

Vorlík). Schopnost systémového a pojmového uchopení problému prokázala Dana Novotná, která především pěči o krajinu prezentovala jako fenomén, který mimo jiné není možno plně racionalizovat.

Avizovaným tématem, kterému měla být věnována část programu, byla koncepce nové zákonné úpravy památkové péče. Vzhledem k tomu, jakou energii a zkušenost vložili do kritického připomínkování návrhu nedávno neschváleného zákona o ochraně památkového fondu prof. Girs a doc. Hauserová z organizujícího ústavu, to nebylo překvapivé, naopak odpovědné. Svými referáty k otázkám nastalé legislativní situace přispěli dr. Jiří Varhaník, dr. Michal Novotný, Ph.D., dr. Šerák a dr. Holeček. Po živé debatě plenum dospělo k plně shodě na podpoře řešení vzniklé situace toliko novelou stávajícího zákona.

Na setkání ovšem zazněla i celá řada dalších podnětných názorů a tezí ke stavu památkové péče, jako např. že jednou z podstatných a zdánlivě banálních otázek hodnotového posuzování památek je, co přetrvává a co se mění (Hauserová), že státní památková péče je silně zapouzdřená, neobjevuje se v médiích a chybí jí zpětnovazební mechanismy (Šerák), že úkolem pedagogů i zprostředkovatelů památkových hodnot je nikoliv ukazovat ty jediné správné pravdy, ale přivádět lidi ke kritickému náhledu a učinit je otevřenými (Hauserová), apod. K podobě diskuse je na místě přiznat, že oproti uzavřenějšímu jednání v roce 2016 tentokrát nebyla příliš konstruktivním dialogem, ale spíše klasickým konferenčním egocentrismem, kdy si téměř každý chce říci to svoje bez ohledů na to, že o tomtéž jinými slovy už mluvil někdo předcházející, atd.

Dvě komentovaná kolokvia však přese všechny výtky díky záměrně odlišné formě nastavené organizátory přinesla řádkou zkušenost odborné debaty nad otázkami teoretické podstaty a směřování památkové péče a prokázala zájem o tuto problematiku i její potenciál.⁴ Vyhrazená rozprava potvrdila schopnost a ochotu k oborovému přesahu výzkumníků, zatímco otevřená nespécializovaná „Inventura“ přilákala neformální reprezentaci odborné a angažované veřejnosti, kterou na řadě akcí např. NPÚ není možné potkat. Na druhou stranu se v obou setkáních projevila ne zcela dostatečná příprava organizační, ale také analyticko-výzkumná, projevující se v podkladech referátů i diskuse. Ve většině prezentací i reakcí bylo znát, že se nejedná o referování o práci na výzkumu péče, že chybí systematické dokládání faktů, strukturované syntézy názorů domácích a téměř zcela i zahraničních. Myslím, že to nelze zcela omluvit tím, že organizátoři žádali o iniciační krátké proslovy.⁵ Mimo jiné je to totiž důsledek dlouhodobé absence kvalitně výzkumně zpracované analyticko-hodnotitelské sebereflexe oboru. V každém případě z této situace plyne výzva k dalšímu, mnohem lépe fakty podloženému jednání, které bez naplnění této podmínky může rychle směřovat k nezávazné přátelské rozpravě.⁶

Už nyní ale můžeme kladně hodnotit uspořádání obou akcí. Ústav památkové péče Fakulty architektury ČVUT se i jimi začíná postupně hlásit k naplňování svého poslání a snaze zaujmout významné místo mezi akademickými pracovišti, která mají blízko k památkové teorii, i mezi působišti nezávislé, nestátní odborné památkové péče.⁷ Vzniká zde centrum neokázalé faktické důvěry překračující akademický okruh, kterou naše památková péče, přilíši spoléhající na svou státní složku, potřebuje jako sůl. Není možné popřít, že zásadní odbornou a neméně charakterově lidskou roli zde hraje osobnost Mileny Hauserové, jejíž nezištná a obětavá práce pedagogická i vědecky myšlenková nese své ovoce. Koncepčně ideový nadhled, odborný přesah přinášející odhalování souvislostí a filozoficko-empirický vhléd paní docentky se na setkáních plně ukázal ve formulování zadání, úvodních proslovů i glossování názorů přednášejících.

Domnívám se, že připomenutá setkání k teorii památkové péče, přestože organizovaná bez nějaké projektové grantové podpory, založila určitý závazek k pokračování, a tím otázku, jak dál. Zůstává prvotní úkol teoretické konceptualizace, systematizace, tematizace a orientace problematiky památkové péče. Jen nepatrně jsme se posunuli v hledání priorit. Odpovědi na otázky, co považujeme za aktuální problémy, čím se v našem diskursu máme zabývat a jak, se zdají směřovat další aktivity k větší specializaci témat teoretické báze a jejich podloženějšímu analytickému zkoumání a projednávání.

Vít JESENSKÝ

■ Poznámky

4 Porovnatelným pokusem se v uplynulých třech desetiletích staly snad jen početnější diskusní kolokvia a konference v rámci projektu PPP PRO Univerzity Pardubice 2011–2013. To byl ale bohatě dotovaný cyklus s dobře vtipovanými tématy (která ale bohužel nedosáhla vždy přínosného projednání a dostatečného respektu odborné veřejnosti) a především v podstatě skončil společně s grantem.

5 V tomto smyslu výjimkou byly referát Miloše Solaře o doktríně památkové péče na 1. setkání, který vzešel z jeho disertační práce a který jím byl prezentován již dříve, a dále, byť i nerozsáhlé, úvody Mileny Hauserové.

6 Jak ukazuje zkušenost, do budoucna volná tematicky a jinak téměř neomezená debata, která utváří pospolitost, početnou účast a prostor volné kritice, rychle vyčerpá své terapeutické působení a může dospět k frustraci z neúčinnosti.

7 Navíc k tomu je třeba brát v úvahu i další aktivity tohoto vysokoškolského ústavu na poli doktorských studií a výzkumu, přednáškové činnosti, propojování památkářských odborníků i zájemců různých generací atd.

What is the theory of heritage care?

Vít JESENSKÝ

Keywords: theory, heritage care, systematics, philosophy, science

This theoretical study attempts to conceptualize the systematics of the theory of heritage care, an outline of its formation and organization (its subject, methods of creation, functions, and mediation). It is the result of theoretical structuralist research. Its sources were professional literature, doctrinal texts, discussions with experts, reflective field practice, and the author's own professional experience. The introductory chapter, recapitulating the state of contemporary theory of heritage care on the background of postmodernism, reveals three decades of the absence of domestic systematic theoretical research.

In the chapter "Principles, Objectives and Tasks of the Theory of Heritage Care", this theory is defined as a deliberately designed tool that deals with the essence (subject matter and fundamental starting points) and the objectives of heritage care and processes them in a consistent interpretation system. The specification of the theory depends on the subject area (heritage care) which is increasingly perceived as a socio-cultural phenomenon. Its specificity is the reason for the discussion of the comprehensiveness and permanence/validity of the theory. The text presents a hypothesis on the value-type and activity-type of the theories of heritage care and the key absence of their interconnection. The fundamental paradigmatic division of the theoretical sphere distinguishes the narrower (ideological basis) and the wider concept of the theory of heritage care (ideological basis and thought instruments of its realization – terminology, methodology, history of the field, systematics, and philosophy).

The second part of the essay deals with the main related cognitive and mediating disciplines: the first is the philosophy in which the thesis on the implications of the origins in analytical and continental philosophy is presented, and the possibilities of a phenomenological concept and an independent philosophy of monument care are discussed. Two other phenomena (activities) are recalled, interpreting experience as not empirically but spiritually as a whole, namely art and religion. Research on their relationship to theory is found to be inadequate. Other related disciplines are ethics and, above all, science, whose role in the field (which as a whole is not scientific), is insufficiently elaborated. The scientism of theory is considered to be the decisive problem, and the question is placed on whether the theory of heritage care must be scientific and, in such a case, what its variants are. The unsuccessful domestic attempt to establish a field of "monumentism", summarizing the science

of conservation and social appreciation of the museum nature of monuments, is also commented. The text also focuses on the predictive possibilities of the theory. The field related to theory is methodology. It answers the questions of “how”, while theory answers the questions of “what and why”. The history of heritage care is a field that is often used, especially in the Czech environment, as a substitute for theory. Managerial and policy disciplines are primarily crucial for addressing field objectives which, in theory, fulfill the function of expected outcomes, visions, and models.

The chapter devoted to the sources, ways of formation, and the forms of the theory of heritage care critically assesses the lack of initial scientific analyses assessing the state of Czech heritage care. It subsequently deals with issues of cognition, mediation, concepts, language, and hierarchy of application levels of theory, as well as with forms of outputs (doctrine, discussion). Other considerations logically lead to the implementers of the theory which mention the negative consequences of the undeveloped nature of academic research of the theory of monument care in the Czech Republic.

The widely-conceived functions, applications, and implications of the deficiencies of theory are the subject of research of the next chapter. Theory serves not only for understanding, planning, and regulating the field, but also fulfills an integration role; it is the framework of science and methodological and legislative solutions in heritage care. It is also the backbone of policy and economics to the level of management and means of mediation of heritage care for the public, education, and the general identity of the field.

The conclusion of the article defends theory as an integral part of heritage care. The importance of theory depends primarily on the awareness of what theory really is. The complexity, generality, and comprehensibility of theoretical thinking is presented for discussion. The article is supplemented by a schematic diagram of the concept of the theory of heritage care:

The theory of heritage care deals with the essence (subject matter and fundamental starting points) and the objective of heritage care and processes them in a consistent interpretation system.

SYSTEM CONCEPT

- 1) set of knowledge (ideas)
- 2) the activity of creating knowledge and its mediation (theory as a part – method of care)
- 3) special discipline of heritage care
- 4) institutional background (ICOMOS TheoPhilos, ICOM CC, ACHS, etc.)

SUBJECT CONCEPT

- 1) narrower – specialized system of the ideological basis (the essence and

the goals) – the deliberate model (especially the theory of the value process)

- 2) broad – general sum of the ideological basis and theoretical tools of conceiving and applying theory – terminology, methodology (including the methodology of economics, legislation, management, research, education), history of the field, systematics (of the heritage fund and institutional), and philosophy (mainly axiology, ethics, and aesthetics)

APPLICATION CONCEPT

- 3 levels of generality and range of theory
- 1) general – formally abstract (dealing with the system, strategic goals, models, philosophical foundations)
- 2) methodologically thematic (development of general ideas into principles, international documents, methodology, etc.)
- 3) instrumentally applied (generalization of concrete practice, empirical doctrine, methodology, etc.)

In the opposite conception of the degree of generalization of experience (1. summary information, 2. generalization of experience and partial patterns, 3. general patterns).

OBJECT CONCEPT

- 1) universal (international)
- 2) culturally limited (e.g. national)

METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

- 1) analytic interpretation summarizing existing experiences for defining the present with the aim of understanding (may be heuristic – preliminary, exploratory, etc.)
- 2) constructively normative constructing visions, models, objectives, or standards for predictions (may even be dogmatic)

RESOLVING THEORY

- 1) research (scientific theory)
- 2) professional discussion
- 3) intuitively (“common sense”), emotions, memories, myth

METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPT

- 1) research (created by research)
- 2) discursive (result of discussion, consensus, tradition, authority)
- 3) intuitive (result of feeling, imagination, inspiration)

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Detail of portal of St. John Cathedral in New York; Fig. 2. The limitation of prediction in heritage care is not just a difficulty of theory but is also a strong challenge of practice. On which of these iconic buildings in lower Manhattan was contemporary heritage care focused? Photo from 1997; Fig. 3. Authenticity is one of the most promising concepts and categories of heritage care theory. How many conservationists, however, apply this knowledge and are able to distinguish works which are authentic and yet only of minimal heritage value? Fig. 4. Excursion in Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome with Werner Schmidt, part of ICCROM ARIS 07 course; Fig. 5. ICCROM, as an educational and methodological organization, has turned from a training center into a place

of open critical international discussion for professionals on conceptually methodological issues; Fig. 6. Summer course Communication and Teaching Skills in Conservation and Science, ICCROM 2013, lecture of Salvador Viñas; Fig. 7. Concepts and assumptions about practical care organized in theory can gain considerable efficiency when properly presented. Scheme of causes of damage to heritage properties, created by ICCROM.

Historical environment and contemporary architecture: Version 2017

Martin HORÁČEK

Keywords: historical environment, contemporary architecture, universal monument cult, heritage value, adaptive design

The essay discusses the terms “historical environment” and “contemporary architecture” in the debate on the optimal form of new construction accentuating conservation criteria. In addition to the demand for a handbook methodology, the motivation to review theoretical thinking of the problem is led by factors with a more general scope and importance: the increase in the population of the planet which necessarily leads to increased pressure on the exploitation of existing structures; the drastic loss of historical structures due to war conflicts, ideological purism and simple vandalism; the radical redefinition of formerly cohesive building aggregates by new “contrasting” features; a shift in the priorities of the expert debate in favor of overall protection and the preservation of “intangible” heritage; a shift of part of the general interest from the real world to the virtual one.

The boundaries between the “historical environment” and its theoretically assumed opposite do not actually exist; in the same way, it is not possible to exhaustively define the set of activities deserving special “heritage” care. A holistic view in the debate thus complicates conservation measures in practice – an intermediary balance would be assisted by a return of aesthetic value among the basic constitutive elements of “heritage values” on one hand, and by a greater emphasis on the present-day value of interesting structures and activities on the other, than on documentary values. Written and oral “history” is a shared story which you can believe, but don’t have to. “Heritage properties” may be the proof of this story; nevertheless, this is not a given fact in itself, but simply because this context is presented to us and we adhere to the relevant interpretation. According to Alois Riegl (1903), particular histories should be replaced by a universal monument cult, based on an intense perception and recognition of “age-value”. Human psychology, however, does not confirm Riegl’s premise: “age”, in the case of artifacts or collective activities,

is merely a story; we perceived it much more in our own bodies or in creatures close to us – and we usually try to minimize its effects and mask its attributes. As humans, we live in a permanent present moment; the “historical environment” into which we were born is a contemporary environment for us and no other. This is the paradox of the universality of the historical environment. “Documents of history” that we encounter during our movement through this environment do not represent, for the overwhelming majority of us, “history documents”, but rather an alternative in the present. It has been proven that the image of the past, if it does not concern us personally, is difficult to construct and is burdened with a relatively large degree of subjectivity. At the same time, the “differentness of the momentary reality” can be mentally grasped relatively easily and, above all, can be shared with a high level of understanding. The “historical environment,” as defined by a selective inventory of monuments and enclosed in (heritage) reservations and open-air museums as dreamed by modernists, was authoritarian and should have confirmed historical determinism: behold here what “progress” has overcome. The natural environment, which is both historical and contemporary, and is located everywhere without borders, is a landscape of possibilities, a landscape of freedom. A land whose value lies in demonstrating how things were before, but even more in that it frees mankind from the dictates of present-day pressures, fashions, and ideologies. More for some, less for others, differently for everyone.

How should something be built in such a landscape? Efforts to define a specific “contemporary” architectural language of new forms have proven to be weak. The “contemporary stamp,” as requested in the 1964 Venetian Charter, was never positively defined. Moreover, at the latest in the 1990's, architecture began to lose its innovative tendencies; what is still being upgraded is technology, not an architectural language with universal ambition, complexity, and plasticity. “Contemporary architecture” has been, overall, practically the same for about thirty years, something that last happened in Europe probably in the 14th century.

If architecture cannot find an anchor in time, then it should – as a spatial art – logically search for one in space. The space we inhabit is not an abstract concept or a “green field”, but a space modeled by nature and generations of people before us, a “historical environment”. The theory of so-called adaptive design recommends, for new forms, a language linking universal morphogenetic rules with regional characteristics. An extraordinary example of such an informed intervention into the “historic environment” is the rebuilding of the French city of Reims after the First World War, wisely linking

the principles of conservation, reconstruction, selection, and adaptation of heritage to a new artistic attitude as well as to social and economic benefits.

Illustrations: *Fig. 1. Historical environment 1 – Olomouc-Neředín: once there was a Roman military camp here, today it is a residential satellite; Fig. 2. Historical environment 2 – Olomouc, Horní náměstí: an intersection of roads that began to play a more significant role in the settlement of the locality several hundred years later than the place on previous picture. Yet the heritage reservation is situated here and not in Neředín; Fig. 3. Historical environment 3 – the route from Telnice to the Cairn of Peace, the battlefield at Austerlitz 1805. A landscape heritage zone, despite the relatively small amount of valuable architecture; Fig. 4. Historical environment, the changes of which are regulated by the authorities of heritage care and nature conservation: Sintra, the former residence city of the Portuguese rulers, World Heritage Site; Fig. 5. Historical environment, the changes of which are not regulated by the authorities of heritage care and nature conservation: the messy settlement development between Sintra and Lisbon, the view from the Moorish Castle in Sintra; Fig. 6. Do you want to save a brutalistic piece of art, or a “reminder of the past”? Dresden, Kulturpalast, Wolfgang Hänsch et al., 1962–1969; Figs. 7–8. Is the “new quality” equal to the “old”? What if the conservationists had to choose? Banská Bystrica, Námestie SNP and Námestie slobody; Figs. 9–11. From monument+document to document, or three times almost the same: Detroit, Lafayette Pavilion Apartments, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, 1956–1958; Brno-Lesná housing estate, Viktor Rudiš et al., 1962–1970; the northern edge of the Brno-Lesná housing estate, developed from the 1990's. The dominant feature is the apartment building from the complex called Orion, Martin Rudiš et al., 2007–2008; Fig. 12. A monument that a Czech native has trouble integrating into our own version of history: Dubai, Sheikh Saeed Al Maktoum House, 1896, inhabited by the ruling dynasty of the Emirate until 1958, subsequently abandoned and left to decay. It was reconstructed by the city leaders, primarily for political reasons, in 1986; Fig. 13. A monument whose story is completely foreign to most modern people, which still doesn't prevent them from appreciating its visual qualities. Ceramic vessel with two monkeys, 750–1400 after Christ, Chiriquí culture (Costa Rica and Panama), Detroit Institute of Arts; Figs. 14–15. The panorama of the historic urban landscape, defined by the Baroque style but not exclusively by the Baroque period: Lisbon, Alfama, the Church of São Vicente de Fora (Filippo Terzi and others, 1582–1629) and the Church of Santa Engrácia (dome by Luís Amoroso Lopes, 1956–1966); Valletta, from the left the Carmelite Church (Guzè d'Amato, 1958–1981), the Church of St Augustine (Antonio Cachia, 1765–1785) and the St John's Co-Cathedral (Girolamo Cassar, 1572–1577); Fig. 16. A mummified and finely-tuned Baroque monument: Rome, the Church of Santi Luca e Martina, Pietro da Cortona, from 1635, cladding of the apse and transverse nave “organized” (sistemazione) by Gustavo Giovannoni in 1932 after demolition of the adjacent buildings for the purpose of exposing and presenting ancient ruins; Fig. 17. The intense life of garden*

artefacts conflicts with conventional ideas of conservation or musealization. Museum village of Niedersulz, Lower Austria, front garden of a saddlery house from Niedersulz with perennials, annuals, and biennials; Fig. 18. London – historical environment and contemporary architecture in non-standard interpretation: on the right, Centre Point Tower (George Marsh, 1963–1966, a Grade II listed building since 1995); on the left, 264–267 Tottenham Court Road (Quinlan Terry, 2008–2009); Fig. 19. A new building emulates the order of the surrounding scales and the style of neighboring buildings: Hamburg, Peterstrasse, 1969–1984, the facades on the left are copied from extinct houses from other city streets (Fritz Pahlke), the houses on the right are reconstructed; Fig. 20. A new building emulates the order of the surroundings, but it brings a (slightly) different stylization of the composite articles: Zadar, Archaeological Museum, Mladen Kauzlarić, 1964–1972; Fig. 21. Washington, DC, National Museum of African American History and Culture, David Adjaye – Philip Freelon, 2009–2016; on the left, Federal Triangle (Arthur Brown Jr. and others, 1930s); Fig. 22. Gothic, Baroque, Art Deco and contemporary street furniture: Reims, Carnegie Library, Max Sainsaulieu, 1921–1927; Fig. 23. Reims, Rue de l'Arbalète, houses from 1934 (with three-storey superstructure from 2006) and 1925; Fig. 24. Historical environment mainly from the 20th century, including the pinnacles of the cathedral in the foreground; Fig. 25. Reims, reinforced concrete roof of the Notre-Dame Cathedral, Henri Deneux, 1924–1938.

The values of heritage properties as a tool for analyzing the interactions between conservation theory and practice

Jan UHLÍK

Keywords: values, value models, heritage property value, heritage care, Pavel Janák, Pelhřimov

Individual value categories, as a kind of general conceptual construct, may, regardless of the degree to which they are assigned at a given time and place, serve to mutually compare the significance that the individual actors of the assessment process attach to a particular work, set of works, or project on the basis of their own ideological anchoring. A coherent set of values thus creates a tool for a more systematic examination of relationships and mutual influence of architectural practice through contemporary ideas of heritage care. Moreover, however, the resulting more synthetic and methodologically more understandable view of this issue creates the prerequisites for assessing the impact of new findings on contemporary heritage care.

An essential prerequisite for the functionality of these analyses is the existence of a consistent and complete set of relevant values. The text deals with the discussion of selected older and contemporary domestic and foreign value models and the possibilities/limitations of their use for these purposes. On this basis, the text presents a model,

proposed by the author, which considers the total value of an architectural work (heritage building), its part or set of buildings, respectively the urban compositional structures to be a system consisting of two components – the heritage values of the work and other values of the work beyond the framework of heritage values.

Heritage values are considered to be of two kinds – general heritage values which, to varying degrees, are found in all objects and aggregates, since they form an inseparable part of their own existence, and other heritage values that are bound to a specific area of valuation of a given work. The general heritage values include the authenticity of the structure or the aggregate, its integrity and its rarity. Heritage values linked to a certain specific area of valuation of a given work are constituted of values having an urban, artistic, historical, or building-technical character.

It is worth noting here that the philosophical-aesthetic categories that include quaintness and an emotional effect, but also the Rieglesque value of age, all of which can permeate individual heritage values to varying degrees, are not considered for the purposes of this model as separate heritage values, but rather as part of the internal structure of some of them. These categories act as a catalyst for the operation of the relevant heritage values. In this context, for example, the universal aesthetic value of heritage properties, which occupies a central position in Max Dvořák's conservation theory, appears as a result of the synthesis of aesthetic categories strongly permeating the individual values of works of art and their aggregates.

Other values of a work beyond its heritage values include economic value, novelty value, and value of modernity. All three form a natural part of the value structure of architectural and urban works and significantly influence their overall value.

The text details the contents of each value category with the objective of clarifying their internal structure and mutual relationships.

The application of the theoretical considerations on the possibilities of using a properly structured value system to investigate the relationship of subjects operating in the field of heritage care and building practice to heritage buildings or sets of buildings – and thus necessarily to one another – is demonstrated using the proposed value model on the case of the unrealized design by Pavel Janák to the Rosol Hotel associated with the proposal to restore the gable character of the southern front of today's Masaryk Square in Pelhřimov from 1912.

A deeper study of the mutual influence between the theory of heritage care and implementational practice has not yet been given the appropriate attention, which corresponds to the hitherto schematic and unprocessed approach to this issue.

The essay offers one way to systematically research these complex relationships. If a professional discussion on this subject develops, it will mean not only an enrichment to the field itself, but will also create the preconditions for a more effective approach to cultural heritage care.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Pelhřimov, south side of Masaryk Square with Hotel Slávie on the site of former house No. 29, hotel built in 1913; Fig. 2. Pelhřimov, southern side of today's Masaryk Square before the planned modifications; Fig. 3. The same, with the drawn proposal of the new construction of Hotel Rosol; Fig. 4. The same, with the drawn proposal of the facade of Hotel Rosol and renovation of the gable character of this side of the square, author Pavel Janák.

The issue of the essence of historical heritage, and the perception, recognition, and defense thereof from the point of view of heritage care practice

Lubomír ZEMAN

Keywords: heritage essence, theory of heritage care, Kyselka Spa

As part of developing the theory and methodology of heritage care, questions of the theory of heritage value and the assessment of properties that are cardinal in terms of the direct impact of practical heritage conservation are quite often discussed. Equally important, however, is the concept of the essence of heritage, whose investigation and finding are an essential step in the optimal protection of monuments. Heritage value is a set of subvalues that complement each other and evolve over time. They are, therefore, variable. Based on the theory that the individual meanings and values of a heritage property comprise comprehensive heritage value, but with a certain hierarchization, we conclude that they even form the very essence of the heritage property. The properties of the values are variable, however, while the essence of the structure is perceived rather as permanent (although it may not necessarily be so). With regard to the international charters on cultural heritage, the 1979 Burra Charter specified the material essence of a structure to be all physical material of a site, including all its parts, inventory, equipment, and structures. The material essence of the structure includes the interiors of buildings and remnants beneath the surface as well as the extracted material. The material essence of a structure defines its spaces, and these can represent important elements of the meaning of the site. The new concept of cultural heritage, promoted as a dynamic phenomenon and a progressive process of recognizing values, leads to the creation of a postulate of new typological groups of structures that become the subject of heritage protection. It creates completely new concepts of the heritage landscape, places of local importance,

and intangible cultural heritage. Their heritage essence, however, remains for the most part hidden. The problem of it not being sought out may be sad for practical heritage care, especially for those typological groups of properties that are specific and distinctive in a certain way. An example would be the Kaiserbad Spa (Císařské lázně – Spa I) in Karlovy Vary, built in 1893-1895 with a unique layout, declared a national cultural monument in 2010. The heritage essence of the building lies not in its beautifully designed “theater” architecture, but in the spa operation, which is absolutely unique and is paramount for the building. Yet this basic function of the building was neglected and overlooked. An insufficient knowledge of the property, with its real values and heritage essence itself, threatens it with irreversible damage. This similarly concerns other technical monuments, industrial aggregates, industrial architecture, etc. As part of the typological broadening of the subject of heritage protection and the broadening of its range of values, the individual heritage values must be examined and the heritage essence itself must be appropriately postulated. The essence of a heritage property is not just a simple value. It is a much deeper meaning based on the inner structure of the work. The essence of the property, a human work, can be understood as a basis, as a foundation of the very existence of the subject of interest which is a source of historical testimony and a witness to the past. It is the nucleus filled with certain physical properties of the function for which the structure originated. As a sum of these properties, it emits signs which create meanings. The essence of these meanings, in retrospect, then gives testimony of the “inner” structure, the substance of the work. The core of the heritage essence, then, lies in the material building substance which is very tightly bound to the functional contexts of the property (form and original idea). To ensure the correct process of recognition and heritage conservation, one must know and understand the property in its entirety, also meaning the nature of its existence to prevent its endangerment and the loss of cultural values.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Karlovy Vary, Císařské lázně, national cultural monument, view of the entrance facade from the northwest; Fig. 2. Karlovy Vary, Císařské lázně, section of the building, project by Fellner & Helmer Studio 1893; Fig. 3. Karlovy Vary, Císařské lázně, section of the Rašelinový pavilion, project by Fellner & Helmer Studio 1893; Fig. 4. Abertamy, Hřebečná, Mauritius mine, national cultural monument, part of the corridor with signs of manual mining and expansion by fire; Fig. 5. Abertamy, Zenker Villa, uniquely preserved bathroom with original equipment from the 1930's; Fig. 6. Lázně Kyselka, bottling plant of Löschner spring; Fig. 7. Heritage essence, graphical expression of relationship between phenomena.

Břetislav Štorm – Catholic intellectual and post-war conservationist

Martin GAŽI

Keywords: Břetislav Štorm, history of heritage care, Emmaus, heritage property management

The study summarizes the thought path of the Catholic scholar, litterateur, publicist, visual artist, architect, and heraldist Břetislav Štorm (1907–1960) to the “people’s democratic” concept of heritage care, applied in Czechoslovakia after the Second World War. Three fundamental impulses led to thoughts on the cultural heritage of Štorm: the critique of the decline of the liturgical art combined with the practical attempt to correct it, the criticism of the overwhelming expertise that does not allow the perception of the historical artifacts in their essential dimension, and the critique of the modern way of life including modern art, especially architecture, turning away from proven material solutions and technologies. In his artistic creation and journalism, he defined himself against the widespread resignation to spiritual universality, the integrity of traditional craftsmanship, and the basic “purposefulness” of things characteristic of the time. The study also deals with Štorm’s views on the adaptation of iconic Prague monuments greatly damaged during the war (Old Town Hall, Emaus Monastery).

Štorm began to work in the heritage conservation profession after being employed by the Ministry of Technology in the autumn of 1945, and in particular from February 1947 when he was appointed Deputy Chairman of the National Cultural Commission. It was then that he fundamentally revised his pre-war principal rejection of cultural centralism. At Štorm’s instigation in the 1950’s, some extensive repairs and building work on the most affected castles began which the National Cultural Commission had designated among “building monuments of the first category” suitable for operation in the tourism industry (especially Švihov, Kost, Blatná, Horšovský Týn, Pernštejn, Jemniště, Roudnice nad Labem, Jindřichův Hradec, Mělník, Náchod, Boskovice, and Chlumec nad Cidlinou). He was involved in the design process in some of them. He was deeply disappointed with the process of decentralization of heritage care which led to the issuance of Act No. 22/1958 on Cultural Monuments.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Břetislav Štorm – member of the Military and Hospital Order of the Knights of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem, 1937; Fig. 2. Břetislav Štorm – conservationist, 1955; Fig. 3. Table with the emblem of the Czechoslovak Republic as designed by Břetislav Štorm, placed since 1946 on all the state-listed monuments; Fig. 4. Kost Castle, a relief with the state emblem according to the design of Břetislav Štorm, condition in 2003; Fig. 5. Břetislav Štorm, sketch of the proposal of the Church of the Divine Heart of the Lord

in Malý Beranov u Jihlavy, 1933; Fig. 6. Břetislav Štorm, sketch of the proposal of the restoration of the Emmaus Monastery, 1948; Fig. 7. Břetislav Štorm, sketch of the proposal of the completion of the Old Town Hall, 1946; Fig. 8. Bechyně, the Kohoutek bastion after 19th century editing on a postcard from 1907; Figs. 9 and 10. Bechyně, the Kohoutek bastion after the reconstruction of sgraffito according to the design of Břetislav Štorm, realized in 1953 by Václav Pichl using traditional technology; Fig. 11. Kost Castle, façade of the medieval palace in the main courtyard before reconstruction of the window lining, early 1950’s; Fig. 12. Kost Castle, façade of the medieval palace in the main courtyard after reconstruction of the window lining according to the project by Břetislav Štorm, 1954; Fig. 13. Švihov Castle, Kašpárka tower, condition after the completion of the project by Břetislav Štorm, 1952; Fig. 14. Karlštejn Castle, entrance hall with electoral banners according to the designs of Břetislav Štorm, 1956; Fig. 15. Karlštejn Castle, modification of the Mockery Altar of St. Nicholas according to the design of Břetislav Štorm, 1956.

The rehabilitation of the cloister of the former Dominican Monastery in České Budějovice – 150 years of state heritage care theory and practice of on the example of one quite significant heritage property

Petr PAVELEC

Keywords: České Budějovice, Dominican monastery, cloister, heritage care, Central Commission for Research and Care for Building Monuments, restoration, rehabilitation

The article deals with the project of rehabilitation of the cloister of the former Dominican monastery in České Budějovice in 2004–2015. The text also summarizes and reflects upon, in a broader context, the 150-year-long peripeteia of the theory and practice of heritage care in relation to this remarkable monument.

The architectural values of the originally medieval Dominican monastery in České Budějovice have made it more and more frequently the object of interest of heritage professionals and employees of the newly constituted state heritage care since the mid-19th century. After the year 1860, on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of its foundation, the administration of the monastery started the project of its regothification. During the implementation of the project, state heritage care was represented by the conservationist of the Viennese Central Commission for Research and Conservation of Building Monuments, Professor Jan Erazim Vocel. However, other reputable experts stated an interest in the project’s realization, such as the then President of the Central Commission, Josef Alexandr Helfert, or the architect and master builder of the St. Stephen’s Dome in Vienna, Friedrich Schmidt and his student Josef Mockner.

Other monumental activities took place in the monastery complex and its cloister after 1893 under the supervision of the art historian and conservator of the Central Committee, Josef Braniš. In contrast to his predecessors, who held the characteristic purist principles of heritage care, Braniš showed more understanding in repairs to the monastery in preserving more than merely its medieval architectural elements and furnishings. This was partly due to the views of modern heritage care as represented by the art historian and later general conservationist of the Central Committee, Alois Riegel.

In 1908, Professor František Valentin Schmidt replaced Josef Braniš as Central Committee conservationist. Regarding the building modifications and restoration of wall paintings in the cloister, he held a more pragmatic attitude and more accommodating to the operational requirements of the administration of the monastery than its predecessor. This eventually led him into a conflict of opinion with the then provincial conservationist, Rudolf Hönigschmid, and with the interested public. He resigned in 1912.

A remarkable rehabilitation project of the cloister, in heritage terms, was also prepared for the 700th anniversary of the city’s foundation in 1965. Its goal was to remove the younger partitions dividing the cloister space, restoring the stone elements, and other work with the intention of rehabilitating and opening the entire cloister to the public. The realization of the project was negatively affected by the socio-political and economic circumstances of the period, however, especially the lack of qualified suppliers of construction and restoration works as well as the ideological intervention of the state authorities. In the end, the planned work was completed only partially.

After repeated unsuccessful attempts to complete the project of the cloister’s rehabilitation in the 1980’s and 1990’s, it was fully realized only between 2004 and 2015. The church depository was gradually cleared in the eastern wing of the cloister, the partitions in the east and west wing of the cloister were demolished, newly discovered mural paintings and architectural features were restored, the floors were reconstructed, and other important repairs were carried out. Thus was created a rehabilitated area of the cloister which now reflects the rich history of the monastery and which provides an inspirational environment for spiritual and cultural activities of various kinds.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. View of the cloister from the northeast corner; Fig. 2. View of “the most beautiful and best preserved parts of the Gothic cloister”, engraving by Josef Vojtěch Hellich from 1860; Fig. 3. A view from the north to the eastern wing of the cloister to the partition from 1894; Fig. 4. Northeast corner of the cloister in 1912; Fig. 5. Josef Braniš (1853–1911),

art historian, gymnasium teacher, in 1888–1908 also Imperial conservationist for heritage care, II. section for the districts of České Budějovice, Kamenice nad Lipou, Jindřichův Hradec, Pelhřimov, Tábor, and Třeboň; Fig. 6. František Valentin Schmidt (1863–1927), priest, historian, gymnasium teacher, in 1908–1912 Imperial conservationist for heritage care, II. section for the districts of Kaplice, Český Krumlov, České Budějovice, Prachovice, and Susice; Fig. 7. Rudolf Hönigschmid (1876–1967), art historian, from 1912 the provincial conservationist for the German regions of Bohemia, from 1925 to 1936, the head of the State Monument Office; Fig. 8. Discovery of a medieval saddle portal in the northern area of the eastern wing of the cloister and the removal of the tracery window in the adjacent area, 1965; Fig. 9. view of the paradise court with installed rotating stage by Joan Brehms, 1965; Fig. 10. West arm of the cloister, the result of “restoration” in 1991; Fig. 11. View of the cloister from the northeast corner area, condition after removing the secondary partition during the floor reconstruction; Fig. 12. View of the cloister vestibule before the transfer of gravestones to the interior of the monastery church.

The nationalization of Nova Stránov and its other fates during the Communist period

Alena NACHTMANNOVÁ

Keywords: Nový Stránov, post-war confiscation of property, National Cultural Commission

The article, using the example of one heritage building, attempts to map the course of the nationalization of castles in the second half of the 1940's and their further fates. The Šimonka family, to whom Nový Stránov belonged, was among the so-called industrial nobility and was very loyal to the Czechoslovak Republic. The castle of Nový Stránov was owned by the family since 1917. The castle was built through the reconstruction of a medieval castle first in the Renaissance style, later in the Baroque style. During the rebuilding, the castle church was built and an extensive forecastle area and gardens were built. The last reconstruction from the late 19th century adapted the building to modern housing requirements and allowed for year-round habitation. The castle was nationalized in accordance with Act No. 142/1947 Coll. on the revision of the first land reform, with the decision itself being notified to the owners on 8 March 1948. Subsequently, the castle was taken over by the National Cultural Commission, but its use was not decided for a long time. Initially, there was the possibility that the family could continue to live there. In 1950, the castle itself was handed over to the Ministry of National Defense as a space for archive storage, while the service buildings in the forecastle area were taken over by the Czechoslovak state, namely Bezno, which also took over the land of the former estate. As for the movable items, the National Cultural Commission took 40

valuable items to be transferred to a collection point in the Mnichovo Hradiště Castle, while the rest was taken over by the Ministry of National Defense. This part of the mobiliary became lost in the years to come. The Šimonka family had to move out of the castle and were permitted to take only personal belongings and the furnishings of a few rooms. In 1951, it was taken over by the Central National Committee of Prague and converted into a children's home there. Over the following years, the building slowly dilapidated – the individual users did not have the means and often did not even care about the allocated buildings. All maintenance performed was purely functional with no regard to the heritage character of the building. The castle church was left completely without maintenance and completely vanished, so a demolition was ordered in 1987 due to the impending collapse of the roof. The demolition, fortunately, never took place. In 2003, the castle was returned to the descendants of the original owners, who are slowly repairing the property.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. View from the northwest, around 1900; Fig. 2. View from the southwest, 1920–1940; Fig. 3. The first gate – entrance to the forecastle area, 1952; Fig. 4. Interior of a room on the upper floor of the tower with star vaulting and wall paintings, already significantly damaged, 1952; Fig. 5. View of the tower of the castle church from the north, the building already showing distinct signs of damage, 1952; Fig. 6. Nový Stránov Castle, view of the castle church interior, still fully equipped and not damaged, 1952.

Bečov Castle. Analysis of the disruption of the southern stone wall of the connecting wing and proposal for its rehabilitation

Jiří WITZANY; Klára KROFTOVÁ; Tomáš ČEJKA; Radek ZIGLER

Keywords: Bečov Castle, analysis of static disruptions, stone wall rehabilitation

As part of the ongoing renovation of Bečov Castle, the conservation and restoration of selected parts of the south wall of the connecting wing was carried out. This connecting wing with its late Gothic hall, initially two-storeyed, was connected in 1524 with a separate tower called the chapel tower, built in 1352 with a massive dungeon from 1356. The formerly separate dungeon was modified in the third quarter of the 14th century by the construction of a chapel (hence the name “chapel tower”). In the last quarter of the 16th century, the connecting wing was raised by another floor (the so-called tabular) during the Renaissance modifications of the castle buildings.

The masonry of the southern wall of the connecting wing was largely disrupted by significant cracks, some of which were visible from the outside on the inside and covered with a weathered and

damaged lime plaster. Finding the probable causes of the formation and development of the cracks is one of the crucial prerequisites for ensuring the required life span of the repairs. The technology and material used for the conservation and restoration of the masonry surface, in particular for the repair of the existing “passive cracks” (steady structural failure) are different from “active cracks” and from the increased intensity of the degradation processes that lead to mechanical disturbances that develop and spread further. First of all, due to the location of the castle in a seismically active area (the center of Nový Kostel from where “seismic swarms” spread), it is necessary to assess whether the effects of natural seismicity are the cause of the cracks and disturbances.

The article presents the results of analyses and a proposal for the rehabilitation of the cracks. Based on the visual inspection, the analyses, and the assessments carried out, the existing state can be stated as stabilized and the existing cracks as passive cracks. In view of this fact, in accordance with the requirements for heritage care, for the renovation and restoration of the walls of the southern and eastern wall, injection grouting is recommended as a basic measure.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Plan view of the tower layout and the connecting wing; Fig. 2. Diagram of the disruption of the southern wall masonry by tensile and shear cracks (view from the outside) and view of the south and east wall of the connecting wing; Fig. 3. Tensile horizontal crack in the southern wall masonry at level 3 of the above-ground floor; Fig. 4. Plan view and photo of the masonry disruption of the eastern wall by tensile and shear cracks (exterior view) and photo of the masonry of the east wall after repair; Fig. 5. The trajectory of the pressure stresses s_2 , (5a) and the disruption of the south wall masonry by tensile cracks (5b); Fig. 6. The disruption of horizontal stone sills in the lower part of the window openings on the 2nd floor and the south wall after repair; Fig. 7. Course of the main compressive stresses s_1 and main tensile stresses s_2 – I. Stage, initial state, intact masonry; Fig. 8. Course of the main compressive stresses s_1 and the main tensile stresses s_2 – II. Stage, development, and spreading of cracks, after the formation of tensile cracks at the top of window openings on the 3rd floor; Fig. 9. Course of the main compression stress s_1 and main tensile stresses s_2 – III. Stage, development, and spreading of cracks, after the formation of tensile cracks in the top of window openings on the 2nd and 3rd floor; Fig. 10. Plan view of the deformation of the south wall after the formation of tensile cracks at the top of window openings in the 3rd floor (a) and after the formation of tensile cracks in the 3rd floor (b); Fig. 11. Disruption of the south wall by a horizontal tensile crack, view from the interior; Fig. 12. Cracks separating the eastern wall from the chapel tower (3rd floor); Fig. 13. The roof trusses of the connecting wing, state after the reconstruction.