes special attention to stones named after the members of the Brotherhood of St. Hubert, a hunting and shooting club set up by Count Robert Lichnovský and which held celebratory shooting contests in the park and in the interiors of the castle of Hradec nad Moravicí from 1850 to 1857.

Illustration: Fig. 1. Jakob Alt, north facade of the White Castle in Hradec nad Moravicí with introductory parterre, lithograph, 1855; Fig. 2. Anonymous, Jan Karel Bohumil Lichnovský of Vořtice, 1750's; Fig. 3. Anonymous, Olomouc canon, Count Robert Lichnovský – founder of the Brotherhood of St. Hubert, after 1875; Fig. 4. Excerpt of a map of the castle park in Hradec nad Moravicí showing the location of the memorial stones of Erzherzog Carl Franz Platz, Liszt Platz, and Graf Arthur Sprinzenstein Brücke, 1850's; Fig. 5. Stone of Graf Arthur Sprinzenstein Brücke in the central part of the park; Fig. 6. Stone of Maria Sitz in the park in Záhaň, named after the Prussian Princess Mary of Saxony-Weimar (1808–1877); Fig. 7. Jakob Alt, wooden shed of the Brotherhood of St. Hubert shooting range in the castle park in Hradec nad Moravicí, lithography, 1855.

Spa parks. Composed therapeutic landscape of three spa locations from the 19th and early 20th century

Lubomír ZEMAN

Keywords: composed landscape – spa – therapeutic landscape – healing environment – breaks in the earth's crust – Karlovy Vary – Mariánské Lázně – Františkovy Lázně – UNESCO

Modifications in the landscapes around spa towns are among the most extensive in the Czech Republic. This type of landscape is characterized by the high quality and great variety of its main functions embedded into the natural environment. The overall structure of urban and rural spa areas combines architecture, urbanism, landscape architecture, and landscape modification in a unique way that integrates the surrounding countryside into the built environment, both functionally and visually. To make the spas more pleasant, spa parks, gardens and alleys, and colonnades under the open sky were built in urban areas. The area around the spa units, designed to be reminiscent of a wilderness area, was interwoven with walking paths connected by visual axes that enabled composed views onto individual dominant features of noble residences, water surfaces and dramatic water features, romantic rock outcroppings, and individual or groups of trees. Lookout points

looking over spa towns were sites where numerous stops, pavilions, and observation towers were later added. The urban and non-urban landscape was thus mutually intermingled to offer places to linger and relax with spa treatments according to the financial means and preferences of visitors. Creating impressive sceneries as well as unique units and compositions with intentionally interrelated compositions of natural and structural elements would ensure an appropriate therapeutic environment. Strolls along forest paths were an important part of spa therapy. The landscape around spa towns and therefore formed precisely for the purpose of treating patients utilizing physical movement, hydrotherapy in open nature, and trips to romantic and dreamy destinations. The medicinal tool itself, of course, is not merely walking and movement, but is also the actual effects of the environment, as recently demonstrated by scientific methods. Natural phenomena acting on crustal faults is what provides the genuine therapeutic effect; this is precisely what makes a normal landscape therapeutic. The area around spa locations along with its spa buildings is thus considered a "therapeutic environment". Detailed surveys managed to more closely decipher the origin and evolution of spa parks in their natural landscape modifications, but also in the formalized gardens of our most important spa towns. In contrast to deeply rooted assumptions, our views of the origins of the spa parks in Mariánské Lázně, Františkovy Lázně, and even in Karlovy Vary have thus changed. Valuable natural landscape modifications are also to be found in other spa locations such as Lázně Teplice, Lázně Libverda, and Luhačovice, as well as Lázně Jeseník in Moravia.

The therapeutic landscape forming an important and specific part of the spa environment has therefore become a prominent element in an upcoming serial transnational nomination of The Great Spas of Europe on the UNESCO World Heritage List, where the Czech Republic is represented by the spa towns of the West Bohemian spa triangle – Karlovy Vary, Mariánské Lázně and Františkovy Lázně. Spa parks and the therapeutic landscape of spa towns thus rank among the exceptional works of natural landscaping in the Czech Republic.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. A. F. Seifert, Panorama view of Karlovy Vary with its surroundings from the top of Three Crosses, around 1835; Fig. 2. V. Morstadt, View of Karlovy Vary from the Chapel of St. Lawrence, 1840; Fig. 3. W. Rothe – J. G. Jentsch, Dorota's floodplain in Karlovy Vary with Dorota's Gloria, 1815; Fig. 4. E. Gurk, Findlater's Temple, 1835; Fig. 5. P. Corneillan, View from Findlater's Temple, around 1820; Fig. 6. L. Janscha – P. Corneillan, Mount Parnassus, 1815; Fig. 7. H. Jakob, Map of the promenades of Karlovy Vary, around 1900; Fig. 8. Karlovy Vary, view from the Otto Highlands; Fig. 9. Ground plan of the Mariánské Lázně area from 1813; Fig. 10. Mariánské Lázně, aerial view;

Fig. 11. Ground plan of Mariánské Lázně in the 1820's; Fig. 12. Mariánské Lázně, indication sketch from the stable cadastre, 1839; Fig. 13. T. Gruber – J. Rothhesel, Františkovy Lázně ground plan, 1795; Fig. 14. Františkovy Lázně, ground plan of the enlarged spa colony from 1804; Fig. 15. E. Gurk, View of the colonnade and the old pavilion of the Francis Spring, 1825; Fig. 16. K. Postl, View of the parterre behind the colonnade in Františkovy Lázně, 1807; Fig. 17. Františkovy Lázně, imperial print from the stable cadastre, 1841; Fig. 18. J. Stadler – J. Soukup, Design of the America Park in Františkovy Lázně, 1882; Fig. 19. Panoramic view of Františkovy Lázně and surrounding parks from 1940; Fig. 20. Františkovy Lázně, aerial view from the south.

Interpretation of the historical development of a garden art structure: The Žižkovy Sady municipal park in Hradec Králové

Roman ZÁMEČNÍK

Keywords: Municipal park – Žižkovy Sady – Hradec Králové – history – composition – interpretation

The historic urban park of Žižkovy Sady in Hradec Králové was founded between 1904 and 1906 based on a design by landscape architect František Thomayer, a leading personality in Czech gardening art. Through an analysis of archival sources, and based on findings from field research, the historical development of the park was interpreted. Emphasis was placed on the oldest history of the building (first quarter of the 20th century). Žižkovy Sady was evaluated in relation to the level of preservation of its historical composition. Attention was focused on the importance of the structure in the history of the development of the public urban park.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Park on a postcard from 1909; Fig. 2. Satellite image (orthophoto) of the park from 2013; Fig. 3. Present view of the central parterre of the park from the west; Fig. 4. The central circular pool with staircase accented with decorative floral bowls on pedestals. Condition after renovation in 2000; Fig. 5. Bronze statue of Jan Ladislav Pospíšil from J. Škoda and J. Rejchl from 1933; Fig. 6. Sandstone monument to Jan Žižka from J. Dušek and J. Hejman from 1971; Fig. 7. František Thomayer, draft plan for the park on Žižkov square in Hradec Králové; Fig. 8. Comparison of two variants of a draft for the park by František Thomayer – the excerpt shows the western part with proposed vegetative landscaping. 8a – unrealized variant no. 1; 8b – realized variant no. 2; Fig. 9. View onto the larger part of the Žižkovy Sady park from the northwest on a period photo from shortly after its founding, undated; Fig. 10. View of the southern part of the park with details on plantings from the east from shortly after the founding of the park; Fig. 11. Longitudinal vista over the parterre from the west on a period photo from the 1930's; Fig. 12. Same view on a historical postcard from the first quarter of the 20th century; Fig. 13. Photograph of the extinct wooden gazebo; Fig. 14. Vintage postcard from 1917 with a view to the western part of the park from the southwest; Fig. 15. Analysis of a historical aerial photograph of the park in 1937 highlighting the composed axes; Fig. 16. Aerial photo

of Žižkovy Sady from 1963; Fig. 17. Ideal state of the Žižkovy Sady garden plan (combined 1st and 2nd variants of Thomayer's design) compared to the state of the park captured on an aerial photograph of 1973; Fig. 18. Detail of modifications around the central pool on a postcard from 1907; Fig. 19. Detail of the vegetative landscaping along the northern edge of the perimeter path of the parterre on a historical photo from 1964; Fig. 20. Detail of summer planting of the circular bed on the parterre from around 1915; Fig. 21. Photo of flowerbeds from the east, from shortly after the founding of the park; Fig. 22. Analysis of the authenticity of the trees in Žižkovy Sady; Fig. 23. Circular beds captured in a period photo from 1964.

Historical development, architects, and head gardeners of the Libochovice Castle Gardens in the 19th century

Jaromír TLUSTÝ

Keywords: 19th century – architect – gardener – castle garden, greenhouse – exotic plants

The history of the castle gardens of the Libochovice State Castle can be tracked from 1685 to the present. The 19th century had a smaller impact on the shape and scope of the gardens.

The first head gardener of the 19th century was František Damaska (1759–1840). In 1808 he prepared plans to transform the park based on the fashionable trends of the time. These plans, however, did not come to pass. In 1821, the castle proprietor, Prince Josef Dietrichsteinen (1767–1854) transferred him to another location in his estate.

The new gardener Čeněk Seigerschmidt (1783–1830) was commissioned in 1821 by Prince Dietrichstein to convert the castle gardens into an English park based on the design of architect Johann Philip Joendl (1782–1870). The same architect presented Prince Dietrichstein with several plans for the construction of a castle greenhouse. The prince, however, was not satisfied, rebuking the architect for the structure's sizeable budget. J. P. Joendl drew up the plans again, suggesting a smaller greenhouse. The greenhouse was built under this plan in 1833, under the new head gardener, Karel Binder (1788–?). The greenhouse was built by the master mason Josef Kruchina (1776–1844) with whose daughter the Č. Seigerschmidt married in 1853. Another of the mason family of Kruchina, the gardener's brother-in-law Tobiáš (1812–1887), repaired in 1853 and built in 1857, according to his own plans, castle greenhouses. During the construction of the new greenhouses, building components brought from the discontinued Salmov Gardens in Prague were used. Plants used from 1853 to 1858 to expand the castle gardens came from the same garden. Extensive changes and expansion of the garden eastwards were designed and supervised by garden director under Count Eduard Clam-Gallas (1805–1891), Josef Blecha (1816–1895).

Expansion of the castle park to the north of the castle took place in 1864. The castle owner, Countess Theresa of Herberstein (1822–1895) bought the land from the city, and head gardener Antonín Stelz modified it into a park.

Other modifications to the castle garden took place in 1874. Head gardener Václav Joseph (1847–?), according to a design and under the supervision of architect Quido Julio Joendl (1828–?) created new paths and vistas.

Gardener V. Joseph was quite adept at growing exotic plants. This was shown by his cultivation of the banana tree *Musa ensata* that bloomed in 1881. It was the fourth flowering plant of its kind in Europe.

The banana tree was grown in the still extant greenhouse, its oldest plans coming from 1882. At the time, air heating was installed into the existing greenhouse from L. H. Hauber from Munich. This was replaced by a water heater shortly thereafter in 1890.

At the end of the 19th century, the owner of the chateau Libochovice, Jan Josef Count of Herberstein (1854–1944), expanded the collections of plants in the greenhouse. These were plants, especially palm trees, brought in from his travels in North Africa and Asia between 1879 and 1929.

The gardener Martin Hrbek (1846–1917) was the one responsible for these imported plants. The last head gardener of the 19th century, whose greatest achievement was establishing the new park west of the castle building as well as two flower parterres in the eastern part of the park. Both were built in 1885 on the wishes of the wife of Count John Joseph, Marie Anne (1876–1944).

The pillar of each of these gardens were the gardeners. Although the professional approach of each of them was different, they each shared a single particular fate. Gardener Jan Chmelař (1849–1933) was closely linked to the Libochovice castle garden in the third quarter of the 19th century. Between 1865 and 1868, he trained here as a gardener, spending the next two years working as a gardener for the castle in Roudnice nad Labem. In 1870, he returned to the Libochovice castle gardens for several months. From 1871, he was active at several aristocratic gardens (Prague – Košíře, Jezeří, Slaně), spending the last twelve years of his life caring for the garden of Ing. Gustav Bihl, the former director of MUS AG in Most.

Illustration: Fig. 1. V. Pavlik, Reconstruction of the appearance of the Libochovice castle gardens created in 1700–1814 according to the plan of gardener František Damaska from 1814; Fig. 2. Johann Philip Joendl, layout of the Libochovice castle gardens created in 1835; Fig. 3. Johann Philip Joendl, unrealized plans for the greenhouse with parlor in the Libochovice castle garden, 1825; Fig. 4. Tobiáš Kruchina, unrealized plans to rebuild the greenhouse in the Libochovice castle garden, 1853; Fig. 5. (?) Lang, Plans created for the reconstruction of the greenhouse in the Libochovice

castle garden into hot-air heating by the L. H. Hauber Company from Munich, 1880's; Fig. 6. (?) Rabas, layout of the castle park in Libochovice, 1902; Fig. 7. Martin Hrbek (1846–1917) the chief gardener in 1883–1917 of Libochovice Castle; Fig. 8. Jan Chmelář (1849–1933, from 1865 to 1868 he was assistant gardener, then gardener from 1868 to 1871 of the Libochovice castle garden; Fig. 9. Group of plants in the Libochovice castle park.

Thermophilic plants and buildings for their cultivation in the Kroměříž Flower Garden

Lenka KŘESADLOVÁ

Keywords: Flower Garden – Kroměříž – garden art monument – orangery – plants in containers

Using the example of the Flower Garden, typical characteristics can be presented of the phenomenon of plants in containers versus the authenticity of garden art composition, both in terms of the range of plants used and their different methods of wintering and presentation, from the early Baroque period to the present. The Flower Garden in Kroměříž is unique in that the tradition of growing thermophilic plants was not interrupted here even after World War II. The plant collections have been continuously maintained and presented for more than 350 years.

Thanks to the meticulous management of the Archbishop archives, at least partial records of cultivation assortment are available for most of this period, as well as a whole series of plans showing the building development and the development of construction technology for growing plants for the 19th and first half of the 20th century. It may be asserted that the development of the cultivated assortment and the method of plant usage in the garden composition copied contemporary European trends.

From the perspective of authenticity, the structure known as the Large Greenhouse and its collection of potted plants are particularly significant. This began to form in its present appearance in approximately the mid-19th century, and today almost 2/3 of the plants are likely about 100 years old. The plants are presented according to the customs as depicted in photographs from the early 20th century. In the cold season they are presented as a winter garden, enriched by a traditional exhibition of camellias, then in the summer as *rangierung*. The palm house was reconstructed into its late 19th century appearance. Unfortunately, the original collection of palms and cycads was not preserved, and its renewal is presently not under consideration.

As part of the extensive heritage restoration of the Flower Garden, completed in 2014, the space for the Baroque orange garden was returned. For operational reasons, and due to the absence of period planning documentation, it was not renewed as a collapsible wooden structure with plants planted in soil. A total of 36 citrus plants are presented here

planted in containers.

With this undertaking, the Flower Garden has become a place where visitors are presented with period ranges and customs of the use of plants grown in containers both in the Baroque period as well as in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Justus van den Nypoort, *Orange garden in the Flower Garden in the summertime, with limes planted in open soil, 1691*; Fig. 2. *The same, Dutch Garden in the Flower Garden with limes grown in containers, 1691*; Fig. 3. Johann Sarkander Thalbert, *design for the construction of a cultivation area for pineapples in the Flower Garden, 18th and 19th centuries*; Fig. 4. Anton Arche, *layout and design for the roof of the large and palm greenhouse, around 1850*; Fig. 5. *Plan for the new construction of the Large Greenhouse, 1861*; Fig. 6. *Head gardener Romuald Waller at the table bed with pineapple cultivation in the Flower Garden, 1917*; Fig. 7. *Collection of plants from the Large Greenhouse presented in the summertime as rangierung (nanžtrunk) in the early 20th century, period postcards*; Fig. 8. *Inside the Large Greenhouse in winter, around 1920, vintage postcard*; Figs. 9–10. *The current method of presenting plant collections from the Large Greenhouse comes from period documentation. Charts: Transcripts of a list of plants grown in the Flower Garden in 1833 (Tab. 1) in the Large Greenhouse of the Flower Garden in 1920 (Tab. 2), and in the Palm Greenhouse of the Flower Garden in 1920 (Tab. 3).*

Archaeological excavations of garden art monuments versus period iconographic sources.

A few experiences from the Flower Garden in Kroměříž

Jiří JANÁL

Keywords: Monuments of garden art – historical iconographic material – archaeological research – Flower garden in Kroměříž

The International Charter on historic gardens requires the renovation of historic gardens to be carried out on the basis of a scientifically substantiated design. In effect, this means that it is necessary to concentrate all available sources to the memory of garden art, and possibly to subject analogies and this ensemble to criticism. An important source of knowledge concerning the original appearance of a historical garden is also historical depictions. The question, however, is to what extent the structure depicted is truthful and what the degree of possible artistic license may be. For extinct structures, these questions be answered in part through methods of archaeological research. Using the example of knowledge of the Flower Garden in Kroměříž, there are several examples that compare the representation of a certain part of the garden on engravings from the late 17th century with the results of archaeological research. A certain correspondence was indeed found, but it was not always complete. For engravings, the limiting factors were primarily the person of the artist himself (cartographer and topographer

Georg Matthias Vischer, artist Justus van der Nypoort) and the detail of the depicted representation (overall view of the garden, depictions of only parts thereof). Small mobiliary (a stone seat) depicted in the Bird-house and the Bowling House was not depicted at the Trout Pond, even though it is documented in archaeological research. Findings detectable by archaeological research are influenced by local conditions, the method of archaeology for the given situation, and the post-deposition processes.

Illustration: Fig. 1. *General view of the garden from the south on a depiction from 1691*; Fig. 2. *General outline*; Fig. 3. *Westerly situated Trout Pond on a depiction from 1691*; Fig. 4. *Situation determined from archaeological research at the westerly situated Trout Pond*; Fig. 5. *Rabbit Hill on a depiction from 1691*; Fig. 6. *Situation determined during archaeological research of Rabbit Hill*; Fig. 7. *Negative of the dividing wall between Rabbit Hill and the Birdhouse*; Fig. 8. *The Bowling House in a depiction from 1691.*

Possibilities of using archival sources of the National Agricultural Museum in Prague (personal collection of Josef Kumpán) for applied research

Stanislava OTTOMANSKÁ; Eva SPĚVÁKOVÁ; Pavel VAIDA

Keywords: garden architecture – search methodology – Josef Kumpán – First Republic

The garden architect Josef Kumpán was one of the leading figures in his field in the Czech Republic during the first half of the 20th century. The aim of this article is to demonstrate the possibility of using archival sources within the context of a personal fund which is part of the archival fund of the National Agriculture Museum for the purpose of applied research. This was mainly the analysis of archival documentation focusing on Kumpán's design activity; sorting, drawing up a list of structures, subsequent search for structures within the Czech and Slovak Republics for which the projects were developed, etc. The preparation, execution, and evaluation of field surveys at selected structures, an essential part of which was also the documentation of the given structure. The results obtained became a partial basis for creating a review and evaluation of the design activity of Josef Kumpán.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. (?) *Pětiovský, portrait of Josef Kumpán*; Fig. 2. *Josef Kumpán, Modern Gardens, Prague 1934 – title page and page 30 of the book*; Figs. 3–4. *Work and proposals of Josef Kumpán*; Fig. 3. *Urn grove in Nymburk*; Fig. 4. *Sugar Institute in Prague's Vořechovce*; Fig. 5. *Map of the realizations of Josef Kumpán from 1918 to 1945*; Fig. 6. *Garden landscaping of spa square in Luhačovice*; Fig. 7. *Zboril Garden – Bystřice pod Hostýnem*; Fig. 8. *Nature and Garden – excerpt from the article*; Fig. 9–13. *Projects for garden of ing. Čerych in Česká Skalice*; Fig. 14–16. *Čerych Villa in Česká Skalice, current state*; Fig. 14. *View of the south facade*; Fig. 15. *View of the central parterre with pool*; Fig. 16. *Fountain in the Rose Garden. Tables: Tab. 1. Example*

of a subsegment of a table of a Catalog of plan documentation as part of the NAKI project; Tab. 2. Example of a subsegment of a working table of identified structures intended for field research; Tab. 3. Example of a subsegment of a working table for field research for structure ID 80 – Čerch Villa in Česká Skalice.

It's the time you spent on your rose...

Examples of systematic education of primary school pupils in garden art monuments

Petr HUDEC

Keywords: historic gardens – Kroměříž – education – cultural heritage – elementary school

As demonstrated by the results of the project “Enjoying Czech Heritage”, the implementation of educational programs in a historic environment meets the educational needs of visitors more effectively than a usual guided tour. In the case of programs prepared for elementary school students, this means, for example, monitoring relationships in Framework Educational Programs. In order to develop pupils' knowledge and skills as well as shape their values and attitudes, a single visit to a monument is usually not enough. The article presents two concepts of long-term education in Kroměříž UNESCO sites that were created for first-level pupils of elementary school. In the first case, the program was Four Seasons of the Garden, the focus of which was a series of four meetings during the school year. The second project, Ten Times in the Garden, was intended to create even closer cooperation between heritage and educational institutions. Pupils had the opportunity to visit the Kroměříž UNESCO site in all of the months when school was in session. Just like the beauty of a necklace generally does not lie only its part, for educational activities implemented in a historical environment the ideal is also the creation of a chain of educational opportunities with a particular group of visitors to the monuments, which is also associated with a tighter formation of interpersonal relationships. This is also expressed in the idea of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, who provided the name for this article: “It's the time you spent on your rose that makes your rose so important”.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Presentation of garden elves created as part of land-art activities; Fig. 2. Watching the garden through peepholes; Fig. 3. The gallery of statues in the Pompeii Colonnade; Fig. 4. Pupils portray the fountain; Fig. 5. Chinese mechanical puppets in the Castle garden; Fig. 6. The Tea Garden program; Fig. 7. From the program Geometry in the Garden; Fig. 8. Children as guides to their parents through the garden.

Sources of aerial and satellite data for recording immovable heritage properties and caring for the historical landscape

Martin GOJDA

Keywords: Aerial photos – satellite images – landscape – heritage properties – archives

Researchers focused on recording, documenting, researching, and protecting immovable components of prehistoric and historic heritage and on studying the cultural landscape are increasingly appreciating the potential of remote sensing data, specifically aerial photographs and satellite images. Their testimony often significantly enriches our knowledge of their overall appearance, spatial layout (setting in the landscape context), of certain qualitative (e.g. architectural and sculptural) characteristics difficult to observe when viewed from the ground, and of course of their quality and the range of their preservation.

The first chapter introduces aerial photograph archives owned by scientific research, preservation, and museum institutions which were created specifically for the needs of their activities. This includes the archives of the Archaeological Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Prague (probably the largest in the country with 21,000 images), Institutes of Archaeological Heritage Care (Most, Prague, Brno), and several museums (Plzeň, Turnov, Mladá Boleslav, Strakonice, Klatovy, Jičín, Hradec Králové). Foreign archives primarily include the British Unit for Landscape Modelling (Cambridge University) and the Library of Air Photographs (Historic England). Also mentioned is the private collection of E. Vasilak, numbering around 5,000 aerial photographs.

The next section focuses on the historical archives of aerial photographs and satellite images acquired in the past predominantly for military and to a lesser extent for cartographic or other purposes. Historical photographs from the Czech Republic are stored in the collection of the Military Geographic and Hydrometeorological Office in Dobruška (VGHMÚŘ) which manages the largest national archive of historical aerial surveying photographs in the Czech Republic (approximately 800,000), acquired for cartographic and military purposes from the 1930's. This section briefly describes the world's largest archives of wartime aerial photographs (mostly from the WW2 period), the US National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), and the British National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP). Apart from these two largest archives containing historic aerial photos from different parts of the world, many countries have their own archives. In addition to several large archives in Germany and France, some of the largest funds in Europe are in Italy, specifically in the archives of three institutions – Aerofototeca Nazionale, Aeronautica Militare, and Istituto Geografico Militare.

In the last chapter, the author introduces readers to Internet map servers where one can watch either the entire surface of the earth through current satellite images, or the territories of individual countries in the form of vertical, orthophotographically arranged aerial photographs, acquired usually every 3–5 years (Google Earth, NASA World Wind, respectively mapy.cz) and released for the needs of publicly available map servers in varying degrees of spatial resolution.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. P. H. Sharpe, Stonehenge, 1906, the oldest hitherto known aerial photograph of a famous prehistoric monument; Fig. 2. James Wallace Black, Boston, 1860, still the oldest extant aerial (balloon) photograph; Fig. 3. Archive of aerial photographs of the Czech Institute of Archaeology (AÚP); Fig. 4. Two examples of oblique aerial photographs of archaeological immovable heritage properties buried beneath the ground surface and made visible through soil indications from the AÚP Aerial Photograph Archives: (a) modern-day pentagonal (artillery?) redoubt; (b) trench dividing a prehistoric fortified settlement into an acropolis (right) and forecastrle; Fig. 5. Terezín, overall and detail of the fortification system of the fortress town; Fig. 6. Terezín and surroundings. Condition of the Terezín fortifications located between Litoměřice and Trnovany in historical aerial photographs: (A) from the 1950's; (B) spring of 1945; Fig. 7. Terezín and surroundings today. The plan of the central redoubt of the fortification and adjacent fortification connection line is drawn here with the use of aerial historical photos and oblique images, where those components appear as vegetation; these are then rectified into orthophotos (red line); Fig. 8. A wartime aerial photograph of the landscape of the middle Elbe with a number of well-apparent extinct Elbe River meanders and a mosaic of tiny fields; Fig. 9. Multispectral image taken from the satellite Quickbird and adapted into a panchromatic color landscape photograph at the confluence of the Elbe and Eger, taken at the beginning of May 2005; Fig. 10. Image of the Terezín basin at the confluence of the Elbe and Eger near Litoměřice (left) taken 10 April 1945; Fig. 11. Ledčice, spatial indications showing the various components of a prehistoric settlement area, mainly sewage pits (small black dots). Comparison of a panchromatic satellite image in false colors (QuickBird-2, 29. 7. 2008) and an oblique aerial photograph taken by the author two days earlier.