

# From the city to the suburbs. Residential construction in Brno-Královo Pole in the years 1919–1925

Pavla CENKOVÁ; Aleš HOMOLA

Keywords: interwar architecture, Brno, 1920s, residential construction, Královo Pole

In a series of professional articles entitled “My Home is My Castle”, we focus on the formation and form of residential construction in the Brno suburbs in the first half of the 1920s. While the last study dealt with the construction of the Brno district of Žabovřesky, the current article is devoted to the urban creation of Královo Pole, the most important of the Brno suburbs in the first years of the existence of Greater Brno. As in Žabovřesky, the stimulating and supporting measures of the first Czechoslovak Republic toward housing construction had a fundamental influence on the boom in construction activity in the early 1920s. The context of the construction, however, was significantly different. Královo Pole, promoted to a municipality in 1905, conceptually developed its new district west of the backbone of Palackého třída in the structure of the position and regulation plan from 1904, at least since the second decade of the 20th century in the contours of grandiose metropolitan buildings. After the end of the First World War, Královo Pole solved the catastrophic housing shortage by undertaking housing construction itself, actively shaping the new district around the central Slovanské náměstí. The generous spaces, delimited by similarly generous architecture, were supposed to create an ideal urban environment in which the belief in social progress was combined with Czech patriotism, strengthened after 1918 by the ethos of the young nation led by Masaryk. However, the construction situation in the district was largely influenced by the pioneering and far-reaching construction activity of the local Public Benefit Construction Cooperative which replaced the absence of a large development investor which would accelerate the area's construction boom.

In the first half of the 1920s, residential architecture in Královo Pole took the form of an original amalgam of modernism and classicizing design. This defining traditional architectural current evolved organically from the pre-war early modernist and Secessionist chapter of architectural creation in Královo Pole and showed significant resistance to avant-garde functionalist modernism, which no longer made any headway in the considerably built-up area of Královo Pole. In the first four decades of the 20th century, the buildings in Královo Pole were generally characterized by above-standard architectural quality. Immediately from the beginning of the 1920s, new buildings were built here on the projects of important

architects such as Jindřich Kumpošt, Miloš Laml, Jaroslav Grunt, Miloslav Kopřiva, and Oskar Poříška. At the end of the 1920s and in the 1930s, this development was supplemented by functionalist buildings by Josef Poláček and Bohuslav Fuchs. In addition to the well-known names of Brno's interwar modernism, lesser-known creators such as Karel Láník and Josef Novák in particular played an important role in the appearance of Královo Pole in the first Czechoslovak Republic.

Illustrations: Fig. 1. Tenement houses, Brno, Dobrovského 157/1 to 1239/9, 1919–1920, current condition; Fig. 2. Plan of the town of Královo Pole, made by R. Sklenář after about 1926. Scale 1:5,000 (section). Construction from 1918–1925 is marked on the plan with fine pink hatching; Fig. 3. Tenement house, Brno, Tyršova 1272/5 – Těšínská 1272/9, period photograph; Fig. 4. Tenement house, Brno, Tyršova 1272/5 – Těšínská 1272/9, 1921–1922, current condition; Fig. 5. Josef Novák, proposal for tenement house, Brno, Tyršova 1272/5 – Těšínská 1272/9, facade of the facade to Tyršova Street (section), September 1921; Fig. 6. Miloš Laml, family houses Brno, Vodova 1263/67, 1264/69, 1265/71, 1266/73, 1921–1922, period photograph of new buildings after completion; Fig. 7. Karel Láník(?), proposal for tenement house, Brno, Kartouzská 227/10, front facade (section); Fig. 8. Miloš Laml – Jaroslav Grunt, tenement house, Brno, Štefánikova 123/63, 1923–1925; Fig. 9. Family house, Brno, Tyršova 1268/7, 1921–1922, current condition; Fig. 10. Josef Novák, family houses, Brno, Tyršova 1267/5b and 1268/7, 1921–1922, period photograph of new buildings after completion; Fig. 11. Kristián Dejmeke, proposal for family house, Brno, Těšínská 1281/3, March 1922; Fig. 12. Family houses, Brno, Těšínská 1281/3 and 1282/3a, 1922–1923, current condition; Fig. 13. Tenement house, Brno, Skácelova 1455/21 – Vodova, 1922–1925, period photograph (first house from the left); Fig. 14. Tenement house, Brno, Skácelova 1455/21 – Vodova, 1922–1925, current condition; Fig. 15. Tučapský and Krejčí, proposal for tenement house, Brno, Palackého třída 1330/116 – Kollárova 1330/10, front facade toward Palackého třída (section), 16 December 1923; Fig. 16. Tenement house, Brno, Palackého třída 1330/116 – Kollárova 1330/10, 1922–1924, current condition; Fig. 17. František Hrdina, proposal for tenement house, Brno, Slovanské náměstí 1370/4, perspective view (section), February 1924; Fig. 18. František Hrdina, proposal for tenement house, Brno, Slovanské náměstí 1370/4, ground floor plan (section), February 1924; Fig. 19. Public park and buildings on the northern side of Slovanské náměstí, view of Slovanské náměstí 1370/4; Fig. 20. Miloslav Kopřiva, three tenement houses for civil servants, Brno, Skácelova 2792/34, Skácelova 1475/36 – Purkyňova, Purkyňova 1476/72, 1924–1925; Fig. 21. Adolf Hladil, plans for a family house, Brno, Berkova 1269/54, front facade (section), May 1922; Fig. 22. Family house, Brno, Berkova 15/52, current condition; Fig. 23. Tučapský and Krejčí, plans for a family house, Brno, Vodova 1293/30, front facade (section), September 1923; Fig. 24. Family house, Brno, Vodova 30

1293/30, 1923, current condition; Fig. 25. Eduard Grümm, plans for a family house, Brno, Tyršova 1278/19, front facade (section), 1922; Fig. 26. C. Mir. Putna, plans for reconstruction of a family house, Brno, Tyršova 1278/19, perspective view (section), 13 Jan 1927; Fig. 27. Jindřich Štaffá, plans for family houses, Brno, Berkova 496/41 and 1225/43, front facade (section), August 1922; Fig. 28. Adolf Hladil, plans for family houses, Brno, 1290/56 to 1291/58, front facade (section), May 1923; Fig. 29. Adolf Hladil, plans for the Berkova semi-detached house 1317/48 and 1318/50, front facade (section), August 1923; Fig. 30. Family houses Brno, Berkova 1317/48 and 1318/50, 1923, current condition; Fig. 31. Family house Brno, Berkova 1322/66, 1923, current condition; Fig. 32. Tučapský and Krejčí, plans for a family house, Brno, Vodova 1294/28, front facade (section), May 1923; Fig. 33. Family house, Brno, Vodova 1294/28, 1923, current condition; Fig. 34. Tučapský and Krejčí, plans for a family house, Brno, Tyršova 1329/15, front facade (section), April 1923; Fig. 35. Family house, Brno, Tyršova 1329/15, 1923–1924, current condition; Fig. 36. Family house, Brno, Berkova 1460/76, 1923–1925, current condition.

## History and principles of heritage protection of exhibition grounds using the example of the Brno Exhibition Grounds

Lenka ŠTĚPÁNKOVÁ

Keywords: exhibition grounds, heritage protection, urbanism, composition, Brno Urban Heritage Monument Reserve, development, 20th century

The complex of the Brno Exhibition Center is comprised of a unique preserved ensemble of modern architecture from the interwar period, having retained its original function for many decades. The reconstruction of the original complex from the 1920s took place in two important stages. First, in the second half of the 1950s, new exhibition halls were built for engineering fairs with respect to the original composition; this determined the appearance of the complex for several more decades. Later, new modern exhibition halls were built in the western part of the complex from the mid-1990s; the key project, which organically connected the historical part of the complex with the new hall development, was the reconstruction of pavilion G. In the post-war period, mainly due to the adoption of the Act on Heritage Care in 1958 and later in 1987, the grounds gradually fell under heritage protection. In addition to the heritage protection of individual buildings, which are registered in the Central List of Cultural Heritage Properties, the entire area is also partially protected as part of the protection zone of the Brno Urban Heritage Reserve. This involves the definition of heritage protection

of individual buildings and plots in spatial planning documents and documentation as well as in the real estate cadaster. On closer examination, however, it turns out that although there is general agreement between these documents in the manner and extent of heritage protection, they differ from each other in specific details. This ambiguity can be a source of complications in assessing specific development plans in the complex. The fact that the exhibition grounds are still used for their original purpose without change, without its historical urban concept having been fundamentally affected by reconstructions, is one of the factors that significantly contributes to the historical value of the exhibition center as a whole. On the other hand, the fact that the exhibition center still serves for trade fair operation makes intensive heritage protection difficult to some extent. The situation regarding heritage protection of the exhibition grounds as a whole is further complicated by the fact that due to the relatively small number of preserved exhibition areas in the Czech Republic, each of these grounds is practically original with a unique architectural and cultural history, and it is difficult to deduce a general set of rules for the protection of this specific urban type. The Brno Exhibition Center certainly deserves increased attention for its cultural and historical significance and its role in the development of 20th century architecture. The specific level and form of its protection in the future, however, should be the subject of intensive interdisciplinary discussion between heritage care experts and professionals dealing with exhibitions, trade fair business, and the creation of the urban environment.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Aerial view of the Brno Exhibition Grounds along the axis of Pavilion Z. The overall view of the complex shows the main elements of the urban composition. Two trade fair promenades, defined by the wings of the main exhibition palace (now pavilion A), were supplemented by a third axis leading to pavilion Z during the expansion of the engineering exhibition area. In the central part of the complex, a park with an alley leading to the chateau building has been preserved; Fig. 2. Brno Exhibition Grounds, historical aerial view of pavilion A. The historical image of pavilion A shows the appearance of the pavilion before the complete reconstruction in the early 1980s. The foreground shows period landscaping around the pavilion and a multi-row alley in the main road; Fig. 3. Brno Exhibition Grounds, historical aerial view of pavilion G. Original appearance of pavilion G with two subtle side wings and garden landscaping around the lake in the atrium. Close by was Pavilion F, which in 2003 gave way to a new modern pavilion of the same name. At the far left in the back is the older Pavilion K from 1959 (demolished after a snow calamity in 1963) and on the right Pavilion X from 1961 (removed as part of the construction of Pavilion P in 2008); Fig. 4. Brno Exhibition Grounds, view of pavilion A, pavilions Brno and Moravia in the foreground.*

*The view of the exhibition grounds from the roof terrace of a high-rise office building is dominated by the pair of pavilions named Brno and Moravia. The open ground floor of both buildings was additionally enclosed during reconstruction in the post-war period; Fig. 5. Brno Exhibition Grounds, view of the tower of pavilion G. During the reconstruction of pavilion G carried out in 1995–1996, the observation tower with suspended glass facade and one of the smaller side towers on the north side of the atrium was preserved. The original side wings of the pavilion were replaced by two large modern halls with a steel supporting structure; Fig. 6. An analysis of the delimitation of the heritage protection of the Brno Exhibition Grounds from October 2018 points to partial discrepancies between the Central Catalog of NHI (accessible online), the entry in the Real Estate Cadaster, and an older statement by NHI from 2015; Fig. 7. A statement by NHI from 2 October 2015 declares the heritage protection of the Brno Exhibition Grounds according to the Central Catalog of Cultural Heritages. A part of the central park in front of the chateau and the courtyard of pavilion G is marked as a protected area; Fig. 8. In Territorial Analytical Documents from 2016, listed buildings are marked in black while listed areas are marked with black hatching. Their scope differs from the exhaustive list in the Central Catalog of Cultural Heritages; Fig. 9. Heritage protection of the grounds according to the valid Zoning Plan of the City of Brno from 1994 as amended from 2020. Heritage-protected buildings are marked in black while protected areas are marked with a black dotted outline; Fig. 10. Construction development of the exhibition center in the period 1928–2018. It is evident that the location of the pavilions has changed repeatedly, but still with the intentions of the original urban composition. Current structures are marked with dark hatching while outlines represent older structures; Fig. 11. Brno Exhibition Grounds, aerial view of pavilion A. Pavilion A was supplemented by an arched extension of the office wing during the complete reconstruction in 1980–1982. Later, Hall A1 was connected to Pavilion C by a covered connecting corridor, called a “pasarela”; Fig. 12. Brno Exhibition Grounds, aerial view of the complex. The older pavilions A, B, C, D, and E situated along one of the historic trade fair axes in the eastern part of the complex were interconnected in the 1990s by a system of connecting corridors. The two new halls of Pavilion G tied in with the end of the second historical axis and simultaneously laid the foundation for the spatial arrangement of the western part of the complex.*

#### **Liturgical textile and its restoration. The beginnings of textile restoration in the period from the late 1950s to the early 1970s**

Markéta GRILL JANATOVÁ

**Keywords:** liturgical textile, monastery workshops, Christian Academy in Prague, textile restoration, Czech Fund of Fine Artists, Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá, Božena Rothmayerová Horneková, Blanka Kłosová, Jarmila Sikytová

The development of collecting in the 19th century also focused on historical liturgical clothing and textiles which had lost their original function as a part of the liturgy and were rather appreciated for their artistic and craft qualities. The recognition of the heritage value of liturgical textiles led to the realization of the urgent need to change the approach to their care, including repairs. The workshops of women's monasteries had been the traditional place where liturgical garments were repaired, then the production of paraments was later added in the 19th century. The renovations carried out here were intended to bring the garments back into use in the liturgy, but the possible artistic value of the fabric was largely not taken into account. At the beginning of the 20th century, a workshop was established in Stockholm promoting a professional approach to the care of historical textiles, including liturgical textiles. After the Second World War, European museums established their own textile restoration workshops. In the Czech environment, this field was established and developed in the second half of the 1950s following the adoption of the necessary laws. In the early 1950s, the state stepped up its activities against churches and religious communities, resulting in the confiscation of religious property and a number of high-quality liturgical textiles passing into the administration of state institutions. The restoration of arts and crafts, including historical textiles, was under the auspices of the Restoration Commission of the Czech Association of Fine Artists. The first workers Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá and Božena Rothmayerová Horneková, both graduates of the Academy of Arts, Architecture, and Design, and who already had a rich career in the field of textile art, specialized in textile restoration. Restoration contracts came mainly from state institutions, heritage care centers, and museums. The reasons for the restorations was the reinstallation of heritage property interiors or preparation for a new exhibition. Liturgical textiles were abundant among the restored textiles. At Prague Castle, a reinstallation was being prepared for the treasure of the Church of St. Vitus, for which medieval liturgical garments were restored in the 1960s. Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá restored the chasubles which were traditionally associated with the figures of St. Wenceslas and St. Adalbert. Textile relics were also restored, including a supposed veil of the Virgin Mary and a tablecloth used during the Last Supper of the Lord. Liturgical textiles and clothes from the treasury and the Cathedral of St. Vitus were gradually restored in the 1970s as well. For the purposes of an exhibition, the National Gallery had the most important High Gothic liturgical embroidery restored on the Rokycanská and Broumovská chasubles, with

the latter being transferred from the Benedictine Monastery in Břevnov to the collections of the Museum of Applied Arts in Prague. The National Heritage Institute had the Hasištejn-Lobkowitz pearl altar restored, and a set of paraments from Karlštejn Castle and liturgical textile heritage items from other buildings were restored. A considerable number of realized orders for the restoration of liturgical textiles indicate that the activities of the Czech Fund of Fine Artists were governed by a purely professional point of view. This was possible only thanks to the efforts of professionals from among the heritage care and museum community.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Chasuble from the Dean's Church in Rokycany. The embroidered crucifix from the 15th century was transferred to a new chasuble in 1895, sewed by the Parament Institute of the Christian Academy in Prague from fabric with a historicist pattern; Fig. 2. Miter from the Church of the Virgin Mary in Stará Boleslav, condition after 1938. The embroidery with St. Wenceslas and Palladius from the 17th century were incorporated into a new decoration designed by Josef Fanta for the Parament Institute of the Christian Academy in Prague; Fig. 3. Chasuble cross from the 15th century from the collection of the Museum of National History in Planá near Mariánské Lázně, condition before restoration in 1960; Fig. 4. Chasuble cross from the Museum of National History in Planá near Mariánské Lázně, condition after restoration by Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá in 1961; Fig. 5. Textile restorer Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá at work on the St. Vitus miter from the treasury of the Cathedral of St. Vitus; Fig. 6. Cardinal František Tomášek during enthronement by the Archbishop of Prague on 26 March 1978. He is wearing a white miter which was made in 1973 as a free copy of the St. Adalbert miter by Marie Štěpánková-Moudrá and a Baroque chasuble from the Marie Theresa set; ; Fig. 7. The Broumov chasuble, the front side with an embroidered tag which originally formed the decoration of the cope. Condition before restoration in 1971; Fig. 8 The Broumov chasuble, on which two medieval embroideries were applied in the 17th century; on the back is a cross with the Crucifixion from the late 1370s; on the front is a tag with embroidery of the Adoration of Christ from the end of the 15th century. Condition before restoration in 1971; Fig. 9. The Broumov chasuble, condition after restoration by Blanka Kłosová in 1971, during which the back of the chasuble was separated with a scene of the Crucifixion. The embroidery with Adoration, which was presented separately, was removed from the front. Property of the Benedictine Archabbey of St. Adalbert and St. Margaret in Prague-Břevnov, long-term loan to the Museum of Applied Arts in Prague; Fig. 10. Chasuble from Karlštejn Castle No. KA 4550, detail of embroidery, condition before restoration in 1974; Fig. 11. Chasuble from Karlštejn Castle No. KA 4550, detail of embroidery retouching, condition after restoration by Jarmila Sikytová in 1974.*

## The diversity of Chinese wallpaper – interior decoration in the 18th and 19th centuries

Lucie OLIVOVÁ

*Keywords: Chinese wallpaper, paper, silk, workshops of Ding Liangxian, Suzhou, Canton, overseas shop, Lednice, Červený Dvůr, Bruntál, Hradec nad Moravicí, 18th century, 19th century*

The article focuses on Chinese wallpapers from the 18th and 19th centuries which decorated the interiors of aristocratic residences in what is today the Czech Republic. It is based on a survey of preserved wallpapers and professional literature, listed in the introduction by the author. Unlike in Europe, Chinese interiors did not use wallpaper. This is why Europeans at first had only smaller prints available that were sometimes imported from China; these would be fastened individually to a larger textile or paper base. This method of application was used in two rooms at the Veltrusy chateau.

The woodcuts date back to the 1840s and were made in Suzhou. They depict scenes of beauty and flower scenes that fall within the scope of the Ding Liangxian workshop. Other Suzhou woodcuts depicting beauty have been preserved in the residence of the princes of Auersperg. The same woodcuts are found in residences and collections in England, Germany, and other countries. Around the middle of the 18th century, “real” wallpapers began to be produced in Guangzhou in a format corresponding to castle interiors in Europe. It is assumed that the production of these “Cantonese wallpapers”, mostly of paper and decorated with paintings, came as per requirements of European clients. Wallpapers bearing continuous panoramic landscapes, complemented by buildings and staffage, have not been preserved in situ in the Czech Republic. The depository of the Valtice chateau, however, holds a relatively early copy of a wallpaper depicting a mountainous landscape with figures. This extraordinary set of six silk panoramic wallpapers, originally ordered for Versailles in the 1770s, was brought after the French Revolution to Lednice, where it decorated the interior of a now defunct Chinese gazebo. The ensemble is gradually being restored at present. Chinese wallpapers bearing the motif of “flowers and birds” can be found in several buildings. Silk wallpapers with the motif of the “tree of life” adorns the oval lounge in the Archbishop's Palace in Prague. It can be indirectly documented that this motif, depicted on home-made wallpapers, penetrated into bourgeois interiors in the last quarter of the 18th century. An intact interior decorated with silk painted wallpaper of Chinese or perhaps French provenance has also been preserved in a guest apartment at Veltrusy chateau. We can see changed designs on

printed and hand-colored wallpapers in the corner Chinese salon in Lednice which probably date back to the 19th century. The most popular variant of floral wallpaper, however, is the one that evokes the impression of a garden. Paper wallpapers with images on a blue background, the design of which corresponds to the end of the 18th century, have been preserved at Červený Dvůr chateau in southern Bohemia; silk wallpaper with similar scenes again at the Bruntál castle in Silesia. Both interiors were furnished later. The popularity of this version still lives on; an example from the beginning of the 20th century, painted with period ink, can be seen in the castle of Hradec nad Moravicí. The last theme of Cantonese wallpapers combines flowers and birds with miniature figures, already inherited from Cantonese reality. The unlikely contrast of giant and miniature elements comes across as comical. Such wallpapers adorn two rooms at the chateau in Čimelice and the anteroom on the ground floor of Lednice chateau; they are from the end of the 19th century and were probably both purchased at the world exhibition in Vienna. In conclusion, it follows that authentic Chinese wallpapers have been preserved in the Czech Republic in considerable diversity, however sporadically, in the residences belonging to the higher nobility with a connection to the imperial court.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Veltrusy State Castle, the small cabinet (room 2.76), wallpaper with Suzhou prints, 1740s, applied in 1754 or 1764, canvas with Chinese paper; Fig. 2. Veltrusy State Castle, Count's Office (room 2.82), wallpaper with Suzhou prints, 1740–1750, applied in 1754 or 1764, canvas with Chinese paper; Fig. 3. Gabriela von Auersperg, Chinese cabinet at the chateau, watercolor, 1831. Žleby State Castle; Fig. 4. Panoramic wallpaper, painting on paper, 2nd half of the 18th century; Fig. 5. Panoramic wallpaper, print and painting on paper, 2nd quarter of the 18th century. Valtice Castle; Fig. 6. Panoramic wallpaper, detail with boys on a tree, print and painting on paper, 2nd quarter of the 18th century. Valtice Castle; Fig. 7. Panoramic wallpaper, detail, painting on paper, 2nd half of the 18th century. Museum für angewandte Kunst, Vienna; Fig. 8. Panoramic wallpaper, painting on silk, 2nd half of the 18th century. Stored at Lednice Castle; Fig. 9. Archbishop's Palace in Prague, music salon, Chinese wallpaper, painting on silk, mid-18th century; Fig. 10. Lednice State Castle, Chinese salon on the first floor, detail of paper wallpaper with a floral motif, print and painting, 1st half of the 18th century; Fig. 11. J.G. Balzer, Busy Lady, etching, paper, 228×174 mm (180×150 mm painting), last third of 18th century; Fig. 12. Detail of silk wallpaper with painted peonies, birds and butterflies, 2nd quarter of the 18th century. Veltrusy Castle; Fig. 13. Červený Dvůr Chateau, morning hall, paper wallpaper with painting, end of the 18th century, mounted in the 1930s; Fig. 14. Červený Dvůr Chateau, morning hall, detail of paper wallpaper with painting of Oriole. The outline of the rocks is highlighted by stains, as is common in Chinese*



painting; **Fig. 15.** Bruntál Castle, oriental salon – northeast corner, silk wallpaper with painting. The third band on the left shows papaya; **Fig. 16.** Bruntál Chateau, oriental salon, silk wallpaper in a supraporta; **Fig. 17.** Hradec nad Moravicí State Castle, detail of wallpaper with painting (panneau IV), detail, beginning of 20th century; **Fig. 18.** A fragment of wallpaper from the Těplice Castle; **Fig. 19.** Lednice State Castle, hall on the ground floor, wallpaper with a combined theme, 2nd half of the 19th century. A cutout for the door is visible on the detail; **Fig. 20.** Čimelice Castle, detail with torn-off wallpaper, taped with newspaper allegedly from 1911; **Fig. 21.** Bruntál Castle, men's or gaming salon, painting in the style of floral wallpaper from the beginning of the 19th century. The painting respects the wallpaper strips, the supraportas clearly refer to a Chinese theme; **Fig. 22.** Bruntál Castle, men's or gaming salon, detail of the painting and method of floral wallpapers from the beginning of the 19th century.

#### **Aristocratic necropoleis of the Jagiellonian and early modern period – their significance and function: Bechyně and Němčice**

Jan CHLÍBEC; Jiří ROHÁČEK

*Keywords: sepulchral sculpture, epigraphy, burial ground, Bechyně, Němčice, 15th – 16th centuries*

Due to historical circumstances, only a small number of more complete medieval aristocratic necropoleis have been preserved in Bohemia to this day. Such an example of the longer time continuity and complexity of the family burial ground are given by two South Bohemian necropoleis – in the monastery church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Bechyně and in the parish church of St. Nicholas in Němčice. Both aristocratic necropoleis from the late Middle Ages and the early Renaissance are also examples of burial grounds of the significant upper nobility (Bechyně) and the lower, local nobility (Němčice). Both types of necropolis show similarities (emphasis on preserving the place of family burials, proof of kinship), but also differences – the works of the Bechyně necropolis markedly emphasize the artistic side of the tombstone and the type of stone used as a manifestation of family self-representation, unlike the necropolis in Němčice, where the stonework and even the material used for the tombstone recedes into the background in terms of quality. The sculptors and stonemason workshops of Bechyně tombstones focus on progressive artistic tendencies in Transalpine sepulchral sculpture, especially in the area of Passau and the wider Danube. The creators of tombstones of the lower nobility in Němčice remain at the traditional provincial level of local production.

The Bechyně necropolis contained the tombstones of the owners of the Bechyně Šternberk estate, the founders and improvers of the Bechyně Franciscan-Observant monastery, and of their successors held by the Bechyně Švamberks together with members of related families. To this day, a torso has been preserved from the common necropolis of both families, albeit in a representative state: the tombs of Ladislav of Šternberk († 1521), Jan of Šternberk († 1528) and his wife Johana of Rýzmbek († 1529), and Kryštof of Švamberk († 1534) and his first wife Magdalena of Šelmbek († 1508). Most of the tombstones used red marble, probably from quarries in Adnet, except for the tombstone of Magdalena of Šelmbek, for which domestic pink marble, probably from a location in the Czech Barrandien, was used. The economic status of the customer was largely reflected here in the selection of the stone. The sculptural material – probably marble from the Adnet quarries – was disproportionately more expensive than stones from Czech quarries, including Slivenec marble, due both to its high quality and complicated transport from Austria. Adnet marble was traded briskly in the second half of the 15th and 16th centuries, especially in southern and southwestern Bohemia, as evidenced by analyses of some sepulchral works from these regions and archival sources.

The burial ground in the church of St. Nicholas in Němčice, being one of the largest preserved necropoleis of the lower nobility of late medieval Bohemia, differs from the Bechyně ensemble in its suspicious artistic quality and cheaper material of tombstones – granite. It clearly documents the prevailing lower level of sepulchral culture of the lower nobility at the end of the Middle Ages. In chronological order, there are the tombstones of Beneš (Benedikt) from Sedlec († 1483), Anežka from Heraldice († 1485), Markéta, aunt of Petr Kořenský from Terešov († 1492), Petr Kořenský from Terešov († 1493), squire Jiřík of Dub († 1502) and Voršila of Klinštejn († 1526). All the tombstones examined bear Latin or Czech inscriptions. The inscriptions run around the base of the stone with the font inwards or are parallel in the area of stone; the design technique for both necropoleis is limited to carving or relief engraving in a recessed inscription field. The font used is mostly a Gothic minuscule, but one early occurrence of Roman square capitals in both sets is worth mention in the Czech environment. The formats are predominantly the “Anno Domini” type consisting of three basic parts (dating, information on the deceased person, and a closing formula expressing the need to ensure prayers for the deceased), with the alternative missing the final formula (4 examples in Němčice) or an added reference to the place of burial in front. The dating

of the day is according to the Christian calendar, while continuous dating is represented only by the inscription on the plaque of Jan of Šternberk in Bechyně. In Němčice, it is worth noting that most of the dating refers only to the year. In both localities, cases of a single “stoneworker's hand” can be found in the inscriptions, but the fonts are very different. The epigraphic aspect of the tombstones of both burial grounds thus lies, in principle, still deep in the late medieval tradition with the exception of the Roman square capitals on the tombstone of Magdalena of Šelmbek. Nevertheless, we can find fundamental qualitative differences in favor of the Bechyně necropolis. The quality of writing is disproportionately more formal, although not always necessarily genetic, and very high-quality craftsmanship in the inscriptions and the evidently conscious adoption of some more advanced elements can be noted, including from the South German and Upper Austrian regions. Last but not least, greater homogeneity and higher forms of external features are visible; this is probably related to the possibility of (logically) a narrower range of quality stonemasons or workshops. Undoubtedly, the financial possibilities of the customer also played a large role in the choice of material, where marble enables more precise work than granite. In Němčice (and even more so in Bechyně), the concept and execution of scripts accompanied, with the exception of the final specification of the text, seems to be more a matter of the workshops and creator than of the patrons. Regarding both the artistic aspect of the examined tombstones and their epigraphic aspect, the social status of the clients is clearly differentiable, with more precise conclusions being made possible by the testimony of the preserved ensemble of tombstones as a whole.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Tombstone of Magdalena of Šelmbek († 1508), monastery church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Bechyně; Fig. 2a, b. Tombstone of Ladislav of Šternberk († 1521), ibid., complete and detail; Fig. 3. Tombstone of Půta Švihovský of Rýzmbek († 1504), monastery church of the Archangel Michael in Horažďovice; Fig. 4. Tombstone of Jan of Šternberk († 1528), monastery church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Bechyně; Fig. 5. Tombstone of Johana of Rýzmbek († 1529), ibid; Fig. 6a, b. Tombstone of Kryštof of Švamberk († 1534) and his first wife, ibid., complete and detail; Fig. 7. Tombstone of Beneš (Benedikt) of Sedlec († 1483), parish church of St. Nicholas in Němčice; Fig. 8. Tombstone of Anežka of Heraldice († 1485), ibid; Fig. 9. Tombstone of Markéta, aunt of Petr Kořenský of Terešov († 1492), ibid; Fig. 10. Tombstone of Petr Kořenský of Terešov († 1493), ibid; Fig. 11. Tombstone of squire Jiřík of Dub († 1502), ibid; Fig. 12. Tombstone of Voršila of Klinštejn († 1526), ibid.*

## Historical context of the production of fortress brick (technological notes)

Tomáš HANZLÍČEK; Jiří HOFMAN

*Keywords: brick, brick production, baroque fortress, Terezín, technology, Maximilian de Traux, protection of cultural heritage*

The construction of the fortresses at Terezín (central Bohemia) and Josefov (northeast Bohemia) in the second half of the 18th century was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire's defense against the Prussian menace. Both of these constructions were built between 1780 and 1790. The chosen construction material was generally brick in combination with partially used sandstone. The Empire's administration was responsible for the production of bricks and control of the brickyards' production. According to historical Austrian Military Academy and archive documents, information concerning the fortress construction at Terezín was found. The article focuses on the technique and technology of historical brick production and defines the non-negligible rules which should be applied during the execution of restoration and reconstruction work.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. Plan of the fortifications of the town of Terezín, detail of the map showing sampling at the site of ravelin 18 and ravelin 19; Fig. 2. Aerial view of the main fortress Terezín from the south; Fig. 3. Aerial view of the northwestern part of the main fortress Terezín, in the foreground ravelin 18 and in the background ravelin 19. Fig. 4. Plan of the fortifications of the town of Terezín and the Small Fortress on the eastern side; Fig. 5. Part of the exposed original masonry of the breast wall on bastion 2; Fig. 6. A fragment of a brick from the outer perimeter of the Small Fortress (collapsed part); Tab. 1. Chemical composition of brick samples; Tab. 2. Absorbency of samples taken after drying at 105° C to constant weight; Fig. 7. Bricks combined with marl used in the Terezín underground spaces of the main fortress; Fig. 8. The main moat in front of the bastion No. 5, near which samples Rav. 18 and Rav. 19 were taken.*

## European Court of Human Rights and protection of cultural heritage five years later

Jan MALÍŘ

*Keywords: ECHR, ECtHR, protection of cultural heritage, right to property, right of access to cultural heritage, freedom of expression*

The article provides an overview of the case-law concerning cultural heritage protection which the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) rendered under the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) over the last 5 years. The ECtHR continues to be confronted with

cultural heritage protection especially based on applications that challenge the compatibility of measures taken by Signatory States in order to protect cultural heritage with individual right to property, as enshrined in Article 1 Protocol 1. In this respect, the ECtHR goes on to qualify cultural heritage protection – considered to constitute a public interest – as a legitimate aim capable of justifying interferences with the individual right to property. Moreover, the ECtHR rules that Signatory States have a very wide margin of appreciation when it comes to regulating possessions of cultural and historical value. As a result, with the goal of protecting cultural heritage, Signatory States can undertake a wide range of measures, even though these measures interfere with the right to property. Yet, compatibility of any measure which a Signatory State undertakes in order to protect cultural heritage also depends on whether a fair balance is struck in each case between the demands of the general interests of the community on one hand and the requirement of protecting the individual's right to property on the other. In practice, the scrutiny of the existence of a fair balance – assimilated with applying a test of proportionality by the ECtHR – attracts the most attention. While in *Torno vs. Italy* (presumption of the ownership of the State with respect to archaeological finds discovered since 1909 and the reversed burden of proof on the part of an individual who claimed ownership of the finds), or *Kristiana vs. Lithuania* (obligation to demolish former military premises in the area listed in UNESCO World Heritage without any compensation from the state), the ECtHR concluded that such a fair balance was struck. In *Petar Matas vs. Croatia* (preventive protection of cultural heritage pending the assessment of its historical and artistic values by public authorities), the ECtHR held that a fair balance had not been achieved due to acts of public authorities which actually violated the principle of good administration. Upon closer look, scrutinizing the existence of a fair balance is often a delicate exercise which is not free of subjective elements. In addition, in the case of cultural heritage elements which are unique, judicially discoverable and manageable standards are not easily available for this exercise. Importantly enough, the ECtHR recently had an opportunity to explore the place of cultural heritage protection in the context of other rights and freedoms enshrined in the ECtHR.

In *Margulev v. Russia*, the ECtHR expressly held that cultural heritage protection issues are clearly of importance to the general public, who has a vested interest in preserving cultural heritage. Imparting information and ideas on cultural heritage and its protection thus falls within the scope of freedom of expression as guaranteed by Article 10 of the ECHR.

Furthermore, public authorities are obliged to exhibit a high degree of tolerance to criticism over the decisions they take in this area. On the other hand, in the *Sylogos Ton Athinaion vs. United Kingdom* case, and especially in the *Ahunbay and Others vs. Turkey* case, the ECtHR openly declined to recognize that the ECHR, in particular Article 8 thereof, enshrines the individual right to access to cultural heritage or to its protection. While such a conclusion may correspond to the view that cultural heritage protection is a public interest which is collective in nature, the conclusion still somewhat contrasts with the ECtHR's pro-active approach exhibited in other comparable areas such as the protection of environment. Moreover, in the light of global and regional treaties on cultural heritage protection, notably the Faro Convention, and also numerous acts of international organizations, one may ask whether there is indeed no consensus or tendency between Signatory States of the ECHR to award cultural rights in this area more individual character.

*Illustrations: Fig. 1. European Court of Human Rights, beginning of the judicial year, 31 January 2020; Fig. 2a–b. Etruscan Finds, Museo archeologico nazionale di Firenze; Fig. 3. Curonian Spit National Park, inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List since 2000, Lithuania; Fig. 4. Hasankeyf, southeastern Turkey. Remains of an ancient settlement in the area along the Tigris River captured in a photograph at a time when the city had not yet been flooded by water from the Ilisu Dam; Fig. 5. Tsaritsyno Palace, Moscow, Russia.*