

kteří se zaměřovali na kastelologii i v tomto regionu. Vedle již zmíněného Tomáše Durdíka lze připomenout alespoň Františka Gabriela a Jaroslava Panáčka, jejichž dlouhodobý zájem je zaměřen k českolipskému regionu. Na stranách 333 až 380 jsou texty otištěné v anglickém jazyce.

Odkazy na literaturu zde nejsou uváděny u jednotlivých objektů či v poznámkách pod čarou, ale pouze sumárně v závěrečném soupisu literatury. S ohledem na hlavní zaměření publikace a existenci řady souborných děl od Heberových a Sedláčkových Hradů přes *Hrady, zámky a tvrze v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku* až po Durdíkovu *Ilustrovanou encyklopedii českých hradů* či též *Encyklopedii českých tvrzí* to nepovažují za újmu. V uvedených knihách, které patří do základní výbavy každého historika-kastelologa, jsou totiž další informace k historii a v novějších i odkazy na odbornou literaturu přístupné. V neposlední řadě pak publikace dokládá též skutečnost, že i dnes zříceniny zůstávají vděčnými vizuálními objekty, jež stále přitahují zaslouženou pozornost výtvarníků i dokumentárních fotografů.

Dokončení ediční řady *Zříceniny hradů, tvrzí a zámků* je nepochybně dobrou zprávou a pátý svazek o seвероčeských památkách si jistě najde své místo jak v knihovnách odborné veřejnosti, tak i mezi milovníky panských sídel v českých zemích.

Lukáš M. VYTLAČIL

#### Mladá Boleslav Templ – a history of heritage renovation

Jakub BACHTÍK; Vít JESENSKÝ; Alena NACHTMANNOVÁ

*Keywords: Mladá Boleslav, Templ, history of heritage care, architecture of the 2nd half of the 20th century, monument renovation, Vojtěch Láska*

The study deals with the preparation and the course of the heritage renovation of the “Templ” in Mladá Boleslav, an important medieval palace building in the historical center of the city. This municipal palace was founded in the 14th century, but the end of the 15th century is the historically determinant period, when the foundations for its present form were laid and it obtained its most valuable architectural and artistic parts (a hall with ribbed vaulting on the ground floor, portals, etc.). Since then, the building has undergone many modifications, including damage by fire. The most prominent modification was Classicist, giving the building its character well into the 20th century. The building was considered an important Mladá Boleslav heritage property from the end of the 19th century. In the decades after 1900, several repairs have been documented, many of which were financed by the state. In 1924, the Templ was purchased by the religious community of the Czechoslovak Hussite Church, which established a prayer house and priest's apartment here.

The Hussite Church used the Templ until the 1950's, when the complex story of the heritage renovation of a valuable building begins. Despite frequent repairs, the Templ was not in good condition, and the church therefore asked for money in 1955 for the reconstruction of the roof and windows. The money was eventually allotted, but no repairs were made. The religious community received the funds at the end of October, but within the centralized state economy it was impossible to find a contractor who would take on the project so quickly. The money was therefore not spent by the end of the year and had to be returned. The religious community got stuck on this “Article XXII” several times: the authorities repeatedly demonstrated the good will to find the money to repair the Templ, but the intention always failed due to the impossibility of finding a company within the inflexibility of the system. The situation remained unchanged into 1962, when the Templ began to enter a critical state due to, among other things, saturation by municipal sewerage. An agreement was reached between the owner, conservationists, and the city and regional authorities in 1962, but the preparation of repairs began only much later due to delays on the part of the authorities.

It was only in 1967 that a building survey was ordered (Josef Štulc) and then finally a year later the reconstruction project was ordered, which was to be evaluated by the State Institute for the Reconstruction of Historic Towns and Buildings (SÚRPMO). In 1970, the building was taken over from the church into the administration of the State Center for Heritage Care and Nature Conservation (SSPPPO), which was also supposed to oversee the renovation. Even then, however, the building was not repaired. A unique feature of the system was at fault here – the investor in the case of state building events was not an individual owner nor the administrators of the construction, but a particular enterprise, in the Central Bohemian region known as the Regional Investment Institute. This institute approached the Templ project rather arbitrarily, including disputing SÚRPMO's project and spearheading a dispute with the conservationists over the supply company, thus paralyzing the renovation process for several years.

The commencement of the work was finally triggered by two tragedies. In 1974, the southern annex of the Templ collapsed. This did move the concerned institutions somewhat, but it was the collapse of another part of the building in March 1977 that finally put events in motion. As early as the summer of the same year, basic rescue work was carried out, and the reconstruction project prepared by the enterprise Heritage Renovation (Obnova památek) was quickly ready for approval. After preliminary safeguarding and foundation work, the actual reconstruction began in 1981 with the construction of a new roof. The contractor was Heritage Renovation.

For the most part, the concept for the resulting renovation developed during the course of the work itself. It was not until 1981 that a complete renovation study was submitted. Following discussion with conservationists, the study was based around reconstructing the building into its presumed Gothic state, including the hypothetical shape of the roof.

Once the work commenced, there were no other major complications. The rough renovation phase was completed in 1986, but finalizing and restoration work still continued. The building was finally approved at the threshold of the Velvet Revolution, in May of 1989. The revolution, however, presented a problem with the use of the building: the Templ was supposed to be used by the District Museum, which ultimately did not happen. The situation was solved only in 1996, when the decision was made to use the palace for an exhibition on the history of Mladá Boleslav. The Templ had to undergo building modifications after a short time again, and the exhibition opened in 2000.

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Mladá Boleslav, house No. 102, known as "Templ", current condition as seen from Ptácká Street; Figs 2-4. Ground plan of the basement (Fig. 2), ground floor (Fig. 3), and first floor (Fig. 4) with schematic indications of the changes that occurred during the renovation; Fig. 5. Templ, view from Ptácká Street from the 1920-30s (?); Fig. 6. Survey of the building, carried out in 1964 by conservationist J. Košík; Fig. 7. View of the main entrance from Krajčova Street at the end of the 1950s when the building was still used by the church; Fig. 8. Western entrance facade of the no longer used and abandoned building in the early 1970s; Fig. 9. View from the north from Krajčova Street in 1977; Fig. 10. View from Ptácká Street (then Marx Street) in 1971, shortly before the collapse of the southeast annexes; Fig. 11. View from Ptácká Street (then Marx) in 1977, after the collapse of the southeastern part of the building; Fig. 12. Mladá Boleslav, house No. 102, (Templ), view from Ptácká Street (then Marx Street) in 1977, detail of the collapsed southeast corner building; Fig. 13. Detail of the collapsed southeast part of the building, image from 1977; Fig. 14. Detail of the ruins after the collapse of the southeast part of the building in 1977; Fig. 15. Main vaulted Gothic hall on the ground floor in the 1970s, before the beginning of repairs, details of the vaulting consoles; Fig. 16. Scaffolding at the site of the collapsed southeast part of the building in 1981, shortly after the renovation began; Fig. 17. Work in progress at the site of the collapsed part of the building in 1981, shortly after the renovation began; Fig. 18. View onto the roof of the stair tower after the truss was laid and the new reinforcement ring was made in 1981; Fig. 19. View of the western entrance facade in 1981, after the truss was laid and the new reinforcement ring was made; Fig. 20. View of the western entrance bay during renovation; Fig. 21. Mladá Boleslav, house No. 102, (Templ), drawing and survey of the entrance portal, carried out by Vladimír Stodola as part of additional surveys; Fig. 22. The main vaulted Gothic hall on the ground floor in the 1970s, before repair work began in the early 1970s; Fig. 23. Mladá Boleslav, present appearance of the main vaulted Gothic hall, corresponding to the state after the renovation was completed in 1989; Fig. 24. Mladá Boleslav, house No. 102, (Templ), overall photo after the renovation was completed in 1989.

### Mladá Boleslav Templ – an evaluation of heritage property intervention

Vít JESENSKÝ; Jakub BACHTÍK

**Key words:** Mladá Boleslav, Templ, history of heritage care, heritage value, heritage care theory, evaluation of heritage property interventions

In the center of the late medieval palace No. 102 in Mladá Boleslav, known as the "Templ", stands a remarkable heritage structure. Its decisive heritage renovation took place between 1969 and 1989, respectively after 1977, when the southern annexes

of the palace collapsed. Following up on the previous article, which provides a detailed overview of the course of the renovation, this study deals with an evaluation of the actual heritage property intervention itself and its theoretical and methodological context. The aim of the research was to contribute to resolving questions that are not purely theoretical but are of fundamental importance for the execution of heritage care as a practical field: How does one evaluate a heritage property event / intervention, especially qualitatively? When can we say that an intervention has been successful, and why? What are the characteristics of a heritage property intervention, and what criteria do we use to determine its quality and effectiveness? How do we go about examining them?

Simply from an analysis of basic domestic and foreign literature, one could make the claim that, unlike the research of the inherent values of a heritage property itself, the process of evaluating a heritage property intervention is an unexpectedly unresolved topic in the fields of heritage care theory and methodology. Numerous texts devoted to the concept of heritage property intervention (Hauser) almost always address the advance planning of such interventions; they neglect, however, a systematic analysis of events already executed.

In the research theses, the purpose of research of a systematic evaluation of an intervention was defined as a decisive tool for controlling the practical steps of heritage care and, consequently, of its results – the condition of the properties, the related context, and the behavior and actions of the persons involved. The axiological model as elaborated earlier (Jesenský) became the basic starting point. In it, heritage care is conceived as a systematic realization of the value relationship between subject and object, whereas the helical process of recognizing signs based on a pre-understanding of their meanings is characterized, as is the assignment of value – the degree of significance and its realization – the function. What is decisive is the differentiation of the stage of objective discovery and, predominantly, of the subjective assignment of value. We consider attempts to rationalize evaluations in the form of classification and computations to be problematic; we emphasize a verbal interpretation. To objectify the process of subjective decision-making, we propose a more comprehensive and structured understanding of the historical artifact and the process of evaluation and intersubjective solutions. The evaluator himself, and his value profile, are an important factor in the evaluation process and also must be explored and influenced.

An evaluation of a heritage property intervention can be done in two ways: by evaluating the result, respectively the condition "before" and "after",

or by evaluating the intervention process.

A comprehensive evaluation must address both. The condition (current state) of a property can be expressed by its heritage value, something which changes after each intervention. A good intervention is one that increases the heritage value of the property. A change in the heritage value occurs under the influence of changes in the signs of the property (including the signs of context), respectively a change of the evaluating entity – its value profile. The cause of the complexity of the evaluation process is the not fully objective nature of the acquired knowledge and not so much the intellectual cognitive evaluation method, in its complex thinking process. At the same time, it is necessary to realize that in the case of the evaluation of an already ongoing intervention, we are dealing with three value stages: during the design of the intervention, after its completion, and during a new evaluation as part of our research. For the outline of our evaluation, we have compiled a working set of meanings and associated types of partial values and signs for our particular case. The process of evaluating a heritage property intervention must address two tasks: 1) assessing whether the objectives and resources were properly defined, and 2) assessing whether the objectives were met and the resources used appropriately. The objective is based on the priorities of the more general visions as well as the specific possibilities, including the heritage value of the property. By resources, we mean planning, activities (recognizing and documenting, maintenance and renovation, use and presentation), personnel institutional and organizational safeguards, and financing. An evaluation of their determination and selection must focus primarily on their compliance with the objectives.

What follows is the application of these theses for the specific evaluation of the renovation of the Templ in 1969-1989 as a heritage property intervention. An evaluation of the change of partial heritage values is carried out, including an assessment of the authenticity and integrity of the property's signs. Since the objectives, but also the values and, of course, the value profile of the event's petitioners and implementers were not explicitly expressed previously, we had to use a reconstruction of them based on their expressed communication (condition of the property, behavior of named persons).

The evaluation summary acknowledges the lack in the minimum evaluation of personnel-related institutional responsibility for the procedure and outcome of the intervention.

In the chapter devoted to a critical evaluation of the partial tasks and methods of research, the authors admit the time and professional

constraints as well as the subsequent insufficiently executed surveys of the economic evaluation of the entire event (the need to elaborate the relatively broad context of the period's socialist economy and its documents) as well as lack of evaluation of concrete analogical examples for comparison. One of the most important shortcomings, however, is the considerable degree of resignation to the research of the social factor of the event, the interpretation of the social context, the functioning of the institutions, the relation of the users, visitors, and inhabitants to the given property, their value profile, emotional ties, method of use, etc.

The research results are a reflection of the more general limits of the domestic development of the field of theory and methodology of heritage care, which are based, among other things, in the minimalist research community and its corresponding background.

*Illustrations: Figs. 1-4. Mladá Boleslav, No. 102, known as "Templ", transformation of a heritage property as seen from Prácká (formerly Marx) Street: the building in the 1920-30s (?); condition in 1971; proposal for the renovation of the Templ including the removal of the northern and southwest annex and reducing the southern annex, with modifications to the façade and filling in the fortification wall; current condition (September 2018); Figs. 5 and 6. Eastern front façade in 1956 compared to the current condition (September 2018); Figs 7 and 8. Northern façade during the renovation in 1981 compared to the current condition (September 2018); Fig. 9. Terrace under the building which was rehabilitated and today has found new use as an educational space; Fig. 10. Late Gothic entrance portal (restored) from the hall; Figs. 11 and 12. Center vaulted room in 1988, just after renovation and restoration, and today (September 2018); Fig. 13. Basement, northeast room. Current installation of the original spiral Romanesque pillar from the church in Vinec; Fig. 14. View to the roof, new structure from 1981; Fig. 15. Part of the implementation project by Ing. Arch. Petr Brodský from 1981, design of atypical window ironwork.*

#### **Architect Vratislav Růžička and his (not only) Prague realizations**

Anna SCHRÁNILOVÁ; Matyáš KRACÍK

**Keywords:** Vratislav Růžička, late 20th century architecture, Družba Department Store, Merkuria foreign trade company

The article deals with the career of architect Vratislav Růžička (1929–1990), which was significantly associated with two institutions: the Regional Project Institute in Prague (KPÚ Praha) where he worked for many years and was director

in the second half of the 1960's and in the first half of the 1970's, and the Academy of Fine Arts, where he graduated with Professor Jaroslav Fragner and where especially at the end of his life he worked as a teacher.

Numerous proposals and realizations were created both within the KPÚ (intra-institutional competition with Vlastibor Klimeš, Vratislav Růžička, Milan Vašek), later in cooperation with Boris Rákosník and Iva Knappová, while in participation in public competitions through the architectural service of ČFVU (Czech Fine Arts Fund) the team was complemented by architect Eva Růžičková. On several proposals, Eva and Vratislav Růžička worked together.

The realizational works of Vratislav Růžička can be found throughout the entire former Czechoslovakia. In Slovakia, this is primarily in the town of Žiar nad Hronom, where Růžička was the main architect in 1959–1979 and where he designed a number of residential and civil buildings, topped by the monumental cultural house (with Eva Růžičková). In the Czech lands, Vratislav Růžička focused mainly on Central Bohemia (realization within the KPÚ, cultural buildings in e.g. Beroun, Pečky, and Hořovice, apartment buildings in Brandýs nad Labem, Sedlčany, Šestajovice etc.), Prague (e.g. family houses and boathouses in Zbraslav, terraced houses in Střešovice, cultural center of the USSR in Bubeneč, headquarters of the foreign trade company Merkuria in Holešovice, department store Družba in Nové Město, Urology Clinic in Nové Město, the Urban Transport Central Dispatching building in Nové Město), and Vítkovice in the Krkonoše Mountains (modifications of his own cottage, two family houses, cultural house, hotel Průmstav, etc.).

Another area of Vratislav Růžička's work is collaboration with artists on designs of works of art in public spaces (e.g. Jan Šverma monument in Prague's Revoluční Street at today's Štefánik, formerly Šverma Bridge in cooperation with sculptor Antonín Nykl, the monument of Marshal I.S. Koněv on the Yugoslavian Partisan Street in Prague Dejvice with statue author Zdeněk Krybus, architectural design for the plastic of Josef Malejovský "Renaissance" situated on the piazzetta near the historical National Theater building, the bronze Monument of Peace in Vitějovice near Prachatic with Jan Hana, Bohumil Franc, and Iva Knappová) and theoretical work (especially articles published in the journal The Architecture of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, theoretical works elaborated within the KPÚ).

The Družba department store (now Debenhams) was built in 1971–1976 based on the project of KPÚ Prague architects Vlastibor Klimeš, Milan Vašek,

and Vratislav Růžička as a commercial administrative building of the Czech Union of Production Cooperatives. The corner building with its upper part made from a steel skeleton on Wenceslas Square in Nové Město with its predominantly glazed copper facade has a cylindrical superstructure (polygonal ground plan). Originally the restaurant Rostov was here, above which was a café with a view. The original interiors have survived only as fragments, just like most of the works of art. The vanished ones include, for example, a fountain and jardiniere by Luboš Těhník, a glass target by Karl Wünsch, and a wooden grid from I. Bočková. The spiral staircase from the restaurant to the roof café was supplemented with a light plastic sculpture made of metal and glass by Pavel Hlava and Pavel Gruse, while the restaurant was decorated by a glass structure by Stanislav Libenský. Among the preserved works are e.g. the large-format picture "Gypsy Wedding" by Bohumila Doleželová, metal sculpture of a dancer by Rudolf Svoboda, a tapestry with the symbol of the production cooperatives "vd" by Sylva Řepková, and a series of art-protis by Jiřina Hartingerová. The building of the Družba department store is tastefully integrated into the historical environment of the Prague Heritage Reserve by respecting the height level of the building and the articulation of the facades affected by the conditions stipulated by the Chief Architect's Office.

The Urology Clinic in Ke Karlovu Street in Nové Město was created in 1973-1976 based on a study by Eva and Vratislav Růžička. The project was then worked on by Růžička with Boris Rákosník. The mass of the building and the architectural design were shaped with respect to the Prague Heritage Reserve. The lining on the façade responds to the gray bricks of the neo-Gothic birthing clinic. The mass of the clinic, a reinforced concrete monolithic structure, is formed by a distinctive upper floor base from which a richly articulated block protrudes. The irregularly spaced concrete surfaces and combinations of materials create a dramatic composition. The facades of the clinic have been preserved intact in their original condition, including the windows. The public interiors of the building have also been preserved in their original condition. The grand jewel of the building, however, is at the entrance; this is a large-scale glass sculpture with a family theme by Stanislav Libenský. The Urology Clinic is one of the few Prague buildings built in the typical style of Czech Brutalism in the 1970's. It is for this reason that it should receive more attention in literature than it has.

The Urban Transport Central Dispatching building in Nové Město from 1972-1978 on Na Bojišti street (study and project by Vratislav Růžička, Eva



Růžicková, Boris Rákosník, M. Špaček) consists of a dispatching office, an administrative building, and underground garages. The supporting structure of the ten-story surface part consists of a steel skeleton, while the basement is held by monolithic reinforced concrete. While the main and the highest part retreats behind the street, it is considerably higher than the surrounding area, revealing distant views. Regarding the architectural design of the facades, the construction can be evaluated positively. The facade from brutalist black Royal sheet metal elements is exceptional. The typical five-tract office floor plan intersects the central staircase across all floors. The interiors have been modernized; the only interesting element of the interior is Stanislav Libenský's glass artwork located in a publicly accessible part of the ground floor. The construction of the Urban Transport Central Dispatching building represents a brutal encroachment into the urban heritage reserve and the Prague skyline.

The realizations, in which Vratislav Růžicka participated or designed independently, show an original style that results from a professional approach. The originality of the artistic intent is reflected in the constructional design and arrangement of materials or in the exterior materials. From the more detailed Prague realizations presented here, we consider the most valuable to be the Urology Clinic for its architectural quality, the purity of its brutalist expression, its placement of the Prague Heritage Reserve, and its preserved condition. It would be desirable to declare it an immovable cultural heritage property. In the case of the Urban Transport Central Dispatching building and the Družba department store, sufficient general protection exists as part of the Prague Heritage Reserve, while the height of the first structure significantly disturbs the panorama.

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Caricature of Vratislav Růžicka by Jaroslav Kándl; Fig. 2. Study report by Vratislav Růžicka, ČVUT, University of Architecture and Civil Engineering, 1948; Fig. 3. Photograph from a trip to Bulgaria, Vratislav Růžicka first from left, second from left is Eva Růžicková, about 1957; Fig. 4. Photograph of the Cultural House in Žiar nad Hronom, in the foreground is Vratislav Růžicka, 1973; Fig. 5. Photograph of the model of the Culture House in Žiar nad Hronom, 1973; Fig. 6. Prague 5, Zbraslav, Pod urnovým hájem 815, family house; Fig. 7. Prague 5, Zbraslav, Božena Hofmeisterová 1188, family house; Fig. 8. Prague 7, Holešovice, Argentinská 286/38, Merkuria administrative building; Fig. 9. Prague 6, Bubeneč, Sibiřské náměstí 1054/10, Pavilion of the Trade Union of the USSR; Fig. 10. Prague 6, Střesovice, Sibeliova 1001-1009/23-39, terraced family houses, Vratislav Růžicka lived on the left end; Fig. 11. Vitkovice in Krkonoše, family house no. 288; Fig. 12. Eva and Vratislav Růžicka, proposed seat for

the Institute of Nuclear Fuels, Czechoslovak Atomic Energy Commission and Directorate General of Uranium Industry; Fig. 13. Prague 6, Dejvice, Jugoslávských partyzánů, Memorial to Marshal I. S. Koněv; Fig. 14. Prague 1, Nové Město, Wenceslas Square 831/21, Družba department store; Fig. 15. Ibid, meeting room with original wall and ceiling finishes, artwork; Fig. 16. Prague 1, Nové Město, Wenceslas Square 831/21, Družba department store, Art-protis "Remembrance of the Sea" by Jiřina Hartingerová, 1977; Fig. 17. Eva Růžicková, Vratislav Růžicka, Urology Clinic, study, perspective, 1970; Fig. 18. Praha 1, Nové Město, Ke Karlovu 459/6, Urology Clinic; Fig. 19. Ibid, detail of the facade; Fig. 20. Ibid, glass sculpture "Family" by Stanislav Libenský and Jaroslava Brychtová in the entrance area, 1976–1977; Fig. 21. Ibid, picture by Karel Souček; Fig. 22. Prague 1, Nové Město, Na Bojišti 1452/5, Central Dispatching of Urban Transport, overall study; Fig. 23. Prague 1, Nové Město, Na Bojišti 1452/5, Central Dispatching of Urban Transport; Fig. 24. The same, Urban Transport Central Dispatching building, glass sculpture by Stanislav Libenský and Jaroslava Brychtová on the ground floor.

#### Ladislav Machoň (1888–1973)

Martina KOUKALOVÁ

**Keywords:** Ladislav Machoň, architecture, curriculum vitae, Augusta Müllerová, Jan Kotěra – pupils

Architect Ladislav Machoň (1888–1973) studied at a Prague technical school, but the lack of creative instruction there brought him to the studio of the founder of Czech modern architecture Jan Kotěra in 1909. He worked on his projects and also represented him several times as a site supervisor. From 1914, he worked as the head architect at the Law Faculty, which he built after Kotěra's death (1924–1931). Even though he executed his first works, he finally set up his own studio in 1917 and, unlike many others, he did not manage to establish himself before the outbreak of the First World War.

After the establishment of independent Czechoslovakia, he still built smaller buildings in the spirit of Cubism but soon moved on to rondocubism. When designing family houses, he still remained faithful to the style of the late modern with an emphasis on tectonic elements. In 1923, he started designing for Pardubice and he also won a long-standing contract for rebuilding the Clementinum for the university library.

Around the mid-1920's, Machoň's buildings were inspired by the unplastered masonry and the absence of décor in Dutch modernist architecture. He later began to return to a simple and pure articulation of buildings typical for purism.

Ladislav Machoň's presentation of functionalism

did not lose its artistry for the most part, and he remained subdued in his expression in comparison to the younger generation. Even though the ground plan changed on his buildings, with diminished walls, the windows never created a continuous belt and retained their articulation.

The global economic crisis resulted in a significantly reduced number of orders for everyone. Ladislav Machoň became a member of the State Regulatory Commission, participated in competitions, sat in many juries, and mostly realized interiors. In 1933, he met the left-wing architect Augusta Müllerová, who he employed from 1936 and who, after his divorce in 1947, became his second wife. During the occupation, the couple participated in the preparation of the exhibition "For New Architecture" and also worked in a number of resistance groups.

Machoň's membership in the Czech National War Council, as well as his later political activities and engagements in the renewal of construction activities, were probably one of the causes for his arrest in 1952. The official pretext, however, was Machoň's pre-war membership in the Freemasons and his endeavor for its post-war renewal. It is for this reason that he was later sentenced in a fraudulent process for "joining the counter-state conspiracy center".

Although he was politically rehabilitated after a series of peripeties in 1960, he had to work until he was very old. The unclassifiable nature of his work and his political transformations resulted in his work remaining unprocessed for many years, despite his immense amount of realizations.

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Ladislav Machoň, 1932; Fig. 2. Scenography for the play "Scapin the Schemer", 1912; Fig. 3. Competition proposal for the Žižka Memorial, 1913; Fig. 4. Colony of clerk houses for the sugar factory in Choltice, 1919; Fig. 5. Otakar Španiel Villa in Ořechovka in Prague, 1923; Fig. 6. Various interior facilities for Julius Pažout in Prostějov, 1921; Fig. 7. Pasáž department store in Pardubice, 1923; Fig. 8. Colony Domov in Žižkov, Prague, 1923; Fig. 9. Villa for Jan Weiss at Hřeбенky in Prague, 1925; Fig. 10. State Realschule in Pardubice, 1924; Fig. 11. Post office in Lubačovice, 1927; Fig. 12. Hall of the Faculty of Law, Prague, 1924–1931; Fig. 13. Villa for Julius Řivnáč in Jevany, 1930; Fig. 14. The Sokol House in Hostivař in Prague, 1931; Fig. 15. Koruna Bistro on Wenceslas Square, 1931; Fig. 16. Petrol station at Barrandov in Prague, 1934; Fig. 17. Competition proposal of the Czechoslovak pavilion in Paris, cooperation with Jaroslav Benda, 1936; Fig. 18. Villa for the Hrk couple at Baba in Prague, 1937–1940; Fig. 19. Summer house for František Svojsík in Dobřichovice near Prague, 1939–1940; Fig. 20. Garden of the exhibition "For New Architecture", cooperation with Augusta Müllerová, 1940; Fig. 21. Competition proposal for the Old Town Hall, cooperation with Augusta Müllerová, 1946; Fig. 22. Design

for the District Hospital in Roudnice nad Labem, cooperation with Augusta Müllerová, 1946.

### New Barrandov – an attempt at a panel city

Lucie SKŘIVÁNKOVÁ

**Keywords:** construction of panel housing estates in Czechoslovakia, New Barrandov, artwork in public spaces, postmodernism, return to urban structure, genius loci

The increasing criticism of panel housing estates during the 1970's led some architects and urban planners in Czechoslovakia to find other ways of designing these aggregates. An example is one of the youngest housing estates in Prague, Nový (New) Barrandov. Its authors Zdeněk Hölzel and Jan Kerel tried to create an environment in which its inhabitants would be well oriented and would perceive it as their home. They were inspired by the ideas of postmodern theorists such as Charles Jencks, Kevin Lynch, Leon Krier, and others, and attempted to conceive a large panel housing estate as a traditional city. Nový Barrandov was not fully realized due to the political and social changes after November 1989, and changes were made in its original plans. As a whole, however, it is considered to be an exceptional estate with a well-thought-out concept and the most significant example of postmodernism in housing development in Czechoslovakia. An integral part of the unified concept is the well-thought-out placement of five works of art related to the history of the site in the public space of the housing estate. The unresolved case of the arbitrary removal of two statues from Tille Square (Tilleho náměstí) in Nový Barrandov shows how little it takes to disrupt an author's intention.

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Nový Barrandov's overall art plan with marked placement of all sixteen sculptures from 1982; Fig. 2. Title page of the Go-buňko study from 1974; Fig. 3. Model of the sculpture Kameraman by Karel Nepraš at the exhibition "Bydliště": panel housing estate in the Museum of Decorative Arts in Prague (variant), January-July 2018; Fig. 4. Prague, Nový Barrandov, Trnkovo Square in 2001; Fig. 5. Pedestrian walkways over traffic-intensive connecting roads are one of the major town-building elements; Fig. 6. Image from the early 1990's shows the newly completed part of the pedestrian axis of Nový Barrandov lined with front gardens with fences and gates; Fig. 7. Today's pedestrian axis – front gardens on the right, a wavy center line on the left; Fig. 8. Sculpture Obelisk of Movement by Karel Bečvář; Fig. 9. The square in front of the elementary school and kindergarten V Remízku and a branch of the Municipal Library in Prague. The statue of Pegasus by Michael Gabriel symbolizes the Silent Film and closes the Barrandov gallery of sculptures in the open air; Fig. 10. Axonometry of the 1st Stage of Nový Barrandov

construction in 1980 – a school, blocks of houses, streets, gardens, and Chaplin Square (at that time still nameless) were built; Fig. 11. The square in front of the school V Remízku; Fig. 12. Model of Sculpture of Movement by Hugo Demartini and Jiří Novák at an exhibition in Fragner's Gallery in April 1988; Fig. 13. The Barrandov boulevard begins at the "honorary courtyard" of the school at Chaplin Square; Fig. 14. Construction of Chaplin Square in 1985; Fig. 15. Competition designs for the statue of Kameraman presented at the Fragner Gallery exhibition in April 1988; Fig. 16. Kameraman by Karel Nepraš before the footbridge; Fig. 17. Competition designs for the statue Silent Film presented at the Fragner Gallery exhibition in April 1988; Fig. 18. Charlie Chaplin's Tramp statue descending from the film strip in front of the school building on Chaplin Square "opens" the Barrandov sculpture gallery in the open air; Fig. 19. Visualization of the hierarchy of urban spaces from the overall small architecture plan of Nový Barrandov, developed in 1985 by Zdeněk Hölzel and Jan Kerel; Fig. 20. Visualization and typology of paths in the parterre of the housing estate of the overall small architecture plan of Nový Barrandov; Fig. 21. Application of Lynch's range of public spaces from public to semi-public to semi-private to private from the overall small architecture plan of Nový Barrandov; Fig. 22. Visualization of the view of the unrealized western center from the overall small architecture plan of Nový Barrandov.

### Post-war garages in Bohemia – planning, improvisation, and reality

Petr VORLÍK

**Keywords:** Late 20th century architecture, garages, housing estates

In the interwar era the automobile was a sign of social prestige and a modern, active lifestyle. Consequently, the associated services were provided in an elegant, competitive, business-like manner. But the post-war shortage in automobiles and the change in political system, which put an emphasis on quantity (over quality), ushered in an altogether different architectural philosophy, based on a rational approach and making maximum use of standardization. Despite the theorists who long highlighted the shortage of sheltered parking spaces and criticized the open car parks that had become a blot on the urban landscape, for a long time the mammoth bureaucracy ignored the need for parking garages. Demand in society nevertheless eventually led to the construction of many interesting structures – from independently built individual garages, to the construction of parking garages to service the needs of housing estates or serve as noise barriers or built into the underground of apartment or public buildings.

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Příbram, colony of sheet metal and reinforced concrete prefabricated box-style garages along Březnická Street; Fig. 2. Project for standard garages by the Study and Typing Institute; Fig. 3. Colony of circular sets of self-built box garages along Sportovní Street in Mělník; Fig. 4. Construction of a cooperative garage along Řetězová Street in Děčín; Fig. 5. Interior of one of the cooperative garages on Pařížská Street in Kladno-Kročehlavy; Fig. 6. Car service and garages at the Slovany housing estate in Plzeň; Fig. 7. Cooperative garages and car service on Lovosická street in the Prosek housing estate in Prague; Fig. 8. Round garage with suspended cable roof on U Lesa Street in Ostrava; Fig. 9a, b. Garages and car service at Maléšice housing estate in Prague; Fig. 10. Cooperative apartment house Hadovka for employees of Průmstav in Prague; Fig. 11. 1970's project for garages with shops for the center of Liberec by Mirko Baum; Figs. 12a-c. Garage Slovan in Prague.

### Typological transformations in Czechoslovak architecture of the 1960's and 70's

Lenka POPELOVÁ; Radomíra SEDLÁKOVÁ, Tomáš ŠENBERGER

**Keywords:** post-war architecture, brutalism, typology, industrial buildings, architectural competitions

The paper presents three aspects of the typological transformation of the architecture of the 1960's and 70's. The first part deals with the influence of social change. The 1960's marked a great shift in Czech architecture in the search for new trends, perhaps in all respects, including finding solutions to traditional typological problems. The potential of the project, collected up until 1970 either as part of competitions or as directly assigned projects, was great. It may have seemed at the time that it would continue to develop: large-scale structures, both new and (for Czechoslovakia) exceptional (e.g. the Federal Assembly, the Intercontinental Hotel, and the TV tower with hotel on Ještěd) were being gradually completed. The process of normalization, however, fundamentally changed the situation. A number of projects nearly ready for execution were abandoned, and studies were postponed. This was primarily due to the transformation of a society that had suddenly lost its sense of grandiosity, seeking instead simple solutions with an emphasis on the economic aspect of building and repeatability. The process of designing new structures was seen as a production activity with the necessity of increasing the efficiency of the work on a continuous basis. What became the basis for most projects was the application of typified solutions developed for particular functional units, followed up by the use of standardized building and construction elements. The use of prefabricated elements from collective housing systems began

to be applied to non-residential buildings. In many cases, such a procedure was actually much more costly in the end, but the decisive issue was the how all steps of the construction process could be planned from the design phase to project completion. After the onset of normalization, public tenders ceased to be announced; only intra-company competitions within a single project institute remained. Projects that were to be implemented had to first be approved by the factory that would execute it in order to ensure a trouble-free construction. In some cases, this led to a disproportionate prolonging of the launch of construction, or even a change in the originally intended construction technology. One of the few exceptions was the rapid construction of individual structures of foreign trade enterprises in Prague in 1977 and 1978. Indeed, this was not caused by a relaxation of the established rules, but by the fire that ravaged the Trade Fair (Veletřní) Palace. In general, however, there was no extension in the range of building types.

The second part of the paper deals with the competition projects of the 1960's. In the decade before, construction in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had been mainly concentrated on building industry and on solving the housing crisis. The method of socialist realism was also limiting, as Czechoslovak architecture was far behind the rest of the world. The spectrum of typologies began to spread only in the 1960's. Due to the increased demand for new buildings, a larger number of architectural competitions began to be published – many of them were aimed at helping to test new designs of individual typologies. The development of individual typologies was given a great deal of attention during this period, and professional centers were set up with the aim of systematic and methodic development. Competitions were not the only tool, but they still represent a certain period phenomenon that had a positive influence on the development of the 1960's and 1970's (even though the fact remains that the competition proposals always focused more on a form/formal solution of the given tasks, and typology was secondary for many reasons).

The reason why certain typologies were resolved more by competitions at the time was based on both the general social and political situation of the time, as well as specific operational/availability and technical/technological reasons. Another reason was based on to what degree a particular typology was associated with typification – it was paradoxical that the competition rules stated the requirement for the competition to be listed only for the most important contracts and “especially for proposals concerning mass construction”. In practice, this was not the case. For many types of structures at the

beginning of the 1960's, there existed no expedient modern solutions, and the objective of the competition was to find such solutions and to stimulate discussion. The efforts to promote competitions as a common method of the designing process, which would to some extent offset the inflexibility of socialist construction, were also essential.

The last part of the paper is devoted to typological transformations of industrial buildings. The complexity of the typology of industrial structures led to the gradual creation of a number of specialized project offices focused on individual industries as early as from 1948. By the end of the 1960's, their number and scope was more or less stabilized. In parallel, there were several large construction companies that focused on the realization of industrial and engineering buildings. Additionally, an attempt was made to apply typification across all professions, whether on the level of the entire plant, the building, or at least elements. The typology of industrial plants in the late 1960's and early 1970's, however, was guided by new trends that promoted an operational economy, the quality of the work environment, but also initial efforts to protect the environment. Efforts to minimize the size of properties thus reducing the extent of occupied agricultural land, to rationalize and shorten operational links, to improve the working environment, and at the same time to reduce demands on energy resulted in completely new typological concepts that also brought significant positive impacts on overall architectural designs. When designing multipurpose plants, these new trends were reflected most of all in the concept of factories concentrated in a single monoblock. The method of zones and sections was applied in a single building, predominantly with an open warehouse style. The individual parallel zones ran in the same order – from the workers' zone, through the production zone, to the warehouse and transport zone. Everything was organized under one roof, minimizing both surface and energy losses. Only energy and hazardous facilities were placed outside the monoblock.

This resulted, also due to new building materials, in architecturally remarkable realizations such as Fezko Strakonice (1967–1972), the Gustav Kliment plant in Znojmo (1976), TOS Hostivař (1974), and the Bohemia Glassworks in Světlá nad Sázavou (1975).

**Illustrations:** Fig. 1. Karel Prager, Jiří Albrecht, Jiří Kadeřábek, *Federal Assembly, Prague*, 1974; Fig. 2. Věra Machoninová, Vladimír Machonin, *Project of CKM and Mladé fronta in Prague*, 1969; Fig. 3. Zdeněk Kuna, Zdeněk Stupka, *Project of PZO Ferromet building in Prague-Vinohrady*, 1969; Fig. 4a, b. Zdeněk Sklepek, *Prior Department Store in Jihlava*, 1983; Fig. 5. Růžena

Žertová, *Labe Department Store, Ústí nad Labem*, 1974; Fig. 6. Vladimír Palla, *Ceremonial hall in Luhačovice*, 1977; Fig. 7. Martin Kotík, Tomáš Brix, *Luka Shopping Center, Prague-Jihozápadní město*; Fig. 8a, b. Zdeněk Sklepek, *Prior Department Store in Olomouc (rebuilt for Galerie Moritz in 2013)*; Fig. 9. *Ideal project of House of culture in Prague 9 – Vysočany*, 1960–1961, A. Daříček, V. Buřata; Fig. 10. *Commentary to typological development of theaters*; 1959; Fig. 11. *Two awarded competing project of Opera and ballet house in Pardubice*, 1961–1962; Fig. 12. *Project of administrative building between streets Na Poříčí, Havlíčkova a Na Florenci in Prague*, 1966; Fig. 13. *Project of Zdroj Department Store in Pilsen*, 1960; Fig. 14. *Project of international hotel in front of Šverma bridge, Prague 1965–1966*; Fig. 15. *Model of State College Hospital in Pilsen*, 1964; Fig. 16. *Project of Central telecommunication building in Prague 3*, 1964, 1965. Fig. 17. *Notice for the architectural competition „Socialist housing“*; Fig. 18. *Project of typical layout of “energoblock” for medium size engineering factory*, 1960; Fig. 19. *Method of zones and sections – schematics of multipurpose factory*; Fig. 20. *Mělník Power Station*; Fig. 21. *Barum factory in Otrokovice, general layout plan of monoblock*, 1972; Fig. 22. *FEZKO company in Strakonice, monoblock*, 1972; Fig. 23. *Gustav Kliment factory in Znojmo, layout and section of production building*, 1976; Fig. 24. *Glasswork Bohemia in Světlá nad Sázavou*, 1975; Fig. 25. *TOS Hostivař, monoblock of engineering halls, layout and sections*, 1974; Fig. 26. *Independent apparatuses, Petrochemie II factory in Litvínov*, 1980.

## Forgotten paintings by Roman painter Ludovico Stern in East Bohemia

Petr ARIJČUK

**Keywords:** Ludovico Stern, Adalbert Kliczka, Wallensteins, Roman painting, Baroque painting in East Bohemia, Church of St. Nicholas in Čistá, Piarist Church in Litomyšl, Ignazio Stern, Francesco Trevisani

One of the most admired and most frequently cited Baroque paintings in Bohemia is surely the image of Christ on the cross by the distinguished Roman painter Francesco Trevisani, brought to Litomyšl from Rome in early 1722 and placed on the main altar of the newly built local Piarist church. Another Roman import remained near Litomyšl and this admired picture – two Baroque paintings painted by the Roman painter Ludovico Stern (1709–1777). Until recently, these paintings had been forgotten and professionally unappraised. Both of these paintings – the Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari and Apotheosis of St. Adalbert – were brought to



the Church of St. Nicholas in the village of Čistá in the former Litomyšl Wallenstein estate. They were allegedly ordered by Father Adalbert Kliczka, the priest in Čistá at the time, according to earlier reports. According to contemporary sources, he did so during his stay in Rome in the spring months of 1764. The picture with the image of St. Nicholas was then made for the new main altar of the Čistá church. The artist's oeuvre can be noted on this (until recently) neglected work in the previously discovered picture based on the same theme, which was designated – and is still located, together with three other paintings of Ludovico Stern – on the side altars of the Church of St. John the Evangelist in Montecelio near Rome. Stern painted it in 1766 and only partially completed it with a composition created two years earlier in a painting made for Father Kliczka. In East Bohemia, there was probably a certain awareness in the Čistá church throughout the 19th century of the exceptional nature of both paintings as Roman imports. This is attested by the existence of at least four altar paintings, painted during the 19th century and still preserved, in the churches of East Bohemia and the adjoining Moravian border which are replicas of Stern's image of the Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari.

**Illustrations:** *Fig. 1. Francesco Trevisani, Crucifixion with Our Lady, St. Mary Magdalene and St. John the Baptist (model for the altar painting for the Piarist Church in Litomyšl), around 1721, Regional Museum of Těplice; Fig. 2. Carlo Innocenzo Carlone – Johann Daniel Herz the elder, Engagement of the Virgin Mary, Ljubljana, National Gallery; Fig. 3. Ignazio Stern, St. Nicholas of Tolentino appealing for the souls in Purgatory, detail (painting on the side altar), after 1740, Prague, Church of St. Catherine of Alexandria; Fig. 4. Ludovico Stern – Pietro Campana, Martyrium of St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, Rome, Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica; Fig. 5. Ludovico Stern – Pietro Campana, Martyrium of St. Joseph of Leonessa, Rome, Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica; Figs. 6–8. Ludovico Stern – Joseph Canale, letter of thanks to the Capuchin Order, Polička City Museum and Gallery; Figs. 9–11. Ludovico Stern, Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari (painting on the main altar), 1764, Čistá, Church of St. Nicholas; Fig. 12. Ludovico Stern, Apotheosis of St. Cecilia (altar painting in the side chapel), 1765, Montecelio, Church of St. John the Baptist; Fig. 13. Ludovico Stern, Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari (altar painting in the side chapel), 1766, Montecelio, Church of St. John the Baptist; Fig. 14. Ludovico Stern, Apostles St. Peter and Paul (altar painting in the side chapel), 1757, Rome, Church of San Michele in Sassia; Fig. 15. Ludovico Stern, Apostles St. Peter and Paul (painting hung on the wall in the side chapel), circa 1760, Rome, Church of San Rocco; Figs. 16–18. Ludovico Stern, Apotheosis of St. Adalbert, 1764, Čistá, Church of St. Nicholas; Fig. 19. Jan Vorlíček, Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari (painting on the main altar), 1839, Dolní Dobrouč, Church of St. Nicholas; Fig. 20. Jan Umlauf,*

*Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari (painting on the main altar), 1872, Rychnov na Moravě, Church of St. Nicholas; Fig. 21. Jan Umlauf, Apotheosis of St. Nicholas of Bari (painting on the main altar), 1868, Horní Sloupnice, Church of St. Nicholas.*

#### Italian Baroque vedute in the mobiliary fond of the Buchlovice State Castle

Zuzana MACUROVÁ; Zdeňka MÍČHALOVÁ

**Keywords:** *mobiliary funds, Buchlovice Castle, vedute, Baroque art*

The mobiliary funds of the Czech National Heritage Institute include a vast collection of early modern vedute, especially as drawings and graphic works. An important part of this type of media is stored in the graphics collection of the Buchlovice State Castle. A particular highlight is the large collection of 18th century Italian graphic works that capture distinctive cities and artistic monuments of the Italian Peninsula.

The creation of the Buchlovice graphic collection is related to the collecting activities of the family of Count Berchtold, who owned the estates from 1800. The first owner was Leopold I Berchtold (1759–1809). This enlightened aristocrat, philanthropist, and traveler had the opportunity to enrich his collection during his seventeen-year travels, during which he visited many of Europe's cultural centers and stayed in many of them for a long time. His largest acquisitions occurred during the second half of the 19th century and the first two decades of the 20th century. Zikmund II (1834–1900), a Moravian and Imperial politician residing primarily in Buchlovice and Vienna, took advantage of local Central European arts markets and auctions for purchases. We have a number of auction catalogs in the Buchlovice Castle Library from the given period which were provably used for purchases. His son Leopold II (1863–1942) worked as an Austro-Hungarian diplomat in France, England, and Russia, and in the years 1912–1915 he held the post of Foreign Minister. His career involved frequent travel, with his more frequent and popular destinations being the Italian Peninsula. We know that not only did Leopold travel to Italy, but he also maintained contacts with the Italian arts market. The building and interior modifications of the Buchlovice castle that began at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries also reflect the Count's fondness for Italian architecture and art in general. The Count wanted the building modifications to transform the castle into a sort of Italian Baroque villa. Berchtold's intense interest

in the graphic collection is testified by the fact that had a graphic room set up and located in a space specially selected for this purpose at the beginning of the 20th century.

The collection contains over 1,000 inventory units described as vedute. The most important group in this set are Italian Baroque prints, mostly including depictions of Rome and several other Italian cities. The oldest Roman vedute in the collection are two works published in 1600 by a Netherlander working in Rome, Nicolas van Aelst. Other prominent authors include Baroque graphic personages such as Giovanni Battista Falda and Giuseppe Vasi. Vasi's work in the collection is represented by two hundred vedute from a 1786 edition. It is archived, however, that the Berchtold collection was also part of

the ten-volume album *Magnificenze di Roma antica e moderna* published in 1747–1761. The collection also includes a cross-section of the works of Giovanni Battista Piranesi, whose vedute include twenty views of Roman churches, palaces, and ancient monuments. The small but representative set of Piranesi vedute is also complemented by the Map of Rome with Campus Martius. As for other Italian cities, Venice is significantly featured in the album of Michele Marieschi, and Vicenza in the Christofora dall'Acqua album. The entire ensemble illustrates the transformation of the genre from 1600 until the end of the 18th century, when vedute by the most important authors of the mid-18th century were repeatedly published.

**Illustrations:** *Fig. 1. Ex libris of the Berchtold Library at Buchlovice Castle from the album Vedute of the city of Vicenza, around 1880; Fig. 2. Box for storing graphic sheets; Fig. 3. Nicolas van Aelst – Antonio Tempesta, area in front of the Church of San Giovanni in Laterano, 1600, etching; Fig. 4. Giovanni Battista Falda, Fons Veneris, garden of the Villa Pamphilia, second half of the 17th century, etching; Fig. 5. Giuseppe Vasi, Monastery of San Lorenzo in Panisperna, 1786, etching; Fig. 6. Giuseppe Vasi, area in front of the Palazzo Pontificio sul Quirinale, 1786, etching; Fig. 7. Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Acqua Felice Fountain, etching; Fig. 8. Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Palazzo Barberini, etching; Fig. 9. Michele Marieschi, Ponte di Rialto, etching, 1770's; Fig. 10. Michele Marieschi, Church of San Rocco, etching, 1770's; Fig. 11. Cristoforo dall'Acqua, Palazzo Chiericati in Vicenza, etching; Fig. 12. Cristoforo dall'Acqua, Ponda del Castello in Vicenza, etching.*

#### Archaeological atlases of heritage structures.

##### Spatial identification of field interventions in heritage sites

Petr SOKOL; Marcela WALDMANNOVÁ; Linda FOSTER  
**Keywords:** *heritage structures, archaeological*

research, terrain modification, spatial data, specialized map, data registration, renovation projects, archaeological atlases

Archaeological atlases represent, in the context of heritage care and archeology, a registration system and a professional source of information to individual heritage structures. They are based on the long-term perceived needs for completion and synthesis of spatial and time data in the GIS environment as related to field interventions. The purpose of atlases is primarily the spatial identification of all traceable interventions in the past and the characteristics thereof. The result is an overview from the point of view of the archeology of disturbed, destroyed, and preserved historical terrain areas within individual monumental structures, including temporal and other basic data about these interventions; in other words, a mapping of the archaeological potential of the terrain. Atlases consist of two parts: the textual part, the core of which is a catalog of interventions, and maps. Atlases can be used as a basis for the preparation of projects related to a heritage structure and for planning archaeological surveys of both a salvage and research nature in a given area. Since 2013, the Department of Archeology of the NIH in Plzeň has worked up five archaeological atlases of structures administered by the NIH within the territory of the Plzeň Region. Specifically, these are the castles Švihov and Velhartice (both in the Klatovy district), the ruins of Přebyslav and Gutštejn (both in the Tachov district) and the Plasy Monastery (Plzeň-sever district). For Švihov, 90 field interventions were carried out as part of 36 events in 1948–2012; for Velhartice, 90 field interventions in 37 events in 1980–2017; for Přebyslav, 30 field interventions in 10 events in 1879–2012; for Gutštejn, 23 field interventions in 5 events in 1997–2001; for Plasy, 392 interventions in 43 events in 1920–2016. During their processing, partially distinctive criteria were always applied as given by the character of the structure and interventions and which even reflected in the partially different structure of the map sheets. The atlases are accessible in the Metainformation System (MIS) of the NIH, in their map folder, and in ArcGIS Online.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Ruins of Přebyslav Castle. Example of localization of small-scale field interventions based on a verbal description and sketch, and a label for one of them on the basis of the cadastral map and the contour plan; Fig. 2. Ibid. An example of a map sheet structure (planimetry, altitude, cadastral map, field interventions) with legend in the ArcGIS Online version; Fig. 3. Ibid. Extent of archaeological excavations on the basis of a contour plan; Fig. 4. Ibid. Extent of excavations of a non-archeological nature on the basis of a contour plan; Fig. 5. Ibid. Extent of planes based on a contour plan with color differentiation by event number*

*(year of implementation); Fig. 6. Ibid. Extent of contours based on a contour plan. The last four images make clear the extent and character of damage to the terrain of the heritage site and its disproportion to the archeologically explored surfaces; Fig. 7. Velhartice Castle. Map sheet indicating the area of interest and the scope of heritage protection; Fig. 8. Velhartice Castle. Map (plan, cadastral map) of the whole area and detail of its part, marking the polygons of all non-movable finds (usually brick structures); Fig. 9. Ruins of Gutštejn Castle. An excerpt from a map with polygons of non-movable finds (usually brick structures) occurring in archaeological research and with a label for the selected polygon; Fig. 10. Ruins of Gutštejn Castle. An example of the structure of the map section (planimetry, altitude, cadastral map, field interventions) in the ArcGIS Online version with a legend, individual polygon colors correspond to individual events (archaeological research); Fig. 11. Monastery Plasy. Marking of all terrain interventions differentiated into individual types with a raster of lay sheets covering the whole area of the national heritage site; Fig. 12. Ibid. Selected sheet showing all field interventions differentiated into individual types; Fig. 13. Castle Velhartice. Example of a map section and an inventory of field interventions in the ArcGIS Online version. By activating a specific action polygon, you can read the relevant information; Fig. 14. Ibid. Sample of the map section (detail of the selected part) and link of the selected polygon of the non-movable find (masonry) to a list of field interventions in the ArcGIS Online version.*

#### **New approaches to the living meditation of heritage properties: narrative, presentation, or interpretation?**

Hana HAVLÚJOVÁ; Naděžda REZKOVÁ PŘIBYLOVÁ; Kateřina CHARVÁTOVÁ; Martina INDRŮVÁ

*Keywords: cultural heritage, live interpretation, presentation, discourse analysis, translation, professional development*

The article presents the first outputs of complex discursive research on terms as well as approaches of the live interpretation that has been conceptualized in professional heritage discourse for the last decade. It focuses especially on the linguistic and historical context of the term “interpretation” in order to reveal the paradigm shift in the field of heritage management and care that underpins the Czech translations of the term as well. The objective of the research is to map both the discourses and practises within heritage field. Not only, then, have normative and theoretical texts been analysed, but so have the statements of those who participate in heritage interpretation. The article presents analyses of international Charta, language dictionaries, European and Czech interpretation handbooks, and historical sources. The study aims to set up

a starting point for a wider mapping of interdisciplinary discussion that will influence current trends in the process of professionalization of heritage guides as well as the development of the brand new profession of heritage educators in the Czech Republic.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. What to do when not even the dynamic narrative of a guide catches interest? Šternberk Castle; Fig. 2. Involving the direct experience of the visitor in the game; Fig. 3. Awakening an interest in heritage value; Fig. 4. Searching for the context of heritage properties with our own lives.*