ENGLISH VERSION OF ARTICLE ARCHITEKTURA V REGIONECH: METODA, HODNOCENÍ A TOPOGRAFICKÝ IMPULS, UMĚNÍ/ART LXX, 2022, NO. 1

MATTHEW RAMPLEY
ÚSTAV DĚJIN UMĚNÍ AV ČR, V. V. I., PRAHA

Architecture in the Provinces: Method, Judgement and the Topographical Impulse[1]

Introduction

> *I am, ultimately, a third generation native of Olomouc – as I have already pointed out somewhere. Up to almost the threshold of puberty, I grew up amidst people here who, for no small part of their life, lived through old Austria, the First Republic and the Protectorate. Until today I mix their jargon in my everyday Czech, and today their histories resonate with me. In contrast to my first Meditation, there is, in the background, behind the curtain, of this book, much more emotion. After all, my grannie used to go to Briess and Groag for her laundry, my mum knew the young Czermak and her dearest friend was Erich Opila from the first form of the German public school. In the thirties my dad was, after all, a punctual employee of the building firm of Weisz. He was, eventually, injured at the end of the war by an artillery splinter which Lubomír and Ivan Šlapeta in the house opposite escaped by just a hair's breadth.*[2]

Thus Pavel Zatloukal introduces his recent, monumental, study of the art and architecture of Olomouc between the years 1918 and 1989, *Meditations on the City, the Landscape, on Art: Olomouc 1918-1989*. It is a striking personal testimony, and demonstrates that this considerable work, more than 500 pages long, is not merely an exercise in detached historical scholarship, but the product of a personal commitment to the city. It follows his previous, equally ambitious, book, *Meditations on Architecture*, on Olomouc, Brno and Hradec Králové in the nineteenth century.[3]

Olomouc is primarily known as the Baroque capital of Moravia. Dominant among its monuments is the eighteenth-century Holy Trinity column **(Figure 1)** but it continued to be a major artistic and cultural centre due to its status as the seat of an archbishopric. Zatloukal's studies remind us that its prestigious heritage continued into the modern period. Not only the birthplace of Rudolf Eitelberger (1817-1885), founder of the Vienna School of Art History and of the Vienna Museum of Applied Arts, it was also the home of the Primavesi family that financed the Wiener Werkstätte. It was the birthplace, too, of many members of the Czechoslovak intelligentsia, from the art theorist and critic Bohumil Markalous (1882-1952) to the architect Vít Obrtel (1901-1988) and the novelist and essayist Jaroslav Durych (1886-1962).

Zatloukal's two *Meditations* remind us that the story of Austrian, Czech and Czechoslovak art and architecture was played not only in the capitals of Vienna and Prague but also in regional cities. Brno, the 'second city' of the Czech Republic, has already gained recognition for its cultural and historical importance, but Zatloukal's

work extends the art historical gaze further, to Olomouc and, in his earlier *Meditation*, Hradec Králové. The title of the volume on twentieth-century Olomouc suggests that it will be a general study of the visual arts, and it does indeed consider examples of artistic practice, such as interwar painting and photography, work from the 1950s and 1960s, from socialist realism to various kinds of painterly and sculptural abstraction, neo-figurative painting and conceptualism 1970s and 1980s. It also discusses institutional histories, the founding of artistic groups and associations, as well as the role of galleries and museums. However, the main emphasis is on architecture and urban development, a focus that is in keeping with the approach of the earlier volume. This is signalled right from the start, in which the first chapters are devoted to detailed discussion of the redevelopment of the city in the late Habsburg period as well as after 1918, including a meticulous account of changes in the municipal planning office following independence, itemising key personnel and the easing out of German-speaking staff and their replacement by Czech speakers.

Both *Meditations* take into view political events, but they are not social histories of art and architecture; political events impinge on decisions about what to build and how, or on the kind of art that was and could be made, but the analysis is not set in any wider thesis. Taken together, they nevertheless remain an impressive achievement, scrupulously researched. Indeed, this is all the more so, given that, as Zatloukal notes, primary sources for the period after 1945 are often quite thin on the ground. He notes that he sometimes had to rely on anecdotal evidence from individuals drawing on their memory of participation in events of the time. Olomouc, Hradec Králové and Brno could not lay claim to the same international importance or profile as Prague, but Zatloukal's study demonstrates that they had vibrant local artworlds that were engaged in a traffic of ideas with the Czech metropolis and further afield.

I have dwelt on these two publications not because of their intrinsic worth, but because they exemplify a tradition of writing that is perhaps unique to the Czech Republic: extensive *local* scholarly histories of art and architecture. Zatloukal has devoted his entire career to the study of the art and architecture of the Czech lands outside of Prague; some twenty years ago he completed a history of architecture in Moravia and Moravian Silesia between 1750 and 1918, comprising extended case studies of individual buildings.[4] But he is not alone. In 2015 a volume of nearly 900 pages was published on the history of architecture in Brno up to 1919.[5] It followed an earlier study by some of the same scholars devoted to the city's Baroque palaces.[6] The more recent *Magnum opus* is part of a multi-volume series on the history of the city and is remarkable not only because it did not even cover the city's architecture for most of the twentieth century (not to mention art, design and the applied arts).[7] In addition, it is mostly limited to the city *centre* and its immediate environs. The suburbs are discussed in a separate volume, as are the visual arts.[8]

Given Brno's status in the Czech Republic (and Czechoslovakia) this attention can perhaps be understood, and the city has been the subject of steady flow of art historical studies, but the scale and level of detailed analysis and description is still unprecedented, when viewed in an international context.[9] Zlín, too, site of the Bat'a shoe factory, has also been the subject of a number of comparable publications, including a two-volume study of its twentieth-century architecture as well as a substantial collective volume on the history of the School of Design since 1959.[10] Other major cities have attracted similar studies: Plzeň, Pardubice, Hradec

Králové and Ostrava are prominent examples.[11] Even much smaller towns, such as Hranice and the spa town of Teplice nad Bečvou in Moravia have been the subject of notable scholarly art historical studies.[12]
One can discern in this plethora of publications a celebration of regional centres and cultures. This is to be highly welcomed, but it is unusual, given the diminutive size of the Czech Republic, that there should prevail such a noted sense of local identity and artistic heritage. One might anticipate such attention to regional cities in Germany or Italy, for example, which were only politically unified in the second half of the nineteenth century and which as a result, were composed of a number of separate states each with distinct and long histories and cultural identities. One might think here of cities such as Munich, Milan, Cologne, Venice, Berlin, Dresden and Florence, to name just a few. But in a small state such as the Czech Republic, where many of the cities and towns concerned are hardly known to outsiders and, due to their smaller size, never achieved the critical mass associated with major centres, such detailed exploration is less expected.
It is an impressive achievement and might serve as a model for emulation elsewhere, but this genre of writing prompts a certain level of critical reflection. Given the resources that are invested in this publishing activity, what is its purpose? What is the presumed readership of this literature? Moreover, how it does engage with the dynamics of regional and local identities, and what contribution does it make to narratives of Czech culture more generally? Before seeking to answer such questions, and in order to establish what makes the Czech case so distinctive, it is perhaps useful to gain a sense of the overall publishing landscape in question.

Local Art Histories

The ambitious monographs by Zatloukal, or the volumes on Brno and Zlín, stand at one end of a spectrum with, at the other end, local guidebooks for casual visitors and tourists. The latter also extend beyond the world of book publishing to encompass wider media, from radio and television to social media; between 1995 and 2008, for example, Czech Television broadcast *Šumná města* (Beautiful cities) a series of 66 20-minute programmes presented by the architect David Vávra, each one offering a lively and informal account of the architecture of an individual Czech city. Starting with Krnov (in Moravian Silesia) and finishing with Brno, the emphasis was very much on centres in the Czech Republic outside of Prague, many of them little known even to Czechs.
Alongside massive academic monographs there are numerous other academic studies of the art and architecture focused on regional towns and cities. These are less ambitious in scale, but they highlight one or other aspect of the architectural history of the city in question. In Brno, for example, much has been made in recent years of the association with Adolf Loos.[13] Several publications have sought to place Plzeň on the map of architecture, including, most recently, Petr Domanický's *Workshop of the Republic*.[14] Other towns that have been the subject of similar histories of architecture include Opava and Teplice.[15] After its founding in 1991 the Brno Municipal House Society (Spolek Obecní dům Brno) published a series of profiles cataloguing the work of individual Brno-based architects, as well as larger topics such as Jewish and German architects in the city. There is also a flourishing literature on local architects based primarily in regional cities, such as Hanuš Zápal

(1885-1964) based in Plzeň, Karel Řepa (1895-1963) in Pardubice, or Vladimír Fultner (1887-1918) and Oldřich Liška (1881-1959), both of whom worked in Hradec Králové.[16]

Alongside such academic volumes is the tradition of topography. In his introduction to the volume on the architecture of Brno, for example, Jiří Kroupa openly acknowledges the connection of his project to the 'tradition of central European' art topography.[17] The latter has a well-established place in academic Czech art history; the Institute of Art History in Prague even has a separate Department of Art Topography, which, with 10 researchers, is one of its larger units; the department has published volumes on individual buildings as well as a multi-volume series of volumes on the artistic monuments of Prague and two volumes on Moravia and Silesia. The National Monuments Institute (NPÚ, Národní památkový ústav) also operates an online centralized catalogue of monuments, and publishes numerous topographical catalogues in book form of cities such as Liberec and Prostějov.[18] Such topographical compendia differ from those larger monographic studies, since the conventions and purpose of the genre are rather different, namely, the documentation of buildings. Accordingly, although often prefaced by a brief historical overview, the main body of the publications is the list of buildings, for which basic factual information is provided but little extended art historical analysis or discussion, in accordance with their function as works of reference.

Further along the scale away from such purely academic or even technical publications are those books are written with broader and more general audiences in mind. Prominent examples include the series *Slavné vily / Famous Villas* published by the Prague-based Society of Friends of the Architecture of the Family Home (FOIBOS), consisting of a steady stream of books devoted to modernist villas in different towns and regions of the Czech Republic, as well as notable architectural and related subjects, such as the Lednice-Valtice cultural landscape of southern Moravia (a UNESCO world heritage site), the south Bohemian village of Holašovice (also a UNESCO site) or the historic centre of Telč. Such guides, often written by trained scholars – Zatloukal himself has written a guide to the Lednice-Valtice landscape – are nevertheless not works of academic scholarship.[19] They fulfil a valuable function, but it is important to recognise that their readership is not one of academic specialists. This is evident from the nature of the writing, which, with just one or two exceptions, mostly offers overviews of their subject, avoiding detailed academic debates and concepts, with an emphasis, too, on engaging and high-quality images. Although written for general readers, they have certain features in common with the more technical topographical literature. Extrinsic factual and circumstantial information is usually provided, but, with a just a few exceptions, they mostly offer extended descriptions of buildings, with limited deeper or broader art historical discussion.

A recent enterprise has been the development of Architectural Manuals. This was an initiative launched in 2011 Brno by the Dům umění (House of Art) and supported by Brno city council. It consisted first of a map listing noteworthy modernist buildings with suggested routes for walking tours of the city. This then became an online resource, consisting of a multi-lingual website (Czech / German / English) with more detailed biographies of individual buildings as well as period and contemporary photographs, and profiles of the architects. To aid the reader seeking to visit the actual building, the catalogue number is marked on the pavement outside for easy identification. The website was also published in book format, in English as well as

Czech.[20] The idea has spread to other cities, such as Plzeň, Litomyšl, Hradec Králové, Jičín and Zlín, although these have remained solely online projects.

One can also mention, in addition to the Architectural Manuals, the various architectural guides, such as the four-volume series *Praha Moderní* (Modern Prague) by Zdeněk Lukeš and Petr Kratochvil, devoted to the architecture of Prague and its environs since 1900, as well as the numerous guides by the Zlatý řez publishing house based in Prague.[21] The books in each of these series are published in Czech and English editions, and some of them, too, in German. The publisher, Paseka, has brought out additional volumes in this series, such as Brno, Prague between 1850 and 1900 and, most recently, Ostrava.[22] The Brno Architecture Centre has published a sequence of comparable books on the city's architecture from the early nineteenth century onwards, with an emphasis on modernism and its aftermath.[23] Brno has benefitted from such publishing activity more than any other city outside of Prague, with numerous other topographic guidebooks appearing in recent years.[24] Given its size this is perhaps to be expected; whether, on the other hand, there is a market for such a plethora of often indistinguishable publications is an obvious question, though one that cannot be answered here. Nevertheless, the term 'plethora' is not out of place when considering their sheer number. Czech readers may well be familiar with these publications, but I have consciously listed them in order to convey a sense of the volume of material on local and regional architecture. Indeed, this survey only touches the surface, on the basis of which it becomes clear that there is a booming industry in publishing on regional architectural histories. This is all the more remarkable for the fact that so much of it is the work of trained art scholars. In many other countries, local history is often a matter for amateurs. Yet if we set aside the surprising quantity of material published relative to the size of the Czech Republic, it may, *at first sight*, not seem so different from practice elsewhere. In neighbouring Austria, for example, there is no shortage of comparable guides and studies devoted to its rich architectural heritage, from Vienna to Innsbruck, Salzburg and Linz. The ubiquity of tourism means that there will be guidebooks for every town of any size. In addition, topography is a well-established genre. The roots of Czech topographic scholarship can be traced back to the Habsburg Empire and Viennese art history, where it was a central part of the formation of modern art history. Rudolf Eitelberger, the very first art historian, recognised that a prerequisite for the study of art history was the basic task of mapping out the existing material and hence, as early as the 1850s he pioneered surveys of the architectural monuments of Hungary and Croatia.[25] It was under the auspices of the Habsburg Empire, too, that the first art topography on Bohemia was compiled, the first volume of which was published in 1897.[26]

Many of the current topographical works in Czech are the direct descendants of such projects and one can find them elsewhere in central Europe. In Hungary, for example, examples would be the survey of turn-of-the-century architecture in Budapest by the historian János Gerle and the architect Imre Makovecz, or András Ferkai's two-volume topography of interwar architecture in Buda and Pest, as well as his separate book on twentieth-century architecture in the rest of Hungary.[27] Volumes of the *Katalog zabytków sztuki w Polsce* (Catalogue of Artistic Monuments in Poland), launched in 1951, continue to be published by the Academy of Sciences in Warsaw.[28] This list could include, too, Friedrich Achleitner's three-volume guide to the architecture of Austria.[29]

Kroupa may have thought in terms of 'central European' topographical traditions, but examples of the genre can be found across Europe; one might think of the Dehio handbooks in Germany or the Pevsner series in England. Evidence of its vitality in Britain can be found in the multi-volume series documenting public sculpture published by Liverpool University Press in conjunction with the Public Monuments and Sculpture Association. The series, the first volume of which was published in 1997, now stretches to 18 volumes, encompassing cities such as Liverpool, Birmingham and Edinburgh, as well as English regions such as Yorkshire, Sussex, Lancashire and the West Midlands.[30] It may not be possible to speak of topography as a distinct tradition in Italy, for example, but there is no shortage of comparable architectural guides to major Italian cities – and not just Rome – including international publications.[31]

We may celebrate the proliferation of such local histories – and not just the topographical literature – for they appear to endorse the place of the periphery against the dominance of the centre. In this context it is also worth considering the impulses that gave rise to them. I have already stated that topographical study arose in order to provide art history with a stable foundation; in the place of local informal hearsay and an unsystematic patchwork of information, the material basis of the emerging discipline would be established through systematic study, gathering relevant sources and, for first time, mapping and organizing it. Topography also served wider ideological and political demands. As Walter Frodl has pointed out, it was linked to the formation of national states and identities in Europe, when it was deemed crucial to identify artworks and architectural monuments as emblems of the national culture. The documentation of notable architectural works served wider political and diplomatic ends: before the production of systematic maps in the nineteenth century, recognisable buildings and structures could help define boundaries and bolster claims to ownership of territory and resources.[32] Viewed in this context, we might also conclude that topography was part of the apparatus of power-knowledge that Michel Foucault has argued was central to modern state formation. Indeed, a Foucauldian reading would suggest that like disciplines such as medicine, psychiatry, geography and the law, it was part of the modern systematization of knowledge that underpinned the control and regulation of territories and populations.[33] The metaphor of mapping used here to describe the rise of topographical surveys has a very real counterpart in the contemporaneous development of systemic cartography.[34]

Czech topographical studies conform to a much more general pattern. The same can be said of the local histories and guidebooks for general readers and culturally informed tourists, which have their counterparts elsewhere; obvious instances would be the Blue Guides, or the city guides by the German publisher Reclam. One might also draw into the discussion the series produced in Slovakia by the publishing house of Dajama; bearing the title of *Kultúrné krásy Slovenska* (The Cultural Beauties of Slovakia), it includes volumes on topics such as world heritage sites, synagogues, Gothic churches, Romanesque churches, fortresses and castles, vernacular architecture and the interiors of the homes of historic Slovak artists, writers and musicians. Although originating in the Czech Republic, the model of the manual of modern architecture has also spread: the Ukrainian town of Uzhhorod is now the subject of similar architectural guide, the *Uzhhorod Modernism Architecture Manual*, a Ukrainian-English website and book that are explicitly modelled on the example of Brno.[35]

Readers, Aims, Discourses

So far, I have sketched out the different kinds of local art and architectural histories, ranging from popular television programmes to academic topographies. Czech readers will, hopefully, have been patient with the presentation of material that is familiar to them, for it is necessary to establish the scope of the field before one can embark on an informed critical discussion. What, therefore, is distinctive about the Czech Republic when it comes to literature on architecture in regional and provincial towns?

First, for all the similarities with other states, the Czech Republic is without parallel when it comes to the *volume* of publications (given its population) and the fact that often even small towns will have one or two architectural guides. Striking instances of this include Humpolec (population, 11,000), Hlučín (population, 14,000), Hranice and Teplice nad Bečvou (population, 18,000).[36] These local studies are often substantial publications, and they stand in contrast to practice elsewhere. There is a powerful tradition of local art history in Germany, for example, but seldom are towns of this size the subject of such extensive research activity, especially when the subject is a specific period in the history of the town. Urban histories proliferate, but aside from the official topographic surveys by the Monument Protection Agencies of each German Land, specific architectural histories are rarer and on a more modest scale.[37] In Britain the contrast is even more marked. Major cities such as Manchester, Birmingham or Glasgow may be the subject of general architectural histories, but nothing on the scale of, for example, the histories of Brno or Olomouc. This is even more so in the case of smaller towns, even when they are acknowledged as worthy of architectural interest.[38]

On the whole, therefore, outside of the Czech Republic, local and regional architectural histories are treated as a subject of touristic and amateur interest (with more than a flavour of local antiquarianism), and the character of the publications, written for non-specialists, reflects that outlook. In the Czech case, in contrast, it is not always so easy to disentangle specialist from non-specialist readers, suggesting a different kind of audience and market; as noted earlier, many local publications are the work of trained specialists.

Who therefore are the imagined readers of this literature and what is its purpose? On the one hand it is oriented towards the inhabitants of the cities of the individual publications; such works exhibit pride in the rich artistic and cultural history of the locality. Indeed, one can see in them an act of legitimation and even if not explicitly so, they are a rebuke to the assumption that the history of architecture only takes place in the metropolises. Those works that are not topographical catalogues are still organised around a topographic logic, which involves a massing of information and detail. Zatloukal's detailed discussion of the membership of the Olomouc planning office in the early years of Czechoslovak independence is just one example. We find it, too, in his account of the re-establishment of the university after the Second World War, of the competition for monument to Lenin and Stalin of 1949-1950, or of debates about the historic identity of the city, urban development and the cultural politics of conservation in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[39] There is no question as to the rigour of the research – and it exemplifies the tenor of many such local histories – but the gathering up of material is akin to a type of collecting that can be likened to an accumulation of cultural capital. This is especially visible in the prominence given to *modernist* architectural heritage. This is recorded not merely as an arresting facet of local history but also as a sign of legitimization, and it is linked to the

symbolic importance of the First Republic as a *lieu de memoire*. Modernism plays into municipal politics in numerous ways; Brno emerges from out of the shadow of Prague and Vienna due to its role as a centre of the interwar avant-garde, while Josef Gočár's involvement in the redevelopment of Hradec Králové in the 1920s and 1930s has taken on a similar symbolic importance. Hence, there is a larger implied readership, too, a national and even international one.

Such motivations are understandable, but what other aims might this literature have? In the introduction to his history of Hranice and Teplice nad Bečvou, Tomáš Pospěch offers a few thoughts about his study:

> *When writing, what interested me above all else was whether it is possible to grasp building practice over the past two centuries, the relation between the builder and user of a building, and between the building contractor and the architect on the basis of the example of a small Moravian town. When amassing material from the history of building in this small region I continually wondered about the chance factors that led to the irreversible destruction and forgetting of something, or to its preservation. About the extent to which this selection was shaped by the quality, cultural awareness and good management of the institutions whose concern is with maintaining homes, as well as the protection of their autonomy and care for heritage. One should never cease to ask what one should save and appreciate what was made before us. We are in the role of those who received a heritage from our predecessors. We should look after the city in which we live with the diligence of an orderly caretaker and aim to pass it on to our successors in the same or better state*.[40]

There are several interesting claims here. One is recognition of the sometimes chance and arbitrary events that affect the survival of a building. Another is the idea that an understanding of wider architectural history can be constructed using local buildings as a lens through which to view the past two centuries. Given these reflections, Pospěch aims to promote preservation of the local architectural heritage simply by *documenting* it. The book provides an insightful overview of the urban development of Hranice and the surrounding region and it also draws attention to prominent buildings of interest, such as Wilhelm Doderer's Officer Cadet School (1860-63), the Church of St. Barbora (1860-63) by Karl Schmidt, the Forestry School building (Alois Jambos sr.,1895-96), the neobaroque villa of the industrialist Antonín Kunz (**Figure 2)** by Josef Pokorný and Jan Kříženecký (1897), the new cemetery (1926) by Bohuslav Fuchs, the Bat'a store by Blahoslav Pazdírek (1932), the functionalist house of Stanislav Tomanec by Karel Caivas (1938) **(Figure 3)**, the varied bus shelter designs and 'Finnish style' houses of the 1950s or the Neo shopping centre (2012-15) designed by Tomáš and Šárka Kočnar. It demonstrates that Hranice and its environs possess an ample supply of buildings and other structures that mirror broader architectural developments. There is also pride in the fact that some of them are designed by figures of national importance such as Carl Wilhelm Christian Doderer (who taught Robert Musil and Rainer Maria Rilke), Arnošt Wiesner, Fuchs and František Gahura.

The book thereby argues that for all its provincial status, developments in Hranice were not unconnected from those in Prague or Vienna. At this point, however, we may wish to adopt a more critical and analytical perspective, for what is missing in his account is a persuasive argument as to *why* these buildings merit our attention, once we go beyond the issue of local pride. What is also missing is a sense of the difference it makes if we use them as instruments for exploring bigger questions. Pospěch's book demonstrates clearly

that one *can* narrate a history of Czech architecture from the early nineteenth-century onwards using examples from Hranice and its immediate area. Hence, we learn that Hranice, too, has examples of neoclassical, neobaroque, non-specifically historicist, secessionist, Cubist functionalist, neo-vernacular, socialist realist, neo-modernist and postmodern architecture. Yet this paradoxically undercuts his own aims, since it demonstrates merely that Hranice has examples of buildings that fit into a historical narrative (and its categories) that was already formulated elsewhere, usually in Prague.

What would make his account more compelling would be a sense of the *specificity* of the examples he discusses when viewed in the light of this larger narrative. Or, indeed, whether the micro-history of architecture in Hranice might lead the reader to *reconsider* or question those larger framing narratives. One might also wish to ask: what insight does the example of Hranice give us into the relation between metropolitan architectural centres and provincial life? What does the apparent conformity of the local examples to models and trends devised elsewhere tell us about the architectural culture of Czechoslovakia (and, before it, of the Habsburg state)? By *not* addressing such questions the survey undermines its own claim that Hranice and the neighbouring villages have a built heritage *that is worth preserving* because it has a certain value.

Questions of Method, Value and Purpose

I have interrogated the book by Pospěch not because it is particularly problematic; it is, in fact, well-researched and demonstrates the productive outcome possible from local study. It does, however, exemplify a wider phenomenon that can be seen in the monumental studies by Zatloukal as well as architectural histories of other cities. *Ve víru modernosti* [In the maelstrom of modernity], a survey published in 2008 of modern architecture in Hradec Králové and its environs, states likewise that 'We find in the region of Hradec Králové high quality examples of all trends,' which it organises in chapters on 'late historicism and secessionism,' 'modernism,' 'cubism,' 'national decorativism and art déco,' modern classicism,' interwar avant-garde,' 'post-war avant-garde' and 'contemporary architecture.'[41] Yet in what respect are they 'high quality'? This is a statement that requires amplifying, in order that we may have a clearer sense of what it means to talk about the quality of a work of architecture, since the meaning of 'high quality' should not be presumed to be self-evident. Some of the individual examples discussed, such as the water turbine power station **(Figure 4)** by František Sander (1909-12), the church of the priest Ambrož by Josef Gočár and Josef Havlíček **(Figure 5)** (1926-27) and the regional museum building designed by Jan Kotěra (1906-13) are indeed original, unusual and, consequently, striking structures, and one might argue that they deserve greater prominence in the history not only of Czech but of European architecture, too. But how might this inform our larger understanding of the architectural significance of Hradec Králové? What is meant by the idea of 'maelstrom' (*Víř*) in the title? Is this purely for rhetorical effect or is it supposed to convey a thesis about the experience of modernity in a mid-sized town in eastern Bohemia? If so, what made it thus, and how do we interpret it as an interpretative thesis about the local architecture? This volume offers little guidance on this issue, beyond the affirmative character of the fact *that* the town has an impressive number of arresting and unusual buildings designed by well-known architects.

These might appear to be pedantic questions, but they raise basic conceptual and methodological issues relating to the emergence of architectural history as a discipline. Indeed, it is not necessarily misplaced to consider them in the light of Friedrich Nietzsche's critical observations on historical practice and value, articulated some 150 years ago, just at the moment when the modern disciplines of art and architectural history were beginning to take shape in the second half of the nineteenth century. In his essay 'On the Use and Disadvantage of History for Life,' Nietzsche made the following comment:

> *The antiquarian sense of a person, a municipality, a whole people, always has an extremely restricted field of vision; most of what exists, it does not perceive at all, and what little it does see, it sees much too close up and isolated. It cannot measure it up, and it therefore grants everything equal importance and therefore too much importance to each individual thing. There is a lack of that discrimination of value and that sense of proportion which would distinguish between things of the past in a way that would do true justice to them.*[42]

For Nietzsche, this tendency to view everything from close up, with little sense of critical perspective, was one of the three basic impulses driving the sense of the past, the other two being (1) monumental and (2) critical history. Each had its own function and value; antiquarian history met a deep human need to preserve the past, monumental history helped understand the way in which the past could serve as a resource and inspiration for action in the present, while critical history helps avoid excessive piety and reverence towards the past. Nietzsche emphasised the need to maintain all three together. Problems arose when any single mode dominated; antiquarian history alone could degenerate into 'the repulsive spectacle of a blind rage for collecting, a restless raking together of everything that has ever existed."[43] Monumental history, on the other hand, could lead to a schematic view of history: 'as long as the past has to be described as worthy of imitation …. it incurs the danger of becoming somewhat distorted, beautified, and coming close to free poetic invention."[44] Excess critical historical consciousness could lead to a sterile condemnation of the past, sterile, he claimed, because however we may condemn the crimes and aberrations of past generations, 'this does not alter the fact that we originate in them. The best we can do is confront our inherited and hereditary nature with our knowledge … and implant in ourselves a new habit, a new instinct …"[45]

Published in 1874, Nietzsche's essay was a polemic not only against the antiquarianism of the previous century but also against the positivist historicism of his own time, and it appeared at a time when the humanities were on the threshold of assuming their modern disciplinary form. Crucial to this was the question of what it meant for the humanities to be 'scientific.' In the 1870s positivism was seen as the foundation of rigorous inquiry; only a year earlier, Moriz Thausing, for example, newly-appointed professor of art history in Vienna, had rigorously distinguished between positive 'scientific' research in art history and aesthetic judgement.[46] Nietzsche, although not aware of the specifics of Thausing's argument, was dismissive of such an idea; it produced a desiccated consciousness of the past, he argued, and was a sign of the over-weaning presence of 'science.' It had led, he claimed, to a situation in which there was no genuine culture but rather merely a *knowledge* of culture.

Nietzsche's complaint was about a lack of discrimination of value and proportion in such a scientific notion of inquiry; positivist historiography simply records and gathers information, he claimed, and by its refusal to

make distinctions is unable either to do justice to its objects or to account for its value and purpose. At first sight, his criticisms may seem to have little contemporary resonance, but, arguably, much, if not most, of the literature on local and regional art histories has not entirely managed to break free from the positivistic impulse that Nietzsche was criticising. From guidebooks and architecture manuals to the gargantuan volumes on Brno and Olomouc, the same discursive logic applies: documentation, description and presentation of circumstantial factual information. As such, like the genre from which descend, they are driven by what we might term a 'topographical impulse.' Topography is, of course, a well-established and important instrument of art historical inquiry. When serving overt external ends – the documentation of objects for the purposes of public administration, record keeping, conservation, settling legal questions of ownership, even issues of authenticity – it has immense social and cultural value and purpose. But as a product of positivism, it is also vulnerable to the kinds of criticism Nietzsche was levelling at positivist scholarship. Specifically, he was suggesting that since positivism, and topography in particular, is concerned primarily with means rather than ends, it lacks the conceptual resources on its own to account for its goals and the implicit value judgements underpinning the inquiry. His comments anticipated a basic point that would be made later by Max Weber about objectivity and object choice. The positivist adherence to 'objectivity' as a value can only pertain to questions of method, he argued, but object choice is itself never 'objective' since it is always dependent on human interests.[47]

Significance

Much local and regional architectural history writing consists, therefore, in a kind of topographic cataloguing, or compiling of cultural and symbolic capital in the provinces away from the metropolitan centre. We might think of it in terms of the logic of collecting described by Walter Benjamin. In *Arcades Project* Benjamin stated:

> *What is distinctive in collecting is that the object is detached from all its original functions in order to enter into the closest conceivable relation to things of the same kind. This relation is the diametric opposite of any utility and falls into the peculiar category of completeness. What is this 'completeness'? It is a grand attempt to overcome the wholly irrational character of the object's mere presence at hand through its integration into a new expressly devised historical system: the collection*.[48]

Buildings are sorted into categories, treated as specimens of styles; the fact that localities have examples of every major style or period (that they are 'complete') is taken as an intrinsic marker of affirmation. How is Benjamin's comment about detachment from function relevant here? In order answer this we can consider a comment by Jiří Kroupa on topographical method in the history of Brno architecture. Kroupa correctly characterizes it as a genre in which 'individual works of art are presented according to the basic stages in their history, and then their present-day significance (dnešní význam) is described in terms of their specific content and historical context.'[49] The term 'význam' here is key, and it is important to clarify it, for like the term 'significance' with which I have rendered it in English, it also connotes importance, magnitude, value. For Kroupa, topography entails not only the first-order task of establishing basic information about a building, including also placing it into some kind of historical context and succession, but also the second-order task of

determining its importance and value. How, therefore, is the significance of a building determined? A traditional art historical understanding might attribute significance based on, for example, the extent to which it either conforms to, diverges from, or redefines established typologies (i.e. displays originality or a lack of it), or whether it typifies a certain kind of building in a particularly skilful and imaginative way. Aesthetic values also feed into art historical judgements, and prevailing norms may also shape the determination of significance; at present, when special value is laid on complexity and ambiguity, for example, buildings that exemplify these qualities merit special attention. Buildings will also be deemed significant in light of their relation to wider social and historical categories. The Villa Tugendhat in Brno, for example, is 'significant' not only as an example of modernist domestic architecture and as an illustration of Mies van der Rohe's ideas of space and architectural design; it is also significant due to the light it casts on factors such as bourgeois taste in interwar Czechoslovakia, the embrace of modernism as a marker of social and class distinction, processes of suburbanization and urban development, and Czech-Jewish-German relations, to name just a few factors. We might mention a few other examples to illustrate this point further. In her study of the architecture of 'Red Vienna,' which is a topographical study in all but name, Eve Blau traces how the different internal and external designs reflected not only the municipal ideals of the Social Democratic council of the capital, but also changing notions of familial life and gender relations, as well as being a response to the inherited social relations of Habsburg Vienna sedimented in the built form of Ringstrasse architecture.[50] This is in part a of rebuttal of Manfredo Tafuri's critical comments on the architecture which, he argued, was too indebted to norms of Habsburg urbanism to mark a truly radical break.[51] More recently, Leslie Topp's study of sanatorium architecture in Austria-Hungary examines the ways in which architectural design was informed by prevailing notions of psychiatric treatment, including the understanding of relations between patients and medical staff, while at the same time attempting to accommodate such *general* ideas to specific building traditions in different regions of the Habsburg Empire.[52]

These examples build on a topographical foundation to advance more complex statements about significance; the argument of this article, however, is that in many of the local architectural histories discussed so far 'significance' in this sense is seldom articulated. The research publications on this scale tacitly *assume* that their object is significant enough to merit such detailed and exhaustive treatment, or, indeed, that the very act of devoting extensive and detailed inquiry to them *bestows* significance. However, in the absence of articulation of this assumption or of explanation of the reasoning, such an approach is inadequate. A productive way of approaching this issue, perhaps, is also by considering it not in terms of architectural history but, rather, in the light of the debates surrounding microhistory that was pioneered in the late 1970s and 1980s.

Famous studies such as Le Roy Ladurie's *Montaillou* (1975), Carlo Ginzburg's *The Cheese and the Worms* (1976) and *The Return of Martin Guerre* by Natalie Zemon Davis used small-scale events, episodes and locations – the trial of a sixteenth-century miller, an act of imposture in early modern France, thirty years in the history of a village in the Languedoc – as a means of exploring larger issues of cultural and social history.[53] As Ginzburg subsequently commented, this involved not simply looking at the overlooked, turning the gaze away from the centre and attending to the margin, but also rejecting an ethnocentric teleological

historical understanding based on 'affirmation of a national entity, the advent of the bourgeoisie, the civilizing mission of the white race …'[54] In other words it suspended the usual frame of reference of historical narratives and, in particular, a questioning of the tendency of historians to subsume individual phenomena under general categories and see them as instances of series. Thus, Ginzburg noted, in historical inquiry often 'an object … may be chosen because it is typical … or because it is repetitive and therefore capable of being serialized.' In contrast, ' … microhistory has confronted the question of comparison with a different and, in a certain sense, opposite approach: through the anomalous, not the analogous …' It demonstrates that 'any social structure is the result of interaction and of numerous individual strategies, a fabric that can only be reconstituted from close observation.'[55] This statement highlights the complex relation between heterogenous individual events, the *hapax legomena* of history, as he puts it, and more general structures and categories. Microhistory considers the way in which each shapes understanding of the other.

Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István M. Szijártó have recently defined microhistory as driven by an ideology of 'singularization,' which 'brings into prominence the contradictions and inconsistencies in the mind of each and every individual and heightens the paradoxes that exist within each living person.'[56] Lurking behind this idea is an anti-foundational epistemology that expresses scepticism towards rational ordering and stresses the way in which the individual item, the micro-discursive individual object eludes subsumption into abstract rationalised systems of knowledge. The notion of microhistory has had little direct impact on art history, but one can find an echo of it in the numerous critiques of the concept of style. Georges Didi-Huberman, for example, has been a forceful critic of the determination of traditional art history to subsume individual works of art under stylistic and period categories.[57] It is a difficult approach to maintain, Magnússon and Szijártó state; all too often, micro-historians are unable to resist the temptation to interpreting individual events (we might add here: buildings and works of art) in terms of broad categories. Consequently, they argue, a renewed effort should be made to resist this temptation and to focus solely on singularities.[58]

Behind this endorsement of microhistory is a broader hermeneutic debate over the relation of the particular and the general; Magnússon and Szijártó's conclusion is problematic for, as the philosopher Manfred Frank has argued, the idea of 'pure' singularity is as much an abstraction as are general categories.[59] For interpretation has instead to proceed on the basis of the dialectical relation of the singular and the general, and this can, at times, have two important consequences. On the one hand, attention to previously overlooked particulars may reveal patterns and series that had hitherto not been seen, and therefore open the way to *new* categories. On the other, attention to singularities can, equally, demonstrate points where existing categories may be contradicted, or need redefining. In either case, the particular is analysed in terms of its relation to the general and the converse holds, too, and it is in this relation that issues of significance are worked through. By valorising only one side of the equation, namely, the singular, Magnússon and Szijártó's position would strip historical analysis of its ability to assess significance.

This theoretical debate may seem, at first sight, remote from the local histories of Olomouc, Hradec Králové, Brno and Hranice, yet it impinges on them in important ways. Architectural history emerged as a modern discipline when scholars began to approach individual buildings and structures in relation to general stylistic and other categories; scholars such as Alois Riegl or Heinrich Wölfflin sought to define those categories, on

the basis both of inductive observation and comparison of individual works of art, and of deductive theories about the history of style as reflecting the evolution of perception. Their enterprise took place at the same time as debates among architects, most notably, those of the Werkbund, over the role of types in architecture, and coincided, too, with Max Weber's espousal, in historical sociology, of the ideal type as a heuristic device.[60] Since then, of course, architectural history has developed further, interpreting buildings and structures not only in relation to formal categories but also political, social and cultural ones. However, many of the local and regional architectural histories I have discussed tend to privilege either individual buildings in isolation (making little reference to larger historical, artistic and social categories and contexts) or general concepts (treating local history as just an instance of the broader categories of the history of architecture). This is evident in, for example, the provision of 'facts' about buildings (e.g. who commissioned them, who designed them, where they were sited, what materials were used and how much they cost, who was present at the opening ceremony) or in descriptions of them as examples of one or other stylistic category. In neither case does this address the relation *between* the particular and the general, by which one might demonstrate the significance of the building in question. What intellectual labour is being undertaken, therefore, when local and regional architecture is described in relation to certain stylistic categories? Just how significant *is* the architecture of Olomouc or of Hradec Králové, for example? What criteria are being used to determine that significance and why does it merit repeated study?

I cited earlier two texts, on Hradec Králové and Hranice, as examples of a fairly typical approach that also tends to treat styles as settled categories. However, the latter are, of course, nothing more than interpretative constructions. As Robert Bagley has noted, styles are identified on the basis of arbitrary decisions about which formal and structural features of a work of art or architecture have salience. Moreover, that salience emerges through comparative analysis, for style is not an intrinsic property, rather, it is a way of talking about the relationship *between* objects.[61]

Stylistic analysis may be the most traditional mode of architectural interpretation, but as an index of other social and political factors, it can still be a valuable analytic tool. The study of regional architecture has enormous potential in this regard, because while it can serve as a means of mapping out the geographical and temporal diffusion of a particular style (the adoption, for example, of functionalism in even small provincial towns), attention to idiosyncratic local building forms can bring into question the pertinence and meaning of various general stylistic categories. What is most striking about the modernist architecture of Hradec Králové and its environs, for example, is the fact not that it has a stock of buildings that illustrate the history of modern architecture, but rather the concentration of buildings and spaces that use the syntax and vocabulary of architecture in incongruous ways. Columns, Palladian frontages, tympanums, spires, crescents, arches, are used on buildings such as the House of Josef Jihlavec (Bohumil Waigant, 1909-10), the villa of Václav Charvát (Vladimír Fultner, 1909-10) **(Figure 6)**, the Liska family house (Oldřich Liska, 1923), the Jirásek Theatre in Hronov (Jindřich Freiwald, 1928-30) (**Figure 7)** and the Church of the Sacred Heart (Bohumil Sláma, 1929-30) in combinations that confound the application of established categories, and in ways that seem out of place given the function and scale of the building. These combinations give the city a distinctive profile and are also telling about provincial bourgeois and municipal ambition, in the adoption of

elements from a grandiose architectural vocabulary in circumstances when there are neither the funds nor the space for a structure of a size more fitting to the chosen design. Not only do such examples reveal something about the specific circumstances of Hradec Králové, they also problematise the concepts and categories with which the history of architecture is organised, for it is clearly inadequate as a means of describing them.

In an essay on interpretation, the philosopher Paul Ricoeur examined precisely the issue of the particular and the general in relation to the interpretation of texts. How much weight, he asked, should be given to the individual speaking subject (the author) and how much to the language (the 'rules of the game of which is speech is the execution')? His essay was written at a time when the structuralism of Claude Lévi-Strauss and the anti-subjective turn in semiotics were at their most influential. Rather than endorsing either their anti-humanism or retreating into a philosophy of the subject, his response was to revisit the thinking of hermeneutic philosophers of Friedrich Schleiermacher and Wilhelm Dilthey. Specifically, he argued, 'On the one hand, self-understanding passes through the detour of understanding the cultural signs in which the self documents and forms itself. On the other hand, understanding the text is not an end in itself; it mediates the relation to himself of a subject who, in the short circuit of immediate reflection, does not find the meaning of his own life.'[62] In other words, and transposed onto the theme of local history, one can conclude that it is only via the detour through the 'other' of those general categories that the local can come to understand itself. But that does not mean that the local is simply *assimilated* to the general; the detour can involve contestation as well as simple alignment or conformity.

In the absence of a critical apparatus designed to answer this question, many works of architectural history also fall into the trap of *parataxis*. Parataxis is a rhetorical technique that consists in the juxtaposition of statements without any co-ordinating or subordinating conjunctions. It is the converse of *syntax*, which is based on the hierarchical co-ordination of clauses, phrases and ideas. As a discursive mode it comprises an additive principle that piles on example after example, without a framework determining significance or relative importance. We might use this idea to explain, too, the mammoth size of many of the works of scholarship I have been considering, for there is an intimate connection between parataxis and the drive for completeness highlighted by Benjamin. Both can be attributed to the same logic that seeks to amass material and information, and lacks, as Nietzsche, contended, a sense of proportion. It is of course not only in art historical writing in the Czech Republic that this can be found. A striking illustration is the recent research project on the history of the Hofburg in Vienna, which has resulted in five lavish large-format volumes, each of them at least 600 pages in length.[63] Nevertheless, it is in the Czech Republic that the tradition of gargantuan research monographs has become most visible, one in which the paratactic additive principle is dominant.

Concluding Comments

The year 1907 saw publication of the first volume of the *Austrian Topography*. Initiated by Alois Riegl, it was continued after his death by Max Dvořák, his successor as general conservator of the Imperial Royal Central Commission for Research and Preservation Artistic and Historic Monuments (K. k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale). The series extended to 19 volumes, the last of which was

published in 1926. In the first volume, on Krems, Dvořák wrote an introduction in which he reflected on the history and purpose of art topography. From its earliest beginnings, in church inventories of relics and important places of pilgrimage, it had, he argued, slowly become a scholarly ('wissenschaftlich') enterprise, and as such it reflected 'the general transformation in the conception of historical problems, which were no longer to be solved by *a priori* speculation but on the basis of methodical inquiry on the objective state of affairs.'[64] By adopting this approach, topography would not be led by unexamined assumptions and 'dogmatic points of view' about the relative value of artworks and monuments.

At this stage in his career Dvořák was still a prominent advocate of positivism; it was some years before he would radically shift toward the idea of art history as *Geistesgeschichte*. However, even here he recognised that positive 'science,' merely documenting the objective state of affairs ('Tatbestand'), was insufficient on its own. He went on:

> *… the source of the new general engagement with the artistic legacies of the past is not just the conscious or unconscious interest in monuments as documents of the striving of individuals, generations, of all humanity, to overcome formal problems. The connections have become deeper and more universal still, through a new relation that connects historic monuments with the general artistic and social culture of our time*.[65]

Scientific knowledge, he stated, is based on the 'necessity of synthetic experience' and on recognition of the nexus of culture ('Kulturzusammengehörigkeit'). Topography consequently goes beyond just 'mechanically compiling inventories,' he argued, in order to:

> *… open up to the public local ('heimatliche') art treasures on the basis of their significance ('Bedeutung') for the history of art both locally and in general. Thus, it should set, as its measure of historical development, not only the external historical apparatus but also judgements about the monuments themselves. This is not only a scientific requirement but also, since they both have the same source, grounded in the modern cult of monuments; just like the earlier cult of the artist, so now this alone will find resonance in the intellectual life of the present*.[66]

These words were written over one hundred years ago and were part of a debate that was specific to the early twentieth century. Nevertheless, as with Nietzsche's polemical tirade and Walter Benjamin's comments on collecting, they serve as useful points of departure for the interrogation of current art historical practice. For Dvořák's comments remind us that in topography, recording historic works of art and architectural is just the first step. The next one involves judgements about significance, which includes a sense of the place of the individual work of art in both in the history of art and in the larger nexus of culture (one might add here, society, too).

The contention of this article has been that the paratactic character of so much of the literature on 'local' architecture and art stops short of exploration of that larger nexus (however it might be defined) and hence, too, of passing of judgements about meaning and significance. Indeed, even though histories of art and architecture outside of Prague proliferate in a way that is refreshing and to be welcomed, the towns and regions concerned are not always well represented, because such histories seldom move past the first stage of documentation. This is not unique to Czech architectural history, but it is unusual in the extent to which it

predominates in the landscape of publishing here. What is still needed, therefore, is some kind 'critical regionalism,' to borrow Kenneth Frampton's phase, as a means of assessing the complex social, cultural and aesthetic roles played by art and architecture, and not only within its immediate locality.[67] Only then, perhaps, can we begin to form a more nuanced view as to the value and importance of the architectural heritage of cities outside of the metropolis, from Brno and Olomouc to Humpolec, Hranice and Hlučín.

---

[1] I would like to thank Milena Bartlová, Vendula Hnídková, Marta Filipová and Christian Drobe for comments on earlier drafts of this article.

[2] Pavel Zatloukal, *Meditace o městě, krajině, umění: Olomouc 1918–1989*, Ostrava and Olomouc 2020, p. 9.

[3] Idem, *Meditace o architektuře: Olomouc, Brno, Hradec Králové 1815–1915*, Prague 2016.

[4] Idem, *Příběhy z dlouhého století: Architektura let 1750–1918 na Moravě a ve Slezsku,* Olomouc 2002.

[5] Jiří Kroupa (ed), *Dějiny Brna 7: Uměleckohistorické památky: historické jádro*, Brno 2015.

[6] Tomáš Jeřábek. Jiří Kroupa et al, *Brněnské paláce: stavby duchovní a světské aristokracie v ránem novověku*, Brno 2005.

[7] Other volumes in the series include Rudolf Procházka (ed), *Dějiny Brna 1. Od pravěku k ranému středověku*, Brno 2011. – Libor Jan (ed), *Dějiny Brna 2. Středověké mesto*, Brno 2013. – Lukáš Fasora and Jiří Malíř (eds) *Dějiny Brna 4 - Modernizace města 1790–1918*, Brno 2020. Each volume is on a similar scale, with some 1000 + pages.

[8] Jiří Kroupa, Radka Nikkala Miltová, Michaela Šeferisová Loudová and Ondřej Jakubec, 'Uměleckohistorické areály v připojených obcích,' in Lukáš Fasora and Václav Štěpánek (eds), *Dějiny Brna 6: Předměstské obce*, Brno 2017, pp. 1041-1114, and Fasora and Jiří Malíř (eds), *Dějiny Brna 4 - Modernizace města*, pp. 309-64 and 891-975.

[9] See, for example, Zdeněk Kudělka and Jindřich Chatrný, *For New Brno 1919-1939*, Brno 2000. – Rostislav Koryčanek, *Česká architektura v německém Brně: město jako ideální krajina nacionalismu,* Šlapanice 2003. – Jan Sedlák, *Brno Secesní: Deset kapitoly a architektuře a umění kolem roku 1900*, Brno 2004. – Jan Sedlák and Libor Teplý, *Ve znamení moderní architektury 20. století v Brně*, Brno 2004. – Jindřich Chatrný and Dagmar Černoušková (eds), *Nový dům Brno – New House Brno 1928*, Brno 2018.

[10] Pavel Novák, *Zlínská architektura I: 1900-1950, II: 1950-2000*, Zlín 2008. – Ladislava Horňáková, *Fenomén Baťa. Zlínská architektura,* Zlín 2009. – Ondřej Ševeček, *Zrození Baťovy průmyslové metropole*, Zlín 2009. – Martina Pachmanová, Lada Hubatová and Jitka Ressová, *Zlínská umprumka (1959-2011) od průmyslového výtvarnictví po design,* Prague 2013.

[11] Jindřich Vybíral, *Zrození velkoměsta: Architektura v obraze Moravské Ostravy 1890-1938*, Brno 2004. – Štěpán Bartoš, Zdeněk Lukeš, Pavel Panoch, *Kaleidoskop tvarů. Století moderní architektury v Pardubickém kraji*, Pardubice 2006. – Jakub Potůček, *Hradec Králové: Architektura a urbanismus 1895-2009*, Hradec Králové 2009. – Martin Strakoš, *Nová Ostrava a její satelity,* Ostrava 2010. – Petr Domanický, *Pracovna Republiky: architektura Plzně v letech 1918-1938*, Plzeň 2018. – Marcela Rusinko, *Křehké sny modernity: ČSR a Pardubice v zrcadle výtvarného umění 1918–1938*, Pardubice 2018.

[12] Tomáš Pospěch, *Hranice, Teplice nad Bečvou a okolí: architektura 1815-2018,* Hranice 2018.

[13] See, for example, Jindřich Chatrný and Dagmar Černoušková (eds), *Brněnské stopy Adolfa Loose,* Brno 2010.

[14] Domanický (note 11).

[15] See, for example, Pavel Šopák, *Tvořit město: Opava a Moravská Ostrava 1850-1950: architektura a urbanismus*, Opava 2017. – Jan Hanzlík, Jana Zajoncová, Lenka Hájková, *Teplice: architektura moderní doby 1860-2000*, Ústí nad Labem 2016.

[16] Petr Domanický, *Hanuš Zápal: architekt Plzeňska (1885-1964),* Plzeň 2016. – Pavel Panoch and Miroslav Řepa, *Karel Řepa pardubický architekt ve věku nejistot*, Pardubice 2010. – Marcel Pencák, *Hradecký architekt: Vladimír Fultner ve spletí české moderny*, Brno 2013. – Matěj Bekera, *Oldřich Liska, architekt východočeské moderny*, Červený Kostelec 2019.

[17] Jiří Kroupa, 'Úvodem k sedmému dílu,' in Kroupa (note 5), p. 11.

[18] URL: https://pamatkovykatalog.cz/uskp (accessed 20 January 2021). Examples of the topographic guides include Petra Šternová and Eva Doležalová (eds), *Soupis nemovitých kulturních památek v Libereckém kraji okres Liberec: město Liberec*, Liberec 2010-2013, 3 volumes, and Iva Orálková (ed), *Soupis nemovitých kulturních památek okresu Prostějov,* Olomouc 2012.

[19] Pavel Zatloukal, Přemysl Krejčiřík and Ondřej Zatloukal, *Lednicko-valtický areál*, Prague 2012.

[20] The Brno website is: https://www.bam.brno.cz/. The website is in Czech, English and German. The guidebook is *Brněnský architektonický manuál. Průvodce architekturou 1918–1945*, Brno 2018. An English edition has also been published.

[21] Zdeněk Lukeš, *Praha moderní: velký průvodce po architektuře let 1900-1950 I: Historické centrum*, Prague 2012. – Idem, *Praha moderní: velký průvodce po architektuře 1900-1950 II: Levý břez Vltavy*, Prague 2013. – Idem, *Praha moderní: velký průvodce po architektuře 1900-1950 III: Pravý břez Vltavy*, Prague 2014. – Petr Kratochvil, *Praha moderní: velký průvodce po architektuře IV: 1950-2000*, Praha 2015. – Of the Zlatý řez series see Michal Kohout – Stephan Templ – Vladimír Šlapeta (eds), *Praha – architektura XX. století*, Prague 1998. – Michal Kohout – Stephan Templ – Pavel Zatloukal (eds), *Česká republika - architektura XX.století. Díl I. Morava a Slezsko*, Prague 1999.

[22] Renata Vrabelová et al., *Brno moderní: velký průvodce po architektuře 1890-1948*, Prague 2016. – Pavel Hroch and Zdeněk Lukeš, *Praha na prahu moderny: velký průvodce po architektuře 1850-1900*, Prague 2017. – Martin Strakoš, *Ostrava industrialní a modern: Velký průvodce po architektuře 1845-1949*, Prague 2020.

[23] Karel Doležel, Renata Vrabelová and Filip Šlapal, *Brno Architektura / Architecture 1990-2008*, Brno 2008. – Petr Hrůša, Vladimír Šlapeta and Ivan Ruller, *Brno Architektura / Architecture 1945-1990*, Brno 2010. – Petr Pelčák, *Brno Architektura / Architecture 1918-1939*, Brno 2012.

[24] See, for example, Karel Doležal, *Brno architektura 1990-2005,* Brno 2005. – Pavel Zatkloukal, *Brněnská architektura 1815-1915*, Brno 2006. – Vladimír Šlapeta and Renata Vrabelová, *Brněnská architektura 1918-2008*, Brno 2014.

[25] Rudolf Eitelberger, 'Bericht über einen archäologischen Ausflug nach Ungarn in den Jahren 1854 und 1855,' *Jahrbuch der k.k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale* I, 1856, pp. 91–140. – Idem, 'Die mittelalterlichen Kunstdenkmale Dalmatiens in Arbe, Zara, Tra, Spalato und Ragusa: Aufgenommen und dargestellt vom Architekten W. Zimmermann,' *Jahrbuch der k.k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale* V, 1861, pp. 129–312. – Rudolf Eitelberger, Georg Heider and Joseph Hieser (eds), *Mittelalterliche Kunstdenkmale des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, Stuttgart 1858–60.

[26] Bohuslav Matějka, *Topographie der historischen und Kunst-Denkmale im Königreiche von Böhmen von der Urzeit bis zum Anfange des XIX Jahrhunderts: Der politische Bezirk Laun*, Prague 1897. Sixteen volumes were published before the project ran out of funds.
[27] János Gerle, Attila Kovács, Imre Makovecz, *A századforduló Magyar építészete*, Budapest 1990. – András Ferkai, *Buda építészete a két világháboru között művészeti emlékek*, Budapest 1995. – Idem, *Pest építészete a két világháboru között*, Budapest 2001. – Idem, *Magyarország vidéki építészete a 20. században: Építészeti kalauz,* Budapest 2003.
[28] Katarzyna Kolendo-Korczak (ed), *Katalog zabytków sztuki w Polsce. Tom XII, Województwo podlaskie (białostockie). Zeszyt 3, Powiat Białostocki*, Warsaw 2016.
[29] Friedrich Achleitner, *Österreichische Architektur im 20. Jahrhundert: ein Führer in drei Bänden*, St. Pölten and Salzburg 1980-2010.
[30] It is testament to the central European origins of the genre that the series was initiated by the Birmingham-based Hungarian art historian, George Noszlopy, who was also responsible for several volumes in the series: *The Public Sculpture of Birmingham*, Liverpool 1998; *The Public Sculpture of Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull*, Liverpool 2003 and (with Fiona Waterhouse) *The Public Sculpture of Herefordshire, Shropshire and Worcestershire*, Liverpool 2010.
[31] See, for example, Gianluca Christoforetti, Sergio Torre and Hilda Ghiara, *Genova: Guida di architettura moderna,* Florence 2004. – Piero O. Rossi, *Roma: Guida all´ architettura moderna 1909-2011*, Rome 2012. – Marco Biraghi, Gabriella Lo Ricco and Silvia Micheli, *Guida all'architettura di Milano 1954-2015*, Milan 2015. – See Stefan Grundmann, *Architecture of Rome: An Architectural History in 402 Individual Presentations*, Stuttgart 2007.
[32] This is discussed in Walter Frodl, Idee *und Verwirklichung: das Werden der staatlichen Denkmalpflege in Österreich*, Vienna 1988, pp. 21-48.
[33] Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les choses,* Paris 1966.
[34] On the critical study of cartography see Denis E. Cosgrove, *Geography and Vision: Seeing, Imagining and Representing the World*, London 2008, and J. B. Harley, *The New Nature of Maps: Essays in the History of Cartography*, Baltimore 2002.
[35] URL: http://am.umodernism.com/ua/. Accessed, 20 January 2021.
[36] Jiří Jung and Adam Hubáček, *Architektura Hlučína od počátku města do roku 1938*, Ostrava 2016; Dan Merta, *Humpolec a okolí: Architektura 1900-2014*, Prague 2014.
[37] Stephanie Göhler, *Lübecker Baugeschichte entdecken: Von der Romanik bis zur Moderne*, Hamburg 2009.
[38] In the 1980s the architectural historian Alex Clifton-Taylor published a series of books (accompanying a television broadcast) on notable English towns such as Ludlow, Warwick and Durham. However, each town was the subject of just one chapter. See Clifton-Taylor*, Six English Towns*, London 1986; *Six More English Towns*, London 1988, and *Another Six English Towns,* London 1988.
[39] Zatloukal (note 2), pp. 243-53, 279-82, 407-19 and 435-49.
[40] Pospěch (note 12), p. 11.
[41] Stěpán Bartoš, Zdeněk Lukeš and Pavel Panoch, *Ve víru modernosti: architektura 20. Století v královéhradeckém kraji,* Pardubice 2008.
[42] Friedrich Nietzsche, 'Vom Nutzen und Nachtheil der Historie für das Leben,' in Nietzsche, *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen. Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe*, Berlin 1988, p. 267.
[43] Ibidem, p. 268.
[44] Ibidem, p. 262.
[45] Ibidem, p. 270.
[46] Moriz Thausing, 'Die Stellung der Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft' in Thausing, *Wiener Kunstbrief*, Leipzig 1884, pp. 1-20.
[47] Max Weber, '"Objectivity" in Social Science and Social Policy' in Weber, *Max Weber on the Methodology of the Social Sciences*, trans. Edward Shills and Henry Finch, Glencoe 1949, pp. 50-112.
[48] Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*, eds Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, Frankfurt am Main 1982, V: Das Passagenwerk, p. 271.
[49] Kroupa (pozn. 17), p. 11.
[50] Eve Blau, *The Architecture of Red Vienna, 1919-1934*, Cambridge 1999.
[51] Manfredo Tafuri, *Vienna la rossa: La Politica residenziale nella Vienna socialista, 1919-1933*, Turin 1980.
[52] Leslie Topp, *Freedom and the Cage: Modern Architecture and Psychiatry in Central Europe, 1890-1914*, University Park, PA 2014.
[53] Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou, village occitan*, Paris 1975; Carlo Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermi*, Turin 1976, and Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*, Cambridge, MA 1983.
[54] Carlo Ginzburg, 'Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know About It,' *Critical Inquiry*, No. 20.1, 1993, p. 21.
[55] Ibidem, p. 33.
[56] Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István M. Szijártó, *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*, London 2013, p. 123.
[57] See, for example Didi-Huberman, *Před časem*, Brno 2008.
[58] '*I urge microhistorians to ignore the grand narrative as far as possible, and to concentrate on the research model I call 'the singularization of history.´ In this way they are likely to gain the opportunity to approach their subject in a new way, without being tied to the received standards of the grand narrative*.' Magnússon and Szijártó (note 56), p. 158.
[59] Manfred Frank, *Das Individuelle Allgemeine*, Frankfurt am Main 1985, pp. 262-73.
[60] Max Weber introduced the notion of the ideal type in 1904 in ‚Die Objektivität sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis,' *Archiv für die Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* XIX, 1904, s. 22–87. Alois Riegl's *Late Roman Art Industry*, outlining the three stages of perception and style, was published three years earlier. See Riegl, *Die spätrömische Kunst-Industrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn im Zusammenhange mit der Gesamtentwicklung der Bildenden Künste bei den Mittelmeervölkern,* Vienna 1901.
[61] Robert Bagley, 'Style,' in *Max Loehr and the Study of Chinese Bronzes: Style and Classification in the History of Art,* Ithaca 2008, p. 123.
[62] Paul Ricoeur, 'What is a Text: Explanation and Understanding,' in idem, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*, trans. John Thompson, Cambridge 2016, p. 120. The essay was originally published in 1970.
[63] Mario Schwarz, Maria Welzig, Artur Rosenauer, Werner Telesko, Anna Mader-Kratky et al, *Die Wiener Hofburg,* Vienna 2012-2018, 5 volumes.
[64] Max Dvořák, 'Einleitung' in Hans Tietze, *Die Denkmale des politischen Bezirkes Krems*, Vienna 1907, p. xvi.
[65] Ibidem, p. xvii.
[66] Ibidem, pp. xviii-xix.
[67] Kenneth Frampton, 'Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance,' in Hal Foster (ed), *Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Postmodern Culture,* Seattle 1983, pp. 16-30. Frampton coined the term in relation to architectural practice, but it seems not inappropriate to use it in this discussion, too.