

“Particular and characteristic.” Awakening the heritage consciousness against the backdrop of the Prague development plans of the early 20th century

Richard BIEGEL

Keywords: Prague, historical old town, urbanism, development plans, regulation plans, Prague Sanitization Project, Josef Sakař, Antonín Balšánek, Luboš Jeřábek

The history of the transformation and perception of the historic center of Prague was fundamentally influenced by development plans (zastavovací plány) from the beginning of the 20th century. The plans emerged as a result of the initial heated debates on the value of the historic old town and the degree to which it should be preserved. The precursor to the plan was the Prague Sanitization Project (pražská asanace), which involved the general demolition of Josefov and a large part of the Old Town. From an urban and architectural perspective, the project was guided by an idealized vision of a block city which would completely replace the preserved historic structure and refer to the past only by preserving the most important sacral buildings and historicizing references on the façades of newly built apartment buildings. The turning point was the demolition of buildings on the northern side of the Old Town Square; this evoked a sharp rebuke from the cultural public and ultimately led to the establishment of the Old Prague Club (Klub Za starou Prahu), which in 1900 became the main mouthpiece for the emerging movement of modern heritage care.

The demolition of historic buildings, however, went beyond the buildings earmarked for “sanitization” and encroached into the remaining parts of the Old Town and the Lesser Quarter, the unique historical and architectural qualities of which were quite obvious by this time. The “development plans” were to provide a way out of this quandary – they would clearly identify the buildings to be preserved as well as the methods by which the remaining parts of the individual quarters were to be constructed. A competition for the development plan for the Old Town (and part of the New Town) was announced in 1901, and the winner was the architect Josef Sakař. The Lesser Town competition had been announced a year earlier with the architect Antonín Balšánek as the declared winner. In both cases, the competition led to the establishment of a regulatory office where a detailed plan was drawn up under the winner’s supervision and was subsequently put forward for public comment.

The plans themselves are crucial to understanding the approach at the time, but so are the period commentaries by Luboš Jeřábek, who both glossed out both resulting plans. Sakař’s plan for the Old

Town was directed by the idea of preserving a large part of the main streets (the “Royal Route”) between the Powder Gate and Charles Bridge, i. e. Celetná and Karlova Streets. He saw the remaining parts as less valuable, and in the marginal areas admitted the possibility of a complete reconstruction in the spirit of the principles of sanitization. Antonín Balšánek saw the regulation of the Lesser Town as an architectural role; one in which new interventions would rather supplement the historical structure which would be replaced in the riverbank areas by monumental buildings. These would then form the new base of the Hradčany panorama.

In the end, neither plan was directly realized. Sakař’s regulations were partially implemented, but practical circumstances and the growing social awareness of the value of the Old Town prevented its overall application and the sanitization of unaffected areas. Plans for the reconstruction of the Lesser Town were finally challenged by the author Antonín Balšánek himself, who, after terrain tests and drawings into photographs, admitted that any taller buildings would irreversibly damage the unique panorama of the Prague Castle. The significance of these plans is indisputable, however, because for the first time, the historical areas were understood as distinct organisms with their own historical and artistic qualities that must be taken into account before undertaking any modifications. The inertia of some of the urban ideas captured in the plans is also indisputable, having returned both in competitions and projects (Lesser Town) and in common interventions into the historical structure of the city (Old Town). Discussions on the plans undoubtedly contributed to the fact that after 1918, both historical districts were now seen as heritage units that should be spared any significant traffic or other utilitarian interventions. The plans thus created a significant division between the mechanical regulations that followed a set of building rules and resulted in constructional sanitization projects and the more controversial interventions of the end of the 19th century, and the artistic and architectural approach that led the more comprehensive urbanistic perspectives of the 1920’s and 1930’s. Despite all the legitimate criticism, these plans are an extremely important milestone which in many ways prompted a new chapter in the architectural understanding of the historic city; without them, the city’s destiny would likely have taken a completely different direction.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Old Town on Jüttner’s Plan of Prague, 1816; Fig. 2. Alfred Hurtig and Matěj Strunc, Finis Ghetto – plan for the reconstruction of the Old Town and Josefov, 1886; Fig. 3. Panoramic view from Letná onto the Old Town and Josefov during the sanitization, 1906; Fig. 4. New town hall building with open area on the site of demolished houses

on Platnéřská Street, 1913; Fig. 5. Kaprova Street during the sanitization, 1907; Fig. 6. Krenn’s house before the end of the newly established Milulášská (Pařížská) Street, 1901; Fig. 7. Josef Sakař, Regulatory Plan for the Old Town and lower New Town in Prague, 1908; Fig. 8. Josef Sakař, proposal for regulation of the surroundings of the Church of St. Michal, 1903; Fig. 9. Josef Sakař, proposal for the passage through the Clementinum, 1906; Fig. 10. Jan Minařík, Dolní Lodecké mlýny; Fig. 11. Petr’s Quarter on Jüttner’s Plan of Prague, 1816; Fig. 12. The Lesser Town on Jüttner’s Plan of Prague, 1816; Fig. 13. Antonín Balšánek, proposal for regulation of the southern part of Kampa with its surroundings, 1902; Fig. 14. Antonín Balšánek, test of the constructional height of Lesser Town, 1905; Fig. 15. Antonín Balšánek, variants of the design of construction for the U Klíčů open area, 1907.

Peripety of legislative heritage protection during the First Republic

Michal NOVOTNÝ

Keywords: legislation on heritage care, heritage law, monument law, Zdeněk Wirth, Jan Hofman

The period between the proclamation of the Republic on 28 October 1918 and the Munich Agreement on 29 September 1938 can be perceived as a time of efforts by the young nation to manage its own affairs independently, after its former political dependence on Austrian Vienna (or Hungarian Budapest). The issue of heritage protection was also part of this effort.

The following text is based on the assumption that one of the ways to better understand the status of heritage care in the society of that period is to study the laws that then existed to protect monuments as well as other legislative attempts. Even though the first heritage law was adopted by Czechoslovakia after this period (in 1958), archival documents and the printed periodicals of the time show the dissatisfaction with the insufficient legal regulation of heritage protection. Along with this dissatisfaction, we can also see a continuous effort since the beginning of the Republic to write up and enforce such a heritage law. The archival documents also include a number of documents on the legislative activities of the Awareness Department of the Ministry of Education and National Awareness (Ministerstvo školství a národní osvěty, or MŠANO), as well as complaints, memoranda, resolutions, and summons to associations, professional societies, and politicians all calling for the adoption of a relevant legal regulation for the protection of monuments. In the absence of a heritage law, the very existence of these documents is a valuable testimony to the ability of the heritage care community to formulate the principles, ideas, and ideals of the field; they also

provide a picture of how heritage care was perceived by the lay and educated public.

This text selectively focuses on draft legislation (including responses to these proposals) drafted from the beginning of the Republic to the first version of the proposed heritage law of 1931. This is despite the fact that these regulations never entered into force, they did not make it to Parliament, and they can even be considered bizarre in both historical and contemporary contexts. The significance of recalling them here lies, among other things, in that they reflect a historically conditional path to solving the eternal tension between the interest in protecting a certain segment of material cultural heritage on one hand and the unwillingness to encroach into private property in the name of this interest on the other. To some extent, these problems and the arguments mentioned may be relevant to our present situation.

A strange mixture of continuity and discontinuity with respect to the previous period of Habsburg Austria was characteristic for the initial Czech (for Zdeněk Wirth, consistently Czechoslovakian) situation of heritage care from the very declaration of independence. The ethos of the new Republic as a young, progressive, democratic state, defining itself against the centralist policy of the Austrian monarchy, was manifest in the complicated relationship with Vienna's Central Commission for Heritage Care, which was active in Czech events through its volunteer preservationists and later the Monument Authority.

The official legislative initiative was focused on the Awareness Department of MŠANO, led by the art historian Zdeněk Wirth, an unforgettable figure of Czechoslovak heritage care. The legislative activity of this department was determined by the following aspects: first, MŠANO had been set up as a brand new office in which state secretary (and professor of philosophy) František Drtina advocated the concept of "expertise", according to which well-educated officials had the main say while lawyers were tasked with putting the content of official documents into their appropriate form. This method suited Wirth, as he saw it as an effective means of "learning the agenda". Secondly, the Awareness Department stood outside the main activities of MŠANO, so the heritage law never became a ministerial priority. Thirdly, the Awareness Department concentrated the entire field of "monumentika" (a concept coined by Ivo Hlobil which included a synthesis of the fields of material monuments in situ as well as in museums, archives, and libraries) and extracurricular science into itself.

The absence of a heritage law was criticized by representatives of professional circles, politicians, and interest-based civic groups alike, essentially

throughout the entire period of the first Republic. They thus tied into the situation from the previous period. The dissatisfaction with the absence of a heritage law was formulated in the first Republic in three respects: legal, organizational-legal, and symbolic-representative. From the legal point of view, a heritage law was considered an effective coercive tool for protecting monuments. From the organizational-legal point of view, it was necessary to secure the position of heritage authorities within the state administration system. The third reason pointed to the moral obligation to confirm the declared cultural progressivity of the Czechoslovak state by adopting the heritage law.

But why was the heritage law, despite the efforts of the MŠANO Heritage Department, not adopted during this period? The following reasons are offered: poor political support for the creators of the law, insufficient staffing of the MŠANO Heritage Department, the unwillingness of politicians to accept interventions into private ownership rights, and the undaunted insistence of Wirth and his associates on comprehensive legislation with a broad definition of the concept of a monument (heritage property). It is also necessary to emphasize how different ideas were concerning the concept of a monument between the law's processors and the educated and lay public.

The contemporaneous absence of a heritage law pointed out, above all, the failure of MŠANO (or specifically Wirth) and the lack of interest among political representation. After the Second World War, the absence of a heritage law was unequivocally explained as evidence of the inability of the capitalist state to take care of its national cultural heritage. From today's point of view, after experience with other monumental legislative acts in the 1950's (Cultural Monuments Act, 1958) and the 1980's (State Heritage Care Act, 1987), then from November 1989 to the present day, the possibility remains that the time-consuming nature of legislative preparations is characteristic for Czech heritage conservation. The lengthy nature of the legislative process is particularly clear especially when it comes to democratic consensus.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Zdeněk Wirth (1878–1961), art historian, high civil servant, member of the Old Prague Club, around 1930; Fig. 2. Proposal by representatives Alois Jirásek and others to "organize the official protection of monuments in the Czechoslovak Republic" dated 4 December 1918; Fig. 3. Jan Hofman (1883–1945), lawyer, art historian, conservationist. In 1919 he published, in the Cesta magazine, texts on the regulation of the export of monuments and their expropriation; Fig. 4. Cover of the first version of the heritage law, 1931; Fig. 5. Proposed law on the expropriation of prehistoric, historical, and artistic movable monuments, January 1919; Fig. 6. The Mayor of Prague, Karel Bax (1862–1938), presents

his own bill on the protection of building monuments to the Ministry of Education and National Awareness, 26 October 1929.

Historic noble settlements and the first land reform

Kristina UHLÍKOVÁ

Keywords: first land reform, Czech nobility, noble settlements, heritage care in interwar Czechoslovakia

The nobility in the Czech lands, as elsewhere in Europe, had been the elite of society since the early Middle Ages. Their aristocratic residences always reflected this, despite their physical transformations over the centuries. Fortified and residential castles, country houses, and palaces were the significant landmarks of cities and landscapes as well as their political and social centers. Given the extensive land ownership of their owners, they also served as the agricultural centers for the surrounding regions. This significance finally began to decline only during the second half of the 19th century, but it was not very striking until the beginning of the 20th century, since the nobility at that time largely maintained its elite position in the politics and economy of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The creation of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918 brought about the most radical changes. The new nation wished to discard with the old order in all aspects, blaming it for the outbreak of the terrible world war. The new government saw the personification of this order in the nobility. Aristocratic titles were abolished, and their use was even forbidden. At the same time, the state declared an extensive program of land reform in order to alleviate the strong social tensions. One owner was permitted to hold no more than 500 hectares of land. Since the chief landowners in the Czech lands were the nobles, they were affected the strongest by this new measure. It was an overwhelming encroachment, as they identified the lands they had inherited from their ancestors not only with their identity, but with their material security. Like the aristocracy itself, the castles, palaces, and noble manors quickly lost their previous significance. With the unexpected loss, the relationship of these noble owners to their traditional family homesteads and lands was perhaps even stronger than predicted, and many therefore strove to keep possession of them. The laws implementing the land reform covered many of these buildings, especially in the countryside; most of them, however, were subject to a variety of exceptions and under certain conditions remained in noble ownership. The government officials at the time rather saw the historic preservation of these historical properties as a burden. The first Czechoslovak Republic did not show much of a willingness to finance culture, so it largely had to rely on the private sphere, an attitude

also shared by many other European countries at the time. The priority was rather to minimize national spending and create an economically strong state.

During its emergence, however, the new Republic proclaimed the protection of heritage properties as a state interest; if it was not willing to finance their maintenance, it had to find other solutions. One solution was involving the owners of the aristocratic properties in their management. Often, various forms of providing public access was a condition for exemption from the confiscation of property under the land reform. The nobles generally accepted the role of the state property manager without protest, since they had previously looked after their inherited properties as a public service.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Envelope of the first collections of laws and regulations on land reform issued by the State Land Office in 1920; Fig. 2. A letter from the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment No. 14253 of 1920 on a draft law on the transfer and compensation for large confiscated properties; Fig. 3. The first page of the concept of expert assessment prepared by Zdeněk Wirth on the premises of the Hluboká and Ohrada castles, at that time in the possession of Jan Nepomuk II of Schwarzenberg, 1920's; Fig. 4. Hluboká Castle with entrance to the winter garden, beginning of the 20th century; Fig. 5. Courtyard of the Hluboká Castle, 1st half of the 20th century; Fig. 6. Arcades of the courtyards of Zvíkov Castle, around 1900; Fig. 7. Letter from Ferdinand Hildprand, owner of the castle in Blatná, to Zdeněk Wirth, 5 May 1924; Fig. 8. First page of the list of buildings and natural sites, the owners of which requested their exemption from the land reform pursuant to §20 of the Allotment Act and for which the heritage authorities still had to prepare expert assessments, early 1920's; Fig. 9. Letter from the members of the German section of the State Monument Office in Prague, Karl F. Kühn and Rudolf Hönigschmid, to the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment concerning the purchase of the Duchcov Castle for the purposes of the local district administration, 12 April 1921; Fig. 10. Trosky castle ruins, given in the 1920's by Johann Aehrenthal to the Club of Czechoslovak Hikers, photo from the late 19th century; Fig. 11. Johann Aehrenthal (1905–1972), original owner of the Trosky castle ruins, 1930's; Fig. 12. Švihov Castle around 1900; Fig. 13. Eugen Alfons Czernin (1892–1955), owner of Švihov Castle from 1932, photo from the 1930's; Fig. 14. Courtyard of Křivoklát Castle around 1900, view from the west; Fig. 15. Ruins of Lipnice nad Sazavou Castle around 1900; Fig. 16. The ruins of Bezděz Castle (view from the East), sold by Adolf Waldstein to the Club of Czechoslovak Hikers during the first land reform, photo from the beginning of the 20th century; Fig. 17. Mužský Hill, exempted from the land reform to the Waldsteins as a unique natural monument, 1st half of the 20th century.

Architect Dušan Jurkovič as the government commissioner for the protection of heritage properties in Slovakia in 1919–1922

Martin OROSOVÁ

Keywords: Dušan Jurkovič, Slovakia, heritage protection, government commissioner, national education

After the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic, a small number of Slovak intelligence officers were called into state services to help build the public administrative structures of the democratic establishment. One of them was architect Dušan Jurkovič, who lived and worked in Moravia and was considered to be the most important Slovakian artist and supporter of Czech-Slovak relations. The Minister with Power of Attorney for Slovakia, Vavro Šrobár, appointed him as a government commissioner for the protection of monuments (heritage properties) in Slovakia from 1 April 1919. Dušan Jurkovič had to build a commissariat for the protection of monuments in Bratislava from the ground up, with a small number of employees, without adequate security. His competence was defined by a government order on the powers of the governmental commission for the protection of heritage properties in Slovakia, signed by Šrobár on 20 October 1919. This was the very first regulation on the protection of monuments in the Slovak Republic covering all buildings built before 1850. It concerned the protection of nature, art collections, and museums. Dušan Jurkovič pursued his activity in accordance with the official state cultural policy based on the idea of Czechoslovak national unity. It aimed for the overall cultural uplifting of the population, which Jurkovič saw first and foremost through raising the overall living standards of all levels of the population. The lack of real state support in his case, however, was very disappointing. His position was burdened by the general political tensions and centralist policies of government bodies that sought to abolish Šrobár's government decrees and rather pursue only the agenda of the Prague Ministries. The fate of the governmental commission for the protection of monuments in Slovakia was bound to the existence of an educational report which, together with papers for the Roman Catholic and Evangelical Church, was merged into a Report of the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment in Bratislava. Jurkovič became the head of the education department and served there until the end of 1922, but this did not satisfy him. On 1 June 1922, the agenda for the protection of monuments and museums was transferred to the state office for the preservation of monuments in Slovakia under the supervision of Václav Chaloupecký, archive inspector and librarian. Jurkovič

resigned from state service and returned to active architectural work.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Architect Dušan Jurkovič as government commissioner; Fig. 2. Office of government commissioner Dušan Jurkovič at Konventná 1 in Bratislava in 1921; Fig. 3. Offices of the Governmental Commission for the Protection of Monuments in Slovakia at Konventná 1 in Bratislava; Fig. 4. The text of Regulation No. 155/1919 on the powers of the Governmental Commission for the Protection of Monuments in Slovakia with comments by Jan Hofman; Fig. 5. Lawyer and art historian Jan Hofman, one of the first employees of the Governmental Commission for the Protection of Monuments in Slovakia; Fig. 6. Historian and archivist Václav Chaloupecký as state inspector of archives and libraries in Slovakia; Fig. 7. Inspecting the exports of movable monuments and items of cultural and historical value was an important and demanding part of Jurkovič's official agenda; Fig. 8. Dušan Jurkovič's letter to Zdeněk Wirth dated 30 October 1922; Fig. 9. Typical type of folk house in the village of Čičmany, which Dušan Jurkovič presented at the Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague in 1895; Fig. 10. Construction of the "new Čičmany" after a fire in 1923, which was not realized exactly according to Dušan Jurkovič's vision; Fig. 11. The art of folk painters from Western Slovakia was a great inspiration for Dušan Jurkovič for his own creation; Fig. 12. The project of the renewal of the Zvolen Castle was a great effort for Jurkovič, but the reconstruction ultimately did not happen. Draft of the castle's renovation with a riding statue by Jan Jiskra from Brandys, architects Jurkovič – Pacl, 1924–1925; Fig. 13. Unrealized design for reconstruction of Zvolen Castle, architects Jurkovič – Pacl, 1924–1925; Fig. 14. The original monument to General M.R. Štefánik at Bradlo before the building of the 1920 monument. Dušan Jurkovič, Štefánik's countryman, was entrusted not only to the monument, but also to the scenario of the festive ceremony; Fig. 15. The celebration of the monument at the site of the plane crash of M.R. Štefánik and his Italian guides in Ivanka pri Dunaji on 5 May 1923. The monument and entire area of the memorial site were designed by Dušan Jurkovič in 1921; Fig. 16. Design of a monument to General M.R. Štefánik at Bradlo by architect Dušan Jurkovič from 1926; Fig. 17. Dušan Jurkovič's letter to Zdeněk Wirth of 18 March 1944; Fig. 18. The interior of the Federal House in Skalica in 1931, which Dušan Jurkovič designed in 1904–1905; Fig. 19. During the Second World War, Dušan Jurkovič intensively devoted himself to monumental creation. The tombstone design of Jozef Miloslav Hurban (1817–1888) in Hlboké of 1941; Fig. 20. Construction of the monument to Jozef Miloslav Hurban from the Spiš travertine to the cemetery in Hlboké, May 1947.

Wood carver Bohumil Bek and the Governmental Monument Commission in Slovakia. The beginning of restoration work (1920–1923)

Tomáš KOWALSKI

Keywords: Bohumil Bek, restoration, interwar monument care, Slovakia

The wood carver Bohumil Bek (1879–1951) is one of the better known masters in his field in the Bohemian area. In 1909 he established a separate workshop in Kutná Hora specializing in sacred carvings, decorations, and gilding. During its peak period, twenty artisans worked there. Customers included parishes, societies, private people, families, and others.

Bek's next phase of activities focused on the conservation and renovation of wooden art works. In 1919, he restored the early Baroque main altar of the St. Bartholomew Church in Pelhřimov. This work was thereafter regarded by all as a reference to his skills, including the authorities responsible for heritage protection.

In Slovakia, the Governmental Commissariat for Monument Protection was established in April 1919. Before the end of the same year, the executive secretary of the Commissariat, Jan Hofman, asked the monuments offices in Brno and Prague for skilled workshops or masters in conservation who could work in Slovakia. The Monuments Office for Bohemia offered two names, and the first on the list was Bohumil Bek.

Still, contact between the Governmental Commissariat in Slovakia and Bek only began in June 1920. Vladimír Wagner, a university student of art history in Prague, personally provided information that Bek was without work and looking for a job. Finally, Bek was officially asked for offers and calculations for conservation work in the parish church in Levoča and possibly in Prešov. The work was to start immediately, but he was first invited to Bratislava for a consultation with the Commissariat, which would give permission with a mandate for talking to parishes. Bek personally visited Bratislava on 12 July 1920.

Bek drafted his first offer on salvage and restoration in Prešov on 9 August 1920. He offered work on stalls, Calvary figures, and a statue of St. John the Evangelist for a total sum of 33,450 Crowns, but the state building office corrected his calculation to 21,244 Crowns. After all this, the work in Prešov only commenced in the early 1930's by other masters.

On 15 November 1920 and 7 March 1920, the Commissariat asked Bek for an offer to carry out conservation work in the parish church in Svätý Jur, close to the capital of Slovakia. The heritage authority initiated the complete building renovation. The furnishings consisted of the Baroque chancel and two

side-altars, as well as three Neo-Gothic altars with an idea of a redesign. Bek offered all work in a detailed schedule. Given to the quantity of the tasks, three collaborators from the workshop were also employed.

The final work, however, was assessed by the Commissariat as very embarrassing. His secretary Hofman argued against the changes of colors and believed in using "silver" bronze for the altar structures.

In 1921, Bek worked on the renovation of the Gothic altars in St. Jacob's Church in Levoča. Unfortunately, information is provided only by a "private" letter from Hofman to Bek in which he was asked to perform additional repair work due to a disagreement expressed by the Ministry of Education. The preservation of each of the rest of the original colours was discussed mainly by Hofman and one of the artists from Bek's workshop.

Despite controversy, Bek was contacted about inspecting the gymnasial church of Levoča with the complete furnishings by Olaf Engelholm from the last quarter of the 17th century that had been damaged by pupils. In April 1922, Bek offered to renovate it for the total sum of 109,557 Crowns, which would be divided into four-year-long projects of work. Such a budget was inconceivable for the Ministry of Education as well as the Central Commission for Catholic Properties in Slovakia as a follower of the former School Endowment Fund.

Between June and August 1922, Bek began restoration work on a Baroque main altar in Jur, now the municipality of Hubošovce, in Šariš County. The Governmental Commissariat agreed and asked the Ministry of Education for a state subvention of 6,000 Crowns. The restoration mostly involved placing back statues of St. Joseph and St. John the Baptist. In the end, this work became problematic due to the compensation of the state subvention; the ministry disputed the scale of the work, the absence of a detailed conservation program, and finally the method of billing. Bek worked on loan for materials and his suppliers demanded payment.

The last cases from the time of the Commissariat are Bek's interventions when parishes ordered new altars in traditional styles of historicism. Bek, in contradiction, offered his own designs, combinations of ancient and modern forms. Even though the Governmental Commissariat agreed with Bek's activities, the ministry halted them because of the impossibility of acting as both an official expert and a person interested in business.

In spite of a number of discrepancies, Bek was in favour of state authorities and took part in various specialized tasks associated with the artistic heritage of Slovakia.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Bohumil Bek (1879–1951);

Fig. 2. Recommendation of the Regional Land Office in Prague concerning carpenters available for Slovakia, 2 December 1919; Fig. 3. Pulpit, 1773, gilded and polychrome wood, Svätý Jur, parish church of St. Juraj; Fig. 4. Facility in the north nave, in the background is the altar of the Crucifixion, Svätý Jur, parish church of St. Juraj; Fig. 5. Olaf Engelholm – workshop, main altar of the Virgin Mary, completed 1695, Levoča, Church of Our Lady of the Queen Anjelov; Fig. 6. Olaf Engelholm – workshop, interior of the presbytery, Levoča, Church of Our Lady of the Queen Anjelov; Fig. 7a, b. Olaf Engelholm – workshop, pulpit and interior furnishings of the side nave, Levoča, Church of Our Lady of the Queen Anjelov; Fig. 8. Olaf Engelholm – workshop, row bench in the main nave, Levoča, Church of Our Lady of the Queen Anjelov; Fig. 9a, b. Altar of St. Juraj, Hubošovce – Jur part, Church of St. Juraja, condition before and after renovation, 1922; Fig. 10. Bohumil Bek, proposal for an altar for Čaña, drawing, paper, 1922.

The parliament, the Letná Plain, and Prague's panorama in the First Czechoslovak Republic

Cathleen M. GIUSTINO

Keywords: Prague, urban panorama, politics of heritage care, State Regulation Commission, Club for Old Prague

The founders of the First Czechoslovak Republic, including President Tomáš G. Masaryk, proudly asserted at home and abroad that their independent government was a democracy. The new country had multiparty rule, a bi-cameral parliament elected by universal adult suffrage, distribution of power among branches of government, and opportunities for the free expression of a plurality of opinions in state and society. Leading Czech politicians worked hard to create images, narratives, and symbols of the fledgling republic's democratic character that could attract powerful western allies abroad and project an appearance of shared civic identity among its diverse population at home.

National parliament buildings have strong possibilities to become symbols that serve to construct national unity and a common commitment to democratic rule. During the First Czechoslovak Republic, efforts were made to provide the young democracy with a new parliament building that was specifically constructed for its legislative branch. Czech experts in the State Regulation Commission spearheaded and organized efforts to construct the proposed edifice. This commission was a new administrative authority under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Public Works. It was designed to have tremendous power over urban planning in interwar Prague. Commission members concluded that the parliament had to be placed on the Letná Plain, a large expanse of land with gardens and sports

fields that rested above Prague's Old Town and the recently modernized quarter of Josefov. It was an open space with greenery overlooking the heart of a European capital city and a site with considerable symbolic potential.

Placing the parliament on the Letná posed challenges, however, due to the nearby location of the Castle and the St. Vitus Cathedral, the dominant jewels in Prague's panorama. For some citizens of the First Republic the panorama, with its expansive display of centuries-old architectural heritage, was very worthy of thoughtful preservation. Initially, Czech experts in the State Regulation Commission had concerns about how placing the parliament on the Letná could harm "the picture of the city". They argued that it was necessary to place the building on the eastern end of the plain – as far from the Castle as possible – in order to protect scenic views of Prague. Still, not everyone in the new state, with its broad distribution of power and plurality of opinions, agreed that the parliament should stand on the Letná's eastern end. Czech members of the Executive Councils of the House of Representatives and the Senate had different visions of the symbolic uses of Prague's landscape, as did President Masaryk and his Castle Architect, Jože Plečnik.

The State Regulation Commission undertook numerous activities to construct a National Parliament Building on the Letná. Ultimately, however, its authority was not strong enough to override the diversity of opinions about the parliament and the plain. Thus, Prague's panorama north of the Castle was largely preserved before the Second World War.

This article presents efforts made during the First Czechoslovak Republic to secure a place on the Letná for the parliament. It examines competitions held to determine the best location for the representational site and concerns of Czechs about the disruption that this project could cause to scenic views of Prague. It is argued here that, while these human agents and their ideas were important, they alone are insufficient for explaining why the parliament was never built and that stretch of Prague's panorama reaching north from the Castle was not greatly transformed during the interwar period. Attention must also be given to structural attributes of the young independent state, including distribution of power among branches of government and opportunities for the free expression of a plurality of opinions.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. View from the Petřín Hill towards the Prague Castle and the Letná Plain, by Karel August Richter (based on work of Vincent Morstadt and Josef Šembera), 1830; Fig. 2. The Letná Plain during the First Republic; Fig. 3. Jan Koula's 1907 design for a street cut through the Letná; Figs. 4a, b. František Vahala a Vratislav Lhota, "Undisturbed

Plain," second-place award in the 1920 competition; Figs. 5a, b. Josef Šejna and Ladislav Skřivánek, "Reality or Idea," second-place award in the 1920 competition; Figs. 6a, b. Bohumil Hübschmann, "Occident," third-place award in the 1920 competition; Fig. 7. Arrival of President Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk to the Rudolfinum in 1927; Figs. 8a, b. The Executive councils' building program for the national parliament (completed in 1927); Figs. 9a, b. Josef Štěpánek, "Green Square," first-place award in the State regulation commission's 1928 competition; Figs. 10a, b, c. Jaromír Krejcar, "Big Avenue," second-place award in the State regulation commission's 1928 competition; Figs. 11a, b. Kamil Roškot, "L 2," third-place award for the State regulation commissions' 1928 competition; Fig. 12. Model of Jože Plečnik's 1931 proposal for a spiral ramp linking downtown Prague to Hradčany; Fig. 13. The State Regulation Commission's final plan for the Letná's development (completed in 1934); Fig. 14. The Stalin Monument on the Letná (unveiled in 1955); Fig. 15. Mass demonstration on the Letná Plain during the Velvet Revolution in 1989.

Restoration of Baroque statues from the attics of the entrance façade of the Karlín Invalidovna in 1917 and 1919–1920

Marek PAŘÍZEK; Jana PAŘÍZKOVÁ ČEVONOVÁ

Keywords: Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, heritage care, Baroque sculpture, restoration, Luboš Jeřábek, Stanislav Sochor, Zdeněk Wirth, Jindřich Čapek Jr., Václav Mařan, František Hergesel Jr., Karel Novák

The construction of Prague's Invalidovna was carried out in 1731–1737 on the decision of Emperor Charles VI. The architect was Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofer. The original intention to set statues on the façade of Invalidovna, as captured on its plans, was reduced and altered during the construction. At present, the sculptural decoration consists of a trophy assembly of sculptures on the western façade and a set of twelve trophies on the two attics of the northern entrance façade. Literature dates them to the period of construction in the 1730's and associates them with the workshop of Matyáš Bernard Braun. The use of less common iconography has also been pointed out. A more detailed archeological and historical analysis that would verify these findings has not yet been carried out. The objective obstacle to such an analysis is the fact that the statues have predominantly been preserved in only more or less credible copies. A material restoration, launched in 1917 and continuing in 1919–1920, illustrates the fates of many of the Baroque originals. At the same time, it gives us a glimpse into the practice of heritage care during the break-up period of Austria-Hungary and the rise of the Czechoslovak Republic. The first stage of

the warlike atmosphere of Austro-Hungarian military warfare allowed for the destruction of statues in the spirit of older purist heritage renovation during the restoration process, or perhaps replacing them with copies that even fell outside the original architectural context. This process was planned more or less from the beginning and was carried out with the knowledge of the Vienna Central Commission. It was justified by the inconsistency of the stone, which did not allow for the statues to remain on the attics or even for them to be removed. Based on the reports of Luboš Jeřábek of the then Central Conservatory of the Vienna Central Committee, it is clear that financial constraints were decisive, rather than technical. This was evident, among other things, in the construction of the scaffolding, which involved the sculptures being cut apart. The attempt to use the cheaper work of qualified conscripts, particularly the sculptors Jindřich Čapek Jr. and Václav Mařan, was also telling. In general, the support from the military administration and the Ministry of Culture and Education was inadequate, and not even the Prague Museum seemed to be interested in acquiring the originals into its collections. According to Stanislav Sochor, Conservator of the State Heritage Office, the statues from the western attic were finally thrown from the scaffolding in 1917. Reports on the possible subsequent storage of fragments or damaged torsos are missing and seem unlikely. The continuation of the sculptural decoration of the western attic up until the present has been ensured by gypsum copies, criticized by Stanislav Sochor for their excess of accessories. Continuation of the work in 1919–1920 saw a desirable turn towards a conservational approach to heritage care, placing emphasis on the material nature of the monument. The new Czechoslovak state institutions, especially the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment, where Zdeněk Wirth worked, had a more favorable approach. Restoration work was carried out on six statues of the eastern Attic by sculptors František Hergesel Jr. and Karel Novák. After a more thorough assessment of their condition, three of them were taken down. The location of their later deposit was not specified during the preparations and is currently unknown. The fact that they were not broken, as was the case for the western attics, is demonstrated only by a corresponding increase in funding. They were immediately replaced by concrete spouts in their original locations. Restoration surveys in 2009 found exclusively artificial stone moldings in the attics. The remaining three statues of the eastern attic were also replaced over time. As with the other statues, their secondary location is currently unknown. The only currently available original element from the entire sculptural ensemble of the Invalidovna façades is the trophy sculpture

ensemble preserved in the enclaved pediment on the western façade of the building.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, north façade; Fig. 2. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, a Baroque statue from the western attic of the northern façade (currently corresponds to the fourth spout from the left on the western attic), 1917; Fig. 3. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, a Baroque statue from the western attic of the northern façade (currently corresponds to the fifth spout from the left on the western attic), 1917; Fig. 4. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, a Baroque statue from the western attic of the northern façade (currently corresponds to the sixth spout from the left on the western attic, originally probably placed fourth from the left); Fig. 5–6. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, eastern part of the northern façade; Fig. 7. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, western part of the northern façade; Fig. 8. Prague 8 – Karlín, Invalidovna, Baroque statue on the western façade.

My home is my castle. Formation of family housing in Brno 1919–1925. Žabovřesky: from village to garden district

Pavla CENKOVÁ; Aleš HOMOLA

Keywords: interwar architecture, Brno, 1920's, residential construction, Žabovřesky

The article focuses on the process of the formation of a large residential zone in the Žabovřesky quarter of Brno in the first half of the 20th century and focuses on the urban, architectural, and sociological-historical viewpoints. This territory, primarily containing private family houses, was selected as a laboratory sample of the preferences and possibilities of the builders of the new Czech middle class that formed in Brno with the emergence of the Czechoslovak Republic and Greater Brno. The extraordinary building boom was made possible by the generous supportive activity of the state as well as by the first developer entrepreneurs who significantly affected the construction of the district. The emergence of this new district dates back to the period before the First World War, when the first two colonies of villas built by Czech builders, in the spirit of the English ideas of the garden town, were formed on the open countryside of the separate suburban village of Žabovřesky. Following the disasters of the war and as part of the new constitutional system, the new Czechoslovak Republic initiated a solution to the poor housing crisis through a series of significant legislative measures to stimulate the far-reaching construction activities of private builders, cooperatives, and construction entrepreneurs. From the group of builders who participated in the building of the Žabovřesky residential zone, František Hrdina was the most

prominent, whose share in the appearance of the quarter is unmistakable. Hrdina was also, as one of the first real developers, the forerunner of the extensive building activities of the famous Brno developers Václav Dvořák and Vilém and Alois Kuba, who initially cooperated professionally with František Hrdina.

In Moravia and Silesia, grants for this aforementioned state building aid were mediated and controlled by the Department of Civil Engineering of the State Political Administration in Brno, which executed state inspection of new buildings. The archive of this office is preserved in the funds of the Moravian Archives and provides an extensive and extremely valuable source of information for interwar civil engineering in the whole of Moravia. For construction projects in Žabovřesky in the first half of the 1920's, there were 88 cases found in the fund in which the address of the house could be identified and thus the archive data could be associated with a specific building. The studied set of builders is nearly completely associated with the middle social class with a large predominance of employment of an official character; only in two cases are they builders from a manually working environment. In the remaining two cases, these are individuals on the opposite side of the social spectrum. If the builders were women, they were financially self-sufficient and apparently single women or widows who received a pension for a deceased husband or other property security, with the frequent occurrence of war widows after the First World War.

At the beginning of the 1920's, the massively emerging Czech middle class was seeking and finding its social position for the first time. The material reflection of this was the home as the seat of the family and a refuge from all the shocks and twists of the modern age. Houses that originated at the time of the fall of the old authorities, when the order of the world was being destroyed by the horrors of war and a series of revolutions but while faith in a purification through modernity, in the Masaryk State, and in the ideal of the new order of humanist society was increasing, are notable in their architectural quality and picturesqueness given by their specific formal design in the spirit of "traditionalist modernism". Modernist and traditionalist elements in this type of construction meet in an original synthesis, often with a remarkable result of undisputable aesthetic qualities. Although these residential buildings were limited by the financial means of their builders, they still held a distinctive representation function, and their high building culture and contemporary architectural form created a modern visual identity of the middle class.

Even today, the preserved urban unit still reflects

the building activity, taste, and economic possibilities of the Czech middle class, the main social support of the first Czechoslovak Republic, and the bearer of its ethos. Unfortunately, the protection of the heritage values of this territory and of these valuable buildings is very inadequate. This would be resolved by the declaration of the Brno heritage zone, as has been prepared by the National Heritage Institute.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. František Hrdina, plan of the Alois Zatloukal family house (excerpt), Brno, Šmejkalova 695/45, October 1923; Fig. 2. Ludvík Němeček, plan of a family house for Josef and Anežka Pohanka (excerpt), Brno, Eleonory Voračické 696/1, undated; Fig. 3. Family house, Brno, Eleonory Voračické 696/1, 1924, current state; Fig. 4. Ludvík Němeček, plan of a family house for Ludvík and Anežka Dvořák (excerpt), Brno, Eleonory Voračické 662/6, September 1922; Fig. 5. Family house, Brno, Eleonory Voračické 662/6, 1923–1924, current state; Fig. 6. František Václavek, plans for the Vilém Zeisler Land Council Villa, plan of street façade (excerpt), Brno, Šmídkova 661/7, undated; Fig. 7. František Václavek, plans for the Vilém Zeisler Land Council Villa, plan of the garden façade (excerpt), Brno, Šmídkova 661/7, undated; Fig. 8. Family house, Brno, Šmídkova 661/7, 1923–1924, current state; Fig. 9. Vincenc Kolbinger, plan of a double villa for Josef Kočka and Valentina Pištělková (excerpt of street façade), December 1921, Brno, Jana Nečase 594/8 and 595/10; Fig. 10. Vincenc Kolbinger, plan of a double villa for Josef Kočka and Valentina Pištělková (excerpt of garden façade), December 1921, Brno, Jana Nečase 594/8 and 595/10; Fig. 11. Family house, Brno, Jana Nečase 594/8 and 595/10, 1922, current state; Fig. 12. František Hrdina, first design of a family house on Šeránkova Street (excerpt of street façade), Brno, Šeránkova 638/39, May 1922; Fig. 13. František Hrdina, implementation plan of a family house on Šeránkova Street (excerpt of street façade), Brno, Šeránkova 638/39, July 1922; Fig. 14. Family houses, Brno, Šeránkova 638/39 and 639/41, 1922–1923, current state; Fig. 15. František Hrdina, plan of a block of terraced houses on Eleonora Voračická Street (excerpt), Brno, Eleonory Voračické 683/11, 684/13, 685/15, undated; Fig. 16. Terraced family houses, Brno, Eleonory Voračické 683/11, 684/13, 685/15, 1923–1924, current state; Fig. 17. Terraced family houses, Brno, Doležalova 708/8, 709/10, 710/12, 711/14, 1922–1923, current state; Fig. 18. Terraced family houses, Brno, Šmejkalova 558/25, 633/27, 635/29, 636/31, 1923, current state; Fig. 19. František Hrdina, plan of a terraced house on Šmejkalova Street (excerpt), Brno, Šmejkalova 635/29, May 1923; Fig. 20. František Bláha, plan of a terraced double house on Tolstý street (excerpt), Brno, Tolstého 673/16, undated; Fig. 21. Terraced double house, Brno, Tolstého 673/16 and 673/16a, 1923–1924, current state.

The importance of photodocumentation in the case of the material technological survey of mortar and plaster from Nový Hrádek u Lukova

Vladislava HŮLKOVÁ

Keywords: Nový Hrádek u Lukova, material technology survey, mortars, plasters, photographic documentation

The castle of Nový Hrádek u Lukova was founded in the second half of the 14th century by the Moravian Margrave Jan Jindřich as a hunting castle on a rocky promontory above the Thaya (Dyje) River, on the very border of Moravia and Austria. In the 15th century, it was acquired by the Lords of Eitzinger, who changed its appearance the most after the margrave and turned the hunting lodge into a noble residence. The castle's short period of full use ended during the Thirty Years' War, when the castle and the entire estate associated with it was tied to the estate of Vranov nad Dyjí and was occupied and destroyed by Swedish troops. Today, the unique combination of medieval castle architecture with the nearly untouched nature of the Podyjí National Park, together with the only partial use of the castle by its historical Vranov owners and the public hiking community, is also a result of the area's exclusion and closure as a guarded border zone in the 1950's.

This intactness also provides a good basis for broad research in the field of heritage care, including material technology research. This particular survey focused on the plaster and mortar of the Lower Castle, the structure dating back to the earliest period of foundation by the margrave. Previous research, mainly construction-historical in nature, has well documented and distinguished the two main building phases of the margrave and Eitzingers. Both of these phases were also manifested in the composition and character of the mortars studied, the difference being in the lime/sand ratio and the nature of the sand used (grain size and shape, amount of individual fractions). This clear distinction also brought new insight into the previously unsettled question of the existence, or lack thereof, of the palace during the margrave era. The current palace is dated back to the time of the Lords of Eitzinger, but not only according to dendrochronological dating; the existence of an older palace is assumed but has not yet been confirmed by any research. An analysis of the mortar sample from openings left by the construction of scaffolding for this palace, however, has revealed that the mortar is doubtlessly from the margrave period. The older palace, or rather its parts, could have been incorporated into the mass of the Eitzinger palace. However, this assumption must be verified by sampling and analyzing other samples. An example of this sample from a scaffolding opening also demonstrated the importance of photodocument-

ation for natural science and material-technical analyses. The technological laboratory carries out thorough photographic documentation for each sampling and on-site survey and requires the same for the samples sent to it; especially for cases when the lab worker was not on site, photographs provide an irreplaceable source of information both about the detail and the overall situation at the site where the sample was taken and thus removed irretrievably from the site. This information obtained from the photographic documentation plays a crucial role in interpreting the results of the material technology survey. Photographs also allow the survey results to be reviewed, supplemented, or expanded by precisely locating and capturing the sampling situation, as is the case with photodocumentation for restoration, archaeological, and construction-historical surveys.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Nový Hrádek u Lukova, Lower Castle, excerpt from planning documentation with the marked sampling points discussed in the article; Fig. 2. Nový Hrádek u Lukova, Lower Castle, view from the lookout point of the younger castle; Fig. 3. Nový Hrádek u Lukova, Lower Castle, inner oval with remnants of plaster from the interior of the western building; Fig. 4. Nový Hrádek u Lukova, Lower Castle – palace; the arrow points to the sampling point of the masonry mortar from the opening left after the scaffolding; Fig. 5. Nový Hrádek u Lukova, Lower Castle – palace, detailed view into the opening left after the scaffolding, where a sample of masonry mortar was obtained; Fig. 6. Distribution of insoluble fraction (separated and categorized aggregate) of samples from the margrave period (14th century). Fractions shown larger than 2.5 mm; 1–2.5 mm; 0.5–1 mm; 0.25–0.5 mm; 0.16–0.25 mm; less than 0.16 mm. We see a predominant fraction of aggregate less than 0.16 mm; Fig. 7. Distribution of insoluble fraction (separated and categorized aggregate) of samples from the Eitzinger period (15th century). Fractions shown larger than 2.5 mm; 1–2.5 mm; 0.5–1 mm; 0.25–0.5 mm; 0.16–0.25 mm; less than 0.16 mm. For this sample group, fractions greater than 2.5 mm and sized 1–2.5 mm are significantly represented.

Survey of interior plasters of the Upper Castle in Bečov nad Teplou

Petr KUNEŠ; Dagmar MICHOLINOVÁ; Vladislava HŮLKOVÁ

Keywords: Bečov nad Teplou, Upper Castle, interior, plaster, exploration, material analysis, lime, stone

The article presents the results of the material-technological study of plasters from the donjon area and the connecting structure of the Upper Castle in Bečov nad Teplou. In the interiors of the Upper Castle, a wide range of plasters have survived to varying degrees; they span the castle's entire historical development, from the second half of

the 14th century to the period of the youngest utilitarian modifications from the 18th century. In this study, samples of most of the identified types of plasters and mortars that cover these periods were examined. The mortar analysis showed that all mortars examined contain very similar aggregates that correspond to the local source of sand in their mineral presence. This sand is predominantly the product of degradation and transfer of mica granite and contains quartz and feldspar, predominantly plagioclases, muscovites, and biotite. The individual mortars differ by the width of the aggregate distribution, in particular by its roughness and the content of the aluminum phase. Particularly the fine-grained plasters which served as substrate for paintings were made of aggregate whose roughness was probably adjusted by sieving. From the binder point of view, all of the cases examined are lime mortars, with the exception being only clay mortars or plasters. These exceptions came from utilitarian interior modifications in the 18th century, when the castle served as a granary. An interesting finding in the Gothic mortar, which helped clarify the type of binder and determine the probable source material for lime leaching, was the discovery of marble grains. Grains of unfired calcite are present in the samples of Gothic plaster and exhibit a more or less extensive conversion to micrite and can therefore be uniquely associated with the process of lime production. Natural sources of limestone rocks almost do not occur in the vicinity of Bečova nad Teplou; the only significant deposit of crystalline carbonate is a small karst area near Lázně Kynžvart, approximately 20 km southwest of Bečov nad Teplou. Historical pit mining marble is documented in this area, so it seems likely that rock from this site was used for lime burning for the oldest mortar of the castle. The preserved plaster of Bečov Castle provides proof of the materials used, the working procedures, and the aesthetic and utilitarian demands of the building's owners. Plasters are also a source of information on building developments and long-extinct buildings; they also bear valuable paintings, a number of inscriptions, and other traces of the past. Despite the minimal care devoted to them and the castle in the past centuries, they still show extraordinary durability and functionality and still fulfill their role in the building system after six hundred years. They protect the masonry from moisture, salination, and mechanical damage, and they contribute to the stabilization of the indoor climate of the building. Their aesthetic effect, which contributes to the unique atmosphere of the castle, also plays an unmistakable role. The results obtained by the material technology survey are useful for proposing compatible materials for preserving

and supplementing plasters, and in some cases it has been possible to use them to specify the sources of the materials used and to more precisely distinguish the individual building phases.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, elevated ground floor, hall with construction openings into the adjoining chambers, the extent of preservation of the medieval interior plasters is extraordinary here;

Fig. 2. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, plan of the residential core on the level of individual floors; Fig. 3. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, elevated ground floor, detail of plaster structure on the western wall of the hall with numerous shrinkage cracks and traces of plaster processing which show the work of a medieval plasterer; Fig. 4. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, elevated ground floor, southern wall of the northern chamber. As part of an earlier survey, an uncovered colored engraving of a complex structure (perhaps the Bečov Castle) and other findings reveal that the white plaster is secondary while the original plastering of the interior of these spaces was unpainted;

Fig. 5. Detail of the surface structure of the sample of the Gothic plaster from the oldest building phase of the castle; Fig. 6. Section of the Gothic plaster from the oldest phase of the castle construction, polarized light, crossed nickel. The red arrows indicate the unusually abundant residue after burning lime, while its individual grains exhibit a varied degree of thermal degradation and allow for the determination of the source mineral for lime leaching (in this case, marble); Fig. 7. Detail of a sample of coarse lime plaster used for the utilitarian adaptation of the castle's interior in the 18th century, the surface is covered with lime coatings;

Fig. 8. Detail of the structure of masonry mortar from the time of the construction of the donjon, unlike the other contemporary plasters, residues of burned lime were not found in the masonry mortar; Fig. 9. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, clay masonry wall of a hall on the second floor. The plaster with a high content of chaff and wood chips probably comes from the Baroque phase of the castle usage as a granary; Fig. 10. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, fragment of lime floor preserved at the intersection between the chambers on the third floor;

Fig. 11. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, southern wall of the southern chamber, skirting, area around latrine, in the windows and above its base and in many other places of the Upper Castle the plasters are filled in with a coarse-grained gray lime plaster without further processing; Fig. 12. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon, second floor, southern hall with (laterally moved) late Gothic portals. The plaster on the third floor of the Upper Castle bears a valuable painting decoration, so the research on these plasterworks focused only on plasters without artistic painting;

Fig. 13. Aggregates separated and sorted from the sample from the limestone floor on the second storey, the high proportion of brick debris in the mortar has a major impact on the properties of the floor cover, the continuity of this technology provably reaches back to antique times. Depicted fractions of aggregate size < 0.125; 0.125–0.25; 0.25–0.5; 0.5–1; 1–2 > 2 mm;

Fig. 14. Bečov nad Teplou State Castle, Upper Castle, donjon,

second floor, secondary altered entrance into the table room with fragments of carefully balanced and glazed renaissance plaster with a dropped edge.

Available method for detecting the water absorptivity and wettability of historic plasters and masonry in situ

Dagmar MICHŮINOVÁ

Keywords: historical plaster, historic masonry, absorptivity, wettability, penetration, in situ tests

The professional public is becoming increasingly cautious about the inconsiderate and widespread use of modern materials that fundamentally and irreversibly alter the original characteristics of historic building materials and that do not respect the constructional-engineering system of historic structures. This often evokes a conflicting response from unschooled designers or restorers of historical buildings, many of which are heritage protected. The application of bonders, and some fixing agents, which restrict the absorptivity of the masonry or plaster on historic structures, especially structures which are not insulated from rising moisture, is clearly a case in which caution is needed. It is therefore useful to know, and to be able to easily assess in practice, whether the application of the given agent changes the absorptivity and wettability of the substrate appropriately or fundamentally.

The article describes a simple method for assessing wettability and absorptivity in situ. This is a tool for determining the suitability of the intervention directly on site, ideally on samples of treated and untreated surfaces. The procedure works whereby a suitable amount of water is applied from a syringe onto a substrate at a tested speed under a tested application angle between the between the syringe and the substrate. The method is based on the different rates of water absorption into various wettable and absorbent plasters or masonry. The method allows for the comparison of the wettability and absorptivity of the surface before and after application of the bonders or fixing agents, since some of these agents greatly reduce the monitored properties of plaster and masonry, which is undesirable for sustainable care especially for non-insulated historic buildings. After using the method for a longer period and learning its advantages and limitations, the method of assessing wettability and absorptivity can be used in situ for other more complex assessments such as comparing the absorptivity and wettability of supplemental plasters or when searching for the cause of damage to masonry

and plaster. This method does not give absolute values of absorptivity or wettability. It is, however, a very simple and usable method to use in situ, which is its main priority.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Application of water to the surface of the plaster during a test for absorptivity and wettability of plaster in situ. The trace (darker oval) after the application of water to the plaster indicates the absorptivity of the substrate; Fig. 2. Façade during a comparison of the absorptivity of plaster in the skirting of the façade and the plaster over the skirting. The absorptivity of the skirting is lower than the absorptivity of the plaster over the skirting; Fig. 3. Assessing the absorptivity of various materials. Plastered façade with patching on the left and stone blocks on the right. The degree of plaster absorptivity is comparable, whereas the absorptivity of stone blocks is considerably lower compared to the plaster; Fig. 4. An example of wettability and absorptivity according to Dagmar Michouinová on the façade of the pilgrimage church of St. John of Nepomuk on Zelená Hora in Žďár nad Sázavou; Fig. 4a) Overall image of the area, where the orange chalk marks the surfaces on which different types of bonders were applied. Other surfaces were left untreated; Fig. 4b) The same surface with the graphic evaluation of finding situation. The orange-framed surfaces are left untreated by bonder. The red frames mark the areas, where the absorptivity of treated and untreated plasters were compared; The graphics are further marked: the blue dot – application site of 5 ml of water; oval-shaped blue-bordered traces – areas where the water was absorbed; blue dotted line – section shows, where the water quickly flowed along the treated substrate without leaving a visible trace. Absorption occurred outside the untreated area; Fig. 5. An example of the assessment of absorptivity of the surface (grain) of the plaster and the same plaster without the grain. A higher number of traces guarantees a more representative comparison; Fig. 6. An example of the assessment of absorptivity according to Dagmar Michouinová on the façade of the tower of the castle in Náměšť nad Oslavou. Distinctly large traces of applied water on the left and right of the meter indicate the differences in absorptivity of the original surface (coarser area to the right of the meter) and the newly supplemented (smoother area to the left of the meter).