Copak teprve továrny, sklady, sila… Zatímco na poli badatelském se Národní památkový ústav záslužně činí,[6] následná snaha o faktickou památkovou ochranu stále naráží na nepochopení, a to i mezi památkářskou obcí. Ochrana předpokládá poznání, avšak poznání bez ochrany, tváří v tvář nenávratnému ničení, vede k ještě větší frustraci. Budeme se dále tvářit, že čtyřicet let našich moderních dějin bylo zvnějšku vnucenou deviací, jejíž hmotné projevy je nezbytné vykázat na hanbu mimo slušnou společnost? Česká historiografie se již dokázala vymanit z polistopadového přehození znamének. Jan Rychlík napsal ve výtečné syntéze o socialistickém Československu: *„Revize původního polistopadového přístupu, který zkoumal především represe režimu a odpor proti němu, tedy spočívá nikoliv v obhajobě tohoto režimu, ale v rozšíření rejstříku témat historické látky a přístupu k ní.“*[7] Co památková péče? Bude stále posuzovat architekturu této doby tím, kolik starších staveb bylo na jejich místě zbouráno či kolik škody na tváři našich historických měst napáchala komplexní bytová výstavba? Jsme schopni odborné nestrannosti, nebo to alibisticky necháme na další generaci, držíce se obezličky časového odstupu, jež mnohdy zakrývá jen naše osobní preference? Bude mít ještě oč pečovat?

Mgr. PETR FREIWILLIG, Ph.D.
NPÚ, ÚOP v Liberci
freiwillig.petr@npu.cz

■ **Poznámky**

6 Edici monografií vybraných významných staveb tohoto období (nádraží Ostrava-Vítkovice, obchodní dům Kotva, Transgas, hotel Intercontinental) završil kritický katalog, který však výrobní stavby z důvodu existence jiných grantů zcela pomíjí. Paradoxně – a naštěstí – zde nalézáme množství infrastrukturních staveb. Renata Vrabelová (ed.), *Architektura 60. a 70. let 20. století v České republice*, Praha 2020.

7 Jan Rychlík, *Československo v období socialismu 1945–1989*, Praha 2020, s. 32.

“Honoring the inviolability of the old works” – on the beginnings of the controversy between the restoration and conservation of heritage properties in Bohemia around the middle of the 19th century

Alena JANATKOVÁ

Summary: The heritage conservationist activity of František Schmoranz Sr. is marked by a contemporary cult of history and provincial patriotism.
In this respect, the Czech historian Jan Erazim Vocel warned, in 1845, of the danger of extinction to which the country’s antique heritage properties are exposed every day. According to Vocel, the danger was related both to continuing industrial expansion and to the excessive appetite among conservationists to beautify and improve historical works. Vocel therefore demanded an inventory of land heritage properties. This list was to become a basic prerequisite for knowledge and a broad understanding of heritage properties and would thus ensure their preservation.
The Czech article “Honoring the Inviolability of the Old Work” examines the question of what principles of conservation were available to heritage conservationists in Bohemia around the middle of the 19th century. To what extent did the purism of the restorer Schmoranz control contemporary reflections on the protection of antique heritage properties, in what direction was the theory of heritage property care heading at the time, and how did this differ from actual heritage practice?
The main source here is a theoretical reflection on the preservation of antique heritage properties, especially architectural. This reflection from the originally French milieu was a translation published in the German *Allgemeine Bauzeitung* (1852) which made its way to the Czech environment. It was published as an introductory article in the periodical *Památky archaeologické a místopisné* (1854) by the editor Karel Vladislav Zap and stood in contrast to the restoration concept of the conservator Schmoranz as a thematization of the requirement of the inviolability of the old work.
According to the author, the preciousness of a domestic heritage property here depends, apart from its artistic characteristics, on its age itself. Primarily, the history itself and the originality of the historical matter is where the obligation to protect heritage properties stems from. Preserving the authenticity of historical material means keeping the original character of a work as it has been marked with age. A historical heritage property thus stands out as a part of nature and its laws. Understood in this way, it maintains and protects the memory of the laws of natural origin, transformation, and extinction.
The introductory article, which addresses the conservators directly, however introduces two different classes of heritage properties that require different action on the part of conservationists: the inviolability requirement applies only to purely historical heritage properties, such as old triumphant gates, amphitheaters, columns, obelisks, graves, sarcophagi, ruins of old castles, old churches and monasteries, walls, bridges, and old inscriptions. According to the author, heritage properties that serve current needs, however, must necessarily adapt to current use. The formulated requirement of inviolability is thus seen once again in relation to the needs of heritage care practice.
Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Title and second page of the introductory issue of the oldest Czech professional periodical devoted to the research and protection of heritage properties – Památky archaeologické a místopisné (Archaeological and Topographical Heritage Properties) I, 1854, p. 1, pp. 1–2.* ***Fig. 2.*** *Karel Maixner, portrait of Karel Vladislav Zap (184 –1881);* ***Fig. 3.*** *John Ruskin, illustration of the 6th edition of John Ruskin’s book “The Seven Lamps of Architecture”.*

The work of František Schmoranz Sr. in the context of purist heritage care in Vysoké Mýto

Vojtěch BARCAL

Summary: The panorama of the town of Vysoké Mýto is characterized by its large number of towers.
The town owes this panorama to enlightened personalities of the 19th century, led by Alois Vojtěch Šembera, who promoted the repair of the medieval towers of the town fortifications and the Church of St. Lawrence. Šembera’s efforts were crowned with their first success in 1862, with the repair of the “Klášterská bašta”. Its reconstruction, unlike others, showed no significant signs of the purist manifestations that prevailed in the then-nascent care of heritage properties.
In the same year, the town began the reconstruction of the Litomyšl Gate. This reconstruction, already completely purist in nature, was accompanied by a number of vicissitudes. The opinion of František Schmoranz from October 1862 led to a cessation of its construction; the town council took Schmoranz’s comments into account, and the reconstruction of the gate recommenced, being completed in 1867. From today’s perspective of heritage care, the result of the reconstruction is debatable in it was not based on the shape of the tower, but it cannot be denied that the heritage property was rescued.
Another implementation of purist heritage property care in Vysoké Mýto was the repair of the Gothic

parish Church of St. Lawrence, carried out based on Schmoranz's plans. As in the case of the Litomyšl Gate, today's conservation community may have certain reservations about Schmoranz's procedures in the reconstruction of the church – some parts of the church were rebuilt quite radically, and the regothicization erased the trace of its natural development. Nonetheless, the church was still in need of general repairs. Schmoranz's reconstruction was carried out according to the heritage care approaches of the time.

Schmoranz drew up plans for the reconstruction of another of the town gates, the Prague Gate, as early as 1868. The repair of the gate was postponed until 1882, however, due to lack of funds among other reasons. The purist restoration of the Prague Gate did not require significant interventions to the existing mass of the structure. The top floor was modified to satisfy the practical needs of the tower and fire guard. The romantic appearance of the roof with corner turrets can be considered a lower quality design than that applied to the roof of the Litomyšl Gate. It cannot be denied that Schmoranz's reconstruction of the gate rescued the ancient brick masonry helmet of the small tower and the heritage property as a whole. The damage caused during the reconstruction, however, can still be seen in the walling of the small tower windows and the demolition of the upper bridge between the towers.

These purist realizations also include the modification of the original cemetery Renaissance Church of the Holy Trinity carried out in 1902–1911, without the participation of František Schmoranz. During this reconstruction, the Baroque gable of the church was replaced by a Neo-Renaissance gable with Art Nouveau relief decoration.

In addition to the reconstruction of historic buildings, there were two new buildings built in Vysoké Mýto based on Schmoranz's designs – the schoolhouse and the hospital. In all respects, these buildings fit into Schmoranz's works in other East Bohemian cities. The Vysoké Mýto school from the 1850s became a model for other school buildings. Prior to the reconstruction of the 1920s, the hospital building was very similar to the Schmoranz Hospital in Chrudim.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *General panorama of Vysoké Mýto;* ***Fig. 2.*** *A cut-out from Josef Šembera's drawing uniquely depicts the appearance of the Litomyšl Gate before reconstruction, 1840s;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Older design of the future form of the Litomyšl Gate from the 1850s;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Resulting appearance of the Litomyšl Gate after reconstruction, view from the suburban side;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Detailed photographs of the sculptural decoration of the gable of the Church of the Holy Trinity;* ***Fig. 6.*** *The oldest draft of the future form of the Prague Gate by Hermann Bergman, 1862;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Prague Gate before reconstruction;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Schmoranz's plans for the reconstruction of the Prague Gate, 1868;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Resulting appearance of the Prague Gate, view from the suburban side;* ***Fig. 10.*** *The building of the former main and real school in Vysoké Mýto, built based on the design of František Schmoranz in 1853–1856;* ***Fig. 11.*** *View of the Schmoranz design of the hospital in Vysoké Mýto from the 1870s.*

Stylish reconstructions of town churches in the second half of the 19th century using the example of the Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto

Kristina UHLÍKOVÁ; Jan UHLÍK

Summary: In the last third of the 19th century and at the beginning of the following century, a radical reconstruction of the local medieval dean's church dedicated to St. Lawrence took place in the smaller East Bohemian town of Vysoké Mýto. The town thus became one of the other "rural" Czech and Moravian towns that decided to restore their medieval temples in a monumental way. The large construction project lasted 36 years and was an exceptional event regarding the context of the town's history and the region as a whole as well as in terms of its duration, scope, complexity, resources and the importance that the townspeople placed on it. It also enjoyed the deep interest of all three mayors who held office between 1875 and 1911. The extent of their commitment in favor of the restoration was exceptional; without their support, the successful completion of the project would have certainly been unthinkable. This effort to repair the town's medieval heritage properties (not only the town church) and the effort to restore them to their original monumentality and splendor grew out of the broad consensus among the inhabitants regarding the significance of this event. The heritage structures represented a more famous national past, so their repair expressed not only the local pride in them but also an effort to immediately tie into this past. At the same time, this return to their roots would contribute to strengthening the identity and self-confidence of the town and its inhabitants in a new and modern world.

Several architects (František Schmoranz Sr., Josef Mocker, Josef Podhajský, Arnošt Živný) took turns in leading the reconstruction. Thanks to the uniquely preserved sources, we can now observe a changing approach to the protection of heritage properties and period methods of learning about medieval buildings and their methods of technical support, as well as the motivation for their preservation and monumental restoration and the financial costs and methods of covering them.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Vysoké Mýto, Church of St. Lawrence, view from the northwest, condition before the reconstruction of the western part of the church, after 1880;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto during the reconstruction of the western facade, view from the northwest, 1890s;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Vysoké Mýto, Church of St. Lawrence, interior before restoration, view to the choir, around 1888;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Vysoké Mýto, Church of St. Lawrence after the completion of the reconstruction and refurbishment of the church, view to the choir;* ***Fig. 5.*** *František Schmoranz Sr., reconstruction proposal of the Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto, 1878;* ***Fig. 6.*** *František Schmoranz Sr., Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto, condition before reconstruction, cross section of the choir, triple nave and longitudinal section of the church, undated;* ***Fig. 7.*** *František Schmoranz Sr., Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto, proposal of a new form of the western facade, undated;* ***Fig. 8.*** *First page of the leaflet "Invitation to contributions to the repair of the Dean's Church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto", 1877;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Cover of the workbook "Description of the restoration of the main church of St. Lawrence". Started by Josef Čadík, construction manager of the Dean's Church restoration project, and completed by A. Tůma, town mayor;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Notes by Mayor A. Tůma on negotiations regarding the return of the Baroque main altar to the Church of St. Lawrence, April 14, 1908;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Karel V. Mašek's studio at the Prague School of Applied Arts in 1905, when he and his students prepared the decoration of the Vysoké Mýto church (stained glass proposals in the background);* ***Fig. 12.*** *View of Vysoké Mýto with the reconstructed church from the north, about the 2nd decade of the 20th century; Fig.* ***13.*** *Vysoké Mýto, Church of St. Lawrence after the completion of the reconstruction and refurbishment of the church, view to the presbytery;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Karel V. Mašek, Architects of the reconstruction and the important personalities who contributed to it (from left: F. Schmoranz Sr., A.V. Šembera, J.B. Tůma, V. Votrubec, J. Mocker, H. Jireček), wall painting on the west wall south nave of the church of St. Lawrence in Vysoké Mýto;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Vysoké Mýto, Church of St. Lawrence, view from the northwest.*

František Schmoranz Jr. (1845–1892): apostle of orientalism and pioneer of the art industry in Bohemia

Milan NĚMEČEK

Summary: The admirable shyness, premature death, and long-term disregard of František Schmoranz Jr. in the Czech history of art caused his work to fall into oblivion for many decades. In his time, however, he was a Czech architect who overshadowed most of his countrymen and became one of the famous artists of the Vienna Ringstrasse.

František Schmoranz Jr. was destined to an artistic career through his family environment; he studied Prague technology under J. Zítek and, by coincidence, at the Vienna Academy. As an excellent draftsman, he went to document the heritage properties of Egypt, but due to the sudden death of his employer

Carl Diebitsch, he was forced to take over his construction contracts for an Egyptian Khedive in Cairo, Ismailia, and the Suez region at the age of twenty-four. During the radical redevelopment of Cairo, he had a unique opportunity to study ancient Arab houses and their inventory; he used this knowledge to build and design Egyptian pavilions for the World's Fairs in Vienna in 1873 and Paris in 1878. The World's Fair in 1873 in particular was a key moment in building his reputation as a renowned oriental style specialist and paving the way for him to enter both Viennese art and museum circles and opening a successful architectural office in Vienna. Together with Jan Machytka, he built several rental houses, representative buildings, school institutes, and also participated in the furnishings of the Vienna Museum of Applied Arts and the organization of local exhibitions. Both men established cooperation with a number of companies in the art industry.
The buildings of the Czech Medical Faculty and a complex of school buildings opposite the Rudolfinum in Prague were built based on designs from their office. He designed the residence and monumental tomb of a local factory owner, the dean's office building, and a vocational school for his native Chrudim. Although Schmoranz belonged to the generation of artists of the National Theater, his work included an entire range of stylistic positions. Although he reliably mastered the morphology of historicism, he did not hesitate to violate established rules and used traditional elements to create unusual, even mannerist, practices and combinations. The artistic methods he introduced to Bohemia did not take root here until the end of the nineteenth century. In the Habsburg monarchy, Schmoranz achieved a number of social honors. He associated the height of his career with art education, designing not only the building of the Academy of Fine Arts and the School of Applied Arts in Prague, but at the initiative of the Vienna Ministry he also became the architect of the pedagogical system of the School of Applied Arts in Prague. As the first director of this school, he established school collections and a library and employed some of the outstanding personalities of his time – Myslbek, Ženíšek, Liška, Schikaneder, Jenewein, Klouček, Ohmann, Stibral, Hostinský, and Mádel. At the time, Schmoranz was already exhausting the last days and strength of his life, and so he did not manage to fulfill his goal of bringing this new institute to the level of a university.
Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., 1892;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Cairo, Gezir Palace, entrance hall, 1869, Carl von Diebitsch and Franz Bey;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Cairo, Gezir Palace, interior, 1869, Carl von Diebitsch and Franz Bey;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Frantisek Schmoranz Jr. (probably on the standing camel on the left) and Jan Machytka (on the standing camel on the right) on a study trip in Giza, around 1871;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Cairo, el Esbek Mosque, courtyard wall, 1871, František Schmoranz Jr.;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Vienna, pavilion of the Arab House of the Construction group of the Egyptian Pavilion for the World Exhibition, risalit, 1873, photo studio of J. Löwy in Vienna;* ***Fig. 7a – b.*** *Vienna, Egyptian Pavilion at the World's Fair, 1873;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Cairo, Coptic house, ladies' room on the 1st floor, reconstruction of the state from the 18th century, 1874, František Schmoranz Jr.;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Cairo, reception room of the lord of the house (Mandara Mufti), reconstruction of the state from the 17th century, 1874, František Schmoranz Jr.;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Paris, mosque of the Egyptian Viceroy Isma'il Pasha (originally the design of a tomb for Buda) for the World's Fair, 1877, František Schmoranz Jr. and Jan Machytka* ***Fig. 11.*** *František Schmoranz Jr. in costume for "Fest" of van Dyck with H. Makart held on February 24, 1877, photo studio Victor Angerer Vienna;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Pardubice, synagogue, draft of the Ark of the Covenant, 1879, František Schmoranz Jr.;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Trenčianske Teplice, Hammam Turkish bath, view from the southwest, about 1888;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Kutná Hora, Vlašský dvůr, cross section, 1883, František Schmoranz Jr. and Jan Machytka ;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Reproduction of a proposal of the building of the Museum of the Kingdom of Bohemia in Prague by František Schmoranz Jr., period print, 1884;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Chrudim, cemetery U Kříže, tomb of the Wiesner and Roth family, undated (after 1879);* ***Fig. 17.*** *Ráby No. 38, hunting summer house of the free lord Richard Drasch von Wartinberg.*

The difficult life of an architect around 1900 using examples from Moravian Ostrava
Jan GALETA

Summary: The presented study focuses on several architects who were active in Moravská Ostrava around 1900, specifically in the industrial center which was nonetheless an architectural and artistic periphery. Case studies focusing on the fate and work of students Otto Wagner, Karel Benirschke, Otokar Bém, a graduate of the Vienna Polytechnic named Felix Neumann, Prague graduate Bohumil Židlický, and their colleague František Tichý primarily aim to explore the relationship between architects employed in local architectural offices and their employers. Benirschke and Tichý represent the architects/employees, something which still to this day limits the possibilities of identifying them as the authors of certain buildings. As employees, they were not part of the construction procedure, so their works are therefore attributed to the contracted construction companies. A key contribution to the issue of the mutual position of architect/employer and architect/employee is a dispute between the owner of the company Felix Neumann, and Hermann Müller. This dispute took place not only in court, but also in the contemporary press. Such publications make it clear that the author of the building design was always designated as the head of the office, who came up with a specific architectural idea.
His employees, on the other hand, drew up plans and worked out specific details, but they could only be recognized as "collaborators".
Other examples reveal that in order for an architect on the periphery to achieve financial and social success, he also had to become a practically oriented entrepreneur leading not only a design studio but also a construction company realizing building projects of his own or others' plans. At the same time, he was expected to undertake other types of business, such as the production of construction materials, real estate trade, development, and even hospitality. The life story of Bohumil Židlický, however, who basically went bankrupt due to the financial burden of building a church in Mariánské Hory, shows how such an acquired position could have been unstable and what risks the construction business actually posed.
Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Karl J. Benirschke, reconstruction of a house with an arcade in Nový Jičín;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Karl J. Benirschke (Vincenz Heinz, Gustav Kulka) Plan über die Neuherstellung einer Facade de Hauses Conser;* ***Fig. 3.*** *František R. Tichý (Bohumil Židlický), one of the variants of the facade of the Czech House in Vítkovice, 1898;* ***Fig. 4.*** *František R. Tichý, Facades of the Živnostenská banka branch for Bohemia and Moravia, 1902;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Construction of the church in Mariánské Hory as left by Bohumil Židlický and taken over by the firm Grossmann & Fiala, 1907;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Otokar Bém, Bohumil Židlický, František Fiala, František Grossmann, Antonín Blažek, Church of the Coronation of the Queen Virgin Mary;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Felix Neumann, German House, 1895;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Heinrich Joseph Kayser, Karl von Großheim, House of German Booksellers in Leipzig, 1885, perspective.*

An official devoted to his prince – architect Jan Sedláček (1848–1916)
Jana MAREŠOVÁ

Summary: Southern Bohemia has its own specific architecture. The initiator of these specifics in the style of English Gothic of the 19th century was Prince Jan Adolf of Schwarzenberg (1799–1888) and his court of very skilled and inventive architects. Jan Sedláček (1848–1916), an architect of Moravian origin, was one of such personalities, as was Damasus Deworetzky. As an educated architect, Jan Sedláček left his mark on the character of the South Bohemian landscape primarily by rebuilding the originally Romanesque church of St. Peter and Paul in Hosín near České Budějovice as well as the modification of the Vondrov farm. Both reconstructions were based on quarry stone and bricks, raw materials immediately available to

the Schwarzenberg estate. Although Jan Sedláček had a talent mainly for sacral architecture, his signature style appears on many other churches (Zadní Zvonková, Lhenice) and civic buildings (grammar school in Třeboň). In his practice during reconstructions, Sedláček first followed reconstruction methods, later shifting to conservation methods. Jan Sedláček's activities exceeded beyond architecture; he was also active in literature on the occasion of the project of the Archaeological Commission of the Czech Academy of Sciences and Arts which began at the end of the 19th century. This project consisted of creating an inventory of movable and immovable heritage properties of the Czech Kingdom. For Sedláček, cooperation on this project began in 1897 in conjunction with another Schwarzenberg employee, František Mareš. Their cooperation resulted in four inventories of South Bohemian heritage properties being published for the districts of Třeboň, Prachatice, and Krumlov, as well as the town of Český Krumlov itself (published posthumously in 1916 and 2017). Because Sedláček spent most of his time in Vienna after retiring, his method of census work is revealed by the frequent correspondence between himself and Mareš. This correspondence also presents Sedláček's views not only on the field of heritage care, but also on the emerging field of art history, where, like Karel Chytil, he was a supporter of the originality of Czech art. He entered princely service as a 24-year-old in 1872 and left it after 37 years of successful but exhausting service. His work was thus rewarded by the Papal Order of St. Gregory. Jan Sedláček died in 1916, in the midst of the First War and in the middle of his favorite work.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Jan Sedláček, portrait, Josef Seidel Studio, undated;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Jan Sedláček, sketch of an unknown object, Vienna 1884;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Church of St. John of Nepomuk, Zadní Zvonková, undated;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Church of St. Peter and Paul, Hosín, undated;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Jan Sedláček, proposals for the reconstruction of the Church of St. James in Lhenice;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Jan Sedláček, drawings for List of Historical and Topographical Heritage Properties – Town of Krumlov, 1915;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Initials of Jan Sedláček hidden in a detail of the drawing (reprinted in Fig. 7), 1915;* ***Tab. 1.*** *Overview of construction projects by architect Jan Sedláček.*

Technically educated professionals in Imperial and Royal heritage care in the second half of the 19th century

Marek KREJČÍ

Summary: The article notes the close conceptual connection between national technical services and the emerging state heritage care in the Habsburg monarchy at the beginning of the second half of the 19th century. When the Central Commission for the Preservation of Architectural Heritage was established, a model was deliberately chosen from various possible alternatives in which an established network of conservationists within the Central Commission would be able to rely on professional technical assistance from provincial building directorates and building authorities. Both components were methodically managed by a joint central body of state administration (Ministry of Trade). As a result of the political changes following the fall of neo-absolutism, this network disappeared. The division of competencies between several ministries led to an absence of systematic and controlled cooperation between state heritage care and technical services. Johann Alexandr Helfert, the new president of the Central Commission, a politician with administrative experience from the Ministry of Education, deliberately refused to acknowledge the model that had been in effect before his arrival. During the nearly half a century that he directed Austrian heritage care, he fully integrated the Central Commission into the competence of the Ministry of Education, where he extended its competence to include archival and movable artistic heritage properties. He recommended a number of renowned architects for appointment as members and conservationists of the Central Commission; when it came to legislative attempts at the first comprehensive modification of state heritage care, however, he did not even attempt to build on the historical experience of cooperation between technicians and conservationists that had developed from the Central Commission's beginnings.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Portrait of the First President of the Central Commission Karel Czoernig, undated.;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Diploma of conservationist Vicko Andrić from 1854;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Example of technical documentation for an article by Jan Erazim Vocel about the Porta coeli Convent in Předklášteří near Tišnov, drawing by F. Kirschner;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Josef Alexander Helfert, Czoernig's successor in the leadership of the Central Commission, in a portrait by Christian Griepenkerl, 1890;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Title page of the first issue of the journal Mittheilungen der K.K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale, January 1856.;* ***Tab. 1.*** *Overview of Conservators with technical education working for Central Commission for the preservation of National Heritage Sites.*

František Schmoranz's contribution to the study of stucco decoration of the Hvězda Summer Palace

Pavla MIKEŠOVÁ

Summary: The article presents František Schmoranz's contribution to the study of stucco decorations in the Hvězda Summer House in Prague's Liboc. As a student at the Prague University of Technology, he was to become the author of the first published floor plans of the Hvězda Summer House together with a certain Emil / K. Hofmeistr (not yet identified) in 1866. The underground and ground floor plans were published by Wilhelm Lübke in his book Geschichte der Deutschen Renaissance (Leipzig, 1872). These were the very first plans with outlined compositions of the ceilings of this leading Czech Renaissance heritage property. The first editor to comment on Schmoranz's co-authorship was Joseph Svátek in Golden Prague in 1892 and again in 1899 in his book From Old Prague. During the verification of this information, it turned out that the original plans from the hand of František Schmoranz are not stored in the Czech archives; nevertheless, new facts came to light during the study of this issue. František Schmoranz Jr. was actually present in the Hvězda Summer House in 1866, specifically on October 10, when he dated and signed seven drawings depicting stucco decorations from various rooms on its ground floor. The themes of these studies include four dolphins, two heads of satyrs, a griffin, and the head of a Roman king. They are drawn with charcoal on ocher paper of higher weight and measure 360 × 255 mm. They do not have a watermark. Except for one drawing, they are all described as "Star", "From the Star", "Stern". According to the inscriptions on the two drawings, it seems that Schmoranz, as a future architect, was interested in the technical execution of the stucco: *"flach u. (und) sehr durchnadellirt" and "Sehr flach, manche Partien und Konturen sind in der Grundfläche eingeritzt."* These comments indicate that the drawings could have served as preparatory studies for the possible realization of gypsum castings. Recent literature records a total of four groups of castings. Those of which we know the form, or which have been preserved in the National Technical Museum in Prague and reproduced in the publication *Schloss Stern* (edited by Jacob von Falke, 1879), do not correspond to Schmoranz's sketches. Based on an analysis and the current state of research on gypsum castings, we therefore believe that the studies rather served as a distraction during a precise survey of the floor plan of the building. It can be stated that Schmoranz's stucco drawings from the Hvězda Summer House are among the first documents of "Czech" professional interest in the stucco decoration of this exceptional building, built by Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol. More progress would certainly be brought about by the clarification of the identity of the painter Emil / K. Hofmeister, whose motives and reasons for studying the Hvězda Summer House remain concealed for the time being.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1a–b.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., dolphin*

study; ***Fig. 2.*** *Vlado Bohdan, Hvězda Summer House, Mercury Hall, dolphin with acanthus tail, dolphin with volute tail, dragon;* ***Fig. 3.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., dolphin study;* ***Fig. 4.*** *id., a study of two dolphins;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Vlado Bohdan, Hvězda Summer Palace, Jupiter Hall, a pair of dolphins;* ***Fig. 6.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., the former Church of The Larger Holy Cross in Prague, floor plan, side view, sections, 1889;* ***Fig. 7, 8.*** *id., a study of a satyr's head;* ***Fig. 9.*** *id., a study of a griffin;* ***Fig. 10, 11.*** *Vlado Bohdan, Hvězda Summer Palace, Minerva Hall, male mask and satyr's head;* ***Fig. 12.*** *id., Hvězda Summer House, Mercury Hall, mascaron and fantastic animals;* ***Fig. 13.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., a study of the head of a Roman king;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Vlado Bohdan, Hvězda Summer Palace, Chiron Hall, medallion – a man's head in a helmet with a dragon;* ***Fig. 15.*** *František Schmoranz Jr., Nelahozeves Castle, portal, pen drawing*

One street, two names. Dolnopolní Street in Brno
Pavla CENKOVÁ

Summary: The article is devoted to a colony of family houses from 1923–1924 on the banks of the Svitava, in Brno-Maloměřice (today Dolnopolní Street). Architects Karel Kotas and Bohuslav Fuchs took part in its creation, which was one of their first realizations. They thus became known in the Brno environment, where they also gained other commissions. Previously, this local area was referred to as a workers' colony or garden city, but this designation is inaccurate. The group of houses formed a closed residential unit designed by the city of Brno for the purpose of accommodating employees of municipal structures. It is essential to include the colony on Dolnopolní Street in the context of several groups of typical family houses arising from the creative environment of the Brno city building office and arising in parallel in the Brno suburbs. The head of the town office, architect Jindřich Kumpošt, invited young architects to Brno and supported them in an effort towards modern expression while and at the same time bringing a strong social emphasis to the orientation of local art.
The office led by Kumpošt became involved in solving the problem of still insufficient housing development. Between 1922 and 1923, a series of projects of typical family houses was created which were to improve the quality of the newly established suburban family house construction type and make it accessible to wider classes. Due to the housing shortage, these proposals were implemented immediately, including the colony on Dolnopolní Street. K. Kotas developed two types of small terraced houses (type A; type B) for the Maloměřice colony, a significant element of both were uniformly executed facades made of gray masonry. The sober, even purist appearance suggests the author's deviation from more traditional means of expression and manifests his inclination towards progressive trends. B. Fuchs' L-type houses were self-standing axially symmetrical semi-detached houses with wide gables facing the street. For these houses, an economically advantageous design was used in which two mirror-inverted housing units were situated under a common gable roof.
The effort to create a simple appearance maximizing the period ideal of individual housing available to all, free from the decorativeness of buildings of previous periods, was the main idea behind the chosen design. Fuchs's L-type house can be found not only on Dolnopolní Street (as is the case with K. Kotas' houses), but also in other Brno suburban localities. In addition to the precise authorial definition of the role of B. Fuchs and K. Kotas in the formation of the colony, the study also deals with the formal analysis of houses type A, B, and L and establishes hypotheses of the aspects of their possible formal inspirations.
The standardized colony of family houses on Dolnopolní Street was the personification of the contemporary discourse of searching for the optimal form of a newly formed type of urban terraced house corresponding to progressive trends in contemporary architecture while at the same time affordable and ready for eventual series production. The overall simplicity of the rational concept and the pervasive shape liberation here were, however, not only a consequence of the effort to minimize the budget, but also a signification of programmatically defined radicalism. It was one of several simultaneously emerging family houses in Brno, outstanding in its unique formal quality, which at the time was a manifesto of the inclination of local architecture towards increasingly radical modernity, thus launching a process that manifested itself in full force in the years to come.
Illustrations: Fig. 1. *Fig. 1. Karel Kotas – Bohuslav Fuchs, colony of family houses, Brno, Dolnopolní 37–95, 1923–1924, general view of the colony from the north, photographs from the time after completion;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Brno, Dolnopolní 37–51, development of family houses, current state;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Jaroslav Grunt, family houses, Brno, Barvičova 20–34, 1923–1924, period photography;* ***Fig. 4.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, family houses, 1923–1924, Brno, Barvičova 4–14, period photography;* ***Fig. 5.*** *Jindřich Kumpočt, family houses, Brno, Lerchova 2a–8, 1926, period photography;* ***Fig. 6.*** *Colony of family houses on Dolnopolní Street, situation 1 : 500;* ***Fig. 7.*** *Karel Kotas, six-house (block I), Brno, Dolnopolní 37–47, 1923–1924, photographs from after completion;* ***Fig. 8.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, five L-type semi-detached houses (block II), Dolnopolní 49–67, 1923–1924, photographs from after completion;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Karel Kotas, two four-houses (block III), Brno, Dolnopolní 69–83, 1923–1924, photographs from after completion;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Karel Kotas – Bohuslav Fuchs, colony of family houses, Brno, Dolnopolní 37–95, 1923–1924, general view from the south from the right bank of the Svitava, including no longer existing houses No. 77–95 (second half of block III and block IV), photographs from after completion;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Karel Kotas – Bohuslav Fuchs, colony of family houses, Brno, Dolnopolní 37–95, 1923–1924, general view from the south, no longer existing house no. 85 in the center of the picture, photographs from the time after completion;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Brno, Dolnopolní 49–67, view of L-type family houses with additional landscaping, 1950s;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Brno, Dolnopolní 49–67, view of the street with mature birches, asphalted roads, and paved sidewalks;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Residents of the house Dolnopolní 55 on the street in front of their house (Ludmila Kubíčková née Láníková with her sons Ivan and Oldřich), probably summer 1954;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Karel Kotas, plans of type A and B family houses for the colony on Dolnopolní Street, section and views;* ***Fig. 16.*** *Karel Kotas, plans of type A and B family houses for the colony on Dolnopolní Street, floor plans; Fig. 17. Karel Kotas, type C family house, floor plans, December 1923;* ***Fig. 18.*** *Brno, Dolnopolní 69–75, family houses, current state;* ***Fig. 19.*** *Willem M. Dudok, The Netherlands, Hilversum, a group of family houses in a workers' colony;* ***Fig. 20.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, plans of an L-type family house for the colony on Dolnopolní Street, views;* ***Fig. 21.*** *Brno, Dolnopolní 65_67, street facade, current state;* ***Fig. 22.*** *ibid., plans of an L-type family house for the colony on Dolnopolní Street, floor plans and section;* ***Fig. 23.*** *Willem M. Dudok, The Netherlands, Hilversum, a group of family houses in a workers' colony;* ***Fig. 24.*** *H. Oudertrop, The Netherlands, Hilversum, Ohmstraat 42, end house of a block of family houses, historical postcard, 1927;* ***Fig. 25.*** *Heinrich Tessenow, design of a standardized colony of family houses, perspective view, undated;* ***Fig. 26.*** *Heinrich Tessenow, family house of Gustav Lehmann, Dresden, Gartenstadt Hellerau, Auf dem Sand 12, 1910–1911;* ***Fig. 27.*** *Waltet Kratz, family house, Germany, Kaulsdorf, undated;* ***Fig. 28.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, design of a typified colony of the Rodina cooperative in Husovice, situation 1 : 2880, Brno, Míčkova;* ***Fig. 29.*** *Brno, Míčkova street, view from the south, current state;* ***Fig. 30.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, plans of a family house for a standardized colony of the Rodina cooperative in Husovice, floor plans and section, 28 August 1923;* ***Fig. 31.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, plans of a family house for a typified colony of the Rodina cooperative in Husovice, plans and section, 28 August 1923;* ***Fig. 32.*** *Ibid, design of a typified colony of the Rodina cooperative in Husovice, perspective view, Brno, Míčkova, 28 August 1923;* ***Fig. 33.*** *Ibid., design of a public municipal building – architectural dominants of the typified colony of the Rodina cooperative in Husovice, situation 1:500, Brno, Míčkova, November 1923;* ***Fig. 34.*** *Ibid., plans of an L2 type family house, views and sections, October 1924;* ***Fig. 35.*** *Ibid., design of a group of eight family houses of the Rodina cooperative in Žabovřesky,*

situation 1 : 500, Brno, Horákova 4–10 and Šmejkalova 71–77, October 1923; ***Fig. 36.*** *Ibid., plans of a type L house for a group of family houses of the Rodina cooperative in Žabovřeskách, postcards;* ***Fig. 37.*** *Brno, Horákova 4–6, current state;* ***Fig. 38.*** *Bohuslav Fuchs, school, 1924, Brno, Hamry 12, 1924;* ***Fig. 39.*** *Ibid., villa of Dr. Voženílek, Brno, Mlýnské nábřeží 17, 1927, current state;* ***Fig. 40.*** *Karel Kotas, his own family villa, Brno, Mlýnské nábřeží 15, 1930, current state;* ***Fig. 41.*** *Ibid., villa of Dr. Jaromír Průš, street facade, Brno, Obřanská 214, undated;* ***Fig. 42.*** *Ibid., villa of Dr. Jaromír Průš, garden facade, Brno, Obřanská 214, undated; Fig. 43. Ibid., villa of Dr. Jaromír Průš, Brno, Obřanská 214, 1930–1931, current state.*

Field identification of World War II activities in the cadastral areas of Branka, Hradec nad Moravicí, Raduň, and the surrounding area using non-destructive archaeological methods, their mapping, and proposal for protection in the landscape using the example of the situation in Hradec nad Moravicí - Jakubčovice

Jiří JUCHELKA; Ondřej KLÁPA

Summary: A survey in the vicinity of the suburban part of Hradec nad Moravicí and in Jakubčovice provided evidence of events that occurred in the spring of 1945. The objective of the survey was to evaluate and understand the limits of non-destructive archaeological methods used in searching, identifying, and studying combat activities during World War II in the retreat area of the Wehrmacht troops. To obtain this type of archaeological sources, the area south of Opava was deliberately chosen, since this is an area where German soldiers, followed by parts of the liberation troops, withdrew to after the liberation of Opava on 22 April 1945.

In the area of the Jakubčovice cadaster, three separate locations were selected in which non-destructive archaeological methods were applied in the identification of anthropogenic terrain relics. The objective was to focus on visually visible trenches, to search the area with metal detectors, and to enter individual find locations into a spatial context plan. On the basis of the data thus obtained, the task was then to evaluate the degree of damage to individual movable and immovable situations associated with World War II and to propose a method of their protection.

Based on the testimony of the obtained archaeological sources, it can be said that the German army built defensive terrain elements on the site in advance, even before the conquest of Opava (before April 20). Based on the findings of the remains of artillery shells, we can conclude that artillery cannons also stood on the site.

It is also possible to assume the use of anti-aircraft guns or cannons on combat vehicles. Based on the findings of ammunition, the armament of the German infantry was not at complete all at this stage of the war. What is striking is the large number of rounds for the Mannlicher M 1885 rifle, which was commonly used mainly in World War I. The production years of ammunition for these rifles, when cartridges with a year of manufacture older than 1900 predominate, provide evidence that the German army was running low on ammunition towards the end of the war. In contrast, the Soviet Army had a very strong arsenal. An air attack was the first to be carried out on the area of the German positions, taking place on 25 April. The use of American P-47 Thunderbolts can be assumed.

During non-destructive field prospecting, it was found that many anthropogenic relics had already been damaged due to erosion or destroyed due to human activity. Logging activity primarily damaged the smaller situations (shooter trenches), and other trenches were also subject to degradation.

Their protection is thus possible on the basis of documentation of their current condition and thorough surveys. Due to increased logging activity due to the current bark beetle calamity, during which heavy mechanization is used, it would nonetheless be appropriate to quickly identify or explore these relics even with the use of destructive methods. This is not happening, unfortunately; we will therefore be deprived of a large amount of archaeological sources in the future with the potential loss of information for further study of World War II issues.

In the case of protection of movable finds, the solved problem becomes much more complicated. Artifacts are destroyed due to logging but are far more vulnerable to illegal detector activities. Unless there is a change in legislation leading to a ban of metal detectors in the hands of amateurs, the only reliable way to protect movable metal finds is preventive detector research of endangered sites carried out by archaeologists.

Illustrations: ***Fig. 1.*** *Situation of individual investigated positions on the map base of the Opava district;* ***Fig. 2.*** *Detail of the location of individual investigated positions on various types of map bases;* ***Fig. 3.*** *Position No. 1. Historical and natural development of the place on a map base from 1763 (1), the same situation in an aerial photograph from 1954 (2), and the current state as of 2021 (3);* ***Fig. 4.*** *Position No. 2. Historical and natural development of the place on a map base from 1763 (1), the same situation in an aerial photograph from 1954 (2), and the current state as of 2021 (3);* ***Fig. 5.*** *Position No. 3. Historical and natural development of the place on a map base from 1763 (1), the same situation in an aerial photograph from 1954 (2), and the current state as of 2021 (3);* ***Fig. 6.*** *Results of metal detector surveys within positions 1 (1), 2 (2), and 3 (3);* ***Fig. 7.*** *Survey of anthropogenic terrain relics from the period of World War II within positions 1 (1), 2 (2), and 3 (3);* ***Fig. 8.*** *Position No. 1. Findings of the German army;* ***Tab. 1.*** *Findings from position No. 1;* ***Tab. 2.*** *Findings from position No. 2;* ***Tab. 3.*** *Findings from position No. 3.;* ***Fig. 9.*** *Position No. 1. Findings of personal belongings;* ***Fig. 10.*** *Position No. 1. Findings of the Red Army;* ***Fig. 11.*** *Position No. 2. Findings of the German army;* ***Fig. 12.*** *Position No. 2. Findings of personal belongings;* ***Fig. 13.*** *Position No. 2. Findings of the Red Army;* ***Fig. 14.*** *Position No. 3. Findings;* ***Fig. 15.*** *Position No. 2. Snow markings captured by the drone DJI PHANTOM 4 PRO+ at the edge of the forest may indicate the presence of a trench. Snow belts in a meadow show the path of the current dirt road. Snow spots in the forest indicate trench locations for shooters.*