

HISTORICAL LANDSCAPES IN BOHEMIA

Regions of Třeboň, Broumov and Praha

Eva Chodějovská – Eva Semotanová – Robert Šimůnek



Institute of History

Prague 2015

The work of the Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences
OPERA INSTITUTI HISTORICI PRAGAE
Series A – Monographia

Volumen 61

Scientific Editor:
doc. PhDr. Martin Holý, Ph.D.

Readers:
prof. RNDr. Peter Chrastina, PhD.
doc. Ing. arch. ThLic. Jiří Kupka, Ph.D.

This book was supported by the project *Kartografické zdroje jako kulturní dědictví. Výzkum nových metodik a technologií digitalizace, zpřístupnění a využití starých map, plánů, atlasů a glóbů* (DF11P01OVV021) [Cartographic sources as a cultural heritage. Research into new methodologies and digitalization technologies, publicising and utilisation of old maps, plans, atlases and globes] of the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic.

ISBN: 978-80-7286-258-0

© Mgr. Eva Chodějovská, Ph.D., 2015
© prof. PhDr. Eva Semotanová, DrSc., 2015
© PhDr. Robert Šimůnek, Ph.D., DSc., 2015
© Institute of History, CAS

CONTENTS

PREFACE	5
CULTURAL LANDSCAPES OF THE PAST AS THE SUBJECT OF INTEREST OF HISTORICAL-GEOGRAPHIC RESEARCH	5
SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON THE LANDSCAPE OF THE PAST	24
MODEL TERRITORIES	27
- Landscape of the Třeboň Estates in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times (c. 1400–1700)	29
- The Broumov Region	43
- Prague and Its Surroundings. Landscape as Poetry, Landscape as Prose	52
CONCLUSION	62
SHRNUTÍ	66
SUMMARY	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	72
REGISTER	106

On the authorship

The introductory chapter and the conclusion are the common work of all the authors; Eva Chodějovská wrote the chapter *Sources of Information on the Landscape of the Past*; within the chapter *Model Territories*, the paper *Landscape of the Třeboň Estates in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times (c. 1400–1700)* is by Robert Šimůnek, *The Broumov Region* is by Eva Chodějovská whereas *Prague and Its Surroundings. Landscape as Poetry, Landscape as Prose* was written by Eva Semotanová.

The authors would like to thank to all the colleagues that helped them when writing this book!

PREFACE

Historical landscape ranks among the subjects which have been receiving increased attention from both professionals and lay public during the past two decades. It has often been mythicized, poeticized, veiled by spirituality and idealized in popular publications hand in hand with the media. It is gradually turning into a cult; it has been attributed magic qualities which are breathing from forests, meadows, waters and hillsides and which would, in the past, allegedly decide battles, elicit expressions of ardent patriotism and determine the route of history and, today, perhaps help find us the sense of our earthly existence.¹ An array of recent professional works, as well as works aimed at wider audiences, has pursued the history of landscape from rather uncommon angles of viewing and tried to fuse humans and nature into a single landscape-shaping feature.² A fashionable subject surfacing in connection with historical landscape is the “landscape soul”.³ Yet another commonly used term is the “landscape memory”, developed and forged by experts in conformity with Pierre Nora’s concept of *realms of memory*.⁴ Certain places have been transformed into symbols; into places interlinked with the collective memory. The landscape memory encompasses a landscape charisma radiated by places permeated with history and emblazoned with stories, tales and legends, by worshipped peaks or romantic recesses bearing imprints of human activity, by memorable trees, springs and wells – places enveloped in an exceptional “genius loci”.⁵ The discussion revolving around the definition of this concept is still animated. Genius loci as a philosophical category can be perceived non-indicatively: not necessarily just in the aesthetic context; there can also be the explanation that every place does not only have its physical, but also non-material features; that genius loci represents a quality integral to a certain location.⁶ New, unconventional approaches and often almost deliberately shocking comparisons and literarily interpreted subjects have been enriching previous research on historical landscape. They contribute to a more inward and more sensitive grasping of the entire issue – unless they, of course, slip off the surface of an idea due to shallow catchiness. At the same time, it is more than necessary to respect and accept the research outcomes of the participating disciplines.⁷

Historical landscape as the subject of research and protection. The present publication mainly discusses historical landscape as an expert issue pursued by many scientists of varied focus in the framework of both their elementary and applied research encompassing a wide scale of disciplines (archaeologists, landscape ecologists, botanists, geologists, art historians, urbanists, garden and landscape architects, historians, geographers, historical geographers, experts in the care of historical monuments...; the list could be almost endless), by numerous institutions, associations and – in the good sense of the word – informed laymen.⁸

¹ This not only concerns the wide scale of works which ride the wave of the fashionable categories of “the sacred”, “the mysterious”, “the return to nature” and so on (and can be sufficiently exemplified by HÄNNI 2010), but also in part those presented as the results of professional research (e.g., KVĚT 2003; KVĚT 2011).

² Comp., e.g., SÁDLO – POKORNÝ – HÁJEK – DRESLEROVÁ – CÍLEK 2005.

³ CÍLEK 2002 (and the next editions); CÍLEK 2002a, as well as other works by the same author on the issue of landscape.

⁴ NORA 1984–1992; on the “national mountains” as symbols, see MAUR 2006.

⁵ SEMOTANOVÁ 2007.

⁶ On urban space, see VACEK 2014, where also find the list of basic literature, including the today already classical work by Christian Norberg-Schulz (NORBERG-SCHULZ 2010).

⁷ More complex recapitulation of the variety of views, opinions, theories and methods would certainly require a separate treatise – and perhaps also a separate discourse.

⁸ The wide spectrum of subjects and methodological approaches, topical in current historical and geographic research, is reflected by the pattern of contributions presented in the publication CHODĚJOVSKÁ –

In the Czech lands, the subject of landscape was not totally unknown before 1989, while the line oriented towards nature (landscape) protection ran in parallel with a professional line from as early as the first half of the 20th century.⁹ We can, to this day, successfully build on the tradition of national history and geography – a field first promoted by Josef V. Šimák (1870–1941) and later, especially between the 1940s and 1960s, cultivated by František Roubík (1890–1974) and his Moravian contemporary, Ladislav Hosák (1898–1972). From among their followers, the one perhaps most worth mentioning is Zdeněk Boháč (1933–2001) who significantly connected the field of national history and geography with the history of settlement and enriched the given issue with many overlaps towards historical landscape and was, beside other things, the founder of the specialized magazine *Historická geografie* ([Historical Geography]; 1968).¹⁰

Historical landscape as a complexly conceived interdisciplinary subject came into more considerable play only as late as at the turn of the millennium, which was apparently, to a certain degree, linked with increased social demand.¹¹ In the developing society, the demand began taking on various forms covered by civic initiatives, while the continuity with the earlier period was mainly demonstrated by re-cultivation works, many of which are still under way mainly in the region of North-West Bohemia,¹² and the possibility of uncensored (and thus often critical) views on the development of landscape during the past forty years merely represented one of many aspects at work. Yet another and clearly far more significant aspect was the topicality of the subject – in the early post-1989 period, “the return to old values” was among the presumed ways leading to both a physical and a spiritual renaissance of society, and the very “landscape of our predecessors” began playing a fundamental role within the register of the values of the past which were to serve as exemplary.

The clash of ideals and the post-November reality, eventually resulting in disillusion and apathy in a significant part of the population over the years, is merely mentioned in this text

ŠIMŮNEK 2012; the range in the contents of the research of historical landscapes is discussed in KUPKA 2010 and, especially from the point of historical ecology, in TRPÁKOVÁ 2013.

⁹ Nature and landscape preservation in Czechoslovakia was, in many respects, on a rather high level. Landscape played a significant role in the work of many architects and urban planners – for example Ivan Vorel (garden and landscape architecture) and Miroslav Baše (comp. BAŠE 2009) – as well as an array of art and architecture historians (Mojmír Horyna, Dobroslav Líbal), rural architecture historians and ethnographers (Jiří Škabrada) and active fine artists and theoreticians (Miloš Šejn), to name just a few.

¹⁰ The most widespread publications were handbooks by F. Roubík, aimed at the wider public but conceived at a high professional level – see esp. ROUBÍK 1940; ROUBÍK 1941 (the first edition from the beginning of the war was followed by the second one, symptomatically issued shortly after the liberation of the country, in 1947); see also the continuously published, retrospective treatises in *Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností* [The Magazine of the Society of Friends of Antiques]. – On J. V. Šimák and the national history and geography of his period, see KÁBOVÁ 2013; on Z. Boháč, see the brief treatise with bibliography in BOHÁČ 2001, pp. 243–253.

¹¹ Let us here at least mention the miscellany from the 2010 conference, organized by Collegium Carolinum and the Rachel Carson Center (FÖRSTER – HERZBERG – ZÜCKERT 2013), which, among other things, reflects the fact that the interest in environment and landscape even became, at least in some regions, a catalyst of social changes which climaxed in November 1989. The new political situation then allowed for evaluation of the preceding development without any ideological burden (HÁJEK 2008); simultaneously, the landscape of the forcibly evacuated border areas (the result of the expulsion of its German population) – especially those which had been hermetically closed behind the iron curtain – was no longer either overlooked or “mythicized”. We can in this sense remind the activities of the Antikomplex movement, mainly its successful travelling exhibition and the several times re-published catalogue “Zmizené Sudety. Das verschwundene Sudetenland” ([The Vanished Sudetenland]; MIKŠÍČEK et al. 2007), as well as the book SPURNÝ 2006.

¹² The platform *Tvář naší země – krajina domova* [The Face of Our Country – The Landscape of Our Homeland] (www.prokrajinu.cz/uvod/) and its extensive publication and organization activities (namely the activities of and publications by Josef Vavroušek and Ivan Dejmal). – Re-cultivations conceived from the historical point were most recently summarized by Stanislav Štýs in the final section of the opening text to *Historický atlas měst* (HAM, [Historic Towns Atlas of the Czech republic]) HAM 26.

as a generally known fact and we in no way aspire at either interpreting or providing a detailed analysis of its causes. In the context of studying historical landscape, it is much more fundamental to answer the following questions – What in fact shall we conceive of that “original landscape” for which we strive so much to restore?¹³ And what does “restoring” it really mean (or can mean)? The examples from practice usually equal attempts at reviving something of the landscape’s once documentable (recordable) character. Perhaps an underlying aspect here is also the subconscious effort to at least partially compensate for the violent and frequently unfortunate landscape interventions dating to the latter half of the 20th century (especially the collectivization process and the redintegration of fields and their consequences, the environmental damage caused by the amelioration and the modification of watercourses, air pollution with all its adverse impacts and open-cast coal mining, but also the almost predatory urbanization and globalization in industrial and agricultural architecture, and so on),¹⁴ as well as for the contemporary lack of interest which very negatively affected the centennial heritage of cultural landscape. The landscape seen today is a landscape which has been “re-written” and layered, while the individual layers are imprints of various periods; and a landscape historian in this case faces as difficult a problem as an architecture historian or preservationist commissioned to “revitalize” a construction which had undergone a good deal of renovations and modernizations during the several centuries of its existence.

Studying historical landscape is not a matter of academism, as can be well-documented by long-term concept research as well as *ad hoc* compiled probes (serving as materials for expert opinions), which both respond to a particular demand of the bodies of state administration, self-governments and civic initiatives. The frequent reason for their existence is not only the need to have a fundamental document which would widely embrace the issue of an area worth protecting, but also the disputes over the tolerable degree of influencing the landscape character through construction and other activities. Yet another type of studies focusing on the landscape of the individual regions is that of the nature trails, which have also become available in virtual form during recent years.¹⁵ In some cases, historical landscape (or, respectively, one of the stages of historical landscapes) has turned into an important, vital and widely developed feature of regional identity. This is, moreover, not only linked with intense professional research and with popularizing its results but, simultaneously – and in the framework of the given possibilities –, with its practical application (i.e., revitalization of selected landscape features or, eventually, compositional wholes). An example of this is Waldstein’s and Schlick’s composed landscapes in the Jičín region, the cultural landscape of the territory of the Plasy monastery or in the Liechtenstein domain in the Moravian-Austrian border area.¹⁶ A significant role in reviving interest in the composed Baroque landscape and, as a result, in the landscape of the period of the Bohemian Baroque as such was played by the conference “*The Waldstein Loggia and Composed Baroque Landscape around Jičín*”, the overtones of which also included some rather topical respects (the threat of transforming some landscape features, historical buildings and their surroundings in the immediate vicinity of Jičín into an entertainment park by a private investor and at the same time seeking adequate use of the area of the Waldstein’s casino with its loggia).¹⁷ Professional research of a historical landscape (aimed at a certain period) or historical landscapes (in the sense of the development of a landscape in a selected area) can take several basic routes.

¹³ Even if the history of landscape is phased into several stages of development for working reasons, as studied based on the examples of selected regions, several consecutive “historical landscapes” can still be seen – comp., e.g., SEMOTANOVÁ 2006; CHRASTINA 2009; CHRASTINA 2012.

¹⁴ HÁJEK 2008; BLAŽEK et al. 2010; KAPLAN 2012.

¹⁵ E.g., the 2013 book and the related mobile application *Jeseníky: S Nebelem po Semmeringu* [The Ash Mountains: Through Semmering with Nebel].

¹⁶ Comp. the essential literature on the mentioned areas in the overview of research below.

¹⁷ BÍLKOVÁ – ŠOLTYSOVÁ 1997; HENDRYCH 1998; HENDRYCH – LÍČENÍKOVÁ 1998; SÁDLO – HÁJEK 2004.

One of the possibilities is to assume the view of a historian, and one of the disciplines which perceive historical landscape as the subject of elementary research is historical geography. The view of a historian is, to a considerable extent, limited by the period on which it primarily focuses, departing from the surviving historical sources. A longer time perspective is offered by archaeology, paleobotanics and geology.¹⁸ Historical geography draws the picture of historical landscape in a way influenced by both theoretical and methodological equipment which is intrinsic to this field. Here, too, different viewing of the given subject – either more geographical or more historical – can be found; they, however, do not exclude each other but instead make the interpretation of historical landscape more inspiring and manifold.

From a historian's perspective, historical landscape is every landscape of the past, while the adjective "historical" is given by the explored subject, i.e. the landscape existing in the past (in contrast to the contemporary landscape), by the surviving traces – the remains of landscape features which once co-formed (and today document) it and by the historical information tied to this landscape, for example by the influence of countless historical processes and events (including battles and other military conflicts, massive migrations and epidemics, activities of local leading personalities and so on). The meaning of the collocation "landscape as a historical monument" expresses a body of specific, identified relics of historical landscape which are important in the sense of preserving the cultural heritage of a given country. It must be noted that in this case, cultural landscape is meant as landscape co-transformed by humans.¹⁹

Historiographic and art-historical research of recent years has also shown that – equally as in other fields of exploring the past – the material and spiritual components cannot be separated and nor can studying mentalities be avoided. Also, in this case, we cannot resign an understanding of the spiritual dimension of the landscape. Taking a strictly positivist approach and merely describing a landscape as it "appears" on the basis of available historical sources preclude an understanding of the motives for forming the individual "landscapes" and being drawn closer to knowledge of the relationship between humans and nature in the past. Landscape of a particular period as a whole is the result of mutual influences in play between people and nature, while the closer to the present, the more apparent is the man's imprint, and certain places, conserved for various reasons (such as copying – "transferring" of Jerusalem, the grounds of the Holy graves, Loretos, the "sacral landscapes" of pilgrimage places, the chateaux complexes) are both spatial expressions and reflections of the mentality (and often also the vogue) of their time.

Topical subjects and methods of researching historical landscapes. The hitherto research into the historical landscape of the Czech Republic at least enables an outline of its main transformations. In the global framework and with the necessary degree of simplification, two main stages of landscape development and two basic tendencies in studying it can be formulated. The main stages are basically (1.) the period of pre-industrial (rural and later also urban) landscape, stretching from the Neolithic Era to approximately the mid-19th century, and (2.) the stage of industrialized landscape, concerning the period from the mid-19th century to the recent past or almost present (post-industrial landscape). Partial segmentation is determined by dominating trends and characteristic features of landscape development along with the "revolutionary" twists resulting in essential transformations in the structure of landscape features.²⁰

¹⁸ This is very clearly demonstrated by the diagram in SÁDLO – POKORNÝ – HÁJEK – DRESLEROVÁ – CÍLEK 2005, p. 233; on the approaches of various disciplines, also comp. here below.

¹⁹ SEMOTANOVÁ 2007.

²⁰ SEMOTANOVÁ 2007.

The two crucial tendencies, then, are (1.) researching (reconstructing) parts of cultural landscape (composed landscape complexes, cultivated cultural landscape, industrial landscape etc.), and (2.) studying (reconstructing) the historical use of particular areas (the historical land-use). The first of the suggested trends relates to a rather wide period from as early as the Middle Ages practically to the present while the latter concerns the period from the first half of the 19th century (which is purely technically given by the nature of the exploitable sources).²¹ In all cases, the descriptive stage (the sum of data relevant for the reconstruction, quantification and so on, departing from the results of research of many disciplines and from their mutual combinations and confrontations), is closely followed by the interpretative stage. At the same time, the spectrum of methods and approaches reflects the wide scale of scientific fields which participate in researching historical landscape or, respectively, the outcomes of which are relevant in the given sense. Historiography, historical geography, cartography and iconography as the basic disciplines are being joined by social history and history of mentalities (while historical memory / tradition, fixed both on concrete places in the landscape and on landscape in the wider sense, including the “landscapes of battles”, is exemplary in research of this kind), social geography (extinction of settlement structures – as a consequence of finite-resource mining, flowages as well as forced evacuations (expulsions); also, for example, research into regional awareness and historical and cultural regions), history of technology (constructions which distinctively change the landscape character – especially those linked with waterworks of all kinds, mining and, clearly, communications), historical climatology (long-term climatic trends and short-term fluctuations, floods, etc.), but also other natural sciences (for example, research of surface vegetation in various historical periods; natural conditions as one of the prerequisites for the development of settlement structures). The professional/methodical barriers dividing the individual approaches are to be bridged by various trans-disciplinary events – such as the already traditional January historical-geographical conferences (from 2005; for example “*Landscape as an Anthropological Textbook*”, 13 October 2012), which aim to present the possibilities of interpreting the concept of landscape from the viewpoint of various scientific fields (anthropology, archaeology, art history, geography, urbanism, environmental studies, landscape ecology but also geology and literary sciences and philosophy).²²

²¹ Topical subjects and research methods are reflected by the recently published survey treatises, synoptically: SEMOTANOVÁ – CHROMÝ 2012, for the Middle Ages, especially: ŠIMŮNEK 2009; ŠIMŮNEK 2012a; for the early modern times: SEMOTANOVÁ 2010a; CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2012; for the 19th century: VYSKOČIL 2012. The crucial website from the point of researching land-use is <http://www.lucc.cz/>; as far as concerns the printed publications which, in a representative way, reflect the topical methodology and the contribution of land-use studies, those worth mentioning are at least the book BIČÍK et al. 2010 and the series of representative probes into various landscape types (BIČÍK – KUPKOVÁ – ŠTYCH et al. 2012). – Historical landscape from the Middle Ages to the present is also considered in the most recent synoptic atlas works – in *Atlas krajiny* ([Landscape Atlas], capturing the present situation instead of a retrospective view; for the structure of the work, visit http://www.mzp.cz/cz/atlas_krajiny_cr) and see *Akademický atlas českých dějin* (AAČD [Academic Atlas of the History of the Czech Lands]); the category of landscape conservation and protection in the maps which form part of the edition series *Chráněná území ČR* [Protected Areas of the Czech Republic] and *Atlas krajiny ČR* [Atlas of the Landscape of the Czech Republic] is pursued in SLAVÍK – MACKOVČIN 2008.

²² The range of sources and the possibilities of their use from the point of historical geography are discussed in more detail in the second chapter. Other directions of employing basic work are outlined in MAUR 2006, while the wide framework of perceiving landscape as a “memorial medium” is reflected by the contributions in HLAVAČKA et al. 2011; landscape as a place of memory on the one hand and as a space either visually captured via stylized means (conforming to contemporary taste or a particular commission) or literarily described is discussed, with the help of many examples from Europe and the United States dating to between the 17th and 19th centuries, in SCHAMA 2007; MATOUŠEK 2006 at the same time exemplifies how many views can be taken in researching the “landscape of battles”; the extinction of a primeval cultural landscape, sacrificed in the name of momentary profit, is pursued by KLÁPŠTĚ 1994 on the example of the most tragic case of the Most region; the landscape of the forcibly evacuated regions was already mentioned above; on regionalism and regions, see, e.g., DVOŘÁK 2005 and SEMIAN 2012 (the latter is based on the example of Český ráj [the Bohemian Paradise]); from among technological

The authors of this treatise basically depart from the first of the above-mentioned tendencies, while the aim of their endeavour is to present the possibilities of utilizing the results of primarily historical and historical-geographical research. Three model areas are employed, as well as a methodology which combines generally established processes and takes a wide scale of historical, economic and landscape specifics into consideration, thus corresponding to the current state of knowledge and continuing in the topical trends in studying landscape via historical and historical-geographical means. The outline of this context, submitted below, therefore necessarily anticipates not only the individual case studies but also the overview of exploitable sources and the critical evaluation of their information value, which will be provided in close sequence.

The starting category is *cultural landscape* as a concept which can be used universally – for any type of landscape transformed by human activity in any period. This framework encompasses the fishpond landscape of the 15th and 16th centuries, the composed landscape of a Baroque pilgrimage place and the landscape (English-type) park as a part of a Neo-Classicist château or manor. The concept of cultural landscape is, however, also frequented in the explorations of the local industrial landscape or, respectively, the local landscape experiencing transformation period, as captured by three military surveys dating to between approximately 1760 and 1880 and by the stable register issued at about the same time (the latter quarter of the 19th century).²³

Historical-landscape studies can only marginally employ detailed typologies of cultural landscapes as they were issued for the landscapes of the present or very recent times; the multifaceted views on both the contemporary and past landscapes are reflected in the typology submitted by Jiří Löw and Jaroslav Novák. It departs from three basic angles of viewing (settlement landscape types; landscape types according to the land-use; landscape types according to their reliefs). The first one is further sub-divided chronologically and the two others typologically, the second of which, i.e. landscapes divided according to the land-use (“*the structure of using the areas along the axes of natural landscape – landscapes close to nature – landscapes conditioned and/or transformed by people*”), is the closest to the cultural landscapes of the past as conceived in this publication (also comp. the section “Model Areas” below).

constructions, it is necessary to mention water canals (DVOŘÁK 2012), from the group of waterworks, especially Lipno as one of the relatively old projects realized to a substantially more modest extent than originally planned (DVOŘÁK 2009) and thus representing one of the many unrealized projects in landscape; old roads/historical communications, which enjoy extraordinary attention, can be represented here by the results of the complex research of one of the oldest Central-European connections, the so-called Golden Road ([Zlatá stezka]; KUBŮ – ZAVŘEL 2007–2009); topical trends in researching historical communications are reflected by the contributions in the book MARTÍNEK – ŠMERAL 2012; also comp. the project *Výzkum historických cest v oblasti severozápadní Moravy a východních Čech* [Research of Historical Roads in the Area of North-West Moravia and East Bohemia] – www.historicke-cesty.cz/; the works by O. Brázdil and R. Kotyza are essential achievements in the field of historical climatology, while the most recent are the treatise BRÁZDIL – KOTYZA 2008, the comprehensive climatological compendium for the 16th-century Czech lands (BRÁZDIL – KOTYZA – DOBROVOLNÝ – ŘEZNÍČKOVÁ – VALÁŠEK 2013) and the synthesis BEHRINGER 2010; on floods, synoptically, see KOZÁK – STÁTNÍKOVÁ – MUNZAR – JANATA – HANČIL 2007; the asset of natural sciences is reflected by, for example, the treatises SÁDLO – GOJDA 1994 and MEDUNA – SÁDLO 2009 (while the latter convincingly documents the role of natural conditions in connection with the failed foundation concepts of the Bohemian kings in the landscape under the Bezděz mountain); an example of palynological analysis contributing to the reconstruction of the composition of trees approximately a millennium ago is in the study VRBOVÁ – DVORSKÁ – POKORNÝ 2001. – At the same time, all the above-mentioned publications provide an array of additional specialized literature on the individual subjects. – The overview of the first ten January historical-geographical conferences (held between 2005 and 2014) can be found in SEMOTANOVÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2014; the miscellany *Krajina jako antropologická čítanka* [The Landscape as Anthropological Reader] from the conference of the same name is in print.

²³ The latter type can be exemplified by the treatise devoted to the changing land-use in the area of South-Moravian vales during the 19th and 20th centuries (DEMEK – HAVLÍČEK – MACKOVČIN 2010).

Within this category, Löw and Novák define cultivated landscapes (Z), forest and agro-forest landscapes (M), forest landscapes (L), pond landscapes (R), landscapes of upland balds (H), and urbanized landscapes (U). The discussed model areas (Třeboň and Broumov regions and Prague suburbs) mainly correspond to types M, R and H (please note that all types are marked according to the category titles in Czech); the subjects of study are the secondary (sets of natural and either partially or completely human-affected dynamic systems) and tertiary (social and economic superstructures, conditioned by naturally primary – constant – and secondary components) landscape structures.²⁴

Landscape can be approached from various angles, either conforming to the professional focus of the research or to the aims of the research. This scale ranges from not only historiographic and archaeological to landscape views and to the aesthetics and the symbolism of landscape and its depictions in fine arts, but also to the standpoints of natural sciences.²⁵ Researching landscape, too, must understandably reflect its historical development and it must at the same time consider its two or, respectively, its twofold components: the natural and cultural ones, when neither one nor the other exist in Europe in their pure form and, at the same time, complement or directly condition each other. This is naturally nothing new – (historical cultural) landscape was already perceived in this way, for example, by Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918), regarded as the founder of modern French geography and, at the same time, the French geopolitical school. The same holds true for the concept “cultural landscape”, which is commonly used in the above-suggested sense (and accordingly also appears in the presented publication) while, if we want to draw nearer to the roots of this category, at least the 1925 classical definition forged by Carl O. Sauer (1889–1975) should be mentioned. Contemporary science also understands cultural landscape – still in agreement with Sauer – as a continuous process of the transformation of the natural landscape by human activity.²⁶

As stated above, the main line of the submitted publication is the historical-geographic approach focused on the development and transformations of cultural landscape from the 15th to the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. It is clear that overlaps with the fields of aesthetics and symbolism of landscape, as well as natural sciences (although only marginally in the latter case), are inevitable. The core of the information base is formed by written, cartographic and iconographic sources and, understandably, field research. Field research can naturally only be carried out in the landscape of today where, however, an attentive viewer does not miss many relics – constant landscape features – surviving from earlier periods. Our aim is to continuously capture these features. We are at the same time clearly aware that every historical landscape – a landscape of a certain period – is merely our construct. Historical landscape can only take on the forms which the available, critically evaluated and interpreted sources allow us to know. An attempt will also be made to describe how landscape was perceived by various predecessors – the reconstructible reality on the one hand and, on the

²⁴ The typology of mainly present-day cultural landscapes is pursued in, e.g., BOLTÍŽIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014, pp. 11–18, while historical overlap is provided in LÖW – NOVÁK 2008. – On landscape structures, see, e.g., BOLTÍŽIAR – OLAH 2009, pp. 12–36; BOLTÍŽIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014, pp. 18–23.

²⁵ Self-contained and synoptic spectrum of approaches to landscape is provided in nine thematic chapters in MUIR 1999; the recently published review publication on the Slovak territory, which is well-comparable with the Czech environment, introduces the subsequent general treatise on approaches to landscape and the possibilities and also methods of researching it (BOLTÍŽIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014, pp. 6–69).

²⁶ “The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result. Under the influence of the given culture, itself changing through time, the landscape undergoes development, passing through phases...” (quoted from MUIR 2012, p. 59). – General characteristics of today’s concept of the category “cultural landscape” can be found in, e.g., BOLTÍŽIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014, pp. 11–18.

other hand, the idealized views of it or, respectively, its representations in the form of landscape painting, cultural-landscape leaflets and picture maps do not “contradict” each other here when seeking the only “truth”, but necessarily represent our twofold (two-in-one) angle of viewing the given issue.²⁷

The concept “landscape” (*Landschaft* etc.; in Czech, it was initially the Germanism *landšoft*, commonplace in the 16th century) reaches as far back as to the late Middle Ages and has symptomatically been linked with its graphic depictions (some researchers opine that one of the crucial moments in this sense was the discovery of perspective). Schematic renderings of a landscape framework, composed as mosaics of iconic features (trees, hills, roads and the like) were gradually replaced by depictions which can in general be called landscape painting (and the beginnings of which can be, even in the Czech milieu, dated to the period around 1500). Viewing landscape/landscape framework of towns as spaces with a range of standard (standardized) components was not a novelty which could artificially be linked with the expansion of humanism; it is, however, undoubted that especially this period offers many representative and self-contained bodies of sources for reconstructing the perception of a landscape with architecture and its crucial elements.²⁸

The turn of the 15th and 16th centuries is simultaneously – and indeed not accidentally – a period characteristic of the first attempts at relatively complex reconstruction of old landscapes. This does not contradict the fact that we have a certain idea of how much earlier landscapes looked, and if insights into the prehistoric landscape, which are largely the domain of archaeology, are left aside, it is true that – especially in connection with the several waves of the colonizing process occurring between the 12th and 14th centuries – it is necessary to work here with the category of a landscape framework (natural conditions) as one of the crucial determinants.²⁹ The given period witnessed the first more fundamental human interventions into landscape when its exploitation (such as clear-cutting and founding fields) was accompanied by dominating it. The primary precondition of this was roads providing “accessibility” and “permeability”, and the result of the colonization was the network of settlement units and points of support, jointly expressing the power claims to particular areas. As symbols of landscape cultivation, there were also the monasteries, which often controlled vast parts of previously scarcely populated areas. Domination over the landscape is also embodied in the local as well as field names.

In researching either medieval landscape as a whole or its pinpointed (at least partially identifiable) parts, onomatology (toponymy) today progresses hand in hand with archaeology, which can be widely applied in studying various landscape segments (from vanished medieval villages to cultural landscape – ploughs – and farm-tracks of ancient roads) and which also continuously fuses with the exploration of written sources. In an ideal case, the combination of the two approaches can result in a fertile probe into the mentality of medieval people and their perception of the space they inhabited. The intricacy and ambiguousness of this task are proved by the eternal disputes over interpreting a minute notice uttered about a journey from Prague through Osek to the Bechyně region by the chronicler Cosmas. The explorations of a landscape framework as viewed by medieval people repeatedly employed the methods of

²⁷ On this issue, as discussed on the basis of material of a Bohemian character dating to the period between the 17th and 18th centuries, see ŠIMŮNEK 2012; ŠIMŮNEK 2014; ŠIMŮNEK 2015; ŠIMŮNEK 2015a. Generally on the concept of the “archaeology of viewing”, see ROECK 2004, esp. the chapter *Das Kunstwerk in der Welt*, where see pp. 253–256, specifically on urban landscape in the Czech lands, see CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2014.

²⁸ COSGROVE 1985; briefly, SCHAMA 2007, pp. 8–9. – On the image of landscape in the Bohemian book illumination during the Luxembourg era, see PEŠINA 1965; on the beginnings of landscape painting, see PEŠINA – MENCLOVÁ 1953; the issue in relation to urban panoramas is pursued in JACOB 1982, pp. 13–36; on the landscape framework in early modern-time urban vistas, see FUSS 2004.

²⁹ As summarized by KLÁPŠTĚ 2012.

historical semantics, while spatial relations were, in the main, the focus of researching earlier periods and, in the case of the late Middle Ages, Josef Macek tried to deduce his conclusions on transforming an aesthetic perception from the contemporary vocabulary. Yet another prospective way seems to be exploring legal bonds tied to particular areas and, especially, the specified features of these (e.g., forests, watercourses, water surfaces, and so on).³⁰

The possibilities (as well as insurmountable limits) of understanding the appearance of old landscape were suggested by the 1990s' attempt at reconstructing the development of the Netolice region cultural landscape. This old settlement enclave includes a 16th-century game preserve spanning the area of several villages and adjoining the complex of the Kratochvíle [Pastime] château – perhaps the most illustrious import of Italian Renaissance villa into the Czech environment.³¹ The reconstruction clearly showed that broadening the spectrum of exploitable sources from the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, when written documents were accompanied by those of cartographic and iconographic natures, can mean a considerable turning point in discovering or, respectively, grasping cultural landscape. We necessarily feel that especially visual sources can bring a “real” insight into a landscape, the reconstruction of which through other types of sources can only be more or less hypothetical. The value of utterance of iconographic sources is indeed extraordinary; but it cannot be forgotten that we work here with an amalgam of (concrete) reality and (general) ideals instead of “ancient panoramic photographs”. The apparent detriment of the purely documentary value is, at the same time, very nicely compensated by the documented ideal, i.e. how cultural landscape should have been viewed; an ideal which in individual cases could retrospectively serve as a model worth imitating. This concerns both individual representations and complete series and albums with views of cultural landscape, as are mainly known from the 17th and 18th centuries. Moreover, features of an idealized image of cultural landscape can, in an almost essential form, be found in the picture maps of various estates.³² A (“commonplace”) cultural landscape has, nevertheless, come into focus only recently, while representative composed complexes of both profane and sacral character have been attracting attention for decades. The primary reason was the best chance of conserving at least the torsos of outstanding (and, in part, also historically preserved) wholes and also the mere fact that the significance of the contemporary documentation (plans, maps, prints, texts), providing ideal conditions for research and reconstruction, is directly proportional to the importance they once had.

Profane complexes. The concept of the above-mentioned Renaissance grounds of the Kratochvíle château (one of the crucial visual sources in this case is, symptomatically, the

³⁰ MJČ; OLIVOVÁ-NEZBEDOVÁ et al. 1995; the extent to which local names can testify to the character of individual landscapes is documented in SPERLING 2007 on the example of trees (and the relevant derived toponyms). – The roads existing from the Middle Ages to the 19th century are discussed in an array of literature; besides the above-mentioned publication on the Golden Road as an extremely significant communication researched in an exemplary manner, we can also mention the probe which maps out the fates of a substantially less known Jívov road, where the sometimes almost six-meter wide farm-tracks is a reminder of one of the rather frequently surviving features of medieval landscapes (BOLINA 2004); on the interpretation of Osek mountain, see, most recently, BOLINA – KLIMEK 2010 (where also see the review of the preceding discussions). – The analysis of spatial relations via the method of historical semantics is synoptically discussed in KLIMEK 2014, pp. 103–145; on the perception of the beauty of nature, see MACEK 1997 (although this otherwise methodically innovative probe is to a certain extent burdened by a priori assumptions determining the selection and interpretation of the sources and documents). – A publication abounding in material which allows for the research of the legal relations to waters is KULT 2014 (the time span of the first volume of the work, originally planned as seven volumes only to the White-Mountain period, ends in the mid-13th century).

³¹ BENEŠ – STEJSKAL – OUBODA 1998; BŮŽEK – JAKUBEC 2012.

³² ŠIMŮNEK 2012; ŠIMŮNEK 2014; ŠIMŮNEK 2015; ŠIMŮNEK 2015a. – The picture map of the Třeboň estates (1684) represents one of the crucial sources in the section devoted to the Třeboň cultural landscape (pp. 27–38).

large-dimensional oil painting by Jindřich de Veerle, 1686) basically represents an unrivalled example in the Czech lands, which maybe only the somehow earlier composition of the Star Summer Palace [Letohrádek Hvězda], commissioned by the Austrian Archduke Ferdinand II (1529–1595), could equal.³³ Game preserves and hunting grounds inhabited by various architectures, however, naturally also existed in the Middle Ages – for example, the Royal Game Preserve [Královská obora] in Prague or the so-called Premyslid hunting forest –, and they also formed a rather standard part of noble estates. Their popularity outlasted centuries, with the most memorable composed complexes of this kind being the Valdštejnsko enclosure of Franz Ernest Wallenstein (from the 1720s) and the hunting lodges Ohrada [Enclosure] of Adam Franz of Schwarzenberg (from between 1708 and 1713) and Jemčina, built by Johann Rudolf Czernin (1757–1845).³⁴

If we focus on Baroque landscape compositions, it can be said that one of its earliest surviving examples is the Jičín region, commissioned by Albrecht of Waldstein (1583–1634). His architects of Italian origin, departing from the relief of the central town and from their experience gained in developing Italian Renaissance and early-Baroque towns, filled it with minute constructions and landscape elements. The result was a unique region where the town and its surroundings were interconnected by precise geometric relations, and the landscape around Jičín thus became a rather unprecedented exception in the Czech lands in the 1630s. The care of this landscape composition, however, faded with the death of its ideological leader.³⁵ And if Waldstein was mainly interested in the area north of Jičín, the subsequent owners of the estate looked southward. The concept of Franz Joseph Schlick (1656–1740) and his wife was a very sensitive intervention into the local landscape, enriching it not only with the aesthetic but, significantly, also a spiritual dimension (with the full awareness of the need to employ the landscape economically, as proved by the newly built Baroque granaries in Vokšice and Střevač). The small sacral architectures by the circle of the workshop of Jean Baptiste Mathey, situated on selected elevated points of the articulated landscape, then underlined the landscape cross-shaped composition, with the arms of the cross intersecting in the Loretto chapel on the hill of the same name on the Veliš ridge.³⁶

Schlick's composed landscape organically fused profane and sacral elements. It was the embodiment of proud self-representation of its creator – the estate's owner – and the declaration of his devoutness, and it simultaneously referred to his activities being carried out with "the care of a good husband-man". The combination of these aspects is also largely characteristic of many other examples of composed Baroque landscapes. If we moreover recall the name of Franz Anton Sporck (1662–1738) and the phenomenon of graphic renderings of private estates (while Sporck's activities rank among the most renowned in the

³³ BŮŽEK – JAKUBEC 2012; on Veerle's prospect, see OURODOVÁ – HRONKOVÁ 2011a (where also find the colour reproduction of the whole painting). – On Hvězda, see, most recently, BAŽANT – BAŽANTOVÁ 2013.

³⁴ On the Valdštejnsko enclosure, see ŠIMÁK 1930, pp. 586–594; on Ohrada, see IVANEGA 2011; on Jemčina, see ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ 2014, pp. 110–142. Game preserves viewed in a more general framework are mentioned in SEDLÁČKOVÁ 2005.

³⁵ BÍLKOVÁ – ŠOLTYSOVÁ 1997; HENDRYCH – LÍČENÍKOVÁ 1998; HÁJEK 2003; HAM 18; KLIPCOVÁ – ULÍČNÝ 2011; many outcomes resulted from the grant project *Architektura, urbanismus a krajinná tvorba frýdlantského panství Albrechta z Valdštejna (1621–1634)* [Architecture, Urbanism and Landscape Development of the Frýdlant Estates of Albrecht of Waldstein], realized between 2009 and 2013 and headed by Petr Uličný (comp. www.vevodstvi.cz/, where also see the survey of publications).

³⁶ GOTTLIEB 2001; HÁJEK 2003; CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2009 (the latter treatise at the same time represents an example of the fusion of three types of source documentation – maps and plans, vistas and written documentation in the form of comprehensive inventories from the fidei-commissum files); SOUKUP – NECHVÁTAL 2010; RYCHNOVÁ 2010; RYCHNOVÁ 2012; ŠPERK 2015. Versatile research of the two above-mentioned landscape concepts of the Jičín region served as a basis for projects focused on urban planning and land-use (HERMOVÁ – POLKOVÁ – WATZKO 2007).

Czech lands in this respect), we fully realize the role which composed landscape once played in aristocratic self-reflection. Although the legendary couple of Sporck's complexes – Lysá nad Labem and Kuks – is definitely outstanding, others, somehow hiding in their shadow (such as Vysoká and Valkeřice), are no less remarkable. They jointly appeared in the visually rich and celebratory treatise by Stillenau (1715, 1720) and most of them had shortly before become part of a work by Vogt (1712), while the latter author ranked among the thankful subjects of Sporck's donating activities.³⁷

As far as the proud presentation of one's own estates is concerned, Franz Anton Sporck in his efforts clearly shared the tendencies characteristic of the contemporary elite – good examples being the series of prints displaying the estates of the Lobkowitz and Liechtenstein families and the panoramic prospects of the Bohemian estates owned by Duchess Sibylle Auguste of Saxe-Lauenburg – i.e. representations which all also date to the first quarter of the 18th century. The Delsenbach's album of renderings of the Liechtenstein estates, created for Anton Florian of Liechtenstein (1656–1721) and only half-published in print, shows, among other things, which noble estates seemed adequate for presenting from the contemporary view. In no way did this only concern the highly representative composed wholes of Mikulov – Valtice – Lednice, which have received well-deserved attention during the recent decades, but also towns and cultural landscapes housing seemingly marginal complexes (e.g., stone pits). The close relation between representative architecture and landscape (or, eventually, park or garden) compositions on the one hand and their graphic images on the other hand was inseparable. An illustrious example of this is the Baroque Troja Château, designed as a folly for Wenceslas Adalbert of Sternberg by Jean Baptiste Mathey between 1679 and 1685. In the discussed context, it is simultaneously an exceptionally representative suburban villa surrounded by a vast park and a cultural landscape of agricultural character (vineyard). And there is finally the album of the Litvínov manufactory – an early example of the proud presentation of a new type of cultural landscape (which, in the wider sense of the word, reflects the development of Litvínov as a somehow “model” town). The series of copper engravings in question was commissioned by Johann Joseph of Wallenstein and delivered by Johann Joseph Dietzler (1694–1744) in 1728. It must be noted that here, the artist anticipated the vogue of industrial albums which was to come to the fore a century later, and it is rather symptomatic that in the latter case, the styling of the landscape framework was usually also subordinated to the required tone: the almost bucolic motifs or garden compositions evoking an idyll (even) in the shadow of factory chimneys mingled with dispatched loaded wagons as signs of bustling business (and thus also production) activity.³⁸

³⁷ VOGT 1712, pp. 39–52; STILLENAU 1720, pp. 32–65; on Sporck's personality and his activities in the field of patronage, synoptically, see PREISS 2003; on the vista *Herrschaft Lysa* and Vogt's accompanying text as a historical source, see SEMOTANOVÁ 2007a; on Kuks and its surroundings, see, e.g., KAŠE – KOTLÍK 1999; VAŇURA 2007; HENDRYCH 2008; AAČD, pp. 168–172, map sheet III.8; many professional texts as well as iconographic and cartographic materials are concentrated at <http://www.kuks.estranky.cz/>; on Vysoká, see GRIM 1937.

³⁸ The contemporary context within which the graphic representations of the discussed type originated was explored in VÖLKEL 2001, esp. on pp. 97–186. – On Delsenbach's prospects of the Liechtenstein estates, see LORENZ 2013; on the Mikulov – Valtice – Lednice region, see KORDIOVSKÝ 1998; RIGASOVÁ 2006; RIGASOVÁ 2006a; RIGASOVÁ 2006b; KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ 2010; HAM 25. – On Sockh's prospects of the Bohemian estates in the property of Duchess Sibylle Auguste, see ŠIMŮNEK 2014; it is rather symptomatic that the residential town of Ostrov, despite being a rural location, can pride itself on an extraordinary collection of iconographic sources dating to the era of the Baden margraves and also their predecessors, the Saxe-Lauenburg dukes (almost all of them are reproduced in the book ZEMAN et al. 2001). – On Troja, see, e.g., HORYNA 2000. – On the album of the Wallenstein manufactory in Litvínov, see DIETZLER 1728; HRBEK 2013, pp. 266–278.

A remarkable example of fusing composed Baroque landscape and the grounds of a Neo-Classical château with an adjoining landscape park are Nové Dvory and Kačina (approximately 1.5 kilometres distance apart). They were initially closely linked with the Věžník family of Věžník (see the Baroque composition of Nové Dvory, proudly immortalized, for example, by the large-dimensional oil painting from c. 1700) and, mainly, with the Czernins of Chudenice. The members of this family, and especially Johann Rudolf Czernin, mentioned above in connection with Jemčina, manifested their fervour for composed landscapes in many of their estates (from the hitherto not mentioned, for example Chudenice, Petrohrad and Krásný Dvůr). The global as well as specific aspects of the Czernin landscapes inhabited by both profane and sacral architecture (from the 18th and mainly 19th centuries) have recently become subjects of thorough analysis. From among the Neo-Classical complexes – cultural landscapes which have received attention, there are also the Buquyo's Nové Hradky and Rožmberk, and Slatiňany of the Auersperg family.³⁹

Sacral complexes. A purely sacral pendant to the grounds adjoining residences of the château type is the composed landscape of pilgrimage places, which also includes pilgrimage roads leading to them, fringed by small chapels and often stretching many kilometres. We can speak about the composed landscape of pilgrimage places as early as from the Middle Ages, and especially in the case of the holy tombs, because landscape framework was very significant in the overall concept of *imitatio* (an approximate idea of this can merely be seen in isolated examples, such as the complex of the Holy Sepulchre in the Upper-Lusatian Zgorzelec [G. Görlitz]). In the case of other pilgrimage places, maybe even those with medieval tradition, we can depend on only cursory remarks about the routes via which the pilgrims were arriving (and, occasionally, we also have information about “rival” pilgrimage places) and, for the subsequent period, on the Baroque documentation (as exemplified by the South-Bohemian Kájov). A supreme accomplishment in the field of sacral Baroque landscape composed as *imitatio* was, for instance, the Řimov complex – the work of a rather self-contained concept, but very long in realization (from the 1650s to the first quarter of the 18th century) – and similarly, Wambierzyce [G. Albenorf] in the former Klodzko County, frequented by pilgrims from the Czech lands. Varying degrees of incorporation into landscape are demonstrated by the Loretto chapels (which were also primarily built as *imitatio*).⁴⁰

³⁹ On Nové Dvory and Kačina, synoptically, see LIPSKÝ – ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ – WEBER et al. 2011; on the issue viewed from the point of historical ecology, see TRPÁKOVÁ 2013, pp. 189–201; on the composed landscapes of the Czernins of Chudenice, see, synoptically, ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ 2014; let's just add that also one of the few surviving Baroque picture maps of estates – the map Lnáře 1698 – is linked with the Chudenice Czernins (ŠIMŮNEK 2015a); on Nové Hradky, see PAVLÁTOVÁ – EHRlich 2010; KRUMMHOLZ 2012; KRUMMHOLZ – IVANEGA – TRNKOVÁ 2012; currently, also see the project *Obnova buquoyské kulturní krajiny: Záchrana movitého kulturního dědictví jako báze pro obnovu paměti místa a kulturní identity* [Revitalization of the Buquoy Cultural Landscape: The Rescue of the Moveable Cultural Heritage as the Basis for Restoring the Memory of the Site and the Cultural Identity] – www.buquoyskakrajina.cz, where also find the survey of the hitherto publication activity; on Rožmberk, see IVANEGA – ŠÁMAL – TRNKOVÁ 2013; on Slatiňany, see STEHLÍKOVÁ – ŠTĚPÁN 2014.

⁴⁰ On the phenomenon of medieval pilgrimage, viewed from many aspects, see the monothematic anthology DOLEŽAL – KÜHNE 2006. – On the Holy Sepulchre in Zgorzelec, see ROTH 2003. – A well-known example of a 1460s' goal of pilgrimages, which was not only officially unauthorized but also suppressed by the Church, was a stone bearing the traces of St Wolfgang, situated near the Kájov pilgrimage place, while the latter site began enjoying considerable rise in fame at that time (ŠIMŮNEK 2013, p. 74); the Baroque Kájov, including the pilgrimage road leading from the town of Český Krumlov and the landscape of the pilgrimage place, received thorough attention from Z. Prokopová (on the pilgrimage road, see PROKOPOVÁ 2000; synoptically, PROKOPOVÁ 2013). – On Řimov, see ROYT 1995; KOVÁŘ 1998. – On the Loretto chapels, see BUKOVSKÝ 2000.

A detailed analysis of the landscape of a pilgrimage place – in close spatial relation to a town and thence also initiated – recently focused on Křížový vrch [The Hill of the True Cross] near Český Krumlov (the pilgrimage road to the top housing an octagonal chapel of the Virgin of Sorrows and the True Cross from 1710). From the (at least in part) surviving pilgrimage roads, the routes of which can be precisely reconstructed from historical sources (mainly maps, but also their descriptions – itineraries or, eventually, descriptions of pilgrimage chapels), attention has recently been paid several times mainly to the pilgrimage roads leading from Prague to north-east, to Stará Boleslav, and west, to Hájek, the subject of study being composed landscapes of the legendary pilgrimage places – Svatá Hora [The Holy Hill], Hejnice and the above mentioned Wambierzyce – as well as many less well-known but locally significant places (e.g., Lomec). It is, characteristically, the sacral centres of often solely local importance, which become the bearers of local identities and represent a distinct and traditional component of the domestic landscape even for atheists and followers of other religions.⁴¹

The urbanization process and the industrialized cultural landscape. Historical landscape of early modern times was at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries gradually replaced by industrialized (cultural) landscape which was, in turn, substituted by the so-called post-industrial landscape in most European regions, including the Czech lands. Up to the middle of the 19th century, people largely cooperated with nature, being incapable of substantially transforming it by their activity. The proto-industrial businesses had only local significance from the point of their impact on landscape, although their existence remains part of the identity of many regions to this day. The most significant phenomena in the landscape of the latter half of the 18th century were the transformation of ploughs and the emergence of new villages as the results of comassation and raabisation. A significant phenomenon of the Enlightenment, which can be viewed as a transition period from the point of landscape development, was the reinforced, so-called imperial roads, the construction of which affected all regions throughout the Czech lands. They are, moreover, excellently documented by cartographic sources.

The swift arrival of the industrial revolution, accompanied by vast interventions in the landscape, then launched a new, almost revolutionary stage of landscape development after many centuries.⁴² The construction of railways, densification of road networks, progressive mining of mineral resources, mainly black and brown coal, new waterworks, ameliorations and the urbanization process have jointly left substantial and permanent traces of human activity on the landscape. North-West and North Bohemia and North Moravia became characteristic of quickly developing industrial, heavily urbanized areas having relations to a new type of agricultural countryside, the function of which was influenced by industrial production. A new type of housing development was the blue-collar periphery settlements.⁴³

⁴¹ On Český Krumlov – Křížový vrch, see GAŽI – HANSOVÁ 2012. – The pilgrimage roads to both Stará Boleslav and Hájek have repeatedly earned attention of professional literature (e.g., DUCREUX 1997), most recently, KURANDA 2009; AAČD, pp. 228–229, map sheet III.38 (Stará Boleslav); PAŘÍZKOVÁ 2010 (Hájek). – On Svatá Hora, see HOLUBOVÁ 2006; the example of the pilgrimage road from Březnice to Svatá Hora documents an indirect share of even rather distant famed pilgrimage places in the individual concepts of sacred landscapes (ŠTVERÁKOVÁ 2006). – On Hejnice, see SVOBODA 2008. – On Vamberžice, see SEMOTANOVÁ 2011; AAČD, p. 230, map sheet III.39. – On Lomec, see STUHLÁ 2005.

⁴² The industrialization process has been followed on a long-term basis by the project *Industriální stopy* [Traces of Industry], pursued by the Research Centre of Industrial Heritage of the Faculty of Architecture, Czech Technical University in Prague; within the framework of the project, *Industriální topografie České republiky* [Industrial Topography of the Czech Republic] – <http://ycpd.cvut.cz/industrialni-topografie/> – is developed.

⁴³ JEMELKA 2011; JEMELKA 2012; VYSKOČIL 2012a; NOVOTNÝ 2014.

From the late 18th century (England) or, respectively, from the 19th century (continental Europe), Europe experienced an apparent process of modern-era urbanization.⁴⁴ The Czech lands were in part already affected by the urbanization process by around 1830, but especially in the latter half of the 19th century and in the early 20th century, i.e. in the period of enormous upswing of industry, transportation and agricultural development. The hitherto cohesive settlement system began disintegrating into two parts – northern and southern –, each developing along the lines of its own dynamics. The southern, predominantly agricultural areas of the Czech lands were not substantially influenced by urbanization, and if so, its impact was negative, having the form of depopulation and moving to industrial areas.⁴⁵

Prague, Brno, North-West and North Bohemia, North Moravia and Czech Silesia concentrated crucial industrial sectors (mining, mechanical engineering, metallurgy, textile industry and so on), and the population density in towns and cities was on the rise. The number of towns with more than 10,000 and, prior to the First World War, 25,000 residents increased, but their number exceeded 100,000 only in Prague and Brno. In the beginning, the towns would employ their original territory, mainly the most accessible locations close to the urban centre and the inner non-developed locations (inner peripheries) – but they soon expanded into the spaces of the demolished fortifications, which were perceived as a barrier obstructing further development, as well as to the suburban landscape.

The development of towns during the industrial era and the process of the modern-era urbanization, which has been ongoing in several stages to the present, were considerably shaping the landscape of the Czech lands especially from the latter half of the 19th century. The influx of people to the towns intensified, while the towns themselves first mainly grew within their administrative borders and, during the 20th century, developed extensive urbanized enclaves of various purposes and inhabited by various types of built-up areas. Peripheral villages with their farmsteads and craftsmanship and business backgrounds were turning to either industrial or white-collar suburbs, and the thus urbanized landscape became interconnected by railways and new roads. Urbanization formed an integral part of the overall transformation of the local society, and was not only characterized by an increasingly dense urban population and the changes in its social pattern and inclinations but also by the development of the inner space of the towns, their closest surroundings and, subsequently, the entire settlement structure and communication and technological infrastructure. The first half of the 20th century was marked by systematic electrification of the countryside, conditioned by the development of distribution and hi-tension networks, intense amelioration and ongoing regulation of watercourses. The mountain foraging territories developed sheep-dairy farming as an analogy of Alpine farmsteads.

The image of historical landscape during the post-Second World War period was heavily affected by the expulsion of population from the borderland and its often not-so-successful re-colonization, while vast areas were moreover transformed into military zones. These regions in consequence progressed in total isolation. Another significant phenomenon was the so-called collectivization, resulting in the redintegration of land. This, among other things, meant ploughing away the field boundaries, effacing field tracks and establishing large agricultural

⁴⁴ The issue of urbanization during the 19th and 20th centuries has hitherto been pursued in numerous professional publications, while the less recent but still topical works include TEUTEBERG 1983; MATZERATH 1984; VANCE 1990; KIEß 1991, while the more recent ones are, e.g., SOUTHALL 2000; OUŘEDNÍČEK 2001; HORSKÁ – MAUR – MUSIL 2002; MUSIL 2003; SÝKORA 2002; HNILIČKA 2005; SEMOTANOVÁ 2010. Many aspects of the landscape urbanization process have been continuously considered by textual, map and iconographic sections of the individual volumes of the HAM edition, equally as it is the case of the atlas series published in other European countries (from the older ones, see the programmatic treatise SIMMS – OPLL 1997; currently, see EHBRECHT 2013; GEARTY – STRACKE – CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2015; <http://www.staedtegeschichte.de/portal/staedteatlanten/karte.html>).

⁴⁵ For the view of a historian, comp. LÁNÍK 1986; LÁNÍK 1989.

cooperatives. The given period thus naturally brought along changes in the settlement structure and the formation of vast industrial agglomerations. In general, everything steadily headed towards urban civilization; from the 1960s, towns and cities expanded in an unprecedented way, especially due to new prefabricated housing estates, and the rural settlements suffered from the introduction of the system of the so-called centralized villages.⁴⁶ Yet other interventions to the landscape relief were new highways, artificial water reservoirs and lakes and entire waterworks. The main danger to the contemporary landscape was the “reconstructed” Czechoslovak industry, re-oriented on coal mining, metallurgy and heavy engineering. Open-cast mining, mainly in the North-Bohemian brown-coal district where entire hills and hillsides and ancient settlements were wiped off and abandoned mines flooded, has turned part of the local landscape into wasteland, the re-cultivation of which today requires extraordinary efforts and expense. The extent and scale of forging most of the above-mentioned negative regulations resulted in serious instability of the ecological system throughout the region, and were naturally to its detriment from the aesthetic aspect.⁴⁷

Components of cultural landscape. The surviving written and iconographic sources document that the cultural landscape was already from the Middle Ages – mainly in the places highly exposed both from the communication aspect (along the roads and especially at the crossroads) and the aspect of perspectives (knolls and hills) – scattered with micro-architecture in the form of wayside crosses (calvaries), columns, wooden and stone crosses, sculptures of saints, Marian and Holy Trinity columns, niche chapels and the like. The landscape of today holds relics of the given categories dating to the long time period of approximately five hundred years (from the 15th to 19th centuries), while the earliest and most sparse are late-Gothic calvaries and the most frequent and most recent are the still plentiful crosses from the mid-19th century. Stone crosses can be found in the landscape to a much lesser (but still considerable) extent and other stone elements of memorial and legal character are even rarer.⁴⁸ These features are, first of all, the expressions of the contemporary religiosity, but at the same time once represented significant points of orientation, and today can indicate vanished settlements or, more often, already non-existent communications.

Minute sacral architecture is one of the components of the cultural landscape which have played a more or less constant role throughout the centuries and their only aspect liable to change was their exterior (as a result of individual artistic or, eventually, craftsmanship

⁴⁶ CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2013.

⁴⁷ HÁJEK 2008 (basic trends in landscape development during the 20th century); the point of employed sources and their interpretation is, innovatively, provided in DEJMALOVÁ et al. 2008; SPURNÝ 2006; MIKŠÍČEK et al. 2007 (expulsion of the Germans from the border areas); on the Socialist landscape transformation after the Soviet model, see the project *Stalinský plán přetvoření přírody v Československu (1948–1964)* [Stalin's Plan of Transforming Nature in Czechoslovakia], which is currently being solved by a team headed by Doubravka Olšáková (OLŠÁKOVÁ et al. 2015); TRPÁKOVÁ 2013, pp. 138–167 (the Sokolov region as an example of industrial and later gradually re-cultivated landscape); ŠTÝS – BÍZKOVÁ – RITSCHELOVÁ 2014 (re-cultivation in the Most basin). – On the progressing urbanization and its forms, see, most recently, the project *Panelová sídliště v České republice jako součást městského životního prostředí* [Prefab Housing Developments in the Czech Republic as Part of the Urban Environment] – <http://www.panelaci.cz/>.

⁴⁸ Minute sacral architecture is documented in many regional summary works (from the more extensive editorial achievements, it is worth mentioning the edition *Paměť krajiny* [Landscape Memory] by Irena Bukačová and Jiří Fák, which records minute relics in the Plzeň region); on the level of regions, inventories of stone and brick wayside crosses or, calvaries, in South Bohemia are available (PALOUŠOVÁ 2009; HÁJEK 2009). – On crosses in the landscape as both memorial and legal relics, see URFUS – VÍT – WIESER et al. 2001; BĚLOHRADSKÝ – BELISOVÁ – BORIL et al. 2013. – On the significance of micro-architecture, minute sacral relics/monuments and landscape features, see, e.g., BUKAČOVÁ – HÁJEK 2001; KYSELKA 2001; SUCHÁNEK 2006.

trends). There are many more analogical components – such as connections of all kinds, from the medieval local to the 18th-century state roads, and the same naturally holds for bridges surviving from the Middle Ages and Baroque to nowadays. The suggested heterogeneity of various types or categories of connections, which were in use either from the Middle Ages for many following centuries or, on the contrary, only temporarily, and on both local and supra-regional scale and so on, is perhaps one of the reasons why there is still lacking a synthesis of the history of roads in our country, although certain attempts in this direction appeared prior to the Second World War. Moreover, it is rather symptomatic that it was much more often amateurs instead of professionals who dared to pursue such syntheses. One of the essential issues here is, for example, how to delineate the individual roads, how to perceive their routes, their “beginnings” and their “ends”, and how to mark them (while the latter is an utterly artificial feature – with few exceptions, roads in the past did not have specific names and were called after larger towns to where they headed, similarly as was usually the case of town gates). Another set of methodological pitfalls comes with interpreting old maps and, finally, with confronting the acquired data with the results of field research (i.e., the eventual surviving relics). Today’s people also inseparably link roads with alleys, which many times indicated vanishing or already vanished roads – although it must be noted that alleys fringing roads are a relatively recent feature (mostly originating from the latter half of the 18th century).⁴⁹

Another example is borders – one of the significant expressions of “seizing” landscape (via demarcation or, eventually, plotting). From the Middle Ages, borders were expressions of a multi-layered hierarchy, from land borders to the borderlines of particular forests, meadows and pastures. All borderland types once had their fixed, whether natural or artificial, points which determined them. The routes of the historical borders are a rewarding topic of research – because comparing and combining the information provided by written and cartographic sources and the situation surviving in the field frequently almost equals an unfolding detective story. To those who study historical landscapes, borders are essential as one of the tools of seizing and dominating these landscapes, and their importance increases with the surviving terrain relics and minute monuments (landmarks, milestones). A wider and, in part, already figurative meaning, then, can be ascribed to “imaginary” borders – since “delineating space” as such was a ritual and symbolical phenomenon. This is not only the case of cemeteries, symbolic fences and ditches surrounding particular dwellings and villages and so on, but also commonplace land or forest borders. These, too, were tied to specific traditions (walks along borders, thrashings “by way of a reminder”, feasts or toasts “on the border”), in some cases even bearing “magic” subtext (distinctively, for example, the boundary oaths with ordeal connotations).

⁴⁹ ROUBÍK 1938; the author later published probes approximately delineated by the territories of regions – for example South Bohemia (ROUBÍK 1971; ROUBÍK 1972); the rather mechanical division of the main connections and labelling them by names in the form of adjectives – such as *mostecká* ([Most]; VÁVRA 1979), *žitavská* ([Žitava, G. Zittau]; VÁVRA 1974), *srbská* ([Serbian]; VÁVRA 1978), *polská* ([Polish]; VÁVRA 1972), *haberská* ([Habry]; VÁVRA 1969), *trstenická* ([Trstenice]; VÁVRA 1971) and *uherská* ([Hungarian]; VÁVRA 1968) – have met with considerable doubts, although no real and generally acceptable alternative is available; treatises on communications have received much space in the miscellany *Staré stezky* [Old Roads], where the majority of contributions is, however, devoted to earlier periods; the exception is, e.g., ADAM 2004 (a treatise focusing on the value of utterance provided by the Ist military survey); on the information value of military surveys and cartographic sources, exploitable in the reconstruction of old connections, see ADAM 2012; information jointly provided by written and cartographic sources and sources of field research are fully employed by the treatise devoted to the so-called Gypsy road [Cikánská cesta] from Budějovice to Austria (KOVÁŘ 2013); on alleys in connection with the character of landscape, see SEDLÁČKOVÁ 2005. – The submitted publication also mentions many other works elsewhere (esp. KUBŮ – ZAVŘEL 2007–2009; MARTÍNEK – ŠMERAL 2012).

For centuries, micro-regional boundaries were a matter of tradition – i.e., were based on terrain demarcation and on the knowledge of the local people who, if needed, provided their own testimonies about the boundaries' positions. The ceremonials commonplace in the 16th century (and, in part, perhaps also earlier) were described by Jakub Menšík of Menštejn in his work of 1600, entitled *O mezích, hranicích, soudu a rozepři mezní* [On Boundaries, Borders, and the Trial and the Border Dispute]. Finally, the subject of boundaries is also remarkable due to its close links to other circles of issues which are continuously faced in researching the historical landscape – such as orientation in the field and the capability of reconstructing this phenomenon, equally as the fact that it was disputes over the routes of boundaries which were the main cause of publishing large-dimensional maps incorporating landscape images or, more precisely, landscape elements and features relevant for documenting the core of the dispute.⁵⁰

Cultural landscape as a whole. In observing the landscape, we are constantly presented with identical types of its components – forests, meadows, fields, ponds and watercourses and water surfaces, while the above-mentioned variability of its forms but invariability of its elementary purposes holds for agricultural complexes (farmsteads, mills, stone pits and, from the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, also manufactories). Some landscape features can certainly be studied separately (in some cases, a narrowed angle of viewing is compensated by a wider scope of detail), but historical landscape must naturally be researched in its entirety.⁵¹

Cultural landscapes as wholes – with either profane or sacral composed features/complexes, as well as with “non-composed”, but systematically developed cultural landscapes – have earned well-deserved attention only recently.⁵² This can be exemplified by the case studies on the genesis of the Kladruba stud farm and its landscape (one of the unique models of continuous farming use of landscape, dating to as early as the 16th century), the probes into the development of the largely vanished pond landscapes (e.g., the Poděbrady and Čáslav regions and the former Uhříněves estates), and the studies focusing on specific types of buildings and their incorporation into the landscape (which usually concerns farmsteads, the operation of which automatically required close contact with the surrounding landscape; probes and research results are, for example, available for the Plasy monastic complex and the Schlick, Liechtenstein, Kinski and Schwarzenberg estates).⁵³ Last but not least, there are also

⁵⁰ MENŠÍK 1600 – JANIŠ – ŠENKÝŘOVÁ 2004; SLIVKA 2004 (a border as a symbolic or, respectively, mental category); ŠLÉZAR 2007 (the possibilities of tracing old borderlines in the field); MARKOVÁ 2008; ŠIMŮNEK 2009, pp. 122–127; BYLINA 2012; KLIMEK 2014, pp. 106–145.

⁵¹ On the view of individual features of the landscape or, eventually, environment (for example, forest) as the point of departure of a synoptic concept, see, e.g., ŠIMŮNEK 2009; KLIMEK 2014, pp. 37–101; the extent to which the working division of a cultural landscape into individual components can also be useful from the point of lucidity or the complexity of perceiving it, is demonstrated by the brilliant encyclopaedia MUIR 2012, which can also be in many aspects inspiring for the Czech environment.

⁵² KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ et al. 2011; KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ 2013.

⁵³ On Kladruba, see TRPÁKOVÁ – TRPÁK 2009; TRPÁKOVÁ 2013, pp. 167–189. – On the pond system in the Poděbrady region, see SEMOTANOVÁ 2004, in the Čáslav region, FRAJER–PAVELKOVÁ CHMELOVÁ 2010, throughout the Uhříněves estates, VEVERKA – ČECHUROVÁ 2012; the possibilities of reconstructing old pond networks (although only those dating to the period after the massive wave of abolishing ponds around the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries) mainly on the basis of cartographic sources (and especially the IInd military survey) as well as the possibilities of interpreting them via modern methods (GIS) combined with traditional research are – both on a general level and in various individual examples – documented in PAVELKOVÁ – FRAJER – NETOPIIL 2014. – On the Plasy monastery farmstead, see ROŽMBERSKÝ 1999; BUKAČOVÁ 2005; on Schlick farmsteads, see CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2009; on Liechtenstein farmsteads, see ŽIŽKA 1998; on the farmsteads on the estates of the Kinský family, see ŽIŽKA 1999; on Schwarzenberg farmsteads, see ŽIŽKA 2008.

probes analysing the ground plans of rural settlements (villages) and the transformations of cultural landscapes in their backgrounds.⁵⁴

The specific subject of the “landscapes of battles” was discussed above from two points: reconstruction of the landscape and the landscape as a memorial medium – the “memory of battles”. Now, perhaps, one more aspect should be underlined. “Landscapes of battles” are specimens of spaces which, as a whole, never represented a planned concept as such, but their historical appearance still retains its importance and significance. Their reconstructions simultaneously suggest the high benefits which researching landscapes can bring. They not only contribute to the history of a landscape, but also to the military studies, because they allow for anchoring of the individual military operations and, potentially, military clashes to particular spatial contexts; and they are simultaneously touchstones of the critique of sources, based on drawing a unified picture of historical reality on the basis of written, cartographic and iconographic sources, i.e. sources providing information which are often not in tune with each other.⁵⁵

Two more angles of viewing military history can be added: the archaeological and art-historical ones. They, too, can be informative – each with its specific optics – about the professional potential (and asset) of complex landscape research. Archaeological approaches to prehistoric landscape, reminded in connection with historical landscapes, are only seemingly anachronistic. We depart here from the strong belief in the analogical character of elementary principles; and if perceiving landscape as the space of a compact body of incidental phenomena following from historical settlement activities has recently come to the centre of archaeologists’ attention, also historians and historical geographers can deduce necessary assumptions from it. Because it is apparent that even from the view of a historical period, the shift from the focus of traditional settlement archaeology to “finding places” (in fact merely parts of complexes once inhabited by prehistoric communities) and thus towards the theory of settlement areas – a theory which understands landscape globally, as a space housing vast sections filled with traces of settlement activities – is more than legitimate.⁵⁶

The art-historical angle of viewing once again returns us to Plasy or, respectively, to the cultural landscape within the periphery of the Plasy monastery grounds. Its map dates to approximately the latter half of the 18th century, although it is not clear whether it was issued before or after the monastery’s 1785 secularization. The important thing is, however, that it includes seven coloured views of the crucial Plasy objects (complexes). The remarkable aspect here is not only their renderings but also their selection: the map naturally displays the building of the Plasy monastery (top left) and its provostship in Mariánská Týnice (on the right, third from the top), but also the two chateaux (Dolní Bělá, bottom left, and Kaceřov, bottom right), one castle (Krašov, top right, although it is also labelled as *Schloss*) and two farmsteads (Hubenov, on the left, second from the top, and Bítov, on the right, second from the top). The presence of the chateaux and farmsteads (side by side with the monastery complex itself and the Týnice provostship) indicates a “compact” perception of the monastery where each of the significant complexes is represented by two or three locations. The complex of the monastery, conceived as an ideal micro-world; the sacral centres; the former manorial estates; the paths and roads and other connections; the network of farmsteads – this is architecture in all cases both visually and functionally interlinked with the agricultural and cultural landscape (the geographical framework of which the map captures). Architecture and landscape form an inseparable couple – and although they can exist without each other, they

⁵⁴ DOHNAL 2003; DOHNAL 2006.

⁵⁵ MATOUŠEK 2006; ALTOVÁ – ALT – MATOUŠEK–ŠIMEK 2007; MATOUŠEK – ŠIMEK – ALTOVÁ – KARLÍK 2007; MATOUŠEK – ZIMOVÁ – JANATA 2012.

⁵⁶ Essential monographs on landscape archaeology: GOJDA 2000; KUNA et al. 2004; on the suggested concept, see, esp., GOJDA 2004 and, most recently, GOJDA– TREFNÝ et al. 2011; GOJDA – JOHN et al. 2013.

can never achieve as full an effect individually as they do when closely linked together. This is yet another reason why the Plasy monastery is specifically mentioned here and, along with it, Jan Blažej Santini-Aichel (1677–1723). The cooperation between the Plasy abbots and the architect concerned both sacral and profane architecture and its result in the landscape cannot be overlooked even with the time distance of several centuries. The reconstruction and continuous maintenance of a cultural landscape inhabited by architecture play a crucial role, and it must be added that the grounds of the Plasy monastery offer several unique examples worth recognition in this respect.⁵⁷

Architecture as a representative symbol situated in a landscape, as well as the declarative role of architecture in the landscape, are phenomena known from as early as the Middle Ages. These are partial but, from the point of researching historical landscapes and their concept, substantial aspects equally engaging historians and art historians. One of the characteristic features of the Middle Ages is representative symbols in the form of castles, often combined with a specific type of architecture (imperial architecture, castles of the Teutonic Order, French *castels*, etc.), and analogical model holds true for monasteries. Later, the spectrum of the “architecture of significance” was extended by farming complexes while in the urban environment, the ancient symbols of town character – bulwarks and “showcase” parish churches – were joined by, for example, town towers and armouries.⁵⁸

Another significant component of the global perception of cultural landscape – whether composed garden/park landscape, natural reserve or landscape with architecture – is, finally, its aesthetic dimension. In comparison with critically, but at least in outline exactly interpreted information drawn from written, cartographic and visual sources, it is a rather subjective element departing from the assessment, taste and also experience of the individual observers. However, it cannot be doubted that the aesthetic expression of a landscape and/or the landscape character are things which, on the elementary level, objectively exist. They have recently been researched in more detail on the example of perspective axes and views of landscapes, as well as urban panoramas and natural frameworks of the urban environment – both in their present condition and in retrospect.⁵⁹ This factor is very important: because the very perspective axes, which can be reconstructed on the basis of historical sources and, in some cases, still captured in the field, can significantly help us see historical landscapes through the eyes of the people who once inhabited them.

⁵⁷ The map of the Plasy complex is held by the Museum of West Bohemia in Plzeň, Map Collection, MP 130 (its digitized copy can be found at <http://www.zcm.cz/mapy/images/14/index.html>); besides the literature mentioned in relation with the Plasy farmsteads, which underwent reconstruction like the grounds of the Týnice provostship did, there are also publications pursuing the revitalization of old roads when the realization was very often preceded by systematic historical research (on the road from Plasy to Mariánská Týnice, see BUKAČOVÁ 2009); on Santini’s architecture commissioned by the Plasy monastery, synoptically, see BUKAČOVÁ 2012.

⁵⁸ On the declarative role of castles, synoptically, see ZEUNE 1997, and, for the Czech environment, ŠIMŮNEK 2010; the wide scope of the given issue for the periods of the Middle Ages and early modern era (mainly in connection with residential complexes) is reflected by WAGENER 2012; farmhouses as a construction type inhabiting the estates of the leading noble families of the Baroque period, the concept of cultural landscape and its components, reflected in the picture maps of the estates, and the development of sacred landscape around towns (Český Krumlov) as well as on entire estates (e.g., the Plasy monastery) were already discussed above.

⁵⁹ On the given issue, see, most recently, e.g., HEJTMÁNKOVÁ – KUPKA 2014 (present-day view); ŠPERK 2015 (reconstruction of the contemporary perspective axes).

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON THE LANDSCAPE OF THE PAST

The appearance of historical landscape originating from various time horizons has, to a certain extent, survived in the cultural landscape of today due to minute as well as more conspicuous traces which are both hidden (and can thus only be revealed via sophisticated methods or systematic research) and clearly visible. In general, the longer the distance of time, the higher the number of the vanished traces. However, a gradual evanescence of the remains of human activity dating to very recent decades must sometimes be witnessed, as is especially the case of more substantial harm done to the landscape.

The traces of historical landscape are usually revealed through field research, archaeological exploration and methods of natural sciences (geology, paleobotany, geophysics, historical climatology and others), while the disciplines of constantly increasing significance for studying historical landscape are geomatics (also known as geospatial technology, which includes research of the Earth from a distance, laser scanning and other forms of data collection) and digital cartography. Ethnography, too, is rather supportive, concerning both material relics and the sphere of traditional and folk culture. Historiography, then, starts with studying and interpreting historiographic sources.

Historiography – or the teaching on historical sources – obeys many criteria in differentiating among the individual sources of information on the past (from the perspective of the originator's intent, according to the relation between the originator and the recipient, and so on). The point of external signs serves it to distinguish material, traditional, visual and written sources.⁶⁰ Many other disciplines (of humanities) owe a debt to historiography for developing methods of critical approach to the individual types of sources. Although it is generally thought that the exclusive domain of historiography is written sources, critical approaches to visual and cartographic sources are still improving in terms of precision.⁶¹

Written documents continue to be the main source of information for a historian. They were described in detail in the earlier, above-mentioned works. They are indeed almost inexhaustible, and some orientation in their massive scale can be provided by several ways of classification, e.g. to administrative and narrative sources and ego-documents.

⁶⁰ The essential theoretical vade-mecum in this sense is still PETRÁŇ et al. 1983; a representative survey of the types of sources available for the period of the early modern era is the compendium PAUSER –SCHEUTZ – WINKELBAUER 2004, where on the issue of historical landscapes, see the sources recorded in sections 1.5 (pp. 378–639) and 3 (pp. 941–1109); a compact summary of the basic types of exploitable historical (cartographic, iconographic and written) sources and methods of assessing their information value from the point of both geography and historical and social geography can be found in SEMOTANOVÁ 2002, pp. 27–62; BOLTIZIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014, pp. 34–69. The publications which retain considerable significance for the Czech environment are ROUBÍK 1940 and ROUBÍK 1941, as well as the university textbook KAŠPAR 1990; most currently (despite some shortages) KAŠE – ŘÍHOVÁ – STRÁNÍKOVÁ 2012. – A work from related disciplines, which is worth mentioning, is the series of original treatises focused on the sources of geography and its related fields, published in the magazine *Geografické rozhledy* [Geographic Prospects]; old maps as sources for studying geography were pursued by Karel Kuchař in his several studies which still hold validity (e.g., KUCHAR 1967). Vistas and photographic vistas perceived from the point of historiography have mainly been followed by Zdeněk Wirth and, currently, Libor Jůn; the issue was most recently summarized in HANUŠOVÁ 2013. Vistas found on the Central-European territory and the topographic value of their utterance have been systematically discussed by, among others, Ralph Andraschek Holzer (ANDRASCHKEK HOLZER 2002; ANDRASCHKEK HOLZER 2011); also comp. JACOB 1982; ŠIMŮNEK 2015b. A theoretical essay on historical cartography as an auxiliary historical science was published in HOJDA 1996.

⁶¹ On historical geography, comp. the vade-mecum SEMOTANOVÁ 1994; specifically on the category of old postcards, see KARPAS 2005.

Iconographic historical sources are mainly vistas (both hand-written and executed in the media of graphic arts), photographs and postcards, but also posters, promotion materials, tourist stickers and stamps and (oblique) aerial photographs and, last but not least, modern dynamic media, such as film and video. Old maps and plans are sometimes associated with the given group as well. Partial justification of this can be found in the period to the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries when cartography moved between science and fine arts,⁶² and also in the character of some documents where we cannot positively draw a line between a vista and the so-called perspective plan. The authors of the present publication are nevertheless inclined to perceive old maps and plans, along with vertical aerial photographs, as a separate category.

Cartographic historical sources are maps and plans and, due their nature, the above-mentioned vertical aerial photographs. Maps and plans with already untopical map contents, i.e. archive documents, are called old maps/plans in contrast to historical (reconstruction) maps. The latter term relates to the outcome of a work of a historian who produces a thematic map with historical contents.⁶³

The fact that every classification is merely an orientation aid is demonstrated by the number of sources featuring not only textual but also visual or, even more often, cartographic components. The most characteristic example is military topographic surveys and land registers and, to name some types of later documents, community, school and association chronicles and memorial books. The group of printed books of various genres (cosmography, world chronicles and topographic compendia of a certain territory, widely popular in the 17th and 18th centuries, and geographically and topographically oriented works mainly influenced by the Enlightenment), which sometimes submit images and maps as equivalent to texts, moreover presents a landmark – appearing from 1800 – dividing the traditionally historical sources and secondary literature. This landmark is, however, indefensible in the context of our research, because topographic and, for instance, also castellology works dating to the late 18th century had their immediate followers in the 19th and 20th centuries.⁶⁴ Its idleness from the point of historical-geographic research is most illustrative in the publications reflecting the development of tourism. Tourist guides integrally combine verbal (text) and visual (vistas and maps) components and were published in the Czech lands only from the early 19th century and, to a larger extent, from its last third.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, they can still be viewed as one of the sources essential for our knowledge (and discovery) of the landscape of the past.

All historical sources primarily represent an *image* of reality in the eyes of their authors (originators). They captured reality, in our case landscape, as it appeared to them, departing from their possibilities, skills and instructions given by the commissioner and worked along the lines of the contemporary taste and the publication purpose. Therefore, the general rule based on realizing this purpose and the circumstances of the origination of a given document must be followed and there must be a resolute avoidance of any a priori judgements as to its either “poor” or “good” quality. For the author or the commissioner did not always plan to

⁶² On this issue, widely discussed abroad, comp. at least BOSTERS 1989; ROBINSON 1989; SCHULZ 1990; SEIFERT 1979; WOODWARD 1987.

⁶³ SEMOTANOVÁ 1994, pp. 11, 24. Also comp. the contributions in *Historická geografie* [Historical Geography] 34, 2007.

⁶⁴ SCHALLER 1785–1791/I–XVI (topography is the most well-known but certainly not a single Schaller’s topographic exploit – his fundamental works are listed at http://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jaroslav_Schaller); SOMMER 1833–1849/I–XVI; HEBER 1844–1849/I–VII; MIKOVEC 1860 and others.

⁶⁵ The guides were not only published in regions; many noted publishers addressed the wide public in this respect as well via their own edition series – see, e.g., *Dra Bělohlava Podrobné mapy zemí Koruny české* [Dr Bělohlav’s Detailed Maps of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown], which was produced by the Topič Publishing House from 1909.

arrive at a topographically precise, “photographically faithful” image of a landscape. The fundamental precondition therefore is selecting historical sources appropriate for exploring the assigned subject and assuming a critical approach. The latter lies, on the one hand, in understanding the circumstances and contemporary contexts of the origination of a given source and, on the other hand, in its thorough analysis, aimed at assessing both the external and internal signs.

While the structure of historical sources remains rather constant and its critique is undergoing continuous improvement in terms of precision, the extent and forms of making them accessible and the possibilities of their analysis and presentation have been radically transformed by developments in the sphere of digital technologies. They, however, contain the danger of diverting to excessive pandering and of making them an end in itself. In addition, they do not disengage a historian from the duty to adopt critical approach when working with the collected historical sources.

MODEL TERRITORIES

The section devoted to both recent and completely topical subjects and long-term trends present in the research into historical landscapes concluded with paragraphs on studying cultural landscapes as wholes. In this place, we can immediately follow up on this issue. It has already been observed above that even many territories which, as wholes, are not the results of a clearly designed concept and thus cannot be described as composed landscapes have their undoubted value and qualities – territorial wholes which are remarkable from the historical, landscape, artistic and conservationist aspects are often protected as reserves and, from the point of researching historical landscapes, therefore represent a parallel to composed (historical) landscapes, based on clear concept and rather unambiguously graspable. We opine that the field of future research is wide open in this sense. We understand landscape as a mosaic composed of, on the one hand, changeable and, on the other hand, largely constant features – the combination of which is variable over time, and thus also the resulting face of the landscape is always new. This is why our starting point is the individual features and then the exploration of their development on the basis of case studies. The space of more extensive but, historically, still mostly compact territories serves us to recognize which features are constant and, on the contrary, unstable, and how the transforming particular features have influenced the overall landscape character.

When selecting three model territories, the final choices were one (sub)urban environment (Prague suburbs) and two “rural” ones – the hilly landscape of the Broumov Hook and the flatland of the Třeboň basin. It is a choice of landscapes geographically distant and differing in morphology as well as in their historical development; of the overflow of towns to landscape and the source of industrial suburbs; of Baroque cultural landscape of the Benedictine Order and the medieval and early modern-time landscape of the Rožmberk and Schwarzenberg dominions.

The suburban, rural landscape of big cities of the latter half of the 19th and the 20th centuries became the support for the spatial expansion of urban agglomerations. The development of towns during the industrial epochs and the process of urbanization in the modern era, which in several stages continues to our day, have had a distinctive impact on the modern landscape of the Czech lands. The influx of people to the towns intensified, while the towns themselves first mainly grew within their administrative borders and, during the 20th century, developed extensive urbanized enclaves of various purposes and inhabited by various types of built-up areas.

Urbanization formed an integral part of the overall transformation of the local society, and was not only characterized by an increasingly dense urban population and the changes in its social pattern and inclinations but also by the development of the inner space of the towns, their closest surroundings and, subsequently, the entire settlement structure. Peripheral villages with their farmsteads and craftsmanship and business backgrounds were turning to either industrial or white-collar suburbs, and the thus urbanized landscape in the close vicinity of the towns became interconnected by railways and new roads. Part of the modern communication network respected the earliest courses of pathways and roads, but the rest was often built from scratch.

The present agglomeration of **Prague** which serves us as an example in following the outlined issues, developed as an amoebic formation hemmed in concentric circular belts, irregularly receding from the historical urban centre in various stages over time. The transformation of the Prague environs and suburbs into individual parts of the city is a fascinating process, documented in countless historical sources as well as in the landscape as such and explored by scholars professing most various disciplines and perspectives. The current changes in

process, then, gradually and far too often irreversibly destroy the Prague historical landscape, and therefore are one of the subjects deserving more than average attention.⁶⁶

The characteristic features of the Central-European landscape during the modern times have survived to our day in the **Broumov region**. It is the result of a landscape character in the form of a natural wall of rocks and forests (the Broumov Walls), which separate the territory from the neighbouring regions of Náchod and Hronov and from human activity, in this case mainly the conception activities of the Benedictine Order. The development of the local cultural landscape is relatively well-documented by medieval written and later visual and map sources, while the crucial source for the Baroque era is moreover the surviving landscape as such. The landscape in this period received many dominants via a unique network of churches (analogically like Santini in the Plasy complex, the Dientzenhofers worked on the grounds of the Břevnov-Bromov monastery) and was also inhabited by various minute relics (chapels, crosses, calvaries and sculptures of saints); at the same time, vast farmsteads – a characteristic type of rural architecture of the so-called Broumov type – can be still found in the local villages. The distribution of these monuments influenced the form of the ploughs as well as the network of roads leading to the extravillan. The Broumov region, situated on the periphery of Bohemia, never experienced massive industrialization and urbanization, and could therefore retain its many features and character, close to the landscape existing between the 16th and 18th centuries. The local nature is of extraordinary value as well, which is why it became the Broumov Region Landscape Reserve.⁶⁷

An example of an exceptionally preserved agriculturally used cultural landscape of a different type is the **Třeboň region**. Its current appearance was gradually formed from the 13th century by developing a settlement network, while its landscape dominant, determining the character of the local nature, is till now the ponds, mostly founded during the 15th and 16th centuries. Although several more similar pond systems appeared in the Czech environment during that period (the most significant ones could be found in East Bohemia), the unique value of the Třeboň landscape is due to the fact that here, the pond landscape – a work of late-medieval and early modern-era landscape cultivation – survived (the phenomenon of drying up ponds, mainly symptomatic of the latter half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries, affected this territory to only a small extent). Ponds are the prevailing but certainly not exclusive component of the local historical landscape, the residua of which we can today observe – whether directly in the field or through the wide spectrum of available historical sources. It is also the technological facilities related to the pond network (such as drains), old roads, minute sacral architecture and mills and farmsteads: altogether, a “non-composed” historical cultural landscape.

In addition, the qualities of the Třeboň landscape are outstanding from the aspect of nature protection. This is proved by the fact that the RS 2 (Pond System 2) – the Třeboň ponds, and the RS 8 (Pond System 8) – the Třeboň peat-bogs are among the 12 declared and 2 proposed areas – especially rare biotopes – of the Czech lands, which fall under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. In the context of researching historical landscape, it is perhaps worth noting that not only the Třeboň ponds, but also part of the Třeboň wetlands – which at first sight seem to be works of nature – are artificial landscape elements (exemplary being the Novořecké [the New River] swamplands). Their origins, too, go back as far as to the 16th century.

⁶⁶ Synoptically, SEMOTANOVÁ 2010; on the three Prague suburbs – historical towns, comp. the Prague volumes of the edition *Historický atlas měst ČR* ([Historic Towns Atlas of the Czech republic] – HAM 14; HAM 19; HAM 24).

⁶⁷ On the architectonic icon of the Broumov region in the form of the Dientzenhofers' churches, see, e.g., POLÁČEK 2000; PROKOP – KOTALÍK – SŮVA 2007; for the database of monuments, developed in the framework of the project *Zapadlými cestami minulosti* [Travelling the Vanished Roads of the Past], visit (<http://www.collegium.cz/index.php?menu=broumovsko/zapcest&page=uvod>).

Landscape of the Třeboň Estates in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times (c. 1400–1700)

The Třeboň region is a commonplace denomination of a landscape around the town of Třeboň, which is characteristic of flat relief with ponds, wetted and paludinous territories and forest areas. The prevailing nature of the Třeboň landscape is very nicely captured already in the earliest historical texts on Vítkovci, originating from around 1600. The delineation of the region in the following treatise is based on a combination of the landscape (geographic) and territorial-administrative (administrative) aspects. Its core remained unchanged throughout centuries and stretched over the landscape demarcated by the river Lužnice (the Lomnice basin), heading in this area south-east to north-west.⁶⁸ And while the term “the Třeboň region” is used for the territory defined by the character of landscape, the expression “the Třeboň estates” is an artificial territorial and administrative construct (and, in part, variable over time). Both labels have their foundation. The process of high-medieval colonization of the landscape in the (later) Třeboň region falls to the 13th century and the subsequent formation of the Třeboň estates as a unit of territorial administration, then, to the following century – the first available references to its territorial structure date to the period around the mid-14th century and the earliest maps featuring these estates as a territorial and administrative unit come from the latter half of the 17th century. The territorial development can thus be explored in the course of approximately five centuries, from the early mentions to the termination of the patrimonial administration (c. 1350–1850). The centre of the region during the given period was always the town of Třeboň which (if we leave aside the specific position of Lomnice nad Lužnicí, housing a minor farmstead in the 14th and the first half of the 15th centuries) played not only the role of administrative centre for centuries but, repeatedly, was also a residential town. (Třeboň served as a secondary residence already in the Rožmberk era from the 14th to the early 17th centuries, and it was the only residence of the last member of the Rožmberk family, Petr Vok; the residential tradition of the Třeboň castle/château was soon followed up by the Švamberk family and, from the 1660s, the Schwarzenbergs, the owners of the estates to the modern era.)

The area of the Třeboň pond landscape is, in the framework of the former Třeboň estates, formed by the central part within a perimeter of roughly 10 to 15 kilometres from the central town (and mainly to the north and south-east; to the south-west, it is the enclave around Zvíkov, Libín and Mladošovice). The region’s terrain is from flat to slightly undulated (the altitude of the highest points is between 400 and 500 metres) and is inhabited by ponds and wetlands interwoven by both natural and artificial watercourses (mainly Zlatá stoka [the Golden Drain] and Nová řeka [the New River]) and interleaved by meadows, woodlots and silhouettes of villages, farmsteads and minute sacral architecture. The medieval and early modern-era territory of the Třeboň region can be described as a cultural landscape conceived by people, while the ponds and the related waterworks (mainly power and drainage canals) were its crucial, although not the only feature: agricultural use of the wetted meadows found its reflection in the very characteristic haylofts, captured in plans and paintings as early as in the 17th century and present to this day; during the 16th century, the landscape was typified by gradually established extensive farmsteads (from the close vicinity of the town of Třeboň, i.e., for example, the farmsteads of Dvorce, Vrchy and Vranín); and mills were founded near ponds (which served as retention reservoirs in the case of need) from the Middle Ages (the most well-known are the Opatovice and Zábalský mills, situated by the ponds of the same names). As elsewhere, the region was also scattered with elements of “sacred landscape” from

⁶⁸ HESKE 1909, pp. 6–12; CHÁBERA et al. 1985; JENÍK – PŘIBIL 1978.

the 14th century – such as calvaries and other minute sacral architecture (micro-architecture), as well as several hermitages.

The landscape character of the Třeboň region was not subjected to changes even in the last decades of the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries, i.e. the period which became a touchstone of the viability of the pond systems, when the extensive drying up of ponds and transforming them to arable land significantly modified the character and complexion of many traditional pond areas. An illustrious example of this process are the Pardubice and Poděbrady regions where merely a fraction of the original 16th-century condition survives to today, with the overall extinction of the pond systems largely dating to approximately between 1780 and 1850. The Třeboň region, in contrast, had displayed a conspicuous stability of its pond system and the extinction of only a low percentage of ponds, usually those which proved uneconomic on a long-term basis (such as the Hradeček pond near Třeboň). Thus the unrealized proposals of pond abolitions and, maybe even more interestingly, the examples of abolished and subsequently restored ponds (e.g., Nový Vdovec) are extremely remarkable particulars.

The Třeboň region and the Třeboň estates as a settlement, agricultural and administrative unit

The earliest borderline delineation in the south-east tip of the Czech territory along the border with the Vitoraz [G. Weitra] region originates from 1179, while the borderline between the Czech lands and Austria is mainly fixed here by two watercourses, “*quorum unus vocatur Schremelize, alter Lunsenize*” (in the latter case, it is the very earliest written evidence about the river Lužnice). There is also a rather detailed testimony documenting a ride around the borders of the Třeboň, Nové Hrady and Vitoraz estates. The first two were the property of Vilém of Landštejn, while Vitoraz was in the possession of Austrian dukes. The aim of the given tour was to establish or, respectively, describe and undoubtedly also (where needed) survey the border in the field. The description works with an array of field-names which cannot always be identified, and many of them – in the sense of being supporting points in the course of the borderline, if they could be recorded on a map – can be determined only approximately. It is, however, apparent that surveying borderlines, describing them in words and, simultaneously, highlighting them in the field was an utterly commonplace practice prior to the mid-14th century. Detailed borderline surveys, however, only appeared as late as in the early mid-16th century – at least as far as is known today. This is proved by the borderline protocol (1548/1549) which also indicates that the course of the borderline (especially when it was determined by a brook or, in general, a watercourse) was largely constant over a long horizon of time.⁶⁹

Settlement and territorial and administrative structures. The (later) Třeboň region was a space covered by a 13th-century colonization; there are, however, settlement enclaves in the immediate vicinity – especially along the land border, in close contact with the Vitoraz region – which date to substantially earlier periods. This area was marginally populated from the 8th century and could also possibly include provisional supporting points, established for example in connection with the fights over the Vitoraz region under the Bohemian Duke Soběslav II

⁶⁹ SEDLÁČEK 1920a; the current course of the borderline is the result of the much later Czechoslovak and Austrian peace treaty, signed in Saint-Germain-en-Laye in 1919 (for more on this, see MARTÍNEK 2012). – Detailed paraphrasing of the protocol (1548/1549) is provided in DOMEČKA 1896–1897; on its interpretation, based on comparing it with maps and the results of field research, see KUCHYŇKA 1999; KUCHYŇKA 2002.

(the fights terminated with an 1179 agreement containing the first above-mentioned, although rather general, description of the borderline).

The high-medieval settlement and, consequently, administrative structures within the perimeter of the Třeboň region and the Třeboň estates began developing in the 13th century. It seems that their crystallization centre was the town of Třeboň (the local pleban was most probably documented as early as in the 1240s) and its southern environs (the Vítkov *Presnik*, half of which was donated to the Zwettl monastery, later most probably became a Cistercian *grangium* laying foundations for an agricultural complex with a mill and a pond, later accompanied by the village Opatovice). From the mid-13th century, the sources repeatedly mention both the town of Třeboň and other supporting points of the Vítkov expansion in the area (mainly Lomnice nad Lužnicí and Ledenice), and also provide the earliest evidence of the existence of individual villages. Reports from the first half of the 14th century indicate gradual stabilization of the perimeters of the particular property shares (estates and commodities), as well as the parish networks.

From 1366, when half of the town of Třeboň and several villages (such as Jílovice and Kramolín) were acquired by the Rožmberk family from Jan of Landštejn, the Třeboň estates experienced continuous expansion and development. The local settlement (and administrative) structures can be quite thoroughly reconstructed from the latter half of the 14th century. The basic sources dating from this period are mainly the land and duties registers issued around 1380 – for example the register of the Třeboň Augustinian canonry, established by the Rožmberks in 1367 (1378), and the section devoted to the Třeboň estates found in the register of the Rožmberk estates (around 1380). The latter source proves that the Třeboň estates consisted of 13 villages (or their parts), most of which also formed the estates' constant core in the future. Apart from minor transactions (both purchases and sales), the estates witnessed several waves of territorial expansions between the 15th and 17th centuries, although only part of the gains was of a permanent character (e.g., the Stráž estates).

The territorial scope of the Třeboň estates from the Rožmberk or, respectively, Švamberk, epochs remained – with only minor modifications – unchanged during the era of the Schwarzenbergs who gained the domain after the mid-17th century. The first decade of the Schwarzenberg possession was characterized by purchases of minute farmsteads neighbouring the Třeboň estates to which they were subsequently attached. The post-White Mountain estates' confiscation was also largely connected with the restoration of the Augustinian canonry, initiated by Archduke Ferdinand (later known as the Bohemian King Ferdinand III) between 1630 and 1631, and was subsequently accompanied by a property restitution.⁷⁰ The situation regarding the estates in the given period is in part reflected by the

⁷⁰ On the Augustinian canonry, see KREJČÍK 1949, where on the land and duties register, see pp. 3–10; KADLEC 1978; on the Rožmberk land and duties register, see TRUHLÁŘ 1880 (where on the Třeboň estates, see pp. 54–56, Nos. 465–480), on the assessment of the individual indicators, see HENNINGSEN 1989; on the administration of the Třeboň estates, see CIRONISOVÁ 1984; ŠIMŮNEK 2005 (acc. to the index). – On the territorial development of the Třeboň estates in brief, see, HESKE 1909, pp. 3–5, and, most recently, PALECZEK 2011, p. 291, and DIBELKA 2012, pp. 62–63 (although the years given in the two publications slightly diverge); KALNÝ et al. 1976/II, pp. 290–324, Nos. 311–348 (including the urbarial tools of the Třeboň Augustinian canonry); the villages of Bzí and Žimutice are also separately recorded in SCHALLER 1789, where on the Třeboň estates, see pp. 53–117 (where also find a comprehensive historical part and the extent of the estates, including the independent Bzí and Žimutice farmsteads and the properties of the secularized Třeboň Augustinian canonry); more closely on the period from the 14th to the early 16th century, see ŠIMŮNEK 2003. The extent of the Třeboň Augustinians' estates soon after their secularization is reflected in the income registers of 1567 (their data were in detail analysed in KADLEC 1978, pp. 15–18). – On the context of purchasing the Stráž estates, see HAUBELT 2003, pp. 121–123; on the land and duties register of the Stráž estates, (1579), see KRYL 1948. – On the Borovany canonry and its farmstead, see ŠEDA 1968; ŠEDA 1986; KUBÍKOVÁ 1986a. – On the restoration of the Třeboň canonry and the second stage of its existence (1631–1785), see, most comprehensively, KADLEC 2004, pp. 173–299.

data included in the 1654 Role of Assessment or, respectively, its revision of 1679; as far as the earlier registers are concerned, the main one mentioned here is, of course, the Theresian register.⁷¹

The **connecting junction of the Třeboň estates** was, from the Middle Ages, the town of Třeboň due to the intersecting crucial roads, cutting through the Třeboň estates from west to east and north to south and connecting the estates and their centre with the inland and the neighbouring Austria. (This is moreover reflected by the names of the four Třeboň town gates – the western Břilice/Budějovice, the eastern Hradec, more recently also called Viennese, and the southern Sviny – inner, and Nové Hrady – outer ones). The basic trans-borderline routes can already be traced in the Stich map of local roads and custom-houses (1676), the specific contents of which had not even been antiquated by the Müller map (1720). The road from Prague headed towards Tábor, Soběslav and Veselí, where it separated and continued southwards (to České Budějovice, Kaplice and, further, Austria) and to south-east (to Lomnice, Třeboň and Suchdol and also Austria). From the point of the Třeboň estates, the road represented an imaginary south-east line. It ran eastwards from the town, while the section between the Hradec gate and Kopeček was also common for the communication axis in the west-east direction. The given axis stretched past the (developmentally very old) road České Budějovice – Lišov – Třeboň – Stráž nad Nežárkou – Jindřichův Hradec (and, finally, Moravia), which is repeatedly labelled as “*Post- und Landtstrasse*” in the description accompanying the 1st military survey (and can also be found on the Stich map). The roads forked at Kopeček, the first branch heading south-east, along the Ss Peter and Paul chapel to Majdaléna, Suchdol nad Lužnicí and Austria, and the latter to Stará Hlína and Stráž and onward.⁷²

The cultural landscape of the Třeboň estates

Starting from the elementary definition of the term “cultural landscape”, it can be said to be a landscape the face of which results from the combination of natural and human influences and activity. The centre of our attention here lies in the anthropogenic element of the landscape development, while the co-determining and, in some cases, also directly determining role of natural factors are also taken into consideration. The compact image of the cultural landscape of the Třeboň region/Třeboň estates during the Baroque era is the picture map of the estates from 1684. It captures less than ten towns and townlets (Soběslav, Veselí nad Lužnicí, Mezimostí, Lomnice nad Lužnicí, Třeboň, Lišov, Rudolfovo and the eastern part of České Budějovice), several tens of villages and sporadically also secluded dwellings and solitary churches. The degree of “authenticity” in depicting the individual locations basically equals their significance – on the level of villages, it is merely repeated standardized representations of a few small houses. Many visually dominating features of urban panoramas moreover have not changed over the centuries, and thus their “trustworthiness” can frequently be verified even today. This is more than logical, because towns used to have their unmistakable

⁷¹ On the Třeboň estates in the 1654 Role of Assessment and its 1679 revision, see KUBÍKOVÁ 1986; in summary, DOSKOČIL 1953–1954/I, pp. 39–41. – On the Theresian register, see CHALUPA – LIŠKOVÁ – NUHLÍČEK – RAJTORAL 1964, pp. 148–153, Nos. 274–276 (the Třeboň estates, the Třeboň town farmstead, the estates of the Augustinian canonry). On establishing new settlements between the 17th and 19th centuries, usually in connection with economic activities (glassworks, ironworks, land plotting etc.), see KŘIVKA 1978.

⁷² Essential works in this respect are SCHMIDT 1901 and ROUBÍK 1971; on the Stich map and the context of its origination, see ROUBÍK 1933; on the routes recorded in the 1st military survey, see ŠIMŮNEK – ANTOŠ – HAVRLANT 2014, pp. 167–172; an example of reconstructing a road on the basis of comparing written and map sources and terrain remains can be found in KOVÁŘ 2013.

panorama in contrast to villages, where the only unmistakable feature could be, at most, a parish church or a significant farmstead. In the case of locations without a church, their depiction here is without doubt purely standardized (although, with all the schematisation, they are not drawn in the same way – the houses come in various compositions). Analysis of both the map as a whole and its details (settlement units, waters and ponds, communications etc.) leads to an unambiguous conclusion: the map is an idealized image of the estates which, in the basic plan, corresponds to reality (the position of towns, townlets and villages; the courses of water currents and main connections) but is in many aspects heavily selective and stylized. The painter heeded a harmonious expression and close connection between the landscape framework and architecture, fusing the authentic and the standardized even in the ground-plan arrangement of the particular locations.⁷³

The picture map of the Třeboň estates is a condensed image of components found in nature to this day and mostly resulting from the formation of a (cultivated) cultural landscape during the 15th and 16th centuries. It is far from accidental that it is often called a “map of ponds”. It does not comply completely with its purpose but it does not lack logic, either: because it is **ponds** (water surfaces) which represent a dominant component in the imaginary face of the historical and, to a large extent, also contemporary landscape. Many ponds are of natural origin; the beginnings of targeted interest in ponds – in the sense of their continuous agricultural use and maintenance and developing new pond works – fall to the 14th century, while the period of the upswing of the Třeboň pond system was the 15th and 16th centuries (linked with the legendary names of Štěpánek Netolický, Mikuláš Ruthard of Malešov and Jakub Krčín), which also mostly defined the current condition. This is because new pond works were established only sporadically in the following periods and the region was more or less spared the wave of the massive abolishment of ponds in around 1800: the local soil was not appropriate for agricultural use and ponds, for centuries, embodied the most expedient use of surfaces (this can be documented by the cases from the early 19th century when many once abolished ponds were restored). And it was not just ponds – it also was the relevant technological works, such as drains and mill raceways, affecting the character of the landscape. The most extensive (and influential) were works linked with the concepts implemented by Štěpánek (Zlatá stoka) and Krčín (Nová řeka [the New River], which redirected part of the water from Lužnice to Nežárka and created a “wild” wetland – today a very rare biotope – along its current).⁷⁴

If we take a close look at the picture maps of various estates and their prospects – i.e. views into cultural landscapes forming a representative symbol of an “estate” – dating to around 1700, we are, at first sight, captivated by the strikingly high proportion of **agricultural complexes**, especially farmsteads and granaries, but also stud farms and sheepfolds and, eventually, mills, breweries and similar facilities. It is more than evident that these were the complexes “of significance” – otherwise they would not have received as much attention and would not be as frequently captured to the utmost detail or even on an over-dimensional scale. The same holds true for the picture map of the Třeboň estates where several types of agricultural complexes can be encountered. These reflect the sweeping changes occurring in

⁷³ On the map and the layers of its value of utterance, see ŠIMŮNEK 2012.

⁷⁴ We use the established term “Třeboň pond system” for the ponds situated on the former Třeboň estates (or, eventually, in the Třeboň basin), although its legitimacy (or, strictly put, correctness) from the point of the management of water supplies can be questioned: BERAN 2005 talks about a “*group of Třeboň ponds*”, which are “*divided according to their appurtenance to individual river basins; and only thus can we speak about an array of pond systems in the Třeboň basin*” (p. 4; the main point of the work is the overview of the ponds, each accompanied by a brief description). – On the issue of fish-pond cultivation, discussed in extensive literature, see, at least, ŠUSTA 1898; JANOUŠEK 1950 (the area of the Chlum estates); MÍKA 1955; KAVKA 1966; MÍKA 1970; NOVOTNÝ 1972; KUBÍKOVÁ 1980; KÁLALOVÁ 1981; VANĚK 1984; VANĚK 1985; VANĚK 1986; PÁNEK 1988; BŮŽEK 1997; HULE 2000; RAMEŠ 2011; KATZENSCHLAGER 2012; KNITTLER 2012; STEJSKAL – STEJSKALOVÁ 2012.

the cultivated landscape of large noble dominions during the 16th century – and although the specific feature of the Třeboň estates was the considerable dominance of the pond landscape, they did not lack other components of the cultural landscape in the 16th century, either. Třeboň, too, displayed the tendency towards the farmstead system; a tendency so characteristic of large noble dominions of the latter half of the 16th century. The emphasis laid on not only farmsteads but also on establishing mills and breweries falls, not by chance, to the period of high and the de facto final stage of developing the Třeboň network of ponds. From the point of the estates' economy as well as the entire Rožmberk domain, it was basically yet another chance to massively increase the income of the Krumlov treasury.

The noble farmsteads and breweries are closely linked with the above-mentioned Mikuláš Ruthard and, first of all, Jakub Krčín; the farming production mainly focused on breeding of cattle and, in some cases, directly specialized in sheep-breeding (as was the case of the Vranín farm, located on the site of a vanished medieval village), while one of the aspects of the economic strategy was large-volume growing of corn for the needs of the breweries in the possession of the local aristocracy. An overall picture of the arrangement of farmsteads throughout the Třeboň estates around 1600, i.e. towards the close of the Rožmberks' rule, is offered by the 1590 register (issued simultaneously with the register of both lordly and serfdom mills), and naturally also the land and duties registers dating to the same period. An unclear division line between a farmstead and an occasional lordly residence can be exemplified by the surviving Švamberk near Ševětín, founded in the close vicinity of the vanished medieval village of Stojčín by Jan Jiří of Švamberk between 1613 and 1614.

And when a Rožmberk official reports to Krumlov at the close of the 16th century that *“people enjoy working in the new mill of Veselí, built [by me] not as a mill but as a manor, where even a sawmill is roofed by bricks, and everyone who mills there, exalts it”*, it is not merely a praise of one's own merits but also a reflection of the contemporary way of perceiving agricultural complexes whose utilitarian significance was indivisibly linked with a symbolic one (after all, the illustrious Záblatí mill repeatedly served the nobility as an overnight shelter).⁷⁵ The agricultural complexes and summer houses or, follies, were not divided by an inviolable gap – for the pond landscape around Lomnice nad Lužnicí was not only inhabited by mills and farmsteads but also the Dobrá mysl [High Spirit] summer house. It was built by Vilém of Rožmberk and, in a certain sense, represented a predecessor of Kratochvíle [Pastime] – an exceptionally imposing type of Italian villa which soon totally overshadowed the first architecture.

Ponds and the corresponding works of technology, equally as agricultural complexes, were only a part of the cultural landscape or, respectively, merely co-formed its appearance. The crucial moment in this respect always was the **structure of land-use** (the earlier stages of which can be reconstructed in only rough outlines and in part hypothetically and, in detail, only as late as from the second quarter of the 19th century from when a constant register is available), i.e. primarily the proportion of forests, meadows, fields and so on. The face of the landscape has at the same time been influenced by the degree and manner of **employing raw-material resources** – the extreme case of devastation (or, neutrally put, transformation) of a cultural landscape is the vast coal basins, which in the Czech lands are mainly concentrated in the region of North-West Bohemia. People, however, continuously relied on raw-material resources as early as from the Middle Ages. The two basic types were wood and stone; apart from that, ores were extracted in suitable areas and, from among mineral resources, there is

⁷⁵ On farmsteads, comp. esp. HONC 1959; VALENTA 1965; MÍKA 1970; URBAN 1999; KLEMPERA 2002; NOVÁKOVÁ 2005; on the instructions for the Třeboň estates, see BARBOROVÁ 1973; for the inventory of farmsteads (1590), see State Regional Archives Třeboň, CS II–357–6f; the information value of this source was demonstrated, on the example of the Krumlov estates, by KUBÍKOVÁ 2001–2002, who assumes that it rather reflected an ideal instead of real situation.

the example of limestone extraction in medieval times. And while in the first case wood production had to be accompanied by the appropriate care of forest growths and their revitalization (in addition, forests in the Třeboň region were places of corresponding traditional crafts, being inhabited by both charcoal piles and tar production as well as glassworks in the borderline thick forest), in other cases it was irrecoverable raw-material resourcing. Remains of the extracting activity can be spotted in the Třeboň region to the present day – for example near Dunajovice, where the peak of the Dunajovická mountain housed a stone pit as early as in the Middle Ages and the local extraction lasted into the 20th century by when most of the quarry was inundated. Moreover, a pilgrimage road and a chapel already existed at that time: in summary, it is a rather remarkable document of the symbiosis of various ways of land-use.⁷⁶

Researching historical landscapes as wholes as well as their individual significant (determining) features shows how far landscape transformations can be followed on the basis of combining various types of sources from the discussed period, to what extent the particular interventions were interconnected and, in some cases, literally produced a chain reaction. It is hardly surprising that we are mainly talking here about water – ponds and water drains. The area of the (later) Třeboň region (including the connecting parts of the Nová Bystřice and Nové Hradky estates) with its natural conditions was more than any other predestined for establishing pond systems, and we can witness here the crucial stage of developing cultural landscape focused on agriculture which, on the given territory, undoubtedly belongs to the 16th century. Continuity from the preceding condition or, respectively, the formation of the cultural landscape in the 14th and mainly 15th centuries is totally obvious – neither ponds and water drains nor agricultural facilities and intensive forest use were novelties in the early modern times. Similarly, we should keep in mind the later developments – the future fates of the cultural landscape, the appearance of which was so decisively affected by the 16th century. The traces of this epoch can be encountered and are impossible to be overlooked in the landscape to our day.

Landscape is a space of “many faces”. Yet another one worth attention is **sacred landscape** – and the Třeboň region also has many outstanding examples of it. This poetic idiom can be used to describe a landscape displaying silhouettes of churches on the horizon; a landscape interwoven by a web of roads lined by calvaries, crosses, small chapels and, of course, pilgrimage roads leading to pilgrimage places of both local and supra-regional significance. The beginnings of the landscape of this type are not much earlier than the colonization itself – i.e. the process of populating and dominating the landscape, characteristic of the origination of the network of parishes and the roads which connected the individual locations and enabled accessibility to the churches. The latter constructions, most of them built of stone from the beginning on the South-Bohemian territory, formed visual dominants of the landscape – if only because they towered over the surrounding built-up area and their usually white colour contrasted with the largely wooden structures around (especially in the rural environment). The standardized depictions of the landscape framework, available from the late Middle Ages, indicate that churches, equally as castles, ranked among the customary components of the landscape which also did not lack micro-architecture (calvaries, small chapels etc.). The current condition of the surviving Gothic and Renaissance sacral relics of this kind in the Třeboň region is, however, surprisingly rather dismal. The unusually dense network of local hermitages, reconstructible from the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, is also unique – the relatively small area of the Třeboň region is scattered by more than several, one of the most well-known being Majdaléna (with the church of St Mary Magdalene). Perhaps also because it is the only one of the very early hermitages which was precisely localized, we can merely

⁷⁶ On the types of mineral resources in the South-Bohemian region, see CHÁBERA et al. 1985, pp. 80–102 (while the beginnings of extracting and processing many resources were of a relatively late date).

more or less approximate the location of the other ones or, respectively, assume their possible continuity with at least another hermitage accompanied by a late-Gothic chapel (St Barbara). Hermitry in the Třeboň region then endured to the 18th century but its continuity with the earlier tradition of this kind is utterly hypothetical. The exceptional micro-world of the suburban sacred landscape can still be traced around Třeboň, with the hermitry tradition at St Vitus being only one of its components; other ones are small chapels along roads, in part dating to the 17th and in part to the 18th centuries. The only “classical” hermitage place (i.e. a complex with the Stations of the Cross) in the Třeboň region is on the above-mentioned Dunajovická Mountain, a hillock towering over the village of Dunajovice, where the road runs along the perimeter of the hill and ends by the chapel situated next to a curative spring.⁷⁷

Old landscape and modern landscape. Dominant features and lines co-form (or even determine) the character of later phenomena (and are therefore called antecedents). They are the constant features of the type of settlement structures, networks of routes and sacred districts as well as some parts of the cultural landscape serving agricultural purposes (mainly ponds). This can also be expressed by an utterly terse question: How old is the modern (contemporary) landscape? The main indicator in this sense can be exactly that which remained in it from the landscapes of the past (and still makes its presence felt). “Old landscape” is understood as a landscape with surviving continuous ecosystems, with permanent structures, while “young (juvenile) landscape” is a landscape distinctively formed by human interventions of rather recent date. This suggests that the considerations revolving around the “age of a landscape” are products of the possibilities of reconstructing its individual components. The traceable history of the landscape appearance reaches some 200 or, at most, 250 years back (from the times of a stable register or, eventually, the Ist military survey). This, however, does not contradict the fact that contemporary landscape provides remains (and very often structures as well as solitary relics significantly participating in – and sometimes even directly determining – the landscape character) of much earlier (medieval and early modern-era) origin.

And it is not just the historical cultural landscape but also its components when we do not even realize their age and their impact on the landscape character. One of the ancient features is certainly the **ground plan of settlements** (or, respectively, their historical centres) and, in the case of villages, also the connecting ploughs (the retrospective reach of the information provided by cartographic and, in part, also other sources from the early modern times to the earlier period must, however, be weighed with utmost caution). The same is true for the local names and **field-names** – many forests, ponds and meadows have had the same name for centuries. Ancient origin can also be ascribed to the local programme of the **connecting network** when main roads copy the age-long roads of commerce, and the similar case is railways (no matter if realized or not; the latter type on the Třeboň estates is the planned but never built railroad track Třeboň – Lišov – České Budějovice).

Contemporary landscape, containing an extensive range of remains of past landscapes (from their striking components, such as ponds, to minute, almost unnoticeable relics – e.g., farm-tracks of old roads), is indeed one of the crucial sources for reconstructing the former landscapes. It is, however, anything but singular: there is also a plethora of written, iconographic (visual) and cartographic (map) sources available. Their information value – from the point of completeness or, on the contrary, fragmentariness, the sense of the whole or

⁷⁷ On the clerical administration of the Třeboň estates during the Baroque era, see PUMPR 2010. – On stone calvaries, see PALOUŠOVÁ 2009, on brick calvaries, see HÁJEK 2009, where the degree of their preservation is synoptically provided in the attached maps. – On hermitages in the Třeboň region, see KOLÁŘOVÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2011; on the pilgrimage place at the Dunajovická Mountain, see ČERNÝ 2006, pp. 62–63.

the sense of detail, as well as from the point of historical (non)credibility – is highly variable. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the miscellaneous historical sources in fact are the witnesses of the only former (vanished) reality and that they must be pursued as such. Only the way of combining and confronting partial testimonies and incorporating them into wider contexts of meaning can help construct as plastic a picture as possible. It is simultaneously a matter of course that historians cannot in this respect do without cooperating with experts from other disciplines.⁷⁸

Conclusion

The development of the territorial structure of the Třeboň estates as summarized above clearly shows that their constant historical core was situated in the central part of the geomorphological area called the Třeboň basin, the terrain of which determined and largely still determines the landscape character of the entire region. The historical core of the Třeboň estates is a territory heavily transformed by human activity; on the other hand, its appearance today in many aspects reflects a rather ancient situation. The local natural conditions, suitable for fish farming but, paradoxically, not too favourable for field agriculture, stood at the beginnings of the development of the vast pond systems of the 15th and 16th centuries and at the same time protected them several centuries later, in the advanced 18th and early 19th centuries, i.e. during the period of massive abolishment of ponds.

Therefore, it is possible speak about a uniquely preserved cultural landscape of aristocratic dominion from between the turn of the 15th and 16th to the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries. The character of the local pond landscape, including the indispensable technical adaptations such as altering riverbeds and building drains, is basically the result of the earlier stage of development dating to between the 15th and 16th centuries, while the 18th and 19th centuries witnessed merely slight modifications. It can be said that the Třeboň landscape survived to a rather unprecedented degree. Its cultivated cultural landscape, however, not only consisted of ponds and the relevant waterworks (both Zlatá stoka and Nová řeka survived to our time practically all along their original courses); there also were farmsteads and mills (many of them, too, originating from the 16th century) and, last but not least, the characteristic meadow haylofts, which significantly add to the overall expression of this landscape. Calvaries, crosses and small chapels appeared on hillocks (as visually dominant points) and along roads as early as from the Middle Ages; farm-tracks of old roads – either local or, sometimes, long-distance (the Gypsy road) – can still be traced in the terrain. It would certainly be misleading to reconstruct the spectrum of features, representing the components of cultural landscape, on the basis of their current state of preservation – for the constructions and other elements of later date understandably had a higher chance of survival than the earlier ones. This can be exemplified by mills, documented on the Třeboň estates by many examples from as early as the latter half of the 14th century; the oldest surviving structures of (former) mills are, however, of at maximum Renaissance origin (e.g., the Záblatí and Opatovice facilities). The remains of farmsteads of provably Renaissance date can also be found only sporadically (we are positive about Švamberk in this sense, but our hitherto state of knowledge allows us to merely speculate in the other instances).

The most inconstant landscape features are its **organic components**, i.e. beds of flora and trees. The wooded areas, including their extent and the composition of their tree types, equally as the reintegrated stretches of land and their earlier condition, apparent in old maps

⁷⁸ An illustrious example in this sense is the publication DYKYJOVÁ 2000, aimed at a wider public but very inspiring due to various viewpoints on the contemporary landscape, including the historical one.

– beginning with the stable register and ending with the earliest layer of orthophotomaps from the 1930s – cannot be restored. The waterlogged meadows, on the contrary, necessarily look the same as they did in the past (which is sometimes visually underlined by the haylofts scattered throughout the Třeboň meadows and identical for centuries); the same, then, holds for surfaces of forest-agricultural character (meadows and pastures intertwined with groups of trees). Old trees and, in a certain sense, entire forest growths can even be the bearers of memory of former landscapes. The traditional mix of respect and admiration, held towards monumental trees, keeps seducing to the assumption that they could be eyewitnesses of the celebrated era of the 16th-century Rožmberk fish farming. Although it is not so (except for very isolated cases), it is nevertheless true that growths of much more recent date can be perceived as ancient as well – and some of them even embody tradition due to their status as historically preserved monuments. The beginnings of the preservation of the Branské douby [Branské oak wood] reach as far back as to the Schwarzenberg era. Although it cannot boast the same visual monumentality as the Boubín virgin forest (proclaimed a nature reserve by the Schwarzenbergs already in 1858), it still is an impressive piece of old landscape, preserved to this day despite the changing requirements on the agricultural use of landscape.⁷⁹

Most of the nature (biospheric) reserves and protected locations in the Třeboň region, however, date to a much more recent period – they were proclaimed great works as late as in the latter half of the 20th century. It is also true that the role of significant and perhaps outright decisive factor was at that time already played by other regards, i.e. the value of the individual areas as biotopes, while the aesthetic and landscape aspects merely served as supportive and secondary. The Třeboň region thus at the same time illustrates that even a landscape which was distinctively, albeit sensitively transformed by human touch can become an exceptionally rare biotope. This does not only concern the old pond works and the simultaneously adapted surrounding landscape, which can today evoke the impression of “wildlife” (illustrious in this sense are the Novořecké [the New River] swamplands), but also, for example, the biotopes found in places with rather recently terminated mineral mining. The extraordinary value of the Třeboň landscape ecosystems is tellingly proved by the fact that the RS 2 (Pond System 2) – the Třeboň ponds, and the RS 8 (Pond System 8) – the Třeboň peat-bogs are among the 12 declared and 2 proposed areas – especially rare biotopes – of the Czech lands, which fall under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ On the memorial trees in the Třeboň region, see BARTUŠKA – FLIEGELOVÁ – KOCIÁNOVÁ – KOCIÁNOVÁ – PRACH 2008.

⁸⁰ JANKOVSKÁ 1976; synoptically, JENÍK et al. 1996, pp. 138–160; NEUDERTO VÁ – NEUDERT 2013; the development of the legislative projection of the Třeboň Region Natural Reserve and its real possibilities are summarized in HÁTLE 2001.

The Broumov Region

Contrary to medieval and prehistoric landscapes, which we know many things about but reconstruct them with difficulties, the landscape of the Baroque period is not as distant in time but can nevertheless be concealed under many later layers hampering its research. Catching and reliably datable points are always being sought when reconstructing a landscape of a certain historical epoch, and these often are constructions of various kinds. They are usually – and especially in the case of manorial and sacral buildings – sufficiently documented, and also their approximate age can be very quickly derived from stylistic analysis of them. On the one hand, there are regions in the Czech Republic which abound in significant Baroque monuments, but their immediate surroundings were totally transformed, and we therefore cannot speak about a Baroque landscape. The local buildings, although they remain in a more or less intact condition to today, are solitary (Jezeří, Duchcov); they are constructions which can be approached through landscapes of other periods. On the other hand, some regions developed continuously to the present and retain a plethora of landscape elements which can be linked with the period from the 16th to the 18th centuries or the early 19th century. For this is how it is possible, according to the cultural and historical periodization, to demarcate the era when the Czech lands or, respectively, Central Europe were dominated by the Baroque style (including its fading traces found in the “folk” or, vernacular, architecture). But is the *landscape of the thus defined Baroque period* the same as a *Baroque landscape*? This question is only seemingly nonsensical: if viewed from the perspective of the past fifteen years, when both professional and popular interest in cultural landscape and its history reached an unprecedented scope, the stylistic nuance indeed gets some sense. The collocation “Baroque landscape” appeared to be on the verge of a cliché; it moved away from the results of rigorous scientific reconstruction of how the environment of people living in the given centuries looked like, and received the air of a (rural) idyll linked with understanding and employing the aesthetic and functional qualities of nature or, respectively, a landscape inhabited by a large number of (small) sacral relics.⁸¹

The European continent does not have a single area unremittingly inhabited by people which did not undergo fundamental changes in the 19th and 20th centuries. Industrialization, urbanization, developing transportation, electrification, rationalization and new forms of land cultivation, new building constructions, the two world wars, migration, globalization, multitudinous change of people’s religious and philosophical view of the world which they inhabit along with many other factors mainly affected the densely populated and, from the point of communication, frequented Central-European region to a very high degree. Nevertheless, it is still possible to find regions which in our opinion maintain certain features of the landscape as it was in the Czech lands of between the 16th to the early 19th centuries. One of them is the Broumov region. Both in the discussed period and over time, the local landscape is characteristic of continuous development of constant landscape components and a low degree of urbanization and unscrupulous exploitation of landscape by “socialist type” mining and agriculture. It has a specific landscape nature and is, as such, the subject of several levels of landscape protection.⁸²

Despite everything noted above, the Broumov region of the 21st century represents one of the best, but still problematic and imperfect insights into a Central-European Baroque landscape. It allows for a certain kind of “material reconstruction”. Cultural landscape, however, results

⁸¹ SÁDLO – HÁJEK 2004.

⁸² In general, KUPKA 2010; especially for the Broumov region, see VOREL – VORLOVÁ – KUPKA 2010. Regulation of the Ministry of the Environment of the Czech Republic No. 157/1991, Coll., of 27 March 1991, on the establishment of the Broumov region protected area – landscape park.

from mutual interaction between people and nature developing over a long period of time, and if the continuity of the settlement and population survived, it would help in the gaining of such complex knowledge. In the mid-20th century, this continuity in the Broumov region – equally as in the entire borderland of the Czech lands – was severely disrupted by the expulsion of its original inhabitants, i.e. the direct descendants of the former colonizers and colonists, which significantly reduced the chances of discovering the Baroque landscape in this region as precisely as possible.⁸³

The Broumov region as a periphery?

The Broumov Hook as a specific region appeared in the medium- and small-scale maps of the Czech lands⁸⁴ as early as in the beginning of the 16th century. Already the map issued by Nicolaus Klaudyán in 1518 displays the town of Broumov as separated from the East Bohemia by a belt of forest (which, at that time, represented a widely used sign for mountains). The separation of this area is yet more apparent in the 1568 map by Johann Criginger where the region “behind the Walls” is, along with Kłodzko, situated in Silesia, i.e. beyond the border. Neither these two maps nor the map by Pavel Aretin of Ehrenfeld (published first in 1619 and several more times in the course of the 17th century) and the map by Mauritius Vogt, which formed an appendix to his 1712 topographically-historical treatise *Das jetzt-lebende Königreich Böhmen*, representatively capture the individual residencies and settlements and, merely for the sake of guidance, feature the most conspicuous characteristic of the Broumov region as a whole: the separation of the basin from the rest of the Czech lands by a wall – the noticeable ridge of the Broumov Walls. This almost 300-meter high wall divides the historical Broumov region into two parts, a “Czech” one with its centre in the town of Police nad Metují and a “German” one with its centre in the town of Broumov. The above-mentioned maps are very subjectively generalized and their authors moreover probably did not know the region in person. The map of the Czech lands rendered by Johann Christoph Müller for the needs of the state in 1720 is in general much more precise and moving towards the verge of the so-called cartographic sources. In addition, its scale is much more user-friendly for landscape research; but it still fully proves the limits or, respectively, the insufficiencies of medium-scale maps for studying landscapes. The Broumov region appears here as a rather densely populated, mountainous area, clearly demarcated by the border and the Broumov Walls in the West. Information about the local terrain, mediated by the so-called hill profiles, again merely serves for basic guidance purposes, and the map features the main connections and the river Stěnáva [G. Steine]. The author gave a rather true picture of the character of the local population and, in the framework of the *länge Dörfer* category, highlighted about twenty villages and Broumov as a town constricted by bulwarks and housing a separately standing church (while the local monastery is not drawn in). The selection of the villages featured with a church (Martínkovice, Verněřovice, Ruprechtice and Božanov and the St John chapel at Janovičky) does not correspond to the real condition. The specific features of the Broumov morphology then clearly surface with the topographic surveying carried out by the Austrian army for its own needs. The surviving map sections of the 1st Military Survey for the area of the Broumov region were issued in 1780 and 1782 for the sake of updating the original surveying.⁸⁵ And since the local relief, vegetation, villages

⁸³ Comp. SÁGNEROVÁ 2008; for a general overview including examples from the Broumov region, see, at least, ČAPKA – SLEZÁK – VACULÍK 2005; MIKŠÍČEK et al. 2007; www.antikomplex.cz/fotogalerie/kategorie/6-oblasti/.

⁸⁴ See, most recently and with many reproductions, SEMOTANOVÁ 2001.

⁸⁵ CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2012a.

and towns were the centre of attention for the surveying soldiers due to their potential risks for the transfers of the military units and the military operations, the given sources give us a very detailed picture of the landscape. They not only feature the stable network of residencies and settlements, but also minute sacral relics as well as separately standing constructions. The IInd Military Survey (1842–1852) was executed in close connection with the cadastral surveying of the territory and was preceded by astronomic and geodetic surveys. From the point of cartography, it is a noticeably more perfect achievement than the Ist Military Survey. And since both surveys have almost identical map contents and adhere to the identical scale of 1:28 800 (only the heights of trigonometric points, given in fathoms, were added in the case of the IInd survey), we can clearly see and compare the changes which affected the given landscape during the seventy years between the origination of the first and the second works. The separation of the Broumov region by the Walls is unambiguous.

The transformations of the Broumov landscape in the next decades – mainly the progressing industrialization and urbanization linked with developing the railroad network – were captured in the maps of the IIIrd Military Survey via a stabilized sign code. The development of the villages of Velká Ves and Olivětín, with their cadastres being gradually filled with factory complexes and single-storey blue-collar housing characteristic of the Bohemian borderline architecture, is especially apparent here. In mid-1875, the Broumov region – one of the most densely populated regions in the Czech lands at that time – was directly connected to Vienna and Prague by the Choceň railroad, which also linked the region with Silesia and Kłodzko two years later. In the Czech hinterland, the connection with Trutnov via Teplice nad Metují was established in 1908.⁸⁶

For centuries, the horizon of the local inhabitants exceeded the ridges of the surrounding mountains – many of them set out for business and fairs and journeymen were arriving; the plentiful group of employees working at the Benedictine manor was in lively contact with the Břevnov monastery.⁸⁷ After the 1742 loss of Silesia with Kłodzko, a part of which the Broumov region repeatedly was even in the Middle Ages,⁸⁸ it definitely became a border area. Its marginal position, however, did not mean that it would end up on the margin of events. During the Austro-Prussian wars and mainly the Seven Years' War, Broumov was regarded as a strategically positioned town and, as such, was often threatened by military invasions along with its surroundings.⁸⁹ It was also affected by the fights of 1866. The members of the 19th-century Broumov entrepreneurial and intellectual elite felt they were distinguished supra-regional personalities in their fields (such as the representatives of textile industry, Schroll, Pollack and others);⁹⁰ at the same time, they were a significant regional unit in the framework of the German minority in the Czech lands and moreover in everyday contact with the German population beyond the border. This is, for example, illustrated by the fact that the *Glatzer Gebirgsverein* – a tourist association established in 1881 – was active on both sides of the border and had its direct Broumov section. The Broumov “mountain association”, or “tourist club“, was founded only as late as in 1932 and professed the heritage of the “German Giant Mountains' association” with its headquarters in Vrchlabí, the activity of which had declined prior to the Great War.⁹¹ The above-mentioned representatives experienced cultural and, from the 1930s, also politically defined affinity with both groups of the German-speaking population. When, then, did Broumov become a periphery? The condition lasting for

⁸⁶ ČERMÁK 1997; ČERMÁK 1999; BERGMANN et al. 2003, pp. 68–69.

⁸⁷ The double-monastery of Břevnov (today part of Prague) and Broumov represents an isolated example in the Czech lands.

⁸⁸ KOŠTÁL 1990.

⁸⁹ In spring 1757, the town itself was set on fire, probably started by local bribed inhabitants. It destroyed 180 houses, the town hall, the church and the monastery in four days.

⁹⁰ ČIŽMÁŘ 2007.

⁹¹ PELC 2009, pp. 68 and 253.

several centuries concluded with the events of 1938 when the territory of the Broumov and Teplice nad Metují judicial districts (with 38,616 inhabitants) became part of the so-called *Reichsgau Sudetenland*, a Sudeten administrative division of Nazi Germany. The chronicles from the region reflected these events in a rather remarkable way, which proves how deeply the local people identified themselves with the landscape they inhabited: “*We are mainly losing forest objects and excursion sites in our closest environs: Koruna, Špičák, Hvězda and Ostaš. Also all forests from Teplice as far as to Řeřišný were seized...*”⁹² The Police region came under the Náchod district. Broumov became the seat of the land administrator and the *Landkreis* Broumov was part of the government district Ústí nad Labem. In 1945, the efforts of the *Association for Equitable Borders of the Czechoslovak Republic* [Sdružení za spravedlivé hranice ČSR] found considerable support in the Broumov region, and also the Kłodzko Czechs, who in part settled there after the failed attempts at attaching Kłodzko to the Czech lands, came soundly into play. The newly arrived population, originating from most various regions of, what was then, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, professed no bonds to the widely conceived region of the Kłodzko border area and did not share the contacts and traditions of the deported Germans.

One of the arguments underlying the post-war attempts at attaching Kłodzko to the Czech lands was also its religious and administrative affiliation to the Prague archdiocese, lasting to 1972. This, however, sharply contrasts with the fact that the new, predominantly atheist population largely contributed to the “landscape secularization” in the region⁹³ where thus, for example, the tradition of pilgrimages to Wambierzyce swiftly vanished. The arrival of the new dwellers to the areas on both sides of the border who exclusively concentrated on a narrowly delineated region, the overall post-war Central-European order (the emergence of Poland within new borders) and the closure of the state border (the railway junction from Olivětín across the border was shut off) – these were the real factors which eventually made the Broumov region an outpost of the Czech lands; a picturesque but – despite global influences – progressively declining periphery. The final consequences of this transformation clearly surfaced in the 1990s. The region, however, has been given a chance at wiping off its periphery label during the most recent decade, especially thanks to the EU-supported cross-border cooperation, the wide-spreading modern forms of communication and growth in the standard of living, which jointly allow for higher mobility of the local dwellers and their working from home and result in new increase in the region’s permanent residents and in the support of tourism.

The Broumov region is a wide basin enclosed by a mountain ridge. Its backbone is the river Stěnava, which streams in from Poland north-east from the Broumov Hook, near the village of Starostín, and continues south-east, where it again leaves the Czech Republic below Otovice. The water-shed between the river basin of Stěnava and that of Metuje in the west also significantly defines the territory as a specific and, to a certain extent, enclosed region.⁹⁴ It is the Broumov Highlands from the point of geomorphology, the eastern part of which – the Broumov basin – is outlined by the Broumov Walls in the west. (The highest peak here is Božanovský Špičák [773 m], while one of the most conspicuous points on the horizon is, left from it, the Machov Saddle [Machovské sedlo], also called the Machov Cross [Machovský kříž; 669 m], which separates the Walls from the Table Mountains [Stolové hory, P. Góry Stołowe], situated on Polish territory.) The borderline ridge – the Javoří Mountains – is, to the north-east, dominated by Ruprechtický Špičák ([Spitzberg]; 880 m) and, further south-east, by

⁹² State Regional Archives in Náchod, Pamětní kniha obce Suchý Důl [Chronicle of Village Suchý Důl], 1923–1972, p. 93.

⁹³ SÁDLO – POKORNÝ – HÁJEK – DRESLEROVÁ – CÍLEK 2005.

⁹⁴ It is at the same time the main European water-shed between the areas feeding the Baltic Sea and the North Sea with water.

the somewhat lower Supí vrch ([Vulture Hill]; 541 m).⁹⁵ As far as historical routes are concerned, a rather frequented place mainly was the Hony Saddle [Honské sedlo] which still brings the main road from Police and Metují and Hronov to the Broumov basin; prior to the construction of the railway junction Choceň–Broumov via Meziměstí, it was the only well-negotiable connection between Broumov and the Czech hinterland, also serving for the shipping of wood from the Bohdašín grounds. Another significant frequented place was the Machov Saddle, connecting the south part of the basin with Machov. The central part of the basin is only slightly undulating and defined by deep valleys of brooks.⁹⁶

In the second decade of the 13th century, the scarcely populated Broumov region experienced gradual colonization by the Benedictines from the Břevnov monastery near Prague, with the main settlement centres being Police nad Metují and Broumov. From the point of administration, the Broumov region was, by the ruler's decree, exempted from the Kłodzko castellany and subordinated to Benedictine jurisdiction in 1260, thus falling under the Hradec district.⁹⁷ And although the Police provostship was ruined by the Hussites, the Broumov monastery, erected above a village first mentioned in 1256,⁹⁸ withstood the attacks and came to serve as a refuge for the abbots from the home Břevnov. The Benedictines resided in Broumov continuously, with only short interruptions, to 1946.⁹⁹ It is also worth noting that the long-lasting presence of the Church administration forestalled the settlement of noble families throughout its rather vast domain, and the region has thus been void of manorial estates, a feature very rare in the Czech environment.

Borders of the Broumov estates and the Broumov settlement structure as reflected by old maps

Territorial borders – of administrative units, or even states – were recorded on maps from the 18th century.¹⁰⁰ The development of the land register well illustrates that the hitherto established descriptive form was verbal. It was commonplace in Central Europe of that time that even territories precisely surveyed for the purposes of taxation were not drawn on maps but, instead, described in textual apparatuses. The first document exclusively based on maps was the post-1817 Stable land register. The given practice even concerned the border of the Czech lands which was first subjected to systematic survey, headed by the most distinguished land surveyors, as late as in the first half of the 18th century. In the previous centuries, detailed maps merely served to solve disputable or otherwise pressing cases of local character.¹⁰¹ Contrary to this, the local aristocratic domains of the Baroque era were not only very precisely surveyed in the field (as is proved by the surviving borderstones) but also captured in detailed maps of both large and medium scale, issued long before other territorial units earned well-deserved surveyors' attention.¹⁰² We must, however, distinguish at least two

⁹⁵ <http://geoportal.cuzk.cz/geoprohlizec/> – Geomorfologické jednotky ČR [Geomorphological Units of the Czech Republic].

⁹⁶ <http://geoportal.cuzk.cz/geoprohlizec/> – INSPIRE – vodstvo [waters].

⁹⁷ MUSIL – FELCMAN – ČECHURA 2009; also see MUSIL 2012.

⁹⁸ KUČA 1995; MJČ 1.

⁹⁹ SIOSTRZONEK 2013 and FOLTÝN – KOUPIL 2013, where also find earlier literature (esp. TOMEK 1881).

¹⁰⁰ BURDOVÁ 1986; ROUBÍK 1952.

¹⁰¹ See MAŠEK 1948, esp. as concerns the Josephine and Theresian land registers.

¹⁰² ČERNÝ 1955.

groups of the so-called maps of estates, when perspective maps considerably stand out among the practically-oriented and usually hand-written works of fluctuating quality.¹⁰³

The borders of the Broumov estates were rather constant from the high Middle Ages,¹⁰⁴ and their more or less precise picture can be derived from the inventory of villages provided by the land and duties registers which uniquely survived from the same period in relatively high numbers.¹⁰⁵ The period between 1406 and 1773 left behind a total of seven land and duties registers; the one of 1602, most probably issued in connection with the establishment of a new abbot, Wolfgang Selender of Prošovice, must unfortunately be considered missing.¹⁰⁶ The earliest, i.e. 1406, register recording all Benedictine estates in Bohemia and Moravia survived in a copy dating to the mid-15th century¹⁰⁷ and claims that the Broumov estates (outside the town of Broumov) housed 13 villages in the given year. In 1434, the estates expanded due to purchasing the villages of Verněřovice, Vižňov and Meziměstí.¹⁰⁸ The three settlements subsequently appeared in the registers of 1602 and, mainly, 1631 when the Břevnov-Broumov Abbot Johann Benno of Falkenberg had the estates surveyed and described.¹⁰⁹ The Broumov territory was at that time inhabited by a town and 18 villages. The same was true in 1654¹¹⁰ when the damages and losses ensuing from the Thirty Years' War were assessed. In 1676, the Broumov estates (again apart from the town of Broumov) numbered 19 villages with 894 settlements, 474 of them being managed by peasants, 51 by gardeners and 368 by small farmers, and seven (Velká Ves, Broumov, Otovice, Martínkovice, Jetřichov, Meziměstí and Vižňov) had the status of farmsteads. The farmstead in Otovice was founded in 1614 and two others followed in the 1620s: in Velká Ves (1625) and in Vižňov (1624/1628). And although they were undoubtedly significant from the aspects of economy and agriculture, they did not play as important a role from the aesthetic point and the point of the settlement network as their counterparts found at other, either secular or religious, domains. The series of the land and duties registers closed with the volumes dating to between 1754 and 1757 (describing the town of Broumov and the total of 17 villages found at the Broumov estates) and with the so-called urbarial inventory of properties subject to taxation of 3 February 1773.¹¹¹

There is, however, also the land and duties register issued by Johann Georg Albert Hesselius in 1676, which in many respects defies all the above-mentioned documents,¹¹² not only due to its comprehensive character and painstaking execution and its overall concept (based on consistent combining of texts and maps). Its most exceptional quality within the context of the estates' border can probably be found in the part describing – again with the help of both map and verbal language – the so-called four horizons: for Hesselius captured the central location of the town of Broumov, viewed it as the centre of the region, and subsequently created a de facto circular panorama of the entire basin. The long-term Broumov magistrate and future

¹⁰³ Either their commissioners or authors nevertheless pursued utterly different goals than those of an economic or juridical nature. ŠIMŮNEK 2012.

¹⁰⁴ ČÁP 1998.

¹⁰⁵ See, synoptically, RESLOVÁ 2009 (including the reconstruction maps); for the printed form, see VLČKOVÁ [RESLOVÁ] 2010.

¹⁰⁶ JANOUŠEK 1936, p. 160. KUBA–ŠIMEK–ZAHRÁDKA, p. 12, pp. 43–46.

¹⁰⁷ EMLER 1881; ČECHURA–RYANTOVÁ 1992, p. 94. Prague National Archives, Collection Břevnov Benedictines.

¹⁰⁸ Purchased by Abbot Heřman from the neighbouring lords of Skalice; see ŠIMÁK 1931–1932, p. 12.

¹⁰⁹ State Regional Archives Zámorsk, Collection Vs Broumov, book n. 1: *New Reformirtes Vrbariu[m]... 1631*.

¹¹⁰ National Archives, Prague; for abstract *Urbarium Aller und jeder des Stiftsjährlichen Einkommen von Stadt und Braunauischen Dorfschafften... 1654*, see State Regional Archives Zámorsk, Collection Vs Broumov, box 16, Inv. Nr. 669.

¹¹¹ State Regional Archives Zámorsk – State Regional Archives in Náchod, Collection Eduard Langer.

¹¹² ŠIMEK 2004 and, most recently, KOLÁČNÝ – STEINOVÁ – WAAGE 2014 as a critical edition with an introductory treatise and a list of earlier literature.

administrator of the Broumov estates certainly wanted to add some value to his register by the very “description of the borderline” for the sake of practical use.¹¹³ But he, perhaps unwittingly, at the same gave us a true picture of the bounds of his own existence; of a life lived day after day in the Broumov region at the threshold of the last third of the 17th century. Simply put, Hesselius quite aptly grasped the spirit of the land he would walk through every day, including its laws and regularities which determined the arrangement and forms of settlements in space, and was thus able to describe them with the utmost insight and sense of detail. The Broumov basin is, otherwise, a territory extremely appropriate for being researched by an untrained cartographer – and not just because of the central position of the town of Broumov with its dominating monastery and the linear chain of villages along the watercourses, but also due to its clear delineation, i.e. the horizon given by the relatively high mountains encapsulating the Broumov basin in the form of a ring.

The relics left after the borderline surveying can be found in numerous documents¹¹⁴ as well as in the region’s terrain. The partial borderline disputes with the owners of the neighbouring estates ended in 1700 and a stone stela, commemorating this agreement, was erected in the tri-border area in 1732.¹¹⁵ The so-called Třípanský stone [G. Dreiherrenstein] stands at the place where not only the borders of the estates of the Břevnov-Broumov Abbot Otmar Zinke, Count Konrad Ernst Maximilian von Hochberg and Baron Joseph von Stillfried but also of the historical duchies of Kłodzko, Silesia and Bohemia converged – on the today’s Czech-Polish borderline road on the ridge above Janovičky at an approximate altitude of 730 metres. The verbal description of the border of the Broumov estates is part of the document entitled *Gräntz Beschreibung zwischen den Stift Braunau und Graff Hochbergischen Herrschaften Fürstenstein und Friedland*¹¹⁶ of 1734. The surveying was carried out by engineer Friedrich Gottlieb Schulzen between 15 and 17 July 1733.

In connection with the disputed locations along the land border, two manuscript maps were issued by the land surveyor František Alois Kolbe in the 1780s.¹¹⁷ The first map, *Mappa von der zwieschen Löb. Stiefft Braunau könig. Königgratzer-Böheimischen Krayßes und könig. Preußischen Kammer-Guth Dornikau Glatzer-Districts situirte Anno 1784 aufgenommene Land-gränitz*,¹¹⁸ captures the positions of both sides of the dispute, while *Mappa von der zwieschen Löb. Stiefft Braunau könig. Königgratzer-Böheimischen Krayßes und könig. Preußischen Kammer-Guth Dornikau Glatzer-Districts situirte und Anno 1787 mit Reinsteiner [?] Außgemarckten Landgränitz*¹¹⁹ already depicts the solution. The maps – products of official administrative cartography – represent essential examples of the skill of a contemporary professional. They both refer to the 1728 description of the border and feature the smallish area in the surroundings of a significant point of orientation in the southern part of the basin, the Machov Cross. And although the cartographer strictly adhered to the commissioned subject, i.e. to record the course of the borderline, his maps also contain an array of remarkable details which draw attention to the contemporary practice of cartographers. They, for example, illustrate the persistently most serious pitfall of map-

¹¹³ This is also how this part of the land and duties register was perceived in the given period: comp. *Beschreibung des Braunischen Landes umb Kreis, und dessen Gränzen, in vier theil*, copy from the period after 1720. State Regional Archives Náchod, Collection Eduard Langer, Inv. No. 150, box 53. On the given issue, comp., esp., KOLÁČNÝ – STEINOVÁ – WAAGE 2014, pp. 14–15.

¹¹⁴ The most important document is *Universal-Gräntz Beschreibung* [probably 1734], which contains several older borderline’s descriptions dating back to the 17th and 18th centuries. State Regional Archives Zámrsk, Collection Vs Broumov, box 34.

¹¹⁵ Comp., esp., SCHMITT 1941.

¹¹⁶ State Regional Archives Zámrsk, Collection Vs Broumov, Inv. No. 735.

¹¹⁷ ROUBÍK 1963

¹¹⁸ Prague National Archives, SMP [Map Collection], Inv. No. 674, sign. E II 7.

¹¹⁹ Prague National Archives, Hraniční spory [Borderland Disputes] K 179.

making – rendering the terrain. The cartographer did not determine map signs for it and seemingly did not reflect it, although apparently departing from autopsy. The map legend nevertheless distinguishes roads passable by vehicles and paths for pedestrians, which well indicate the character of the steep terrain on the eastern side of the Walls.

The borderline of the entire Broumov estates was captured by cartographic means as late as in 1793. The anonymous author marked 17 landmark stones or crosses (numbered from Verněřovice southwards) along the estates' perimeter, with the Třípanský stone being number eighteen. The reason for issuing the map probably was not just to record the landmarks and measure the perimeter (area?) of the Broumov estates in order to be able to state *Totum Territorium à num. 1 usque ad 18 in sua circumferentia continet 10 milliaria Germanica*. The coloured manuscript map, oriented approximately towards North-East, captures the Benedictine estates of Broumov and Police.¹²⁰ From the point of cartography, the map is a naïve work probably created by an unschooled author. It does not have geodetic foundations and the spatial relations and distances between the individual settlements as well as other landscape features are merely of a basic guidance nature. The author in fact offers a stylized picture of the Broumov basin and the territory before the Walls as seen from high above the river Dřevíč (?) (*Erla Fluvius*) near Stárkov. This is a distinctively more backward map than the above-mentioned Kolbe's achievements, but its author captured the estates as a whole, without aspiring to create a large-dimensional representative work.

The Broumov estates became extinct in 1850 and were replaced by the political district of Broumov. The total of 59 cadastral villages came under the Broumov district administration which was divided into two judicial districts with their seats in Broumov and Police nad Metují.¹²¹

The town of Broumov as a natural centre

Broumov, situated in the centre of a basin on a promontory above the river Stěnava, was from the very beginning dominated by a complex of monastery buildings.¹²² It received the status of a town in 1348 and its dwellers completed the bulwarks in 1380. The entrance to the town was provided by two gates and four gate-houses (the remains of the last one, the Upper Gate, were demolished in 1880 in connection with the reconstruction of the inn U Labutě [The Swan]). The web of streets and the parcelling characteristic of a medieval location town are still well apparent in the stable land register.

The monastery in Broumov often symbolized the entire area of the Broumov region in prints and maps.¹²³ The slightly simplified axonometric view of the monastery, reminiscent of a model of the complex, occupies an honorary place among other Benedictine monasteries and featured in the central part of the doctoral thesis by Abbot Tomáš Sartorius. A similar miniature can be found in the form of a map sign in the above-mentioned manuscript map of 1793. It is a view from the west, presented from high above, but the direction indicates real posts around the chapel at Hvězda.

An earlier condition of the monastery is rendered in the Hesselius' land and duties register and also in vistas which survive from the early 17th century. The monumental castle, the disposition of which is well visible in the ground plan of the monastery rebuilt in the Baroque style, fell prey to fire in 1664. The appearance of the monastery after the restoration survives in an engraving from 1680. The complex, along with a substantial part of the town, burnt

¹²⁰ Museum of the Broumov Region, Broumov, no detailed records.

¹²¹ ČÁP 2001; CECHNER 1930, where the map precedes p. 1; also see KOŠŤÁL 1990.

¹²² VILÍMKOVÁ – PREISS 1989, pp. 29–43.

¹²³ On pre-photographic vistas, comp. SKALICKÝ 1993; SKALICKÝ 1989.

down again twenty years later, in 1684, which initiated its magnificent reconstruction, headed by Martin Allio. More extensive construction works began in Broumov in 1709, already under the presence of Christoph Dientzenhofer. Abbot Otmar Zinke nonetheless decided to rebuild the complex on a radical scale. It is, among other things, known that stone was delivered from the pits in the Hodkovice, Křinice and Božanov forests. The reconstruction took place between 1727 and 1733 and was conducted by Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofer. The freshly reconstructed monastery was thus recorded in a vista by Johann Joseph Dietzler, which became a model for many others.

The earliest lithographic postcards¹²⁴ from the production of many local publishers (especially Franz Wenzel who promoted his firm as the largest postcard publishing house in the Czech lands) present Broumov of the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries as a modern town. It is still dominated – equally as in earlier vistas – by the massive complex of the monastery, but the panorama already bristles with chimneys of textile factories and new construction beyond the bulwarks, especially the imposing Císařská ([Imperial], later Masaryk) Street with the houses of the Schroll family. Broumov was the seat of a political district, the natural centre of the region, which the postcards express by laying emphasis on modern buildings: the regional hospital, the post office and the council schools. Alejka [Little Alley] became the modern park and a recreational promenade. Today restored, it is remembered by writer Alois Jirásek from the times of his Broumov grammar-school studies.¹²⁵

A plentiful group of postcards is related to the popular excursion inns in the Broumov region. It thus provides an interesting map of Sunday and holiday trips (the inns at Hvězda, in Ráj, Na Pískách, in Martínkovice by the church, the Amerika inn at the foot of the Walls in Křinice and the inn in Janovičky). The continuity of iconographic historical sources and their mutual relations are documented by Wenzel's postcard of 1898, which reproduces the complete view of Broumov in 1711, presented from above and from the west. The original vista is today missing. Another of Wenzel's original postcards, dated 1904, unambiguously reports which is the most characteristic building in the town, located in the Czech-German borderland. The view from the tower of the monastery church westwards captures the flat central part of the Broumov basin, Křinice and the Broumov Walls. A view in the opposite direction – from the Krims inn in the lower part of Křinice by the road from Martínkovice – is offered by the 1902 postcard by Alexander Felgenauer which not only features the general character of the landscape but also the space where one of the Broumov housing estates developed in the 1980s.

Routes and villages of the Broumov region

The central position and significance of Broumov are also underlined by the web of connections which run in a stellar pattern from the town to the individual villages. Reinforced roads have remained rather exceptional among those situated on the periphery. The main factors influencing the road network are the network of settlements and the methods of land cultivation. The road network, however, changes over time. Prior to the mid-20th century, the Broumov region was interwoven by a very dense network of roads of a mainly local character. It was determined by the shape of the ploughs – the land under crop and other landed estate pertaining to each farmstead. The local farms – vast complexes composed of three and sometimes four several-storey brick buildings characteristic of the Broumov

¹²⁴ Comp. REJL 2000; BERGMANN 2013.

¹²⁵ JIRÁSEK 1980.

basin¹²⁶ – are usually situated on elevated terraces above valleys of brooks. The area behind the complex of buildings customarily housed a garden and an orchard, with a belt of field behind them, and yet further were pastures and a forest. Every farmyard had to have an access to all of its plots of land, which was provided by a local track leading from the farm to the border of the cadastre. The main village road was a path following the course of the brook, equipped with small bridges allowing an approach to the individual farmyard complexes or the individual cottages, the latter usually standing in the brook meadow. The backbone of the entire web of routes was the above-mentioned road leading from Broumov through the Hony Saddle to Police nad Metují. It is a road of strategic significance via which enemy armies have been invading the Czech lands from the Middle Ages until recently.

A certain speciality of the region is the stone roads¹²⁷ cutting through the Broumov Walls. They are of varying width, paved with large, irregular flat sandstone blocks and lined with flagged ditches, water drainages and supporting walls. They connected the worlds on the both sides of the Walls, significantly shortened distances and, among other things, served to transport wood and stone and drive cattle from Broumov to Police (while the cattle road led from Martínkovice via Suchý Důl [Dry Mine], and the road from Šonov to the Machov Cross was one of the branches of the Wambierzyce pilgrimage road). These roads also formed natural borders separating the individual forest grounds. The recently restored road leading from Broumov via Křinice to Hvězda was of regional importance.

The valleys of brooks flowing into the river Stěnava became inhabited by gradually expanding colonization villages, always intersected by a main path parallel with the watercourse. The local high-Baroque churches, which made the Broumov region famous to such a degree that art historian Mojmír Horyna would once describe it as “an especially strong rural enclave of Prague art”,¹²⁸ were built after 1690, usually replacing the previous wooden constructions. The latter – as well as the villages and the town of Broumov soon after the 1664 fire – were captured with unprecedented faithfulness by the author of the most significant surviving Broumov land and duties register, Johann Georg Albert Hesselius, in 1676.

Although the Broumov territory is closely linked with the beginnings of the Thirty Years’ War, it suffered relatively little from the hardships resulting from the military conflict¹²⁹ and thrived during the Baroque era. Its landscape was influenced by both agricultural (farmsteads) and construction activities of the most prominent abbots, such as Tomáš Sartorius (1663–1700) and Otmar Zinke (1700–1738) whose monogram OAB – “Otmar Abbas Braunensis” – still decorates dozens of either small or more extensive architectonic monuments throughout the region.

The first stage of erecting new churches in Broumov (the parish church of Ss Peter and Paul, 1679–1682) and Martínkovice (1692–1698) was most probably realized by Martin and Giovanni Battista Allios.¹³⁰ After 1709, Christoph Dientzenhofer participated in the reconstruction of the monastery and most likely also designed the churches of St Michael in Verněřovice (1719–1721) and St James in Ruprechtice (1720–1723),¹³¹ which are displayed side by side with the Vižňov church on the title page of the 1732 estates’ inventory.¹³² New

¹²⁶ The farmyards have many very specific features, such as built-in stone seats and stone dog-kennels. Comp. BERGMANN et al. 2003, pp. 16–19, 50–51.

¹²⁷ WAAGE 2004.

¹²⁸ BERGMANN et al. 2003, p. 33.

¹²⁹ ČECHURA 1997.

¹³⁰ VILÍMKOVÁ – PREISS 1989, p. 127.

¹³¹ VILÍMKOVÁ 1986, pp. 88 and 91.

¹³² State Regional Archives Zámorsk, Sbirka matrik východočeského kraje, Parish Office Ruprechtice, sign. 141–7599, for a more decorated version see State Regional Archives Zámorsk, Collection Vs Broumov, SOA Zámorsk, Vs Broumov, book 27.

village churches, which gradually came to inhabit the Broumov monastery complex – the church of All Saints in Heřmánkovice (1723), the church of St Anne in Vižňov (1725–1727), the extension of the presbytery by the church of St John the Evangelist in Janovičky (1725), the St Barbara church in Otovice (1725–1726), the St Margaret church in Šonov (1726–1730) and the church of St Mary Magdalene in Božanov, built as the last one between 1733 and 1738, although its tower is of an earlier date (1709) – were works of Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofer.

An important point of orientation in the landscape of the Broumov region, “appropriated” by the abbots, was the chapel of the Virgin Mary at Hvězda, built in the same period, i.e. between 1732 and 1733.¹³³ The symbol of the “appropriation” here can be the star – the attribute of the Virgin –, originating from the roof of the Broumov monastery and newly installed on the top of the chapel, which was erected on a highly frequented place and provided an open view of the entire basin.

Compared to other regions of the Czech lands, Broumov enjoyed an unusually long tradition of not only mills (already documented in Stěňava in the high Middle Ages) but also proto-industry, i.e. scattered manufactories. The traditional textile production, initially linen and, after the mid-17th century, mainly drapery, peaked in the second quarter of the 18th century.¹³⁴

It was centralized and subjected to the supervision of the Benedictine authorities from the late 17th century. The number of weavers was seven hundred and, after overcoming the crisis ensuing from the War of the Austrian Succession, increased to one thousand, with most of them working in Heřmánkovice and Martínkovice. The Benedictines also tried to establish their own drapery manufactory in the town of Broumov during the period of the above-mentioned war, but their attempts failed due to apparently bad timing. Guilds had a rather decisive word at that time, although their powers were continuously limited by the Church authority. Abbot Tomáš, for example, introduced a new weaver’s code in 1682, which guaranteed the Benedictines an exclusive right to linen purchases. The main commodities were wool and, in the 19th century, flax, while the latter faced competition from cotton from the first half of the century. During the 1830s, the main organizers of linen production and trade were the firms of Josef Walzel, František Heinzel from Vižňov and Benedikt Schroll.¹³⁵

The industry in the central part of the basin, on the Stěňava riverbanks, concentrated from the late 18th century – first at a slow pace, when mangles, bleacheries and dye-works began to appear alongside the watercourses. It, however, soon distinctly transformed the character of the local landscape due to the new massive factory complexes and chimneys projected on the silhouettes of the villages and mainly Broumov, which expanded by incorporating Velká Ves and de facto interconnected with Olivětín. The village of Olivětín, hitherto mainly famous for its brewery, became the central seat of the state cotton-producing enterprise Veba in 1949 (i.e. after the nationalization of textile businesses), which encompassed the factories in Meziměstí, Velká Ves and Martínkovice.¹³⁶ The above-mentioned railroad not only represented a new noticeable line in the landscape from 1875 but especially enriched it with a new feature in the form of railway stations. It essentially changed mainly the nature of Meziměstí,¹³⁷ which had so far been dominated by a Baroque château – a summer seat of the abbots (a late project of Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofer, built in 1750).¹³⁸

¹³³ VILÍMKOVÁ 1986, p. 119.

¹³⁴ ČECHURA 1995.

¹³⁵ ČIŽMÁŘ 2006, with a list of other literature and a rich visual accompaniment. The treatise is based on research into the collection of the State Regional Archives Zámorsk, Collection Vs Benedikt Schroll, Broumov-Olivětín; Collection Veba, bavlnářské závody s.p., Broumov.

¹³⁶ ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ 1997.

¹³⁷ BERGMANN et al. 2003, pp. 70–73 (including rich iconography).

¹³⁸ VILÍMKOVÁ 1986, p. 124.

Conclusion

The overall landscape character of the Broumov region has been, first and foremost, fundamentally influenced by high-Baroque monuments. Other significant landscape components documenting the early origin and the stability of the web of the local connections are alleys and also minute relics. However, it is advisable to be rather circumspect in this sense because the surviving sacral sculptures and niche chapels, scattered throughout the region in unprecedented numbers but displaying fluctuating artistic quality, often date to the 19th century.¹³⁹

Nevertheless, we should not succumb to the impression that Baroque landscape is formed by Baroque architectonic monuments. “Reading” landscape through buildings is far too condensed. In addition, the label “monument” may lead to interpretations other than those pursued in this publication. Our primary goal is not discovering a historical landscape of a certain epoch via historical sources and relics but, instead, a landscape as an overall environment of people inhabiting it during a specific period of time. It is therefore necessary to interlink the individual components and mainly consider the structure and character of the given landscape. What, then, are the main characteristics which make lead to the opinion that the landscape of the Broumov Hook is close to the landscape of the Baroque period? It is not just the above-mentioned components immensely constant in time, but also the compact settlements of very specific ground plan and specific disposition in the landscape, which did not experience massive growth in the modern era, and therefore helped maintain the hierarchy of dominants. The typical feature shared by the Broumov villages is that they seem to remain hidden – when not even a view from a relatively short distance of several hundred metres can reveal the existence of a settlement with dozens of buildings. What betrays them is the towers of churches, usually (but not exclusively: Otovice) erected on elevated places – often not on the highest brook terrace, and thus always respecting the natural conditions of a given site so that the individual buildings could be appropriately and sensitively incorporated into the landscape. The villages are interconnected by a network of roads running out from the centre and highlighted by old alleys; a network which has not undergone any conspicuous changes and was merely enriched by a railway. The minute relics – either those surviving from the 1780s or of much later date – along with the expressive solitary trees¹⁴⁰ also fundamentally influence the local landscape character. Another essential feature of the local landscape is its reasonable, well-proportioned scale.

The issue lingering for the future is to assess the impact of tourism on the region. The signs of the developing infrastructure in the form of reinforced and trail-blazed roads, as well as restaurant and accommodation facilities, can be found in rather high density here – except in the Broumov basin itself (the lodge at Hvězda, the Adršpach-Teplice Rocks [G. Adersbach-Weckelsdorfer Felsenstadt] and the Table Mountains in Poland). The latter half of the 20th century mainly affected Janovičky in this sense – but, again, not the villages situated somewhat lower. The era of 21st-century tourism based on utterly different principles, the expressions of which are very significant for the Broumov region, still awaits evaluation. In any case, the region’s landscape as a whole is a protected area – a landscape park. The discussed territory (and its immediate surroundings) is moreover incredibly rich in national natural reserves (the Adršpach-Teplice Rocks, the Broumov Walls), natural reserves (Ostaš and the Cross Road), natural monuments (Borek and the Lysý Hill), urban reserve zones (Broumov, Police) and, last but not least, a village reserve (Křinice). In addition, there are two Benedictine monasteries, the specific group of nine Baroque village churches, the earliest wooden church in the Czech lands, the imposing brick farmhouses of the Broumov type and

¹³⁹

For minute relics of the Broumov region, visit <http://www.collegium.cz/pamatky-databaze/>.

¹⁴⁰

<http://www.broumovsko.cz/images/bezecke%20trasy/pamatne-stromy-na-broumovsku>.

dozens of chapels and other minute relics which began to be continuously restored, described and presented in most various forms during the past decade.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, there remains the never-ending task of balancing the protection which would, on the one hand, conserve the character of the landscape of the past and, on the other hand, develop favourable living conditions – because large regions cannot be condemned to the fate of open-air folk museums but, instead, must continue to be populated and be “lived” landscapes.

¹⁴¹ For the complete enumeration, see VOREL – VORLOVÁ – KUPKA et al. 2010, p. I.13; <http://broumovsko.ochranaprirody.cz/>.

Prague and Its Surroundings. Landscape as Poetry, Landscape as Prose

*To see Prague through new eyes... And this city will be changing ceaselessly in front of you, and you will keep discovering it anew and its new features*¹⁴² The chapter “Prague and Its Surroundings. Landscape as Poetry, Landscape as Prose” follows the extensive landscape changes, which occurred in the latter half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, via a body of selected and perhaps less well-known and hitherto sporadically employed historical sources. It presents the rich diversity of the surviving sources of enormous significance which both separately and jointly allow for reconstructing the landscape of the future capital but also the different ways in which its creators perceived landscape.

The city of Prague and its landscape form an inseparable whole, a unity of space, people and time. The wealth of historical traces surviving in the contemporary landscape of the city documents the transformations which permeated it like a diffusing river, like the strands of a spider’s web. Is it possible to analyse these traces and reconstruct the historical landscape, or merely grasp its virtual character and spirit? Or to create a model, a simulation which will carry us back to the past on the basis of historical sources, maps, plans, texts, renditions and terrain relics?

From the beginning of its existence, Prague was moulded by the basic formative landscape elements such as relief, watercourses and greenery. These would influence human dwellings long before the origination of towns as geographically enclosed wholes characteristic of a high density of built-up space and population, delimited by legal regulations and playing specific political, administrative, production, commercial and cultural roles. The layout of Prague in the landscape was predetermined and formed by its constant relief, especially the Petřín (Laurenziberg) and Vítkov hills and the hillocks framing the Prague basin. The local waters – the river Vltava with its four main tributary streams (the Rokytka, the Botič and the Šárka and Daleje brooks) – introduced motion and life to the local landscape. Its historical greenery, fields, meadows, forests, vineyards and gardens, represented a conspicuous and variable framework without which Prague would merely be a cluster of buildings jammed into a limited area.¹⁴³

The origins of Prague are closely linked with the 880s’ origins of Prague Castle as the residence of the ruling duke from the Přemyslid family. The most recent archaeological research revealed that the elevation towering over river Vltava was probably colonized as early as around the mid-9th century, when the fortified settlements of earlier date were gradually losing their significance. The population in the settlement round the castle mainly concentrated on the main routes on the left bank of the Vltava. Abraham ben Jacob, a member of the legation of the Arabian ruler from the city of Córdoba (in, what is today, Spain), sent out to the German Emperor Otto I, mentioned Prague Castle and the nearby dwellings during his visit after the mid-10th century: “*The city of Frága is built of stone and lime and is the largest city as far as trade is concerned.*”¹⁴⁴

In the latter half of the 11th century, the settlement began spreading to the lowland right Vltava riverbank, and the place of, what is today, the Old Town Square, hosted markets from the second half of the 12th century. The connection between the future Old Town and the settlement round Prague Castle (later the Lesser Town) was from 1172 facilitated by the stone Judith Bridge. Prague Castle and the settlement around it proliferated with villages serving as an agricultural background for the developing settlement agglomeration with simple religious

¹⁴² Miloš Václav Kratochvíl. In: ČAREK 1948, 7, 10.

¹⁴³ On the following brief sketch of historical and land-formative development of Prague, comp. SEMOTANOVÁ et al. 2015 (where also find more literature on the given issue).

¹⁴⁴ MINULOST [THE PAST] 1971, p. 27, report on the period between 965 and 966.

constructions. The period between the 9th and 13th centuries already witnessed the existence of an extensive settlement between Prague Castle and Vyšehrad, called Mezigrady [Between the Castles]. From the early 13th century, the development of the settlement agglomeration accelerated, which mainly resulted from the boom of crafts and trade. The space of the future Prague Old Town was in the 13th century inhabited by approximately 3,500 citizens of predominantly Slavic origin with German, Jewish and Romance minorities.

In the latter third of the 13th century, the right-bank settlement around the main marketplace (today, the Old Town Square) began transforming into a city. After 1231, the Bohemian King Wenceslas I had let part of the Old Town agglomeration fortify, thus laying the foundations of the Prague Old Town on an area of approximately 140 hectares. The built-up space was characterized by an irregular web of streets departing from the original communication routes and lined by spectacular Roman houses and courts. Separate settlement units were monasteries, erected on vacant sites. In 1257, King Přemysl Ottokar II founded the Prague New Town on the left bank of the Vltava, in the space of the former settlement under Prague Castle, which came to be called the Lesser Town in 1348. The two towns experienced rapid development of construction activity and, after the mid-13th century, also the replacement of the Romanesque style by Gothic.

A very significant stage of Prague urban development arrived in the 14th century with the reign of the Bohemian and Roman King Charles IV who changed Prague into a residential city rivalling the contemporary Paris, Rome and Constantinople in its extent as well as its grandiosity and standard of culture. Both the political and cultural renown of Prague was, among other things, contributed to by elevating the local bishopric to an arch-bishopric and the 1348 foundation of Prague University. After the mid-14th century, the banks of the Vltava were arched by a new stone bridge, today called after the name of its founder. In 1348, the Emperor moreover noticeably extended the city agglomeration by a generous urban work, establishing the Prague New Town situated on 360 hectares south and east from the Old Town city bulwarks and scattered with an array of important monumental buildings.

From the 15th to the mid-19th centuries, the Prague landscape, hemmed in bulwarks, did not undergo any more distinct changes. And although its individual towns – the Old Town, Lesser Town, New Town and Hradšchin – differed in location and the character of the built-up areas, they otherwise formed a relatively compact urban whole constricted by fortification. The Old Town, into which the Jewish Town was wedged, was characteristic of rather narrow and meandering streets, small squares and deep and narrow lots of burghers' houses. The Lesser Town, equally as the smallish neighbourhood of Hradšchin, served as a background especially for the local aristocratic palaces with their carefully designed and expensively maintained Renaissance and later Baroque gardens. The New Town and its wide straight streets and large squares, then, perfectly suited the social requirements of living in urban dwellings. The south-east edge of the New Town still provided enough free area opening space for further construction development. Both banks of the freely flowing river Vltava were scattered with mills and other, mostly noisy and stinking, businesses such as tanning workshops, and the local wood trade and fishing thrived. The low-lying Vltava riverbanks and islands were also flooded on an annual basis.

In 1784, the Old, Lesser and New Towns and Hradšchin merged into a single administrative unit. The urban landscape began to be gradually intermeshed and ingrown by a new lifestyle with all the changes brought about by the 19th-century industrial revolution and modernization of society. Industry first concentrated in the Old Town and in a part of the New Town. It, however, also infiltrated several Prague islands, the first Prague suburb of Karlín and the developing Smíchov. The Prague landscape of the first half of the 19th century nevertheless initially did not differ much from that of the previous periods. The space outside the fortification was still a rural landscape inlaid with suburban villages of a craft and trade

atmosphere, vineyard and other farmsteads and vast areas of cultivated gardens, forests, fields, vineyards and gradually also park greenery (the Hvězda and Stromovka game preserves).

The rural landscape surrounded Prague as a green belt, a ring which became a space for the urban expansion from the latter half of the 19th century in connection with the rapid increase of population, the progressing urbanization, industrialization and the development of railway transportation. The first Prague suburb in this ringlet was Karlín, founded in 1817 east from the New Town on a plain stretching along the Vltava and covered by gardens, fields and meadows.

Prague in the given period initially developed on the vacant land available within its historical centre, on the territory of the demolished fortification and also in part in the inner unpopulated spaces. The systematic demolition of the bulwarks, launched in 1874, allowed for the thus acquired areas, as well as the landscape behind the torn-down bulwarks, to be used for housing and industrial development. Prague began expanding to the suburban landscape, and its green belt was heavily disturbed. Some villages around the city gradually metamorphosed into significant Prague suburbs of swelling economic, construction and cultural boom. Other locations virtually appeared on brownfield sites, in the space of the greenery which encircled the historical centre to the east and south-east. The city mainly spilled over on the right bank of the Vltava, beyond the borders of the New Town, which soon became inhabited by the suburban municipalities (later receiving the status of towns) of Královské Vinohrady and Žižkov. They both had the nature of settlements with residential housing development. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, intense construction hit Smíchov south of Prague and Holešovice-Bubny, Libeň and Karlín north and north-east from the centre, which concentrated the profusely growing industry. Prague was in addition connected to other railway tracks and its river was arched by new bridges.

And while the green belt around Prague increasingly densified with both residential and industrial development, the city itself enjoyed many examples of new public greenery. The Supreme Margrave, Count Charles Chotek, established the first Prague public park in 1833 and more parks and alleys accessible to the wider public, often appearing on the sites of the demolished fortifications, kept appearing in the course of the 19th century. The significance of urban greenery – along with the significance of its recreational and entertainment roles – then naturally further increased with the progressing urbanization process.

One of the most fundamental interventions to the Prague urban landscape was the redevelopment dating to the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries which, together with the subsequent construction development, permanently changed the face of the Jewish Town (called Josefov from 1851) and some parts of the Old and New Towns. Redevelopments and demolitions of various kinds have been going hand in hand with the development of towns and cities since time immemorial and form an inseparable part of their life – similarly extensive redevelopments were in the same period also realized in Paris, Vienna and Berlin. It cannot be doubted that they indeed resulted in the loss of often irreplaceable values but, on the other hand, created new ones. The redevelopment of the Prague Jewish Town has nevertheless been perceived as the hitherto most intense and most isolated intervention in the historical centre of Prague. The origins of the Jewish town – a ghetto of the Prague Jewish population – reach as far back as the Middle Ages, and its rather confined area witnessed a rapid increase in population. It was stuffed with almost three hundred houses in the first half of the 19th century, one third of them being in very poor condition. The local living conditions worsened over time; there was no sewerage and no supply of clean water, and the ghetto was moreover situated in a diluvial area. In the late 19th century, the city council therefore settled on a complex redevelopment which meant the demolition of approximately six hundred houses except the most outstanding constructions, such as synagogues and the town hall, as

well as the old Jewish cemetery as a significant constituent of urban greenery. Till the early 1920s, the demolished houses were replaced by a new neighbourhood with many Art-Nouveau apartment houses lining much wider and straighter streets. Even Albert Einstein, visiting Prague in 1911, said that “*for that matter, the city of Prague is wonderful; so beautiful that it alone is worth a longer sojourn*”.¹⁴⁵

After the 1918 constitution of the Czechoslovak Republic, Prague became the capital of the independent Czechoslovak state, simultaneously experiencing a heavy influx of population from both neighbouring and distant regions. The expanding Prague agglomeration was not compact from the point of territorial administration, which soon issued a radical solution: the 1920s’ establishment of the so-called Greater Prague as a result of attaching the adjoining villages (in effect from 1922). The territory of the capital fundamentally expanded to approximately 172,000 km², with its 1921 population numbering about 677,000 and increasing to about 849,000 over the following nine years. Prague at that time experienced the fusion of many municipalities with various levels of economic and cultural development, various settlement typologies and various, often fragmented built-up areas and various degrees of public transportation accessibility. The Prague urban landscape thus received an utterly new dimension.

The Landscape of Prague as a historical phenomenon

The urbanization of European and Czech lands, accompanied by growth in population numbers and transformation of both urban and suburban landscapes, represents a patulous subject widely discussed by local as well as foreign experts of various foci and various disciplines. The researchers’ attention turns to the landscape of the contemporary big cities as a living formation boasting a rich past, while recording and analysing this history forms part of the cultural heritage of the society and – perhaps – also inspires the future development of the city agglomerations. It must be noted that historical geography and cartography is merely one of many participating scientific fields.¹⁴⁶

Although the landscape of the city of Prague as an independent and remarkable phenomenon has not hitherto been systematically pursued, it ranks as an intensely followed subject. The particular rare and stimulating probes in the field of the transformations of the Prague landscape are part of many both professional and popularizing publications, monographs and treatises. The issue is viewed synoptically as well as in detail, chronologically or according to partial subjects, possibly via the combination of both. It can be found in the framework of the history of architecture and urbanism, overland as well as waterborne traffic, economic development, cultural and industrial topography, care of historical monuments, extinct settlements and buildings, park adaptations and so on. An inventory of publications on the

¹⁴⁵ KNEIDL 2005, p. 236; [online], http://einstein-website.de/z_biography/prague.html.

¹⁴⁶ On the subject of urban landscape in historical geography, see, e.g., KUPKA 2010. Urban landscape also was the subject of the 2010 historical and geographic conference *Krajina města – město v krajině* [Landscape of a City – A City in a Landscape], which contributed to more extensive interdisciplinary discussion, evaluated the earlier works on the subject and initiated the genesis of many interesting studies focusing on methodological and theoretical issues as well as of specific landscape probes exploring the landscapes of towns and cities and their parts. Another relevant conference, *Jak psát dějiny velkých měst?* [How to Write the History of Big Cities?], was held in Brno in 2014. Also, not to be omitted is the eight-volume work by Karel Kuča, entitled *Města a městečka v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku* [Towns and Townlets in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia] and written from the viewpoint of an architect, where landscape plays a crucial role in the origination and development of towns and cities (1996–2011), and the summarizing work by the architect Jiří Hrůza, *Svět měst* [The Urban World] of 2014.

subjects where landscape played a distinct role in the past of Prague would alone represent a comprehensive bibliographic handbook. The significant works worth mentioning where landscape penetrates other subjects of the historical development of Prague are the synoptic book by Jiří Kohout and Jiří Vančura, *Praha v 19. a 20. století, technické proměny* [Prague in the 19th and 20th Centuries, Technical Transformations], the edition series *Zmizelá Praha* [Extinct Prague] of many volumes, largely written by Kateřina Bečková but also other authors, and the treatises in the miscellany *Documenta Pragensia*. Characterization of the Prague landscape is, among other places, part of the several-volume work by Pavel Vlček et al. on the artistic monuments of Prague and Greater Prague. Jiří Kupka, then, systematically pursues this issue from the point of the formation of the composition of the city and how it has been aesthetically perceived.¹⁴⁷

The Prague landscape is also captured in the several volumes of *Historický atlas měst České republiky* [The Historical Atlas of Towns of the Czech Republic] – *Prague-Libeň*, *Prague-Královské Vinohrady* and *Prague-Smíchov* – while the next planned volumes are *Prague-Karlín* and, with a longer time horizon and according to possibilities, *Prague-Žižkov*. It is atlases of suburban municipalities (later towns), which were attached to the historical core of Prague to 1920 (respectively 1922), and it takes into account their individual character, the specifics of their neighbouring the Prague historical centre and their mutual political, economic and cultural relations, developing over centuries. They evolved as significant Prague suburbs of intense economic, construction and cultural development: Karlín (a town from 1900, attached to Prague in 1920), Královské Vinohrady (a town from 1879, attached to Prague in 1920), Žižkov (a town from 1881, attached to Prague in 1920), Libeň (a town from 1898, attached to Prague in 1901) and Smíchov (a town from 1903, attached to Prague in 1920). Each volume provides a synoptic map and picture sources and presents and assesses individual old plans and renderings of the given locations along with reconstruction maps, issued, for example, with the help of the methods of historical land-use and GIS (geographic information system). It is, at the same time, immensely valuable and inspiring to follow the international discourse in the field of the historical landscape of towns and to participate in foreign projects.¹⁴⁸

An attempt at a synoptic, analytically synthetic view exploring the Prague landscape with the use of sources and methods of historical geography and historical cartography is the 2015 atlas work *Ottův historický atlas Prahy, krajina města* [Otto's Historical Atlas of Prague, the Urban Landscape] where a group of authors in a basic survey present the landscape of Prague and its surroundings from prehistory (i.e. before the foundation of the town residence) to modern times. Every chapter of the atlas, however, simultaneously opens subjects for more and detailed views of the transformations of the landscape of the Prague agglomeration throughout its entire historical development. Also the *Atlas československých dějin* [An Atlas of Czechoslovak History] and *Akademický atlas českých dějin* [An Academic Atlas of the History of the Czech Lands] reflect, on selected map sheets, the changes of the Prague landscape in connection with other issues.¹⁴⁹

Semotanová in her publication selected the period of about 50 years of initially gradual and later turbulent development of the Prague landscape and its surroundings, which can be approximately delineated by the 1870s and the outbreak of the Great War. The given time span has left behind a considerable quantity of written, map and picture sources, as well as landscape relics, documenting the era of enormous social changes in the Czech lands that

¹⁴⁷ HLAVSA 1970; KOHOUT–VANČURA 1986; VLČEK, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000; MÍKA 1999; BEČKOVÁ 2003 a, b, 2004; KUPKA 2012; VLČEK 2012.

¹⁴⁸ *Historický atlas měst ČR* ([Historic Towns Atlas of the Czech republic] HAM 2006, HAM 2010, HAM 24; LELO–TRAVAGLINI 2013, and others.

¹⁴⁹ PURŠ 1965; SEMOTANOVÁ–CAJTHAML ET AL. 2014; SEMOTANOVÁ ET AL. 2015.

cannot be thought of without the changing landscape as a living space for society. The historical sources, containing valuable information and observations, at the same time often capture the Prague landscape in a rather peculiar manner. They were narrowed down to a model group which will perhaps contribute to a widening of the horizon of our knowledge of the Prague basin's landscape and its close surroundings in the latter half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries. The model group consists of official administrative sources, which is the descriptions of the Karlín, Smíchov and Prague-Vyšehrad districts, dating to 1872 and issued exclusively for the needs of pricing and classifying land in the written documentation of the revised cadastre and for the descriptions of the Prague surroundings in the publication *Výsledky šetření (anketa) poměrů hospodářských i kulturních zemědělského obyvatelstva v Království českém v letech 1898–1900* [The Results of Investigating Economic and Cultural Conditions of Agricultural Population in the Kingdom of Bohemia between 1898 and 1900 /Inquiry/], published by the Council for Agriculture of the Kingdom of Bohemia after 1900. The sources of non-administrative character in the group are the writings of the natural scientist – geologist – Jan Krejčí, which employ the results of his research in the fields of geology and geography, and various works by writers and publicists – the guide to Prague by Karel Vladislav Zap and the description of the Prague surroundings by Jakub Arbes from one of the volumes of the monumental 1887 publication *Čechy společnou prací spisovatelův a umělcův českých* [The Czech Lands Jointly Conceived by Their Writers and Artists], accompanied by illustrations by Eduard Herold, Antonín Levý, Adolf and Karel Liebschers and many other both famed and less well-known artists. Typologically in between the guides and many-sheet map series is the work by Josef Bělohav following the Prague of 1912, mainly his *Podrobné mapy zemí Koruny české* [Detailed Maps of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown] and *Vlastivědné sborníky* [Anthologies of National History and Geography].

At the same time, significant synoptic map sources should not be omitted, among them the 1873 IInd military survey with adaptations, the IIIrd military survey from the 1870s and 1880s and Alfred Hurtig's plans from the period prior to the close of the 19th century, as well as the more detailed several-sheet *Orientační plán Prahy a obcí sousedních* [An Orientation Plan of Prague and the Neighbouring Municipalities] from between 1909 and 1914. Concerning the years immediately preceding the Great War, Bělohav's map of Prague and its surroundings from the above-mentioned collection *Podrobné mapy zemí Koruny české* is of a corresponding character.¹⁵⁰

These sources go hand in hand with various contemporary renditions, such as impressive panoramic vistas capturing a complete view of the city with its immediate surroundings as a composed whole. Vistas, however, must be judged very circumspectly regarding their preciseness: the information recorded in them by artists can often be distorted, idealized or even fabricated with regard to either the sources or the artistic style. On the contrary, photographic vistas, a genre developing in the latter half of the 19th century, depicted the landscape panorama in a hitherto unprecedented bareness and lucid reality. The leading authors of photographic vistas of Prague during the given period were especially František Fridrich and Jindřich Eckert. One of Eckert's most well-known pictures is the panoramic view of 1864, taken in wide-angle from Petřín to Střelecký Island, where the undeveloped north and north-east hillocks frame the Prague panorama with greenery. František Josef Arnošt Fridrich photographed Prague from Nebozítek on Petřín hill around 1865, ignoring Prague Castle completely and focusing on the Lesser Town and the Old Town.¹⁵¹

¹⁵⁰ <http://historickemapy.cuzk.cz/>; <http://oldmaps.geolab.cz/>; <http://www.chartae-antiquae.cz/cs/mapsets/>.

¹⁵¹ ČECHY [BOHEMIA; 1886, 1887]; ECKERT 1974; WIRTH 1940; KROPÁČEK 1995; PASÁKOVÁ 1995; PRAHA V PLÁNECH [PRAGUE IN PLANS] 1999; MÍKA 2007; HEJTMÁNKOVÁ – KUPKA 2014.

The landscape of Prague. As poetry? Before the demolition of the bulwarks

The period of the few years before the demolition of the Prague fortifications – i.e. prior to 1874 – which launched a new stage in the city's development and its expansion outside the existing borders and built-up area, has left us three unique historical sources of utterly different purpose and form. They, however, display several common features: they all distinctly perceived and described two natural elements which considerably influenced the appearance and charisma of Prague: its relief and its watercourses, and mainly paid attention to land as one of the main sources of living and economic prosperity of the society.

The first source is three administrative documents – descriptions of the Karlín, Smíchov and Prague-Vyšehrad districts, dating to 1872 and issued exclusively for the needs of pricing and classifying land in the written documentation of the revised cadastre.¹⁵² The officials who issued the descriptions mainly sought sources of economic revenues in the landscape and evaluated it accordingly. The second source, this time of a non-administrative character, is the writings of the natural scientist – geologist – Jan Krejčí, which employ the results of his scientific research in the fields of geology and geography. It is mainly the publication *Horopisné obrazy okolí pražského* [Orological Pictures of the Prague Surroundings] from the latter half of the 1850s, composed as a text accompanied by illustrative pictures by Eduard Herold, which was preceded by *Přírodopisný průvodce po okolí Pražském, Horopisný a zeměznalecký popis okolí Pražského* [A Natural-Historical Guide to the Prague Surroundings, an Orological and Geographic Description of the Prague Surroundings] of 1854, intended for higher secondary-school education. These publications – along with *Geologická mapa okolí pražského* [A Geological Map of the Prague Surroundings] by Jan Krejčí and Rudolf Helmhacker, dating to between 1868 and 1877 – form a complex body of textual, pictorial and map sources from the period after the mid-19th century.¹⁵³ The third source is the Prague landscape viewed by both its inhabitants and visitors, as captured by the historian, writer and publicist Karel Vladislav Zap in his guide to Prague from 1868.¹⁵⁴ It was first published in 1835 and later in several more German and Czech editions (1854, 1868, etc.). Zap conceived it as a personal testimony, produced on the basis of generally available information as well as his own knowledge, with the aim of emphasizing and drawing attention to the qualities of the capital of the Bohemian Kingdom.

The landscape of Prague. As prose? Prior to the Great War

In 1883, the city of Prague received a new part, Vyšehrad, which was closely followed by Holešovice-Bubny (Holešovice being joined with Bubny in 1850) as an already vital industrial neighbourhood. The number of Prague inhabitants thus rapidly increased and the city's territorial scope noticeably expanded. The development of the previous suburbs – Karlín and Smíchov – in the landscape beyond the fortification, subjected to demolition from 1874, accelerated, and also the space beyond the New Town bulwarks experienced turbulent construction activity. Libeň, which was attached to Prague in 1901, also witnessed intense residential and industrial development, along with the first more extensive regulation works in

¹⁵² Written documentation of the revised cadastre. Ústřední archiv zeměměřictví a katastru [Central Surveying and Cadastre Archives], Collection Stabilní katastr, jeho údržba a obnova [Stable Cadastre, Its Maintenance and Restoration] (1824–1957), Písemný operát [Written Documentation], B2/c/C (hitherto unprocessed – without signature).

¹⁵³ KREJČÍ 1854, 1857; KREJČÍ – HELMHACKER 1868–1877.

¹⁵⁴ ZAP 1968.

the space of the Libeň port.¹⁵⁵ Other distinctively growing suburban villages were Vršovice and Vysočany. And while the population of Prague (including Holešovice-Bubny and Vyšehrad) totalled 182,000 in an area of 14,000 square kilometres in 1890, it was about 224,000 in 21,000 square kilometres (including Holešovice-Bubny, Vyšehrad and Libeň) in 1910.¹⁵⁶ The territory of the city increased by one third and the number of its inhabitants by about a quarter. The changes in the space of the growing city and beyond are discussed in the introductory parts of this chapter.

Land, its use and the relevant revenues were the centre of attention for many professionals in the fields of economy and agriculture also in the late 19th century. One of the significant sources on the landscape transformations is the publication issued by the Council for Agriculture of the Kingdom of Bohemia. In 1873, the council took over the tasks of the Patriotic Agricultural Society after its dissolution. It worked towards supporting agriculture and agricultural industry, encouraged the activities of agricultural interest organizations and associations and fostered schools of agriculture. Its statistics department collected information on the results of harvests, weather developments and changes, market prices of farming products and wood, agricultural properties and farming population. In 1897, the department became the foundation of the newly established National Statistical Office, headed by Karel Kořistka.¹⁵⁷

The prolonged agrarian crisis (1873–1878 and 1879–1904) resulted in, among other things, thorough investigations of the situation in agriculture. One of them was carried out towards the end of the 19th century and its outcomes were summed up in two – German and Czech – publications, which contained information acquired in selected locations via a pre-designed form. The areas with a prevailing Czech population were surveyed in the above-mentioned work *Výsledky šetření (anketa) poměrů hospodářských i kulturních zemědělského obyvatelstva v Království českém v letech 1898–1900*.¹⁵⁸ The answers to carefully formulated and detailed questions, divided into fourteen sections, were collected by authorized commissioners. They focused on many spheres of the agricultural economy, such as land, climatic conditions, grown farming products and bred animals, ameliorations, agricultural businesses (breweries, sugar factories, creameries etc.), life of the population working in agriculture, tax issues and so on.¹⁵⁹ Prague and its surroundings were examined as a separate territory (No. XXV), represented by the political districts of Karlín, Královské Vinohrady, Smíchov, Žižkov and the capital city of Prague and the judicial districts of Karlín, Královské Vinohrady, Smíchov, Žižkov and the capital city of Prague.

The textual and visual documents capturing the Prague landscape at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries were recorded in the many volumes of the comprehensive work from the field of national history and geography, *Čechy společnou prací spisovatelův a umělcův českých*, which is also mentioned above. It was issued at the close of the 19th century by Otto's Publishing House under the auspices of the editors František Šubrt and Karel Borový. The bookseller and publisher Jan Otto (8 November 1841 – 29 May 1916) gained renown due especially to the famous *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia], but also produced an array of other works of the same character, one of them being the extensive cycle *Čechy* [Bohemia].¹⁶⁰ Its individual volumes, monumental in format, contents, decoration and scope, present particular regions of the Czech lands, the charm of which attracted writers, poets and

¹⁵⁵ PUDR 1945; SEMOTANOVÁ 2005; HISTORICKÝ ATLAS MĚST 2006, 2010, 2013.

¹⁵⁶ SPECIAL ORTS-REPERTORIUM 1893; STATISTICKÝ LEXIKON [STATISTICAL LEXICON] 1934.

¹⁵⁷ GÖRNER 1957, pp. 182–212.

¹⁵⁸ JAKUBEC-JINDRA et al. 2006, pp. 113, 150; VÝSLEDKY [RESULTS; after 1900].

¹⁵⁹ VÝSLEDKY [after 1900], pp. XXV–XXXIII.

¹⁶⁰ OPELÍK 2000, pp. 715–725.

painters, in the form of texts, poems and artistic renditions and focuses on, among other places, the Šumava, the Orlické Mountains, the Vltava basin, the Tábor region and the Labe basin and, naturally, also Prague.

The volumes devoted to Prague (III/1 and III/2) are divided according to its individual urban neighbourhoods and the Prague surroundings. Surprisingly, Holešovice is discussed in the framework of the surroundings, although it was incorporated into Prague already prior to the publishing (in 1884), while Vyšehrad (attached in 1883) is included in the part on the capital. It is most probably because the attachment of Holešovice (and Bubny) to Prague could not have been taken into consideration during the preparatory and printing works on the two volumes. The texts, poems and various renditions capture the history, topography and everyday life of the capital of the Bohemian Kingdom in the late 19th century. The most interesting information, well exploitable in researching the landscape of the Prague agglomeration, can be found in the chapter “Okolí Pražské” [Prague Surroundings] in Volume III/2,¹⁶¹ provided by the journalist and writer Jakub Arbes. It is very readable and reflects the author’s genuine admiration for and rather detailed knowledge of the city.

Prague and its surroundings were also captured in maps issued by the geographer and cartographer Josef Bělohav. He mainly became famous for the above-mentioned series *Podrobné mapy zemí Koruny české* and his *Průvodce statisticko-historický* [Statistical and Historical Guide], which came out from 1909 from one of the most prestigious Prague publishing houses, that of František Topič. The total of 43 soft-cover parts composed of texts and maps was published between 1909 and 1914; however, the plan to issue 156 volumes failed after the Great War.¹⁶² They typologically ranked among detailed maps surveying rather small territorial wholes, which began to be published after the 1860s’ abolishment of the regional constitution, and usually contained not only the demarcation of the geographic border but also data on specific subjects (e.g. the natural-historical character; such as ruins, chapels, monuments and observation towers) and, eventually, also basic statistical overviews of the depicted territory. The early 20th century then came to witness the increasing fondness for *Vilímkovy podrobné mapy okresních hejtmánství zemí Koruny české* [Vilímek’s Detailed Maps of District Executive Offices in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown], drawn on a scale of 1:100 000 by Jan Srp (later published as *Vilímkovy podrobné mapy okresních hejtmánství* [Vilímek’s Detailed Maps of District Executive Offices]), Srp’s *Místopisné mapy země Koruny české v měřítku 1:100 000* [Topographic Maps of the Lands of the Bohemian Crown on a Scale of 1:100 000], and also the maps by Bělohav.¹⁶³ The publisher always reserved several pages in the individual volumes for commercials, usually promoting consumer goods, but also titles from the field of classical literature, such as Jan Neruda’s collected works, which he himself produced. However, the *Guide* and the textual part of the *Detailed Maps* are not mere enumerations of locations, accompanied by statistical data and information on their cadastral and parish affiliation – for Bělohav felt free to add his apt comments on places which apparently attracted his attention.

The landscape of Prague – “sense and sensitivity”? Conclusion

The profusion and variety of written, cartographic and iconographic sources, terrain relics and other documents draw many variants of the historical landscapes of the city of Prague and its immediate and more distant vicinity. And although the preciseness and information value of these sources are relative, they complement each other in the synergic effect of analysing

¹⁶¹ ČECHY [1887], pp. 405–496.

¹⁶² MARTÍNEK 2008, p. 44.

¹⁶³ SEMOTANOVÁ 2001, p. 121.

deliberately created model groups with only seemingly differing particulars. The chapter “Prague and Its Surroundings. Landscape as Poetry, Landscape as Prose” presents two model groups of sources concerning two successive stages – first, the period of less than two decades prior to the 1874 demolition of the Prague fortifications and, second, the approximately three decades before the outbreak of the Great War. They provide different and characteristic pictures of the landscape, with the turning point being the demolition of the Prague fortifications, the impact of which was gradual but, from the 1880s, increasingly intense.

The two groups of sources share some features – the necessity or, even, duty to observe relative preciseness in the case of the administrative sources (the descriptions of districts from the written documentation of the revised cadastre, the agrarian inquiry of the Council for Agriculture of the Kingdom of Bohemia) and the prevailing interest in the variegated relief, concealing very desirable mineral resources, and in its use (all researched sources). Both groups at the same time include sources which are identical in the foci of their authors – whether it was writers and journalists captivated by various disciplines, mainly history, geography and geology, or scientists strolling through their beloved recesses, or cartographers obsessed by producing works on national history and geography, guides and maps. They all apparently have a joint tendency towards fervent story-telling about the landscapes they had seen and towards poetic depictions of their topics, because their texts are not only professional treatises but also guides and pieces of classical literature. Their prosaic characteristics of landscapes are imbued with reality, and poetry does not come in verse but, instead, in the form of innermost impressions and emotional engagement.

The sources selected for the purposes of this text were supplemented by maps and various types of representation, such as drawings and engravings, which may seemingly suffer from a lack of credibility in the contemporary era of photography. However, they still represent a view of landscapes – composed wholes – as influenced by the intimate and personal declarations of their creators. And equally as a journalist or an author can write works on landscape which can provide information exploitable in reconstructing historical landscape, an artist, too, can produce depictions of landscapes useful for complementing the picture of what had long been lost. The historical sources presented in this chapter reflect, in a rather unusual way, the transformations occurring in the agglomeration of Prague which, in the given period, rushed toward the contemporary concept and character of a big European city. The value of these sources does not lie just in the specific phenomenological data, which nevertheless could not be exhaustively listed, but mainly in the personal points of view – the ways of perceiving landscape through the eyes of officials, writers, journalists and experts of various professions.

CONCLUSION

Historical cultural landscapes have left an indelible trace on the cultural landscape of today. They form its inseparable part. The authors of the submitted publication understand the term “cultural landscape” in a wide framework of meaning – the framework of a natural landscape and landscape adapted and continuously transformed by people. Contemporary landscape fuses elements of many layers of time, some being more constant, others more changeable, and several of the imaginary time layers existing in landscape in parallel can thus always be found.¹⁶⁴ Analysis of the information provided by cartographic, iconographic as well as written sources, confronted with the results of field research, enabled the possibility of being drawn nearer to historical landscapes – and every time we attempted to revive their former components, the primary consideration was their remains in the present landscape and how this landscape had been formed.

Three types of cultural landscape were focused on, while both the choice of regions and the methodology of pursuing them closely followed on from the condition of historical landscape and trends in the relevant research. The three regions were selected deliberately because they are not composed cultural landscapes but landscapes formed throughout their primeval development and adapted by people for their own needs. From the point of methodology, underlining the potential of studies concentrated on “non-composed” historical landscape was attempted. This angle of viewing requires simultaneous perceiving of the development of the individual components of the landscape character and following their stability or, on the contrary, their transformations over the wide time span from the 16th to the 20th centuries.

The first case study was devoted to the area of the former Třeboň estates, the core of which overlaps with the area of the **Třeboň pond basins**. It is an old cultural landscape, determined from the 15th and 16th centuries by ponds and the related works of technology (channels etc.) and agricultural complexes, such as mills and farmsteads. Especially the farmsteads visually dominate here to this day and are impossible to overlook. The settlement network was basically completed on the territory by the 14th century and underwent only local and, on the overall scale, not too distinct changes in the following centuries – the extinction of merely several villages in an area with an exceptionally high proportion of water surfaces constituted by people at the same time indicates the degree of settlement and, secondarily, agricultural potential of the landscape. The fact that human settlements never emerged on many rather vast areas (which were later inundated) visibly documents the only little favourable natural conditions, when establishing ponds appeared as the most expedient and advantageous way of land-use. This moment very distinctly came to the foreground in the decades around 1800, in the period of the hasty abolishment of ponds as well as entire pond systems: the given process affected the Třeboň estates only marginally, and it is rather symptomatic that some once abolished ponds were again restored after several decades. This is thus one of the crucial aspects as concerns the degree to which the historical pond landscape has survived. The second significant aspect is the fact that the given area is relatively poor in minerals, which were therefore extracted to a minimum extent and the related processing industry was scanty. This, too, determined the prevailing rural character of the landscape inhabited by settlements of largely village type and only few towns and townlets. The wider public of today perceives the Třeboň region as a serene location of ponds and forest, only little harmed by the negative impacts of modern civilization, and therefore perfect for relaxation; but it is at the same time a territory with a very old and uniquely preserved cultural landscape – and, no less importantly, it is a very rare biotope.

¹⁶⁴ The term “cultural landscape” and its use and definition in contemporary science were presented in the introductory part of this work.

The **Broumov region** of the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries is characterized as a harmonious, ecologically and aesthetically balanced landscape; in 1991, the local cultural landscape became a natural reserve. It never experienced massive industrialization and urbanization, although the collectivization process in agriculture in the latter half of the 20th century, equally as the 1945 expulsion of Germans and the arrival of more than thirty thousand newly allocated dwellers, had an undoubted negative impact on the entire territory. After 2000, the Broumov region entered a new stage which tries to follow on from the earlier developments in the spheres of historic preservation and civic activities, as well as everyday life. Exploring and understanding the local historical landscape thus represents an extremely topical subject. Compared to other regions of the Czech Republic, its contemporary landscape retained many characteristic features of the early modern-era landscape from the spatial, material and aesthetic aspects. It is also perceived as a “Baroque landscape”, especially owing to the very precious architecture of religious nature – the churches built over a relatively short period by Martin Allio, Christoph and Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofers, which dominate the local villages, and the Broumov Benedictine monastery, splendidly reconstructed in the Baroque era. These are the reasons why the Broumov region was incorporated into this publication as the second case study. However, if a full understanding of the development of the local cultural landscape is required, it must be realized that its settlement structure and its network of communications date to as early as the Middle Ages, and Baroque was superimposed on the earlier epochs thanks to the economic prosperity of the estates and the systematic care of the Benedictine authorities. Put in a simplified way, the landscape constants of the local relief and the river network jointly bore a medieval settlement scheme which received an opulent and, to an unprecedented intensity, preserved Baroque attire.

The Broumov region is a wide basin clearly defined by high mountains and a visual dominant – the town of Broumov, situated in its almost ideal centre. The pattern of local settlement was given by watercourses coming together in the river Stěnava. The valleys of brooks house rather large villages, the axes of which are main connections running in parallel to the watercourses. The cultural landscape of the Broumov region, hitherto uninhabited and moreover located on the periphery of Bohemia, began developing prior to the mid-13th century. It was transformed into a populated and cultivated land by the Benedictines who introduced German colonists to the territory “behind the Walls”. The market village of Broumov was first documented in 1256. The stability of the Benedictine estates as an administrative and economic whole (to the mid-19th century) and the continuity of the settlement along with everyday landscape care and cultivation (up to 1945) long represented yet another significant characteristic feature of the region. And although the textile industry in the form of dispersed manufactories has an unusually long tradition here as compared to other regions of the Czech lands, it began more noticeably influencing the face of the landscape of largely agricultural use only from the late 18th century. The process was initially slow, with mangles, bleacheries and dyeings increasingly lining the watercourses and joining the earlier mills, and later, from the mid-19th century, rather noticeable – but only in the central part of the basin, on the riverbanks of Stěnava. Besides Meziměstí (Halbstadt) and the Broumov suburb Velká Ves (Grossdorf), a place of an unambiguously industrial character is especially Olivětín – a village which defies the otherwise uniform structure of villages in the Broumov region simply by the late date of its establishment. The new residential housing, going hand in hand with the textile businesses and built in a style characteristic of the entire Czech borderland, decomposed the very regionally specific architecture, mainly expressed by village settlements – the so-called farmsteads of the Broumov type. Both Broumov and the surrounding villages were thoroughly affected by global trends in architecture and urbanism in the latter half of the 20th century when the Broumov region began losing its specific character. The forced replacement of the local population after the end of the Second World

War disrupted the long continuous development of the local landscape, had a negative impact on its physical appearance and its *genius loci* and, last but not least, worsened the historians' chances of penetrating its earlier appearance on the basis of studying the available sources.

The third case study pursues the transformation of the landscape (landscapes) of **Prague and its surroundings** in the latter half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries. This extensive and seemingly comprehensively explored subject still contains many questions and answers which can, by employing less well-known sources, supplement the complex picture of the historical landscapes of the Prague agglomeration. The development of Prague in the followed period not only resulted in the gradual changing of the urban landscape but also in the changing geographic horizons as the Prague inhabitants and visitors perceived them and as they felt delimited by them. As the administrative borders of the city moved outward, spreading from its original centre, the scope of human activities widened and the contemporary achievable distances, either imaginary or real, lengthened. Human settlements, transportation, crafts and industry entered the landscape, accommodated to it or transformed it, formed its image and influenced each other. The urban landscape came alive with political events, arts, leisure activities and relaxation, entertainment and sports. It has left many traces – some of them still lingering and some slowly disappearing, while many are vanishing and will gradually vanish (an array of them, however, survives in historical sources). The medieval townhood, constricted by bulwarks stretching along both river banks for as long as to 1874, matured to the big city of Prague – an open urban agglomeration which exceeds the original area and ground plan of the historical centre by many times.

Two distinctive and different historical “landscapes” in the Prague agglomeration can thus be observed during the followed span of time. The first one dates to the period prior to tearing down the bulwarks, launched in 1874, and the second one to the following era, climaxing in 1914 with the outbreak of the Great War. The first “landscape” can be described as a relation between relief (in the sense of a landscape constant) and partial, more or less tardily developing landscape variables – waterworks, greenery, settlements and communications – with the only exception being the 1817 establishment of the first Prague suburb, Karlín, and its subsequent swift growth. The latter “landscape” during the final decades already indicated the commencement of a Greater Prague, the capital-to-be of the future Czechoslovak Republic. The belt of villages, fields, meadows, gardens and forests, which at that time surrounded the city, became more and more densely filled with both residential and industrial developments and new connections. The slow variables accelerated, the city began expanding beyond its administrative borders and absorbing the rural landscape behind the bulwarks, the transportation network densified, the waterworks were regulated and the Prague intravillan experienced radical redevelopment.

What will be the future of the relics of historical landscapes in the landscapes of today? The majority of the contemporary cultural landscape in the Czech lands ranks as the type of European open field landscapes. What makes the professionals of various foci and disciplines explore historical landscape – the cultural landscape of the past? What is the aim of reconstructing a seemingly vanished or modified landscape and what is the sense and goal of many projects pursuing the transformations of landscapes decades and centuries ago? Which subjects, linked with researching historical landscapes, are topical in the current historical geography? How are the acquired pieces of knowledge and information employed? These are questions which can be, on the one hand, asked academically but, on the other hand, are apparently topical.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ Synoptically on this, e.g., SEMOTANOVÁ 2007.

People began negatively influencing the landscape after the mid-20th century, especially in connection with the society's severe and insensitive attitude to its space, history and biodiversity. Both the rapid development of some business sectors and the overall changes in lifestyle and thinking, along with abandoning the human scale, resulted in an intensified devastation of the landscape when its aesthetic value was pushed far aside. Human arrogance also went unleashed in the so-called landscape formation and renewal.

Re-cultivation and sustainable landscape development have come to the fore only recently. The structure of the current cultural landscape of the Czech Republic is formed by three basic types: urban and suburban landscapes and the more distant countryside.¹⁶⁶ This landscape harbours large numbers of heavily damaged areas suffering from either temporary or irreversible loss of ecological stability and identity. These are the reasons why professionals more and more often turn to the reconstruction of historical landscapes, which inspires them in developing and protecting contemporary landscapes, as well as in forecasting those of the future. Urban planning is not aimed at reconstructing historical landscapes from scratch. The changing lifestyle of society also changes its landscape which absorbs the new tempo and lifestyles with more or fewer difficulties or, more or less easily. The sense of exploring historical landscape is to employ the acquired knowledge to the benefit of modelling new, modern and harmonious landscapes, which definitely should not lack the aspect of the past – i.e., landscapes which will follow on from their previous development, viewed on a time horizon exceeding the life span of merely one or two human generations. This is exactly what the authors of the presented publications had on their minds as they set off to track the traces of old landscapes in the various parts of their homeland.

¹⁶⁶ E.g., VOREL – SKLENIČKA 2006; VOREL – KUPKA 2008; SKLENIČKA 2011; the poetically conceived publication CÍLEK 2002 is also inspiring.

SHRNUTÍ

HISTORICKÉ KRAJINY ČECH Třeboňsko – Broumovsko – Praha

Historické kulturní krajiny zanechaly nesmazatelnou stopu v kulturní krajině dnešní. Jsou její nedílnou součástí. Pojem „kulturní krajina“ vnímáme v předkládané publikaci v širokém významovém rámci krajiny přírodní, adaptované a průběžně proměňované člověkem. V dnešní krajině se prolínají prvky řady časových vrstev – některé jsou stabilnější a jiné proměnlivější: oněch pomyslných časových vrstev bychom tedy v krajině paralelně našli více. Na základě rozboru výpovědi pramenů kartografických, ikonografických i písemných, konfrontovaného s výsledky terénního výzkumu jsme se pokusili se historickým krajinám přiblížit – pokud jsme se pokoušeli oživit jejich někdejší komponenty, zamýšleli jsme se v prvé řadě nad tím, co z nich zbylo v krajině dnešní, jak byla formována.

Pozornost jsme zaměřili na trojí typ kulturní krajiny; jak volba regionů tak i metodika jejich zpracování těsně navazovala na dosavadní stav a trendy studia historických krajin. Ve všech třech případech se záměrně jednalo o regiony, jež nejsou komponovanými kulturními krajinami, ale takovými, jež vznikaly v průběhu staletého vývoje, adaptovány člověkem pro jeho potřeby. Z hlediska metodického jsme se pokusili poukázat na potenciál studií zaměřených na „nekomponované“ historické krajiny. Tento zorný úhel vyžaduje souběžné vnímání vývoje jednotlivých složek krajinného rázu, sledování jejich stability či naopak proměn, a to v širokém časovém záběru od 16. do 20. století.

První případová studie byla zaměřena na oblast bývalého třeboňského panství, jehož jádro se překrývá s oblastí **třeboňské rybníční pánve**. Jedná se o starou kulturní krajinu, jejíž ráz již od 15.–16. století určují rybníky a s nimi spjatá další technická díla (kanály apod.), hospodářské areály typu mlýnů či hospodářských dvorů. Zvláště pak hospodářské dvory podnes tvoří nepřehlédnutelné vizuální dominanty v krajině. Sídlní síť se v oblasti vytvořila do 14. století a v pozdějších staletích doznávala již jen lokálních a v celkovém měřítku nepříliš výrazných změn – zánik jen několika vsí v oblasti s mimořádně vysokým podílem vodních ploch založených člověkem naznačuje současně sídelní a ve druhém plánu hospodářské možnosti krajiny. Na řadě poměrně rozsáhlých ploch, jež byly později zatopeny, lidská sídla nikdy nevznikla – což je zjevným odrazem málo příznivých přírodních podmínek, kdy právě zakládání rybníků se ukázalo být jako nejvýhodnější způsob využití ploch. Tento moment velmi zřetelně vystoupil do popředí v době překotného rušení rybníků i celých rybníčních soustav v desetiletích okolo roku 1800 – tato etapa se třeboňského panství dotkla jen okrajově a je příznačné, že v některých případech byly rybníky jednou zrušené po pár desetiletích znovu obnoveny. Tento moment je tedy jedním z klíčových z hlediska stavu dochování historické rybníční krajiny. Druhým významným aspektem je skutečnost, že jde o oblast relativně chudou na nerostné suroviny, které se tak těžily jen v omezené míře a návazné podniky zpracovatelského průmyslu byly svým rozsahem velmi skromné. I tento moment se podepsal na dodnes výrazně rurálním charakteru krajiny se sídliště převážně vesnického typu a jen několika málo městy a městečky. Třeboňsko dnes vnímá veřejnost jako poklidný kraj s rybníky a lesy, málo dotčený negativními dopady moderní civilizace a tudíž ideální pro rekreaci; současně jde o oblast s velmi starou a unikátně dochovanou kulturní krajinou a neméně podstatná je i skutečnost, že jde o velmi cenný biotop.

Broumovsko přelomu 20. a 21. století je charakterizováno jako harmonická, ekologicky a esteticky vyvážená krajina; roku 1991 byla zdejší kulturní krajina vyhlášena chráněnou krajinou oblastí. Neproběhla zde nikdy masivní industrializace a urbanizace, i když kolektivizace v zemědělství ve druhé polovině 20. století region poznamenala, stejně jako

odsun německého obyvatelstva v roce 1945 a příchod více než třiceti tisíc nových osob. Po roce 2000 vstupuje Broumovsko do nové etapy, která se snaží v rovině památkové péče, péče o krajinu, občanských aktivit i každodenního života navázat na starší vývoj. Poznání historické krajiny Broumovska je tady nadměrně katalýzním tématem. Prostorově, po hmotné a estetické stránce nese současná krajina Broumovska ve srovnání s jinými regiony České republiky velké množství charakteristik raně novověké krajiny. Zejména díky architektonicky výjimečným církevním objektům – kostelům realizovaným v relativně krátké době Kryštofem a Kilianem Ignácem Dientzenhofery, které dominují zdejšími vesnicím, a v barokním období okázale přebudovanému broumovskému benediktinskému klášteru, je také vnímáno jako „barokní krajina“. Proto bylo Broumovsko zařazeno jako druhá případová studie do naší knihy. Pro pochopení vývoje kulturní krajiny v obalstí je ovšem nutné si uvědomit, že samotná struktura osídlení a síť komunikací vznikly již ve středověku. Barokní období díky hospodářské prosperitě panství a systematické péči benediktinské vrchnosti převrstvilo starší dějinná údobí. Zjednodušeně je tedy možné říci, že v rámci krajinných konstant reliéfu a říční sítě se vytvořilo středověké schéma osídlení, které dostalo okázalý a v nebyvalé intenzitě dochovaný barokní háv.

Broumovsko je širokou kotlinou, která se ve svém celku jeví jako vysokými horami jasně definovaný region s vizuálně dominantním centrem, městem Broumovem v téměř ideálním středu. Osnovu místnímu osídlení daly vodoteče stékající se do řeky Stěnavy. V údolích potoků jsou situovány poměrně velké vesnice, jejichž osami jsou paralelně s vodotečemi procházející hlavní komunikace. Kulturní krajina do té doby neosídleného, na periferii Čech ležícího Broumovska začala být utvářena před polovinou 13. století. V osídlený a obdělávaný kraj přetvořili Broumovsko benediktini, kteří do kraje „za Stěnamí“ uvedli německé kolonisty. Tržní ves Broumov je poprvé doložena roku 1256. Stabilita benediktinského panství jako správního a hospodářského celku (až do poloviny 19. století) a kontinuita osídlení a každodenní péče a kultivace krajiny (do roku 1945) byly dlouho další významnou charakteristikou regionu. I když textilní průmysl má v podobě rozptýlených manufaktur na Broumovsku ve srovnání s jinými regiony Čech nebyvale dlouho tradici, podobu výrazně zemědělsky využívané krajiny výrazně ovlivnil až od konce 18. století. Nejprve pozvolna, když začaly podél vodních toků vedle starších mlýnů vznikat mandly, bělidla a barvírny, od poloviny 19. století výrazně, ovšem pouze v centrální části kotliny, na březích Stěnavy. Vedle Meziměstí a broumovského předměstí Velká Ves tak má jednoznačně průmyslový charakter především Olivětín – obec, která se vymyká jinak jednotné struktuře vesnic na Broumovsku již pozdní dobou svého založení. Obytná zástavba doprovázející textilní závody, provedená ve stylu typickém pro celé pohraničí Čech, prolomila do té doby velmi regionálně specifickou architekturu vyjádřenou zejména vesnickými usedlostmi – tzv. statky broumovského typu. Globální vlivy v architektuře a urbanismu města Broumova i okolních vesnic se naplno projeví v druhé polovině 20. století, kdy Broumovsko začalo ztrácet svůj specifický charakter. Nucená výměna obyvatelstva v regionu po skončení 2. světové války znamenala přetržení dlouhého kontinuálního vývoje, ovlivnila negativně fyzickou podobu krajiny i jejího *genia loci* a v neposlední řadě ztížila možnosti historika proniknout na základě studia pramenů ke starší podobě zdejší krajiny.

Třetí případová studie se zabývá **proměnami krajiny (krajin) Prahy a okolí** ve druhé polovině 19. a počátkem 20. století. Obsáhlé, zdánlivě důkladně zpracované téma v sobě stále skrývá řadu otázek a odpovědí, které, s využitím méně známých pramenů, mohou doplňovat složitý obraz historických krajin pražské aglomerace. Ve sledovaném období se s rozvojem Prahy neměnila jen městská krajina, ale také geografické horizonty tak, jak je obyvatelé a návštěvníci Prahy vnímali a jak se jimi cítili vymezení. Správních hranice města se posunovaly a vzdalovaly od původního jádra, mantinely lidských aktivit a tehdejší dosažitelné vzdálenosti, myšlené i skutečné, se postupně zvětšovaly. Lidská sídla, doprava, řemesla

a průmysl vstupovaly do krajiny, přizpůsobovaly se jí nebo ji přetvářely, formovaly její image a vzájemně se ovlivňovaly. Krajina města ožívala politickým děním, uměleckou tvorbou, odpočinkem, zábavou a sportem. Zanechala budoucnosti řadu stop – některé zůstávají, jiné pomalu mizí, mnohé zanikají a postupně zcela zaniknou (mnohé z nich jsou ovšem uchovány v historických pramenech). Od středověkého souměstí, ještě před rokem 1874 sevřeného hradbami po obou březích řeky, dospěla Praha k otevřené velkoměstské aglomeraci, přesahující mnohonásobně původní plochu a půdorys historického jádra.

V sledovaném období se tak rýsují v pražské aglomeraci dvě výrazné a rozdílné historické „krajiny“. První před bouráním hradeb, zahájeným roku 1874, a druhá v období následujícím, vrcholícím roku 1914 vypuknutím první světové války. První „krajinu“ lze charakterizovat jako vzájemný vztah reliéfu (ve smyslu krajinné konstanty) a dílčích, spíše pozvolných krajinných proměnných – vodotečí, zeleně, sídel, komunikací. Výjimku tvoří vznik a poměrně rychlý růst prvního pražského předměstí Karlína od roku 1817. Druhá „krajina“ již v sobě nesla v závěrečných desetiletích předzvěst vytvoření Velké Prahy, hlavního města budoucí Československé republiky. Pás vesnic, polí, luk, zahrad a lesů, který Prahu obklopoval, se začal vyplňovat obytnou i průmyslovou zástavbou a novými komunikacemi. Pomalé proměnné se zrychlovaly, město expandovalo za své administrativní hranice, pohlcovalo venkovskou krajinu za hradbami, zahušťovala se dopravní síť, regulovaly vodoteče a v intravilánu Prahy probíhaly radikální asanační procesy.

Jaké budou další osudy reliktních historických krajin v krajinách současných? Kulturní krajina Česka dnes patří převážně k typu evropských otevřených polních krajin. Co vede odborníky různých zaměření a specializací ke studiu historické krajiny – kulturní krajiny minulosti? Kam směřuje úsilí o rekonstrukci zdánlivě zmizelé či modifikované krajiny, jaký je smysl a cíl mnoha projektů, zabývajících se proměnami krajiny před desetiletími a staletími? Jaká témata, vážící se k výzkumu historické krajiny, jsou v současné historické geografii aktuální? Jak jsou využívány získané poznatky? To vše jsou otázky, jež si na jedné straně lze klást akademicky, na straně druhé je zřejmá jejich aktuálnost.

Negativní působení činnosti člověka v krajině se výrazně projevilo po polovině 20. století v souvislosti s razantním, necitlivým přístupem společnosti ke krajinnému prostoru, k jeho historii a biodiverzitě. Rychlejší vývoj některých odvětví ekonomiky i proměny životního stylu a myšlení společnosti a opuštění lidského měřítka znamená intenzivnější devastaci krajiny, kdy její estetická hodnota ustupuje do pozadí. Arogance člověka se projevila i v tzv. tvorbě a obnově krajiny. Rekultivace a udržitelný rozvoj krajiny dostaly prostor až v nedávné době. Struktura současné kulturní krajiny České republiky je tvořena třemi základními krajinnými typy, městskou krajinou, příměstskou krajinou a vzdálenějším venkovem. V této krajině existuje značné množství narušených oblastí s dočasnou nebo trvalou ztrátou ekologické stability a identity krajiny. To jsou důvody, proč se odborníci stále více obracejí k rekonstrukcím historických krajin, jimiž se inspirují při tvorbě a ochraně krajin současných i prognózování krajin budoucích. Není cílem územního plánování historickou krajinu důsledně rekonstruovat. Mění se styl života společnosti proměňuje i svou krajinu, která přijímá hůře či lépe nové životní tempo a styl. Smyslem studia historické krajiny je využití získaných poznatků k modelování nových, moderních a harmonických krajin, které by neměly postrádat aspekt minulosti; tedy takových, které navážou na předchozí vývoj, chápaný v dlouhém časovém horizontu přesahujícím život jedné či dvou lidských generací. A právě to měli na paměti i autoři této publikace, když se vydávali po stopách starých krajin v různých koutech naší vlasti.

SUMMARY

HISTORICKÉ KRAJINY ČECH Třeboňsko – Broumovsko – Praha

Historical cultural landscapes form the cultural landscape of today. To discuss this large topic, the present book is divided into three main parts. The first one, Cultural Landscapes of the Past as the Subject of Interest of Historical-Geographic Research summarizes the current state of research; the second one deals with historical sources used for the studies of landscape in the past and their critics. In the third one, the authors have chosen three types of cultural landscape. The three regions were selected deliberately because they are not composed cultural landscapes but landscapes formed throughout their primeval development and adapted by people for their own needs. From the point of methodology, underlining the potential of studies concentrated on “non-composed” historical landscape was attempted. This angle of viewing requires simultaneous perceiving of the development of the individual components of the landscape character and following their stability or, on the contrary, their transformations over the wide time span from the 16th to the 20th centuries.

The first case study was devoted to the area of the former Třeboň estates, the core of which overlaps with the area of the Třeboň pond basins. It is an old cultural landscape, determined from the 15th and 16th centuries by ponds and the related works of technology (channels etc.) and agricultural complexes, such as mills and farmsteads. Especially the farmsteads visually dominate here to this day and are impossible to overlook. The settlement network was basically completed on the territory by the 14th century and underwent only local and, on the overall scale, not too distinct changes in the following centuries – the extinction of merely several villages in an area with an exceptionally high proportion of water surfaces constituted by people at the same time indicates the degree of settlement and, secondarily, agricultural potential of the landscape. The fact that human settlements never emerged on many rather vast areas (which were later inundated) visibly documents the only little favourable natural conditions, when establishing ponds appeared as the most expedient and advantageous way of land-use. This moment very distinctly came to the foreground in the decades around 1800, in the period of the hasty abolishment of ponds as well as entire pond systems: the given process affected the Třeboň estates only marginally, and it is rather symptomatic that some once abolished ponds were again restored after several decades. This is thus one of the crucial aspects as concerns the degree to which the historical pond landscape has survived. The second significant aspect is the fact that the given area is relatively poor in minerals, which were therefore extracted to a minimum extent and the related processing industry was scanty. This, too, determined the prevailing rural character of the landscape inhabited by settlements of largely village type and only few towns and townlets. The wider public of today perceives the Třeboň region as a serene location of ponds and forest, only little harmed by the negative impacts of modern civilization, and therefore perfect for relaxation; but it is at the same time a territory with a very old and uniquely preserved cultural landscape – and, no less importantly, it is a very rare biotope.

The Broumov region of the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries is characterized as a harmonious, ecologically and aesthetically balanced landscape; in 1991, the local cultural landscape became a natural reserve. It never experienced massive industrialization and urbanization, although the collectivization process in agriculture in the latter half of the 20th century, equally as the 1945 expulsion of Germans and the arrival of more than thirty thousand newly allocated dwellers, had an undoubted negative impact on the entire territory. After 2000, the Broumov region entered a new stage which tries to follow on from the earlier

developments in the spheres of historic preservation and civic activities, as well as everyday life. Exploring and understanding the local historical landscape thus represents an extremely topical subject. Compared to other regions of the Czech Republic, its contemporary landscape retained many characteristic features of the early modern-era landscape from the spatial, material and aesthetic aspects. It is also perceived as a “Baroque landscape”, especially owing to the very precious architecture of religious nature – the churches built over a relatively short period by Martin Allio, Christoph and Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhofers, which dominate the local villages, and the Broumov Benedictine monastery, splendidly reconstructed in the Baroque era. These are the reasons why the Broumov region was incorporated into this publication as the second case study. However, if a full understanding of the development of the local cultural landscape is required, it must be realized that its settlement structure and its network of communications date to as early as the Middle Ages, and Baroque was superimposed on the earlier epochs thanks to the economic prosperity of the estates and the systematic care of the Benedictine authorities. Put in a simplified way, the landscape constants of the local relief and the river network jointly bore a medieval settlement scheme which received an opulent and, to an unprecedented intensity, preserved Baroque attire.

The Broumov region is a wide basin clearly defined by high mountains and a visual dominant – the town of Broumov, situated in its almost ideal centre. The pattern of local settlement was given by watercourses coming together in the river Stěňava. The valleys of brooks house rather large villages, the axes of which are main connections running in parallel to the watercourses. The cultural landscape of the Broumov region, hitherto uninhabited and moreover located on the periphery of Bohemia, began developing prior to the mid-13th century. It was transformed into a populated and cultivated land by the Benedictines who introduced German colonists to the territory “behind the Walls”. The market village of Broumov was first documented in 1256. The stability of the Benedictine estates as an administrative and economic whole (to the mid-19th century) and the continuity of the settlement along with everyday landscape care and cultivation (up to 1945) long represented yet another significant characteristic feature of the region. And although the textile industry in the form of dispersed manufactories has an unusually long tradition here as compared to other regions of the Czech lands, it began more noticeably influencing the face of the landscape of largely agricultural use only from the late 18th century. The process was initially slow, with mangles, bleacheries and dyeings increasingly lining the watercourses and joining the earlier mills, and later, from the mid-19th century, rather noticeable – but only in the central part of the basin, on the riverbanks of Stěňava. Besides Meziměstí (Halbstadt) and the Broumov suburb Velká Ves (Grossdorf), a place of an unambiguously industrial character is especially Olivětín – a village which defies the otherwise uniform structure of villages in the Broumov region simply by the late date of its establishment. The new residential housing, going hand in hand with the textile businesses and built in a style characteristic of the entire Czech borderland, decomposed the very regionally specific architecture, mainly expressed by village settlements – the so-called farmsteads of the Broumov type. Both Broumov and the surrounding villages were thoroughly affected by global trends in architecture and urbanism in the latter half of the 20th century when the Broumov region began losing its specific character. The forced replacement of the local population after the end of the Second World War disrupted the long continuous development of the local landscape, had a negative impact on its physical appearance and its *genius loci* and, last but not least, worsened the historians’ chances of penetrating its earlier appearance on the basis of studying the available sources.

The third case study pursues the transformation of the landscape (landscapes) of Prague and its surroundings in the latter half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries. This extensive and seemingly comprehensively explored subject still contains many questions and answers which can, by employing less well-known sources, supplement the complex picture of the historical

landscapes of the Prague agglomeration. The development of Prague in the followed period not only resulted in the gradual changing of the urban landscape but also in the changing geographic horizons as the Prague inhabitants and visitors perceived them and as they felt delimited by them. As the administrative borders of the city moved outward, spreading from its original centre, the scope of human activities widened and the contemporary achievable distances, either imaginary or real, lengthened. Human settlements, transportation, crafts and industry entered the landscape, accommodated to it or transformed it, formed its image and influenced each other. The urban landscape came alive with political events, arts, leisure activities and relaxation, entertainment and sports. It has left many traces – some of them still lingering and some slowly disappearing, while many are vanishing and will gradually vanish (an array of them, however, survives in historical sources). The medieval townhood, constricted by bulwarks stretching along both river banks for as long as to 1874, matured to the big city of Prague – an open urban agglomeration which exceeds the original area and ground plan of the historical centre by many times.

Two distinctive and different historical “landscapes” in the Prague agglomeration can thus be observed during the followed span of time. The first one dates to the period prior to tearing down the bulwarks, launched in 1874, and the second one to the following era, climaxing in 1914 with the outbreak of the Great War. The first “landscape” can be described as a relation between relief (in the sense of a landscape constant) and partial, more or less tardily developing landscape variables – waterworks, greenery, settlements and communications – with the only exception being the 1817 establishment of the first Prague suburb, Karlín, and its subsequent swift growth. The latter “landscape” during the final decades already indicated the commencement of a Greater Prague, the capital-to-be of the future Czechoslovak Republic. The belt of villages, fields, meadows, gardens and forests, which at that time surrounded the city, became more and more densely filled with both residential and industrial developments and new connections. The slow variables accelerated, the city began expanding beyond its administrative borders and absorbing the rural landscape behind the bulwarks, the transportation network densified, the waterworks were regulated and the Prague intravillan experienced radical redevelopment.

Re-cultivation and sustainable landscape development have come to the fore only recently. The structure of the current cultural landscape of the Czech Republic is formed by three basic types: urban and suburban landscapes and the more distant countryside. The sense of exploring historical landscape is to employ the acquired knowledge to the benefit of modelling new, modern and harmonious landscapes, which definitely should not lack the aspect of the past – i.e., landscapes which will follow on from their previous development, viewed on a time horizon exceeding the life span of merely one or two human generations.

LITERATURE AND SOURCES

- AAČD:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ – Jiří CAJTHAML a kol., Akademický atlas českých dějin, Praha 2014.
- AČ:** Archiv český.
- AČD:** Jaroslav PURŠ a kol., Atlas československých dějin, Praha 1965.
- ADAM 2002:** Dušan ADAM, Využití starých map ve viatistice, *Z dějin geodézie a kartografie* 11, 2002, pp. 103–109.
- ADAM 2004:** Dušan ADAM, I. vojenské mapování. Informační zdroj pro výzkum starých cest, *Staré stezky* 9, 2004, pp. 9–19.
- ADAM 2012:** Dušan ADAM, Kývalka – místo větvení západní brněnské radiály, in: *Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové*, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 221–244.
- ADLER 1984:** Jiří ADLER, Zaniklá sklárna v Suchdole nad Lužnicí, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 53, 1984, pp. 10–17.
- ALTOVÁ – ALT – MATOUŠEK – ŠIMEK 2007:** Blanka ALTOVÁ – Jaroslav ALT – Václav MATOUŠEK – Jan ŠIMEK, Krajinná panoramata bitvy u Jankova v Theatru Europaeu, *Archeologie ve středních Čechách* 11, 2007, no. 2, pp. 589–633.
- ANDERLE 2008:** Jan ANDERLE, Zaniklá ves a tvrz Kokot, Plzeň 2008.
- ANDRASCHEK HOLZER 2002:** Ralph ANDRASCHEK HOLZER, Zur wissenschaftlicher Nutzung topographischer Ansichten, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* 56, 2002, pp. 336–343.
- ANDRASCHEK HOLZER 2011:** Ralph ANDRASCHEK HOLZER, Topographische Ansichten und Wahrnehmungsgeschichte. Eine Erkundung, St. Pölten 2011.
- ANSCHIRINGER 1858/I–II:** Anton ANSCHIRINGER, Album der Industrie des Reichenberger Handelskammer-Bezirks I–II, Reichenberg [1858].
- ANTL – PEKAŘ 1901:** Theodor ANTL – Josef PEKAŘ, Kojakovice. Materiály k dějinám české vesnice, *Český časopis historický* 7, 1901, pp. 163–187.
- AZZANI 2005:** Abdulla AZZANI, Mapové sbírky ve vědeckých knihovnách a archivech České republiky, *Historická geografie* 33, 2005, pp. 432–475.
- BACHMANN 1939:** Friedrich BACHMANN, Die alten Städtebilder. Ein Verzeichnis der graphischen Ortsansichten von Schedel bis Merian, Leipzig 1939.
- BAKER 2006:** Alan BAKER, *Geography and History: Bridging the Divide*, 2. ed., Cambridge 2006.
- BALATKA – SLÁDEK 1976:** Břetislav BALATKA – Jaroslav SLÁDEK, Reliéf Prahy, *Historická geografie* 14–15, 1976, pp. 5–18.
- BALBÍN 1986:** Bohuslav BALBÍN, Krásy a bohatství české země, ed. Zdeňka Tichá – Helena Businská, Praha 1986.
- BARBOROVÁ 1973:** Eva BARBOROVÁ, Instrukce Petra Voka z Rožmberka pro správu třeboňského panství, *Archivum Trebonense* 1973, pp. 248–254.
- BÁRTOVÁ – BAĐUROVÁ 2008:** Lenka BÁRTOVÁ – Anežka BAĐUROVÁ, Vyobrazení měst a jiných lokalit v tiscích 16.–18. století (se vztahem k území České republiky), II. Bibliografie cizojazyčných bohemikálních tisků z let 1501 – 1800, Praha 2008.
- BARTUŠKA – FLIEGELOVÁ – KOCIÁNOVÁ – KOCIÁNOVÁ – PRACH 2008:** Václav BARTUŠKA – Václava FLIEGELOVÁ – Alena KOCIÁNOVÁ – Blanka KOCIÁNOVÁ – Jindřich PRACH, Staré a památné stromy Třeboňska, České Budějovice 2008.
- BAŠE 2009:** Miroslav BAŠE, město – suburbie – venkov = [town – suburbie – countryside], [Praha] 2009.

- BAŠTECKÁ – TRENČANSKÁ 2013:** Lydia BAŠTECKÁ – Barbora TRENČANSKÁ, Broumov, Praha 2013.
- BAŽANT – BAŽANTOVÁ 2013:** Jan BAŽANT – Nina BAŽANTOVÁ, Vila Hvězda v Praze (1555–1563). Mistrovské dílo severské renesance, Praha 2013.
- BEČKOVÁ 2003:** Kateřina BEČKOVÁ, Zmizelá Praha. Dodatky 1. Historický střed města. Praha 2003.
- BEČKOVÁ 2003a:** Kateřina BEČKOVÁ, Zmizelá Praha. Dodatky 2. Historická předměstí a okraje Prahy - pravý břeh Vltavy, Praha 2003.
- BEČKOVÁ 2004:** Kateřina BEČKOVÁ, Zmizelá Praha. Dodatky 3. Historická předměstí a levý břeh Vltavy, Praha 2004.
- BEHRINGER 2010:** Wolfgang BEHRINGER, Kulturní dějiny klimatu. Od doby ledové po globální oteplování, transl. Oldřich Brázdil – Rudolf Kotyza – Petr Kreuz, Praha 2010.
- BĚLIČOVÁ – VANDROVCOVÁ – NOVOZÁMSKÁ – JŮN 2008:** Milena BĚLIČOVÁ – Mirka VANDROVCOVÁ – Martina NOVOZÁMSKÁ – Libor JŮN, Hradní fotoarchiv / The Prague Castle Photographic Archives 1918–1933, Praha 2008.
- BĚLINA a kol. 1998:** Pavel BĚLINA a kol.: Dějiny Prahy II. Od sloučení pražských měst v roce 1784 do současnosti, Praha 1998.
- BĚLOHLAV 1909:** Josef BĚLOHLAV, Podrobné země Koruny české, List 41: Smečno-Kladno-Unhošť, Praha 1909.
- BĚLOHLAV 1909a:** Josef BĚLOHLAV, Podrobné země Koruny české, List 55: Praha-Brandýs n L., Praha 1909.
- BĚLOHLAV 1912:** Královská Praha, in: Vlastivědný sborník III, sešit 3.–5. (33.–35.), Praha 1912.
- BĚLOHRADSKÝ – BELISOVÁ – BOŘIL a kol. 2013:** René BĚLOHRADSKÝ – Natálie BELISOVÁ – Petr BOŘIL, Kamenné kříže Čech, Moravy a Slezska, Liberec 2013.
- BENEŠ – STEJSKAL – OURODA 1998:** Jaromír BENEŠ – Aleš STEJSKAL – Vlastislav OURODA, Historická krajina Netolicka. Specializovaný turistický průvodce, Prachaticy – Netolice 1998.
- BENEŠ 1978:** Antonín BENEŠ, Pravěké a slovanské osídlení na území připravované Chráněné krajinné oblasti Třeboňsko, in: Ekologie a ekonomika Třeboňska. Z výsledků stejnojmenného kolokvia, pořádaného Československou akademií věd a Federálním ministerstvem pro technický a investiční rozvoj I, ed. Jan Jeník – Stanislav Přibil, Třeboň 1978, pp. 35–46.
- BENEŠOVÁ 2012:** Emilie BENEŠOVÁ, Archivní zpracování fotografických archiválií, Paginae historiae. Sborník Národního archivu 20, 2012, no. 2, pp. 427–504.
- BENEŠOVSKÝ-VESELÝ 1890:** Jan BENEŠOVSKÝ-VESELÝ, Velká povodeň v Čechách ve dnech 2. až 5. září 1890, Praha 1890.
- BERAN 2005:** Jan BERAN, Rybníční soustavy jižních Čech, Praha 2005.
- BERGMANN 2013:** Petr BERGMANN, Broumovsko na historických zobrazeních I. Broumov, Meziměstí, Teplice nad Metují, Adršpach, Stárkov, Police nad Metují, Machov a okolí, Meziměstí 2013.
- BERGMANN a kol. 2003:** Petr BERGMANN a kol., Broumovsko. Interpretace kulturního a historického dědictví na Broumovsku, Broumov 2003.
- BEZDĚK – FROUZ 2014:** Ladislav BEZDĚK – Martin FROUZ, Digitální a digitalizovaná fotografie pro vědecké účely v památkové péči, Praha 2014.
- BIČÍK – KUPKOVÁ – ŠTYCH a kol. 2012:** Ivan BIČÍK – Lucie KUPKOVÁ – Přemysl ŠTYCH a kol., Změny funkcí české krajiny a jejich dopad na využití ploch. Modelová území Košťálkov, Abertamy – Hřebečná, Rudná, Živohošť, Moravské Slovácko, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K poctě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 347–372.

- BIČÍK – KUPKOVÁ 2006:** Ivan BIČÍK – Lucie KUPKOVÁ, Vývoj využití ploch v Pražském městském regionu, in: Sociální geografie Pražského městského regionu, ed. Martin Ouředníček, Praha 2006, pp. 42–63.
- BIČÍK a kol. 2010:** Ivan BIČÍK a kol., Vývoj využití ploch v Česku, Praha 2010.
- BÍLKOVÁ – ŠOLTYSOVÁ 1997:** Valdštejnská loggie a komponovaná barokní krajina okolí Jičína. Sborník referátů z vědecké konference konané ve dnech 6.–8. března 1997 v Jičíně, ed. Eva Bílková – Lenka Šoltysová, Semily 1997.
- BÍLKOVÁ 2003:** Eva BÍLKOVÁ [Chodějovská], Samuel Globic z Bučina a zeměměřictví v Čechách v 2. polovině 17. století, Historická geografie 32, 2003, pp. 31–61.
- BINTEROVÁ 2004:** Zdeňka BINTEROVÁ, Zaniklé obce Doupovska ve fotografiích, 3. ed., Chomutov 2004.
- BLAŽEK 2009:** Václav BLAŽEK, Okolo Třeboně (pasou etymologové), in: Genius loci českého jihozápadu V. Sborník z konference konané 22. a 23. října 2008 v Jihočeském muzeu v Českých Budějovicích, České Budějovice – Plzeň 2009, pp. 3–18.
- BLAŽEK a kol. 2010:** Petr BLAŽEK a kol., Akce „K“. Vyhánění sedláků a jejich rodin z usedlostí v padesátých letech. Studie, seznamy a dokumenty, Praha 2010.
- BLAŽKOVÁ 2002:** Lenka BLAŽKOVÁ, Vyobrazení měst a jiných lokalit v tiscích 16.–18. století (se vztahem k území České republiky), I. Knihopis českých a slovenských tisků od doby nejstarší až do konce XVIII. století, předmluva a úvod Anežka Baďurová, Praha 2002.
- BLÜMLOVÁ – CÍLEK a kol. 2012:** Dagmar BLÜMLOVÁ – Václav CÍLEK a kol., Vnímání krajiny. Sborník z konference Krajina jako duchovní dědictví, Praha 2012.
- BLÜMLOVÁ 2013:** Dagmar BLÜMLOVÁ, Místa a lidé. Výbor textů z let 1984–2012, České Budějovice – Pelhřimov 2013.
- BOGUSZAK – CÍSAŘ 1961:** František BOGUSZAK – Josef CÍSAŘ, Mapování a měření českých zemí od poloviny 18. století do počátku 20. století (= Vývoj mapového zobrazení Československé socialistické republiky III), Praha 1961.
- BOHÁČ 1982:** Zdeněk BOHÁČ, Katastry – málo využitý pramen k dějinám osídlení, Historická geografie 20, 1982, pp. 15–87.
- BOHÁČ 1983:** Zdeněk BOHÁČ, Vesnice v sídelní struktuře předhusitských Čech, Historická geografie 21, 1983, pp. 37–116.
- BOHÁČ 1986:** Zdeněk BOHÁČ, Geneze sídla a pluziny jako pramen k dějinám osídlení, Historická geografie 25, 1986, pp. 7–52.
- BOHÁČ 2001:** Zdeněk BOHÁČ, Topografický slovník k církevním dějinám předhusitských Čech. Pražský archidiakonát, ed. Pavel Boháč – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2001.
- BOLINA – KLIMEK 2010:** Pavel BOLINA – Tomáš KLIMEK, K problematice Kosmovy bechyňské cesty, Historická geografie 36, 2010, pp. 99–136.
- BOLINA 2004:** Pavel BOLINA, „Per transversum montis Scalicze“ – k interpretaci pozůstatků starých cest na katastru Dolan u Olomouce ve světle rozhraničovací dohody dolanského kláštera a olomoucké kapituly z roku 1404, Archaeologia historica 29, 2004, pp. 93–118.
- BOLTIŽIAR – CHRASTINA – KRAMÁREKOVÁ – LAUKO – ŠOLCOVÁ 2014:** Martin BOLTIŽIAR – Peter CHRASTINA – Hilda KRAMÁREKOVÁ – Viliam LAUKO – Lucia ŠOLCOVÁ, Výskum krajiny v príkladových štúdiách, Nitra 2014.
- BOLTIŽIAR – OLAH 2009:** Martin BOLTIŽIAR – Bronislav OLAH, Krajina a jej štruktúra (Mapovanie, zmeny a hodnotenie), Nitra 2009.
- BOSTERS 1989:** Kunst in kaart. Decorative aspecten van de cartografie, ed. Cassandra Bosters, Utrecht 1989.
- BRÁZDIL – KOTYZA – DOBROVOLNÝ – ŘEZNÍČKOVÁ – VALÁŠEK 2013:** Rudolf BRÁZDIL – Oldřich KOTYZA – Petr DOBROVOLNÝ – Ladislava ŘEZNÍČKOVÁ

- Hubert VALÁŠEK, *Climate of the Sixteenth Century in the Czech Lands*, Brno 2013.
- BRÁZDIL – KOTYZA 2008:** Rudolf BRÁZDIL – Oldřich KOTYZA, *Historická klimatologie a historie*, in: IX. sjezd českých historiků. Pardubice 6.–8. září 2006, sv. 2. *Historie v kontextu ostatních vědních disciplin*, Brno 2008 pp. 265–341.
- BRŮNA – BUCHTA – UHLÍŘOVÁ 2002:** Vladimír BRŮNA – Ivan BUCHTA – Lenka UHLÍŘOVÁ, *Identifikace historické sítě prvků ekologické stability krajiny na mapách vojenských mapování*, Ústí nad Labem 2002.
- BRŮNA – PACINA – PACINA – VAJSOVÁ 2014:** Vladimír BRŮNA – Jan PACINA – Jakub PACINA – Eliška VAJSOVÁ, *Modeling the extinct landscape and settlement for preservation of cultural heritage*, *Città e Storia* 9, 2014, no. 1, 131–153.
- BRŮNA 2010:** Vladimír BRŮNA, *Cesta do Vídně aneb* <http://oldmaps.geolab.cz> osm let poté, *Studia Oecologica* 4, 2010, no. 2, pp. 101–105 (<http://bruna.geolab.cz/bibl.htm>; http://fzp.ujep.cz/Veda/Edice/StudiaOecologica/SO_2-2010_web.pdf).
- BŘEZAN 1985/I–II:** Václav BŘEZAN, *Životy posledních Rožmberků I–II*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek, Praha 1985.
- BUKAČOVÁ – FÁK 2007:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ – Jiří FÁK, *Paměť krajiny II. Soupis drobných památek Kralovicka a Žihelska*, Mariánská Týnice 2007.
- BUKAČOVÁ – FÁK 2009:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ – Jiří FÁK, *Paměť krajiny V. Soupis drobných památek Dolnobělska a Hornobřízka*, Mariánská Týnice 2009.
- BUKAČOVÁ – HÁJEK 2001:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ – Tomáš HÁJEK, *Příběh drobných památek. Od nezájmu až k fascinaci*, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2001.
- BUKAČOVÁ 2005:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ, *Památky hospodářské architektury Plaska a Kralovicka*, in: *Tvář naší země – krajina domova 6. Naše krajina v kulturním prostoru Evropy*, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2005, pp. 58–70.
- BUKAČOVÁ 2009:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ, *Cesta opata Fortunáta Hartmanna (1755–1779). Příspěvek k barokní topografii Plaska*, *Historická geografie* 35, 2009, pp. 229–248.
- BUKAČOVÁ 2012:** Irena BUKAČOVÁ, *Architektura Jana Blažeje Santiniho-Aichla na severním Plzeňsku*, Plzeň 2012.
- BUKOVSKÝ 2000:** Jan BUKOVSKÝ, *Loretánské kaple v Čechách a na Moravě*, Praha 2000.
- BURDOVÁ 1986:** Pavla BURDOVÁ, *Laické mapování koncem 18. století*, *Z dějin geodézie a kartografie* 5, 1986, pp. 94–100.
- BŮŽEK – JAKUBEC 2012:** Kratochvíle posledních Rožmberků, ed. Václav Bůžek – Ondřej Jakubec. Praha 2012.
- BŮŽEK 1997:** Václav BŮŽEK, *Das Goldene Zeitalter der südböhmischen Teichwirtschaft*, in: *Lainsitz. Natur- und Kulturgeschichte einer Region*, St. Pölten 1997, pp. 81–92.
- BYLINA 2012:** Stanisław BYLINA, *Sippamus granicies alias kopcones, czyli o wytyczeniu granic lokalnych*, in: Stanisław Bylina, *Drogi – granice – most*. *Studia*, Warszawa 2012, pp. 43–88.
- CAJTHAML 2012:** Jiří CAJTHAML, *Analýza starých map v digitálním prostředí na příkladu Müllerových map Čech a Moravy*, Praha 2012.
- CDB:** *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae*.
- CECHNER 1930:** Antonín CECHNER, *Soupis památek historických a uměleckých v politickém okresu broumovském*, Praha 1930.
- CÍLEK 2002:** Václav CÍLEK, *Krajiny vnitřní a vnější*, Praha 2002.
- CÍLEK 2002a:** Václav CÍLEK, *Paměťová struktura krajiny a památné kameny*, in: *Téma pro 21. století. Kulturní krajina a proč ji chránit?*, Praha 2002, pp. 69–73.
- CIRONISOVÁ 1984:** Eva CIRONISOVÁ, *Správa třeboňského panství za Rožmberků (1366–1611)*, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 53, 1984, pp. 1–9.

- COSGROVE 1985:** Denis COSGROVE, Prospect, perspective and the evolution of the landscape idea, Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series 10, 1985, no. 1, pp. 45–62.
- COUFALOVÁ 2015:** Iveta COUFALOVÁ, Dokumentace, nebo nostalgie? (Ediční řada Zmizelé Čechy, Morava, Slezsko). Několik poznámek k jedné ediční řadě a obecně k roli a možnostem editora v digitálním věku, in: Jak psát dějiny velkých měst?, ed. Radana Červená et al., Brno 2015 (= Brno v minulosti a dnes – Supplementum), in print.
- ČADA – VICHROVÁ 2012:** Václav ČADA – Martina VICHROVÁ, Rukopisné mapy krajů Jana Kryštofa Müllera. Krajina a sídla v Čechách na počátku 18. století, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 123–142.
- ČÁP 1998:** Jaroslav ČÁP, Česko-Kladská hranice v 18.–19. století, Kladský sborník 2, 1998, pp. 183–210.
- ČÁP 2001:** Jaroslav ČÁP, Polický soudní okres a jeho rozdělení dle národnosti (1849–1898), Stopami dějin Náchodska 7, 2001, pp. 59–89.
- ČAPKA – SLEZÁK – VACULÍK 2005:** František ČAPKA – Lubomír SLEZÁK – Jaroslav VACULÍK, Nové osídlení pohraničí českých zemí po druhé světové válce, Brno 2005.
- ČAREK 1948:** Vilímkův průvodce Prahou, ed. Jiří Čarek, Praha 1948.
- ČECHOVÁ 1987:** Geolog Jan Krejčí. Sborník prací k 100. výročí úmrtí Jana Krejčího, ed. Vlasta Čechová, Praha 1987.
- ČECHURA – RYANTOVÁ 1992:** Jaroslav ČECHURA – Marie RYANTOVÁ, Urbář kláštera Břevnov z roku 1406, Časopis Národního muzea – řada historická 161, 1992, pp. 79–107.
- ČECHURA 1995:** Jaroslav ČECHURA, Broumovsko 1615–1754. Nový rozměr evropské protoindustrie, Časopis Národního muzea v Praze – řada historická 164, 1995, no. 1–4, pp. 61–88.
- ČECHURA 1997:** Jaroslav ČECHURA, Broumovská rebelie, Praha 1997.
- ČECHURA 2014:** Jaroslav ČECHURA, Strategie versus realita: kdo bude dědit, kdo hospodařit a jak dlouho? (Třeboňsko v první třetině 18. století), Jihočeský sborník historický 83, 2014, pp. 106–151.
- ČECHY III/1–2:** Čechy III/1–2. Společnou prací spisovatelův a umělcův českých, ed. F. Šubert, Praha [1886–1887].
- ČECHY VI:** Čechy VI. V jihovýchodních Čechách. Společnou prací spisovatelův a umělců českých, vedou Fr. Ad. Šubert – F. A. Borovský, Praha b. d. [cca 1890].
- ČERMÁK 1997:** Luboš ČERMÁK, Stopy – fakta – svědectví z historie trati Choceň – Broumov v datech a obrazech, Praha 1997.
- ČERMÁK 1999:** Luboš ČERMÁK, Stopy – fakta – svědectví z historie trati Choceň – Broumov v datech a obrazech II, Praha 1999.
- ČERNÝ 1955:** Václav ČERNÝ, Mapy velkostatku v zemědělsko-lesnických archivech, Kartografický přehled 9, 1955, pp. 91–93.
- ČERNÝ 2006:** Jiří ČERNÝ, Poutní místa jižních Čech. Milostné obrazy, sochy a místa zvláštní zbožnosti, České Budějovice 2006.
- ČÍŽEK – SLAVÍK 1995:** Jan ČÍŽEK – Jiří SLAVÍK, Polní opevnění za sedmileté války na Broumovsku, in: Fortifikace a obrana státu I, [Praha] 1995, pp. 41–47.
- ČIŽMÁŘ 2007:** Zeno ČIŽMÁŘ, 150 let textilní průmyslové tradice na Broumovsku: 1857–2007, Broumov 2007.
- DAVID – MÁCHA 2014:** Jaroslav DAVID – Přemysl MÁCHA, Názvy míst. Paměť, identita, kulturní dědictví, Brno 2014.
- DĚJINY 1989:** Dějiny českého výtvarného umění II/1, Praha 1989.

- DĚJINY 2001:** Dějiny českého výtvarného umění III/1, Praha 2001.
- DEJMALOVÁ a kol. 2008:** Kateřina DEJMALOVÁ a kol., Český svět. Kulisy let 1948–1989. Lomnice nad Popelkou 2008.
- DEMEK – HAVLÍČEK – MACKOVČIN 2010:** Jaromír DEMEK – Marek HAVLÍČEK – Peter MACKOVČIN, Vývoj kulturní krajiny jihomoravských úvalů v 19. a 20. století (Česká republika)in: Sborník příspěvků z konference 50 let geografie na Přírodovědecké fakultě Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci, ed. Miloš Fňukal et al., Olomouc 2010, pp. 59–71.
- DENKBUCH 1836:** Denkbuch über die Anwesenheit Ihrer K. K. Majestäten Franz des Ersten und Caroline Auguste in Böhmen im Jahre 1833, Prag 1836.
- DIBELKA 2012:** Jaroslav DIBELKA, Obranné strategie mužů a žen obviněných ze smilstva a cizoložství. Panství Třeboň na přelomu 17. a 18. století, České Budějovice 2012.
- DIETZLER 1728:** Johann Joseph DIETZLER, Designatio Iconographica Oberleutensdorfenses Pannarias Officinas Vvlgo Fabricas Penicilli arbitrio Representans, (...), Prag 1728 (<http://k4.techlib.cz/search/i.jsp?pid=uuid:5da3d065-ab80-431d-b6bc-e6479b2568e3#>).
- DOHNAL 2003:** Martin DOHNAL, Historická kulturní krajina v novověku. Vývoj vsi a plážiny v Borovanech u Bechyně, Praha 2003.
- DOHNAL 2006:** Martin DOHNAL, Vesnická sídla a kulturní krajina na Táborsku v 15.–19. století, Praha 2006.
- DOLEŽAL – KÜHNE 2006:** Wallfahrten in der europäischen Kultur. Tagungsband Příbram, 26.–29. Mai 2004, ed. Daniel Doležal – Hartmut Kühne, Frankfurt am Main 2006.
- DOMANJOVÁ – TRUC 1987:** Helena DOMANJOVÁ – Miloslav TRUC, Jan Willenberg. Pohledy na česká města z počátku 17. století, Praha 1987.
- DOMEČKA 1896–1897:** Ludvík DOMEČKA, O ustálení hranic Českých a Dolnorakouských v krajině Chlumecké a Novobystřické, Památky archaeologické a místopisné 17, 1896–1897, pp. 729–732.
- DÖRFLINGER 1984/I-II:** Johannes DÖRFLINGER, Die österreichische Kartographie im 18. und zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Privatkartographie zwischen 1780 und 1820 I–II, Wien 1984.
- DOSKOČIL 1953–1954/I–II:** Karel DOSKOČIL, Popis Čech r. 1654. Souhrnný index obcí k berní rule I–II, Praha 1953–1954 (= Berní rula 2/I–II).
- DUCREUX 1997:** Marie-Elisabeth DUCREUX, Symbolický rozměr poutě do Staré Boleslavi, Český časopis historický 95, 1997, pp. 585–620.
- DUDÁČEK 1996:** Karel DUDÁČEK, K názvu a stáří jihočeských Hrdlořez, Archivum Trebonense (8), 1996, pp. 71–79.
- DUDEK 1984:** František DUDEK, Potravinářský průmysl v sociálně ekonomickém vývoji českých zemí v 19. století, Hospodářské dějiny 12, 1984, pp. 5–48.
- DVOŘÁK 2005:** Jiří DVOŘÁK, „Počátek velkého díla“. Z dějin československého regionalismu, Moderní dějiny. Sborník k dějinám 19. a 20. století 13, 2005, pp. 181–233.
- DVOŘÁK 2008:** Filip DVOŘÁK, Rybníční hospodářství na Jindřichohradecku ve druhé polovině 17. století, diplomová práce PF a FF JČU České Budějovice 2008.
- DVOŘÁK 2009:** Jiří DVOŘÁK, Krajina Lipna a tzv. Šumavské moře – proměny ve 20. století, Historická geografie 35, 2009, pp. 323–357.
- DVOŘÁK 2012:** Jiří DVOŘÁK, Putování krajinou Schwarzenberského plavebního kanálu (po proudu vody i času), in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012 pp. 199–220.
- DYKYJOVÁ 2000:** Dagmar DYKYJOVÁ, Třeboňsko. Příroda a člověk v krajině pětileté růže, Třeboň 2000.

- ECKERT 1974:** Jindřich ECKERT, Fotografie Prahy 1863–1905, Praha 1974.
- EBBRECHT 2013:** Städteatlanten. Vier Jahrzehnte Atlasarbeit in Europa, ed. Wilfried Ehbrecht, Köln etc. 2013.
- EMLER 1881:** Josef EMLER, Decem registra censuum bohemia compilata aetate bellum husiticum praecedente, Praeae 1881.
- EZOP 1872:** J. EZOP, Popsání okresu Pražsko-Vyšehradského, 14. září 1872. Písemný operát reambulovaného katastru, Ústřední archiv zeměměřictví a katastru, Fond Stabilní katastr, jeho údržba a obnova (1824–1957), Písemný operát, B2/c/C (nezpracováno; bez sign.).
- EZOP 1872a:** J. EZOP, Popsání okresu Smíchovského, 26. září 1872. Písemný operát reambulovaného katastru, Ústřední archiv zeměměřictví a katastru, Fond Stabilní katastr, jeho údržba a obnova (1824–1957), Písemný operát, B2/c/C (nezpracováno; bez sign.).
- FAUSER 1978/I–II:** Alois FAUSER, Repertorium älterer Topographie I–II, Wiesbaden 1978.
- FECHTNEROVÁ 1984/I–V:** Anna FECHTNEROVÁ, Katalog grafických listů univerzitních tezí uložených ve Státní knihovně ČSR v Praze I–V, Praha 1984.
- FIALOVÁ – STEYEROVÁ – SEMOTANOVÁ 2015:** Dana FIALOVÁ – Michaela STEYEROVÁ – Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Vltavské ostrovy v Praze, Praha 2015.
- FIALOVÁ 1973:** Ludmila FIALOVÁ, Charakteristiky pražských příměstských usedlostí a jejich vývoj, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica 1973, no. 1, pp. 27–53.
- FIALOVÁ 1973a:** Ludmila FIALOVÁ, Vznik a dnešní stav pražských příměstských usedlostí, Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica 1973, no. 2, pp. 47–72.
- FIEDLER 1995:** Günter FIEDLER, Doplnky k Soupisu map českých zemí – 2. svazek, Listy katedry historie 8, 1995, pp. 81–100.
- FIEDLER 2002:** Günter FIEDLER, Druhé doplnky k Soupisu map českých zemí – 2. svazek, Východočeské listy historické 15–16, 2002, pp. 251–266.
- FOLTÝN – KOUPIL 2013:** Jeroným Růžička: Dějepis kláštera Břevnovského a Broumovského, ed. Dušan Foltýn – Ondřej Koupil, Praha 2013.
- FÖRSTER – HERZBERG – ZÜCKERT 2013:** Umweltgeschichte(n). Ostmitteleuropa von der Industrialisierung bis zum Postsozialismus. Vorträge der Tagung des Collegium Carolinum in Bad Wiessee vom 4. bis 7. November 2010, ed. Horst Förster – Julia Herzberg – Martin Zückert, Göttingen 2013.
- FRAJER – PAVELKOVÁ CHMELOVÁ 2010:** Jindřich FRAJER – Renata PAVELKOVÁ CHMELOVÁ, Nejstarší rybníky na Čáslavsku a jejich funkce, in: Sborník příspěvků z konference 50 let geografie na Přírodovědecké fakultě Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci, ed. Miloš Fňukal et al., Olomouc 2010, pp. 73–80.
- FRANTA 1880:** Frant. Jos. FRANTA, Okres Třeboňský. Nástin statisticko-historický, Praha 1880.
- FRB:** Fontes rerum Bohemicarum.
- FUSS 2004:** Ulrike Valeria FUSS, Landschaftsspezifische Charakteristika in den Stadtansichten der Frühen Neuzeit, in: Städtelandschaft – Réseau urbain – Urban Network. Städte im regionalen Kontext in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, ed. Holger Th. Gräf – Katrin Keller, Köln etc. 2004, pp. 199–217.
- FÜSSEL 2008:** Städte der Welt: 363 Kupferstiche revolutionieren das Weltbild; Gesamtausgabe der kolorierten Tafeln 1572–1617. Nach dem Original des Historischen Museums Frankfurt, ed. Stephan Füssel, Hong Kong – Köln etc. 2008.
- GAŽI – HANSOVÁ 2012:** Martin GAŽI – Jarmila HANSOVÁ, Svatyně za hradbami měst. Křížová hora u Českého Krumlova v jihočeských a středoevropských souvislostech, České Budějovice 2012.

- GAŽI 2008:** Schwarzenbergové v české a středoevropské kulturní historii, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2008.
- GAŽI 2011:** Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011.
- GEARTY – STRACKE – CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2015:** Sarah GEARTY – Daniel STRACKE – Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, The “Digital Turn” of the European Historic Towns Atlas: comparing solutions for digital atlas production and online presentation, *Città e storia* 10, 2015, in print.
- GOJDA – JOHN a kol. 2013:** Archeologie a letecké laserové skenování krajiny, ed. Martin Gojda – Jan John a kol., Plzeň 2013.
- GOJDA – TREFNÝ a kol. 2011:** Martin GOJDA – Martin TREFNÝ a kol., Archeologie krajiny pod Řípem, Plzeň 2011.
- GOJDA 2000:** Martin GOJDA, Archeologie krajiny. Vývoj archetypů kulturní krajiny, Praha 2000.
- GOJDA 2004:** Ancient Landscape, Settlement Dynamics and Non-Destructive Archaeology, ed. Martin Gojda, Praha 2004.
- GOJDA 2012:** Martin GOJDA, Význam moderních metod dálkového průzkumu pro studium, dokumentaci a mapování historické krajiny českých zemí. Relikty fortifikační architektury v krajině (Terezín), in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 319–346.
- GÖRNER 1957:** Josef GÖRNER, Česká zemědělská rada, Sborník archivních prací 7, 1957, pp. 186–212.
- GOTTLIEB 2001:** Jaromír GOTTLIEB, Zahrada mariánská, in: Tvář naší země – krajina domova 3. Duchovní rozměr krajiny, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2001 pp. 31–45.
- GRAUS 1957:** František GRAUS, Dějiny venkovského lidu v Čechách v době předhusitské II. Dějiny venkovského lidu od poloviny 13. stol. do roku 1419, Praha 1957.
- GREGORY – ELL 2007:** Ian GREGORY– Paul ELL, Historical GIS: technologies, methodologies, and scholarship, Cambridge 2007.
- GREGORY 2002:** Ian GREGORY, A Place in History. A Guide to Using GIS in Historical Research, publikováno on-line (<http://hds.essex.ac.uk/g2gp/gis/index.asp>).
- GRIM 1937:** František GRIM, Vysoká, vrch a zřícenina u Kutné Hory, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností českých 45, 1937, pp. 69–83.
- GRIM 2011:** Tomáš GRIM, Kopie, reprodukce a faksimile starých map, Geodetický a kartografický obzor 57 (99), 2011, no. 5, pp. 116–119.
- HADAČ 1946:** Jaroslav HADAČ, Rožmberk české moře. Hrst technických a historických dat, Třeboň 1946.
- HÁJEK 2003:** Pavel HÁJEK, Česká krajina a baroko. Urbanismus českého baroka na příkladu města Jičína a jeho okolí, Praha 2003.
- HÁJEK 2008:** Pavel HÁJEK, Jde pevně kupředu naše zem. Krajina českých zemí v období socialismu 1948–1989, Praha – Malá Skála 2008.
- HÁJEK 2009:** Pavel HÁJEK, Zděná boží muka v jižních Čechách, České Budějovice 2009.
- HAM 14:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XIV. Praha-Libeň, ed. Eva Semotanová, Praha 2006.
- HAM 18:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XVIII. Jičín, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Eva Semotanová, Praha 2009.
- HAM 19:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XIX. Praha-Královské Vinohrady, ed. Eva Semotanová, Praha 2010.
- HAM 24:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XXIV. Praha-Smíchov, ed. Eva Chodějovská, Praha 2013.

- HAM 25:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XXV. Mikulov, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012.
- HAM 26:** Historický atlas měst České republiky XXVI. Most, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2014.
- HÄNNI 2010:** Pier HÄNNI, Putování krajinou k místům síly a posvátným kamenům. Místa odpočinku, inspirace a léčení si každý může najít sám, Olomouc [2010].
- HANUŠOVÁ 2013:** Helena HANUŠOVÁ, Fotografie 19. století jako historický pramen, bakalářská práce FF UK Praha 2013.
- HARLEY – WOODWARD 1987–2007/I–III:** The History of Cartography I, II/1–3, III, ed. J. B. Harley – David Woodward, Chicago 1987–2007.
- HÁTLE 2001:** Miroslav HÁTLE, CHKO Třeboňsko – „krajina kompromisů“ a nástroje její ochrany, in: Tvář naší země – krajina domova 1. Krajina jako přírodní prostor, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2001, pp. 149–153.
- HAUBELT 2003:** Josef HAUBELT, Jakub Krčín z Jelčan. List z historie jižních Čech, Praha 2003.
- HEBER 1844–1849/I–VII:** František Alexandr HEBER, Böhmens Burgen, Vesten und Bergschlösser I–VII, Prag 1844–1849.
- HEERMANN 1897:** Norbert Heermann's Rosenberg'sche Chronik, ed. Johann Matthäus Klimesch, Prag 1897.
- HEJTMÁNEK 1896:** Ladislav HEJTMÁNEK, Libeň. Historický nástin, Libeň 1896.
- HEJTMÁNKOVÁ – KUPKA 2014:** Barbora HEJTMÁNKOVÁ – Jiří KUPKA, Rozbory panoramatického pohledu, Historická geografie 40, 2014, pp. 263–283.
- HENDRYCH – LÍČENÍKOVÁ 1998:** Jan HENDRYCH – Michaela LÍČENÍKOVÁ, Historická krajina Jičínska, Zprávy památkové péče 58, 1998, no. 3, pp. 76–83.
- HENDRYCH 1998:** Jan HENDRYCH, Krajina kulturní a historická, Zprávy památkové péče 58, 1998, no. 3, pp. 73–75.
- HENDRYCH 2001:** Jan HENDRYCH, Barokní zahrady a krajinné úpravy v Čechách, in: Tvář naší země – krajina domova 2. Krajina jako kulturní prostor, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2001, pp. 12–20.
- HENDRYCH 2008:** Jan HENDRYCH, Krajina bývalého nadačního panství Choustníkovo Hradiště, její příběh, proměny a souvislosti; péče o historickou krajinu světového významu, Zprávy památkové péče 68, 2008, pp. 302–308.
- HENNINGSSEN 1989:** Uta HENNINGSSEN, Besitz und Einkünfte der Herren von Rosenberg in Böhmen nach dem Urbar von 1379/84, Marburg/Lahn 1989.
- HERMOVÁ – POLKOVÁ – WATZKO 2007:** Hana HERMOVÁ – Miroslava POLKOVÁ – Karel WATZKO, Analýza vývoje území jako podklad pro současné plánování (na příkladu Mariánské zahrady na Jičínsku), Historická geografie 34, 2007, pp. 350–371.
- HESKE 1909:** František HESKE, Popis knížecího Schwarzenberg'ského svěřenského panství třeboňského se zvláštním zřetelem na jeho lesy. K orientaci P. T. pp. účastníků exkurse „České lesnické jednoty“ v srpnu roku 1909, Praha 1909 (totéž pod názvem Lesy knížecího Schwarzenberg'ského svěřenského panství třeboňského. Za příčinou exkurse „České lesnické jednoty“ v srpnu roku 1909, Praha 1909; v obou případech s německým překladem v témže svazku).
- HLAVÁČEK 1988:** Ivan HLAVÁČEK, Diplomatika, in: Ivan Hlaváček – Jaroslav Kašpar – Rostislav Nový, Vademecum pomocných věd historických, Praha 1988, pp. 175–270.
- HLAVAČKA a kol. 2011:** Milan HLAVAČKA a kol., Místa paměti česko-německého soužití. Sborník příspěvků z konference pracovní skupiny Česko-německého diskusního fóra Místa paměti v Chebu 5. 6. 2010, Praha 2011.
- HLAVSA 1970:** Václav HLAUSA, Pražské teritorium v druhé polovině 19. století (rozvoj zástavby), Pražský sborník historický 5, 1970, pp. 5–51.

- HNILIČKA 2005:** Pavel HNILIČKA, Sídlní kaše, Praha 2005.
- HODGKISS 1981:** Alan G. HODGKISS, Understanding maps. A systematic history of their use and development, Folkestone 1981.
- HOJDA – CHODĚJOVSKÁ a kol. 2014:** Zdeněk HOJDA – Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ a kol., Heřman Jakub Černín na cestě za Alpy a Pyreneje I. Kavalířská cesta českého šlechtice do německých zemí, Itálie, Francie, Španělska a Portugalska; II. Cestovní deník *Heřmana Jakuba Černína* z let 1678–1682, Praha 2014.
- HOJDA – PÁTKOVÁ 2008:** Pragmatické písemnosti v kontextu právním a správním, ed. Zdeněk Hojda – Hana Pátková, Praha 2008.
- HOJDA 1996:** Zdeněk HOJDA, Historická ikonografie – pomocná věda historická?, in: Pomocné vědy historické a jejich místo mezi historickými obory, Praha 1996, pp. 145–154 (= Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philosophica et Historica 1996, no. 1, Z pomocných věd historických 13).
- HOJDA 1999:** Zdeněk HOJDA, Obraz a text na pražských vedutách 17. století, in: Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Philosophica et Historica 1999, no. 5, Z pomocných věd historických 14, pp. 85–91.
- HOLEC 1970:** František HOLEC, Zápas o Velkou Prahu, Pražský sborník historický 5, 1970, pp. 117–136.
- HOLUBOVÁ 2006:** Markéta HOLUBOVÁ, The Jesuit place of pilgrimage – Svata Hora near Pribram in the light of books of miracles, in: Wallfahrten in der europäischen Kultur. Tagungsband Příbram, 26.–29. Mai 2004, ed. Daniel Doležal – Hartmut Kühne, Frankfurt am Main 2006, pp. 367–380.
- HOLZBACHOVÁ 2004:** Ivana HOLZBACHOVÁ, Škola Annales a její proměny, in: Filozofie dějin. Problémy a perspektivy, Brno 2004, pp. 235–255.
- HONC 1959:** Jaroslav HONC, Spotřeba chlebového obilí a rušení a rajonizace mlýnů na rožmberských panstvích v roce 1590, in: Vědecké práce Československé akademie zemědělských věd z dějin zemědělství a lesnictví, Praha 1959, pp. 147–168.
- HONL – PROCHÁZKA 1981–1992/I–VI:** Ivan HONL – Emanuel PROCHÁZKA, Úvod do dějin zeměměřictví I–VI, Praha 1981–1992.
- HONL 1939:** Ivan HONL, Zeměměřiči ve službách české komory v době vlády Rudolfa II. a na začátku vlády Matyášovy, Brno 1939.
- HONL 1956:** Ivan HONL, O pramenném významu starých lesních map, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností 64, 1956, pp. 138–140.
- HONL 1960:** Ivan HONL, K rozvoji map velkostatku v 18. a na začátku 19. století, Archivní časopis 10, 1960, pp. 221–227.
- HONS 1961:** Josef HONS, Když měřičkové, rybníkáři a trhani krajem táhli, Praha 1961.
- HORSKÁ – MAUR – MUSIL 2002:** Pavla HORSKÁ – Eduard MAUR – Jiří MUSIL, Zrod velkoměsta. Urbanizace českých zemí a Evropa, Praha – Litomyšl 2002.
- HORSKÁ-VRBOVÁ 1970:** Pavla HORSKÁ-VRBOVÁ, Pražský průmysl v druhé polovině 19. století, Pražský sborník historický 5, 1970, pp. 52–67.
- HORSKÝ – SLÁDEK 1993:** Jan HORSKÝ – Miloš SLÁDEK, Rodinné, sociální a demografické poměry v poddanských vsích na panství Třeboň v letech 1586 a 1651, Historická demografie 17, 1993, pp. 71–110.
- HORSKÝ 1993:** Jan HORSKÝ, Příspěvek ke studiu venkovské poddanské čeledi v 16.–18. století (panství Třeboň – sonda), Archivní časopis 43, 1993, pp. 145–166.
- HORSKÝ 1993a:** Jan HORSKÝ, Příspěvek ke studiu rodinných struktur v Čechách v 16. století (panství Třeboň – sonda), Jihočeský sborník historický 62, 1993, pp. 50–57.
- HORYNA 2000:** Mojmir HORYNA, Zámek Trója u Prahy. Stručná historie, Litomyšl 2000.
- HRBEK 2013:** Jiří HRBEK, Barokní Valdštejnové v Čechách 1640–1740, Praha 2013.

- HRŮZA – BEČKOVÁ – MÍKA a kol. 1993:** Jiří HRŮZA – Kateřina BEČKOVÁ – Zdeněk MÍKA a kol., Pražská asanace. K 100. výročí vydání asanačního zákona pro Prahu, Praha 1993 (= Acta Musei Pragensis).
- HRŮZA 2014:** Jiří HRŮZA, Svět měst, Praha 2014.
- HRŮZA a kol. 1999:** Jiří HRŮZA a kol., Praha v plánech a projektech od středověku po současnost. Katalog výstavy, Praha 1999.
- HUBKOVÁ 2010:** Jana HUBKOVÁ, Fridrich Falcký v zrcadle letákové publicistiky. Letáky jako pramen k vývoji a vnímání české otázky v letech 1619–1632, Praha 2010.
- HULE 2000:** Miroslav HULE, Rybníkářství na Třeboňsku. Historický průvodce, Třeboň 2000.
- HULE 2004:** Miroslav HULE, Rožmberkův Krčín a Krčínův Rožmberk, Třeboň 2004.
- HULE – KOTYZA 2012:** Miroslav HULE – Michal KOTYZA, Rybníkářství na Jindřichohradecku, Třeboň 2012.
- CHADT 2009:** Bohdan CHADT, Jak se pečuje o památné stromy, in: Památné stromy v lesích jako příspěvek k plnění celospolečenských funkcí lesa, Praha [2009], pp. 15–26.
- CHALUPA – LIŠKOVÁ – NUHLÍČEK – RAJTORAL 1964:** Aleš CHALUPA – Marie LIŠKOVÁ – Josef NUHLÍČEK – František RAJTORAL, Tereziánský katastr český I, Praha 1964.
- CHALUPA 1984:** Aleš CHALUPA, Hesseliova kronika o povstání poddaných na broumovském panství, Sborník Národního muzea, řada A – Historie 38, 1984, no. 1–2, pp. 5–93.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ – PACINA – POPELKA 2014:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ – Jan PACINA – Jan POPELKA, Information system for easy access of the First Military Survey, 14th International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference, SGEM 2014, Conference Proceedings. 2014, Book 2, Volume III, Sofia 2014, pp. 683–690.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2012:** Krajina jako historické jeviště. K poctě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2009:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Příspěvek k ikonografii hospodářských budov na schlikovských panstvích Jičínska, in: Šlechtické rody a jejich sídla v Českém ráji, ed. Ivo Navrátil, Semily 2009 (= Z Českého ráje a Podkrkonoší – Supplementum 13), pp. 332–346.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2011:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Geografické informační systémy v práci historika, Český časopis historický 109, 2011, pp. 794–806.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2012:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Studying the Early Modern Landscape in the Czech Republic, Historická geografie 38, 2012, pp. 63–98.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2012a:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, I. vojenské mapování jako pramen pro poznání krajiny druhé poloviny 18. století. Komunikace v pražském regionu, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K poctě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 159–184.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2013:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Landschaftsveränderungen des Prager Stadtrands während des Sozialismus und post-sozialistischer Zeit, in: Umweltgeschichte(n). Ostmitteleuropa von der Industrialisierung bis zum Postsozialismus, ed. Horst Förster – Julia Herzberg – Martin Zückert, München 2013, pp. 105–127.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2014:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Obraz Prahy v raném novověku. Ikonografie jednoho evropského města, disertační práce, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Pardubice 2014.
- CHODĚJOVSKÁ 2015:** Eva CHODĚJOVSKÁ, Staré mapy a plány jako pramen pro dějiny měst v České republice?, in: Jak psát dějiny velkých měst?, ed. Radana Červená et al., Brno 2015 (= Brno v minulosti a dnes – Supplementum), in print.

- CHRASTINA 2009:** Peter CHRASTINA, Vývoj využívania krajiny Trenčianskej kotliny a jej horskej obruby, Nitra 2009.
- CHRASTINA 2012:** Peter CHRASTINA, Rekonštrukcia a prognóza vývoja archetypu poľnohospodárskej krajiny na území mesta Trenčín. Deväť krajín lokality Veľká hora – ad finitum alebo ad continuandum?, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 385–417.
- CHROMÝ 2003:** Pavel CHROMÝ, Vývoj krajiny a formování identity území. Příspěvek k environmentálním dějinám na příkladu České Kanady, Historická geografie 32, 2003, pp. 115–134.
- IVANEGA – ŠÁMAL – TRNKOVÁ 2013:** Jan IVANEGA – Petr ŠÁMAL – Petra TRNKOVÁ, Buquoyský Rožmberk. Vizualní kultura šlechtického sídla v období romantického historismu, Praha 2013.
- IVANEGA 2011:** Jan IVANEGA, Pavel Ignác Bayer, Adam František ze Schwarzenbergu a zámek Ohrada, Theatrum historiae 9, 2011, pp. 397–418.
- JACOB 1982:** Frank-Dietrich JACOB, Historische Stadtansichten. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche und quellenkundliche Momente, Leipzig 1982.
- JAKUBEC – JINDRA a kol. 2006:** Ivan JAKUBEC – Zdeněk JINDRA a kol., Dějiny hospodářství českých zemí od počátku industrializace do konce habsburské monarchie, Praha 2006.
- JANÁK 2009:** Karel JANÁK, Plavení dřeva, in: Sborník referátů ze semináře Vesnické technické památky. Nevýrobní objekty, 12.–14. 10. 2004, Vysoké Mýto 2009, pp. 53–67.
- JANIŠ – ŠENKÝŘOVÁ 2004:** Dalibor JANIŠ – Jana ŠENKÝŘOVÁ, Hranice statků a pozemků – jejich zachycení v písemných (právních) pramenech, Archaeologia Historica 29, 2004, pp. 193–202.
- JANKOVSKÁ 1976:** Vlasta JANKOVSKÁ, Původní lesní dřeviny v Třeboňské pánvi (jižní Čechy), Preslia 48, 1976, pp. 156–164.
- JANOUŠEK 1936:** Emil JANOUŠEK, Další zprávy o patrimoniálních archivech, Časopis archivní školy 12, 1936, pp. 160–170.
- JANOUŠEK 1950:** Em. JANOUŠEK, Rybníkářské dílo Krajířů v jižních Čechách, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností 58, 1950, pp. 8–24.
- JÁNSKÝ 2006:** Jiří JÁNSKÝ, Páni ze Švamberka. Pětisetletá sága rodu s erbem labutě, Domažlice 2006.
- JÁSEK – VRBOVÁ – PALAS 2009:** Jaroslav JÁSEK – Alena VRBOVÁ – Jan PALAS, Pražské kaly, Praha 2009.
- JÁSEK 1998:** Jaroslav JÁSEK, Klenot města. Historický vývoj pražského vodárenství, Praha 1998.
- JAWORSKI 2006:** Rudolf JAWORSKI, Deutsche und tschechische Ansichten. Kollektive Identifikationsangebote auf Bildpostkarten in der späten Habsburgermonarchie, Innsbruck 2006.
- JEMELKA 2011:** Martin JEMELKA, Ostravské dělnické kolonie I. Závodní kolonie kamenouhelných dolů a koksoven v moravské části Ostravy, Ostrava 2011.
- JEMELKA 2012:** Martin JEMELKA, Ostravské dělnické kolonie II. Závodní kolonie kamenouhelných dolů a koksoven ve slezské části Ostravy, Ostrava 2012.
- JENÍK – PŘIBIL 1978:** Ekologie a ekonomika Třeboňska. Z výsledků stejnojmenného kolokvia, pořádaného Československou akademií věd a Federálním ministerstvem pro technický a investiční rozvoj I, ed. Jan Jeník – Stanislav Přibil, Třeboň 1978.
- JENÍK a kol. 1996:** Jan JENÍK a kol., Biosférické rezervace České republiky. Příroda a lidé pod záštitou UNESCO, Praha 1996.

- JEŽEK 1996–1997/I–II:** Martin JEŽEK, Česká města na foliích würzburgského alba I, Průzkumy památek 3, 1996, no. 2, pp. 35–50; II, tamtéž 4, 1997, no. 2, pp. 19–47.
- JIRÁČEK 1998:** Jan JIRÁČEK, Průvodce lesy jižních Čech, České Budějovice 1998.
- JIRÁSEK 1980:** Alois JIRÁSEK, Z mých pamětí, Praha 1980.
- JUNGMANN 2007:** Jan JUNGMANN, Smíchov. Město za Újezdskou branou, Praha 2007.
- KÁBOVÁ 2013:** Hana KÁBOVÁ, Josef Vítězslav Šimák. Jeho život a dílo se zvláštním zřetelem k historické vlastivědě, České Budějovice – Pelhřimov 2013.
- KADLEC 1953:** Jaroslav KADLEC, Zaniklé osady na panství bývalého kláštera třeboňského, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností 61, 1953, pp. 221–224.
- KADLEC 1978:** Jaroslav KADLEC, Hospodářské poměry na panství třeboňského kláštera v 15. a 16. století, Jihočeský sborník historický 47, 1978, pp. 13–22.
- KADLEC 2004:** Jaroslav KADLEC, Klášter augustiniánských kanovníků v Třeboni, Praha 2004.
- KÁLALOVÁ 1981:** Drahoslava KÁLALOVÁ, Nejstarší zprávy o některých jihočeských rybnících, Jihočeský sborník historický 50, 1981, pp. 29–43.
- KALAŠOVÁ 2010:** Karel KRAMERIUS, Putování po českých hradech (1814–1818), ed. Marcela Kalašová, transl. Jindřich Schwippel – Michaela Váňová, Praha 2010.
- KALNÝ 1990:** Adolf KALNÝ, Mapy a plány třeboňského panství a velkostatku. (Rozbor fondového souboru), Sborník archivních prací 40, 1990, pp. 385–395.
- KALNÝ 1993:** Popravčí kniha pánů z Rožmberka, ed. Adolf Kalný, Třeboň 1993.
- KALNÝ 2001:** Adolf KALNÝ, Priorita třeboňského velkostatku v drenážování, Archivum Trebonense (9), 2011, pp. 131–133.
- KALNÝ a kol. 1976/I–II:** Adolf KALNÝ a kol., Soupis urbářů jihočeských archivů 1378–1773 I–II, České Budějovice 1976.
- KAPLAN 2012:** Karel KAPLAN, Proměny české společnosti (1948–1960) II. Venkov, Praha 2012.
- KARPAŠ 2005:** Roman KARPAŠ, Pohlednice. Historie lístků, které zmenšily svět, Liberec 2005.
- KAŠE – KOTLÍK 1999:** Jiří KAŠE – Petr KOTLÍK, Braunův Betlém. Drama krajiny a umění v proměnách času, Praha – Litomyšl 1999.
- KAŠE – ŘÍHOVÁ – STRÁNÍKOVÁ 2012:** Jiří KAŠE – Vladislava ŘÍHOVÁ – Jana STRÁNÍKOVÁ, Literatura a archivní prameny jako podklad průzkumu nemovitých památek se zaměřením na sochařská díla a drobnou architekturu. Přehled a čítanka (nejen) pro budoucí restaurátory, Pardubice 2012.
- KAŠPAR 1840/I–III:** Jan KAŠPAR, Beiträge zur historisch-topographischen Beschreibung der Herrschaft Wittingau I–III, 1840 (manuscript, SOA Třeboň).
- KAŠPAR 1990:** Jaroslav KAŠPAR, Vybrané kapitoly z historické geografie českých zemí a z nauky o mapách, Praha 1990.
- KATZENSCHLAGER 2012:** Wolfgang KATZENSCHLAGER, Teiche und Stadt, in: Ryby a lidé. Rožmberkové a rybníkářství na jihu Čech a ve Waldviertlu, ed. Aleš Stejskal – Helena Stejskalová, České Budějovice 2012, pp. 179–187.
- KAVKA 1966:** František KAVKA, Zlatý věk Růží. Kus české historie 16. století, České Budějovice 1966.
- KELLY KNOWLES 2008:** Anne KELLY KNOWLES, Placing history: how maps, spatial data, and GIS are changing historical scholarship, ed. Anne Kelly Knowles, Redlands 2008.
- KIEB 1991:** Walter KIEB, Urbanismus im Industriezeitalter, Berlin 1991.
- KLÁPŠTĚ 1994:** Jan KLÁPŠTĚ, Paměť krajiny středověkého Mostecka, Praha 1994.
- KLÁPŠTĚ 2012:** Jan KLÁPŠTĚ, Proměna českých zemí ve středověku, 2., revised ed., Praha 2012.

- KLEMPERA 2002:** Josef KLEMPERA, Vodní mlýny v Čechách V. Českobudějovicko, Jindřichohradecko, Vltavotýnsko, Táborsko, Strakonicko, Českokrumlovsko, Milevsko, Písecko, Pelhřimovsko, Praha 2002.
- KLIMEK 2014:** Tomáš KLIMEK, Krajiny českého středověku, Praha 2014.
- KLIPCOVÁ – ULIČNÝ 2011:** Barbora KLIPCOVÁ – Petr ULIČNÝ, Valdštejnský palác v Jičíně, Jičín 2011.
- KLUSÁKOVÁ 2003:** Luďa KLUSÁKOVÁ, Cestou do Cařihradu. Osmanská města v 16. století viděná křesťanskými očima, Praha 2003.
- KLUTSCHAK 1845:** Franz KLUTSCHAK, Der Führer durch Prag, Prag 1845.
- KNEIDL 2005:** Pravoslav KNEIDL, Setkání s Prahou, Praha 2005.
- KNITTLER 2012:** Herbert KNITTLER, Teichwirtschaft und Karpfenzucht im niederösterreichischen Waldviertel. Von den Anfängen bis ins frühe 19. Jahrhundert, in: Ryby a lidé. Rožmberkové a rybníkářství na jihu Čech a ve Waldviertlu, ed. Aleš Stejskal – Helena Stejskalová, České Budějovice 2012, pp. 151–163.
- KOBLASA 2013:** Pavel KOBLASA, Místopis Třeboňska. Okolím Třeboně, Lomnice, Veselí a Stráže, České Budějovice 2013.
- KOHOUT – VANČURA 1986:** Jiří KOHOUT – Jiří VANČURA, Praha 19. a 20. století. Technické proměny, Praha 1986.
- KOLÁČNÝ – STEINOVÁ – WAAGE 2014:** Jaroslav KOLÁČNÝ – Šárka STEINOVÁ – Vladimír WAAGE, Urbarium neoconscriptum cum explicatione brevi čili Nově sepsaný řád všech trvalých povinností a rent, které plní a odvádějí dědiční poddaní slavného kláštera Broumova ve městě a okolí, Praha 2014.
- KOLÁR 1969:** Jaroslav KOLÁR, Mezi kronikářstvím a zábavnou prózou (*Třeboňské paměti* Vavřince Benedikta Mecera), Strahovská knihovna 4, 1969, pp. 111–151.
- KOLÁŘ 2003:** Jan KOLÁŘ, Geografické informační systémy, Praha 2003.
- KOLÁŘOVÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2011:** Eva KOLÁŘOVÁ – Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Poustevna při kapli sv. Barbory u Branné a poustevnictví na Třeboňsku (1400–1600), Archivum Trebonense 12, 2011, pp. 23–35.
- KONEČNÝ – RAIS 1985:** Milan KONEČNÝ – Karel RAIS, Úvod do geografických informačních systémů, Praha 1985.
- KORDIOVSKÝ 1998:** Emil KORDIOVSKÝ, Lednicko-valtický areál, Břeclav 1998.
- KOŠŤÁL 1990:** Zdeněk KOŠŤÁL, Dějiny Broumova a Broumovska, Broumov 1990.
- KOTKOVÁ 2010:** Roelandt Savery. Malíř ve službách císaře Rudolfa II., ed. Olga Kotková, Praha 2010.
- KOVANDA a kol. 2001:** Jiří KOVANDA a kol., Neživá příroda Prahy a jejího okolí, Praha 2001 (<http://www.monet.cz/atlas/default.htm>).
- KOVÁŘ 1998:** Daniel KOVÁŘ, Římov, historie obce a poutního místa, Římov 1998.
- KOVÁŘ 1998a:** Milan KOVÁŘ, Rybníky na dominiu pánů z Hradce ve druhé polovině 16. století, Opera historica 6, 1998, pp. 63–75.
- KOVÁŘ 2013:** Daniel KOVÁŘ, Stará silnice z Českých Budějovic do Rakous, zvaná Cikánka, Historická geografie 39, 2013, pp. 189–212.
- KOZÁK – STÁTNÍKOVÁ – MUNZAR – JANATA – HANČIL 2007:** Jan KOZÁK – Pavla STÁTNÍKOVÁ – Jan MUNZAR – Jiří JANATA – Vladislav HANČIL, Povodně v českých zemích, Praha 2007.
- KOZÁK 1983:** Jan KOZÁK, Civitates Orbis Terrarum. „Pana Francise kniha měst“, Umění 31, 1983, pp. 381–390.
- KRÁL 1947:** Jiří KRÁL, Zeměpisný průvodce Velkou Prahou a její kulturní oblastí. Praha 1947.
- KRAMÁŘ 2007:** Jan KRAMÁŘ, Fotografická sbírka ministerstva pošt a telegrafů 1918–1948, Historická fotografie 7, 2007, pp. 7–22.

- KRAUS 1995:** Vladimír KRAUS, Tvorba kartografických pohlednic, Z dějin geodézie a kartografie 8, 1995, pp. 42–44.
- KRČMÁŘ 2001:** Luděk KRČMÁŘ, Panská sídla na historických negativech Západočeského muzea v Plzni, Historická fotografie 1, 2001, no. 1, pp. 41–47.
- KRČMÁŘOVÁ 2014:** Jana KRČMÁŘOVÁ, Zapomínání a rekonstrukce historie českého leso-zemědělství, nepublikovaná přednáška na 23. sjezdu České geografické společnosti, Praha 27. srpna 2014.
- KREJČÍ – HELMHACKER 1868–1877:** Jan KREJČÍ – Rudolf HELMHACKER, Geologická mapa okolí pražského z let 1868–1877.
- KREJČÍ 1847:** Jan KREJČÍ, Zeměznalecká mapa od Jana Krejčího, Časopis Českého musea 21, 1847, p. 457.
- KREJČÍ 1854:** Jan KREJČÍ, Přírodopisný průvodce po okolí Pražském. Horopisný a zeměznalecký popis okolí Pražského (Pro žáky vyšších škol středních), Praha 1854.
- KREJČÍ 1857:** Jan KREJČÍ, Horopisné obrazy okolí pražského, Praha 1857.
- KREJČÍK 1949:** Adolf Ludvík KREJČÍK, Urbář z roku 1378 a účty kláštera třeboňského z let 1367–1407, Praha 1949.
- KRETSCHMER – DÖRFLINGER – WAWRIK 1986/I–II:** Lexikon zur Geschichte der Kartographie. Von den Anfängen bis zum ersten Weltkrieg, ed. Ingrid Kretschmer – Johannes Dörflinger – Franz Wawrik (= Die Kartographie und ihre Randgebiete. Enzyklopädie, sv. C/1–2), Wien 1986.
- KROPÁČEK 1995:** Jiří KROPÁČEK, Pražské veduty – proměny obrazu města (1493–1908), Praha 1995.
- KRUMMHOLZ – IVANEGA – TRNKOVÁ 2012:** Martin KRUMMHOLZ – Jan IVANEGA – Petra TRNKOVÁ, Buquoyská krajina. Zaniklé i dochované stavby v Nových Hradech a okolí, Praha 2012.
- KRUMMHOLZ 2012:** Martin KRUMMHOLZ, Buquoyské Nové Hrady. Počátky krajinných parků v Čechách, Praha 2012.
- KRYL 1948:** R. KRYL, Urbář panství Stráže nad Nežárkou z r. 1579, Jihočeský sborník historický 17, 1948, pp. 70–73.
- KŘIVKA 1978:** Josef KŘIVKA, Nové osady vzniklé na území Čech v letech 1654–1854, Praha 1978.
- KŘÍŽEK – NEJEDLÝ 2010:** Jiří KŘÍŽEK – Vratislav NEJEDLÝ, Materiály z odborného semináře Historie a současnost soupisů památek, Liberec 5. 11. 2009, Zprávy památkové péče 70, 2010, pp. 41–64.
- KUBA – ŠIMEK – ZAHŘÁDKA 1997:** Jiří KUBA – František ZAHŘÁDKA – Tomáš ŠIMEK, Soupis východočeských urbářů. 2. polovina 13. století – 1776, Zámorsk 1997.
- KUBEŠ 1999:** Jiří KUBEŠ, Švamborský dvůr v Třeboni v letech 1611/1612–1620, in: Aristokratické rezidence a dvory v raném novověku, ed. Václav Bůžek – Pavel Král, České Budějovice 1999 (= Opera historica 7), pp. 441–468.
- KUBÍKOVÁ – LOŽEK – ŠPRYŇAR a kol. 2005:** Jarmila KUBÍKOVÁ – Vojen LOŽEK – Pavel ŠPRYŇAR a kol., Chráněná území ČR XII, Praha 2005.
- KUBÍKOVÁ 1980:** Anna KUBÍKOVÁ, Z dějin rybníka Rožmberka, Jihočeský sborník historický 49, 1980, pp. 167–176.
- KUBÍKOVÁ 1986:** Anna KUBÍKOVÁ, Panství Třeboň ve světle berní ruly a její revizitace, Jihočeský sborník historický 55, 1986, pp. 144–160.
- KUBÍKOVÁ 1986a:** Anna KUBÍKOVÁ, Statek Borovany ve světle berní ruly, in: Borovany. Vlastivědný sborník k osmistému výročí prvé zprávy o obci, ed. Stanislav Malík a kol., Borovany 1986, pp. 101–105.
- KUBÍKOVÁ 1994:** Anna KUBÍKOVÁ, Příspěvek k životopisu Bartoloměje Beránka-Jelínka, Jihočeský sborník historický 63, 1994, pp. 175–177.

- KUBÍKOVÁ 2001–2002:** Anna KUBÍKOVÁ, Poplužní dvory na dominiu posledních Rožmberků – norma a skutečnost, Zlatá stezka 8–9, 2001–2002, pp. 89–98.
- KUBŮ – ZAVŘEL 2007–2009/I–III:** František KUBŮ – Petr ZAVŘEL, Zlatá stezka I. Úsek Prachatic – státní hranice; II. Úsek Vimperk – státní hranice; III. Úsek Kašperské Hory – státní hranice, České Budějovice 2007, 2009.
- KUČA 1995:** Karel KUČA, České, moravské a slezské zvonice, Praha 1995.
- KUČA 1996–2011/I–VIII:** Karel KUČA, Města a městečka v Čechách, na Moravě a ve Slezsku I–VIII, Praha 1996–2011.
- KUCHAR 1959:** Karel KUCHAR, Mapy českých zemí do poloviny 18. století (= Vývoj mapového zobrazení Československé republiky I), Praha 1959.
- KUCHAR 1967:** Karel KUCHAR, Mapové prameny ke geografii Československa, in: Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Geographica 2, Praha [1967], pp. 57–97.
- KUCHYŇKA 1999:** Vladimír KUCHYŇKA, K historii zemské hranice na Novobystřicku, Jindřichohradecký vlastivědný sborník 11, 1999, pp. 22–28.
- KUCHYŇKA 2002:** Vladimír KUCHYŇKA, K historii česko-rakouské státní hranice v oblasti Chlumu u Třeboně a Nové Bystřice, Jindřichohradecký vlastivědný sborník 14, 2002, pp. 8–14.
- KUKAL 1999:** Zdeněk KUKAL, Address of a Czech geologist dedicated to the 150 years jubilee of the Geological Survey of Austria, Abhandlungen der Geologischen Bundesanstalt 56, 1999, no. 1, 45–56.
- KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ 2010:** Lenka KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ, Pozdně renesanční a raně barokní komponovaná krajina Mikulovsko – Falkenštejnsko, in: Komponovaná kulturní krajina a možnosti její obnovy a zachování. Přednášky z odborného semináře konaného v Olomouci ve dnech 22.–23. dubna 2010, Olomouc 2010, pp. 45–55.
- KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ 2013:** Lenka KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ, Metody identifikace komponovaných krajín, in: Ochrana kulturní krajiny. Hledání cílů, možností a pravidel, ed. Kateřina Štréblová Hronovská – Jiří Kupka, Praha 2013, pp. 12–27.
- KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ a kol. 2011:** Lenka KULIŠŤÁKOVÁ a kol., Komponované krajiny, Brno 2011.
- KULT 2014:** Arnošt KULT, Dějiny právních vztahů k vodám na území České republiky I. Do roku 1253, Praha 2014.
- KUNA a kol. 2004:** Martin KUNA a kol., Nedestruktivní archeologie, Praha 2004.
- KUNIKE 1833–1835:** Adolf Bedřich KUNIKE, Malerische Darstellung aller vorzüglichen Schlösser und Ruinen der Österreichischen Monarchie nach der Natur von mehreren Künstlern gezeichnet und lithographirt, Wien [1833–1835].
- KUPKA 2008:** Vladimír KUPKA, Pražská opevnění, Praha 2008.
- KUPKA 2010:** Jiří KUPKA, Krajiny kulturní a historické, Praha 2010.
- KUPKA 2010a:** Jiří KUPKA, Historicko-krajinný rámeček v kompozici města, Historická geografie 36, 2010, pp. 51–72.
- KUPKA 2012:** Jiří KUPKA, Praha – město v krajině, krajina ve městě, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 285–306.
- KURANDA 2009:** Miroslav KURANDA, Z Prahy do Staré Boleslavi svatou cestou podél čtyřiačtyřiceti kapliček a svatováclavskou cestou ze Staré Boleslavi do Prahy, Praha – Brandýs nad Labem-Stará Boleslav 2009.
- KVĚT 2003:** Radan KVĚT, Duše krajiny. Staré stezky v proměnách věků, Praha 2003.
- KVĚT 2011:** Radan KVĚT, Atlas starých stezek a cest na území České republiky, Brno 2011.

- KYSELKA 2001:** Igor KYSELKA, Význam drobných krajinných prvků, zkušenosti s jejich obnovou u nás i v zahraničí, in: Tvář naší země – krajina domova 2. Krajina jako kulturní prostor, Lomnice nad Popelkou 2001, pp. 29–34.
- LÁBOVÁ 2004:** Alena LÁBOVÁ, Jak je to s mýtem pravdomluvnosti fotografie?, Historická fotografie 4, 2004, no. 1, pp. 63–78.
- LÁNÍK 1986:** Jaroslav LÁNÍK, The development of Czech towns in the 1830's to 1850's, Hospodářské dějiny 15, 1986, pp. 377–410.
- LÁNÍK 1989:** Jaroslav LÁNÍK, Otázky vývoje urbanizace v Čechách v druhé polovině 19. století, Hospodářské dějiny 16, 1989, pp. 145–181.
- LAVIČKA 2013:** Roman LAVIČKA, Pozdně gotické kostely na rožmberském panství, České Budějovice 2013.
- LELO – TRAVAGLINI 2013:** Kati LELO – Carlo M. TRAVAGLINI, Rome in the 18th century: a GIS application in the field of urban history, Historická geografie 39, 2013, pp. 167–187.
- LETEM ČESKÝM SVĚTEM 1898:** Letem českým světem, Praha 1898.
- LETEM ČESKÝM SVĚTEM 1999:** Letem českým světem. Obraz proměny českých zemí v odstupu století 1898–1998, Lomnice nad Popelkou 1999.
- LEXIKON 1986:** Lexikon zur Geschichte der Kartographie. Von den Anfängen bis zum ersten Weltkrieg I–II, ed. Ingrid Kretschmer – Johannes Dörflinger – Franz Wawrik, Wien 1986 (= Die Kartographie und ihre Randgebiete. Enzyklopädie, Band C 2).
- LIDDIARD – WILLIAMSON 2013:** Robert LIDDIARD – Tom WILLIAMSON, Gardens and the Larger Landscape, in: A Cultural History of Gardens in the Medieval Age, ed. Michael Leslie, London etc., pp. 167–184.
- LIPSKÝ – ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ – WEBER a kol. 2011:** Zdeněk LIPSKÝ – Markéta ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ – Martin WEBER a kol., Vývoj krajiny Novodvorská a Žehušicka ve středních Čechách, Praha 2011.
- LOR:** Listář a listinář Oldřicha z Rožmberka.
- LORENC 1973:** Vilém LORENC, Nové Město pražské, Praha 1973.
- LORENZ 2013:** Hellmut LORENZ, Die Ansichten-Serie der Liechtenstein-Schlösser von Johann Adam Delsenbach, in: Das Fürstenhaus Liechtenstein in der Geschichte der Länder der Böhmisches Krone, ed. Marek Vařeka – Aleš Zářický, Ostrava – Vaduz 2013, pp. 455–468.
- LÖW – NOVÁK 2008:** Jiří LÖW – Jaroslav NOVÁK, Typologické členění krajiny České republiky, Urbanismus a územní vývoj 11, 2008, no. 6, pp. 19–23.
- MACEK 1997:** Josef MACEK, Vnímání přírodních krás v českých zemích pozdního středověku, Český časopis historický 95, 1997, pp. 289–314.
- MALINIAK – MÁCELOVÁ – TOMEČEK – ŽILÁK – HRONČEK 2011:** Pavol MALINIAK – Marta MÁCELOVÁ – Oto TOMEČEK – Jan ŽILÁK – Pavel HRONČEK, Lesy v dejinách Zvolenskej stolice. Lesné remeslá v kultúre a zamestnaní obyvateľstva v stredoveku a ranom novoveku, Banská Bystrica – Kraków 2011.
- MALINIAK 2009:** Pavol MALINIAK, Človek a krajina Zvolenskej kotliny v stredoveku, Banská Bystrica 2009.
- MAREŠ – SEDLÁČEK 1900:** František MAREŠ – Jan SEDLÁČEK, Soupis památek historických a uměleckých v politickém okresu třeboňském, Praha 1900.
- MAREŠ 1887–1888:** František MAREŠ, Das Jagdwesen auf der Domäne Wittingau, in: Vereinsschrift für Forst-, Jagd- und Naturkunde 1887–1888, no. 2 (148), pp. 3–22.
- MAREŠ 1893:** František MAREŠ, České sklo. Příspěvky k dějinám jeho až do konce XVIII. století. Se zvláštním ohledem na jižní Čechy, Praha 1893.

- MARKOVÁ 2008:** Markéta MARKOVÁ, Vymezování hranic a jejich značení v přírodě ve středověku, in: *Regiony – časoprostorové průsečíky?*, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2008, pp. 98–106.
- MARSCH – BILLER – JACOB 2001/I–II:** Die Reisebilder Pfalzgraf Ottheinrichs aus den Jahren 1536/37. Von seinem Ritt von Neuburg a.d. Donau über Prag nach Krakau und zurück über Breslau, Berlin, Wittenberg und Leipzig nach Neuburg I–II, ed. Angelika Marsch – Josef Hugo Biller – Frank-Dietrich Jacob, Weißenhorn 2001.
- MARSCH 2003:** Angelika MARSCH, Reise durch Europas Mitte: Die Reisebilder Pfalzgraf Ottheinrichs aus den Jahren 1536/37, Potsdam 2003.
- MARSCH 2010:** Angelika MARSCH, Friedrich Bernhard Werner 1690–1776. Corpus seiner europäischen Städteansichten, illustrierten Reisemanuskripte und der Topographien von Schlesien und Böhmen-Mähren, Weißenhorn 2010.
- MARTÍNEK – ŠMERAL 2012:** Jan MARTÍNEK – Jiří ŠMERAL, Výzkum historických cest v interdisciplinárním kontextu, Brno 2012.
- MARTÍNEK 2008:** Jiří MARTÍNEK, Geografové v českých zemích 1800–1945, Praha 2008.
- MARTÍNEK 2012:** Jiří MARTÍNEK, Vitorazsko v letech 1919–1920: vymezování zemských hranic v moderní době, in: *Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové*, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 307–318.
- MAŠEK 1948:** František MAŠEK, Pozemkový katastr, Praha 1948.
- MATOUŠ 1972:** František MATOUŠ, Třeboň, Praha 1972.
- MATOUŠEK – BLAŽKOVÁ 2011:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Tereza BLAŽKOVÁ, Česká, moravská a slezská města v ikonografických pramenech ke třicetileté válce, *Historická geografie* 37, 2011, pp. 69–85.
- MATOUŠEK – BOHÁČ 2010:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Jaromír BOHÁČ, Plány obléhání Chebu v roce 1647 v díle *Theatrum Europaeum*, *Archeologie ve středních Čechách* 14, 2010, no. 1, pp. 449–466.
- MATOUŠEK – KLEČKOVÁ 2009:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Tereza KLEČKOVÁ, Rytina bitvy u Přísečnice 17. března 1641 v *Theatru Europaeu*, *Archeologie ve středních Čechách* 13, 2009, no. 1, pp. 509–516.
- MATOUŠEK – KOUKALOVÁ – ŠÁŠINKOVÁ 2014:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Šárka KOUKALOVÁ – Marcela ŠÁŠINKOVÁ, Letní a celoročně obývané vily a villegiatury v okolí Prahy na konci 19. a v prvních desetiletích 20. století. Příspěvek k proměnám krajiny Čech v procesu modernizace české společnosti, *Historická geografie* 40, 2014, pp. 19–40.
- MATOUŠEK – ŠIMEK – ALTOVÁ – KARLÍK 2007:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Jan ŠIMEK – Blanka ALTOVÁ – Petr KARLÍK, Pohled na zámek Brandýs nad Labem a opevnění švédského tábora v prostoru Staré Boleslavi z roku 1640 v díle M. Meriana, *Historická geografie* 34, 2007, pp. 93–148.
- MATOUŠEK – ZIMOVÁ – JANATA 2012:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Růžena ZIMOVÁ – Tomáš JANATA, Optický klam generále Kleinträtla. Rytina bojů u Teplé v září 1647 ve světle mezioborového studia, in: *Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové*, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 63–80.
- MATOUŠEK – ZIMOVÁ 2010:** Václav MATOUŠEK – Růžena ZIMOVÁ, Rytina Kolína z roku 1640 v díle *Topographia Bohemiae, Moraviae et Silesiae*, *Archeologie ve středních Čechách* 14, 2010, no. 2, pp. 915–927.
- MATOUŠEK 2005:** Václav MATOUŠEK, Bitva u Třebel v roce 1647 – obraz a realita. Příspěvek ke studiu vedut v díle *Theatrum Europaeum*, *Historická geografie* 33, 2005, pp. 249–280.
- MATOUŠEK 2006:** Václav MATOUŠEK, Třebel. Obraz krajiny s bitvou, Praha 2006.

- MATOUŠEK 2010:** Václav MATOUŠEK, Čechy krásné, Čechy mé. Proměny krajiny Čech v době industriální, Praha 2010.
- MATZERATH 1984:** Städtewachstum und innerstädtische Strukturveränderungen, ed. Horst Matzerath, Stuttgart 1984.
- MAUR 2006:** Eduard MAUR, Paměť hor. Šumava, Říp, Blaník, Hostýn, Radhošť, Praha 2006.
- MAXOVÁ – NEJEDLÝ – ZAHRADNÍK 2002:** Ivana MAXOVÁ – Vratislav NEJEDLÝ – Pavel ZAHRADNÍK, Mariánské, trojiční a další světecké sloupy a pilíře v okrese Náchod, Praha 2002.
- MEDUNA – SÁDLO 2009:** Petr MEDUNA – Jiří SÁDLO, Bezdězsko – Dokesko. Krajina mezi odolností a stagnací, Historická geografie 35, 2009, pp. 147–160.
- MEIER 2003:** Jan MEIER, Broumovsko & literatura. Kapitoly z literárního místopisu, Liberec 2003.
- MEISSNER – WOLF 1798:** August Gottlieb MEISSNER – Franz Carl WOLF, Historisch-malerische Darstellungen aus Böhmen von A. G. Meissner nebst XIV illuminirten Kupfertafeln nach Zeichnungen von F. C. Wolf, Prag 1798.
- MENŠÍK 1600:** Jakub MENŠÍK z MENŠTEJNA, O mezech, hranicích, soudu a rozepří mezní i příslušenství jich v Království českém, in: Codex Iuris Bohemici IV/5, ed. Hermenegild Jireček, Praha 1883, pp. 148–205.
- MERGL 1995:** Jan MERGL, Plzeňské pohledy a veduty čtyř století 1500–1900, Plzeň 1995.
- MERHAUT a kol. 2008:** Luboš MERHAUT a kol., Lexikon české literatury. Osobnosti, díla, instituce 4/II. U–Ž. Dodatky k LČL 1–3, A–Ř, Praha 2008.
- MERIAN 1650:** Matthäus MERIAN, Topographia Bohemiae, Moraviae et Silesiae, das ist Beschreibung vnd eigentliche Abbildung der Vornehmsten vnd bekandtesten Stätte vnd Plätze in dem Königreich Boheim vnd einverleibten Landern, Mähren vnd Schlesien, Franckfurt 1650.
- MÍKA 1955:** Alois MÍKA, Jakub Krčín z Jelčan, tvůrce českých rybníků, Sborník pro dějiny přírodních věd a techniky 2, 1955, pp. 80–95.
- MÍKA 1970:** Alois MÍKA, Osud slavného domu. Rozkvět a pád rožmberského dominia, České Budějovice 1970.
- MÍKA 1975:** Zdeněk MÍKA, Průmyslové předměstí Karlín v 19. století a jeho význam pro Prahu, Pražský sborník historický 9, 1975, pp. 78–145.
- MÍKA 1985:** Zdeněk MÍKA, K průmyslovému rozvoji Prahy v 19. a na počátku 20. století, Documenta Pragensia 5/1, 1985, pp. 12–26.
- MÍKA 1995:** Zdeněk MÍKA, 150 let železnice v Praze, Praha 1995.
- MÍKA 2007:** Zdeněk MÍKA, Zapomenuté obrazy. Praha 19. století, Praha 2007.
- MÍKA 2008:** Zdeněk MÍKA, Zábava a slavnosti staré Prahy, Praha 2008.
- MIKOTA 1996:** Miloslav MIKOTA, Karel Hartig a počátky Žižkova v 19. století, Praha 1996.
- MIKOVEC 1860:** Ferdinand Břetislav MIKOVEC, Malerisch-historische Skizzen aus Böhmen. Als begleitender Text zu dem „Album von Böhmen“ herausgegeben von Eduard Hölzel, Wien 1860.
- MIKŠÍČEK a kol. 2007:** Petr MIKŠÍČEK a kol., Zmizelé Sudety. Das verschwundene Sudetenland, 5., revised ed., Domažlice 2007.
- MJČ:** Místní jména v Čechách. Jejich vznik, původní význam a změny I–V, Praha 1947–1960.
- MUIR 2009:** Richard MUIR, Approaches to Landscape, London 1999.
- MUIR 2012:** Richard MUIR, Landscape Encyclopaedia. A Reference Guide to the Historic Landscape, Oxford 2012 (reprint of 1. ed., 2004).

- MUSIL – FELCMAN - ČECHURA 2009:** František MUSIL – Ondřej FELCMAN - Jaroslav ČECHURA, Dějiny východních Čech v pravěku a středověku (do roku 1526), Praha 2009.
- MUSIL 2003:** Jiří MUSIL, Changing Urban Systems in Post-communist Societies in Central Europe: Analysis and Prediction, *Urban Studies* 30, 2003, pp. 899–905.
- MUSIL 2012:** František MUSIL, Z dějin broumovského děkanátu, in: Krkonoše – Podkrkonoší. Vlastivědný sborník 20, 2012, pp. 317–331.
- MŽYKOVÁ 2006:** Marie MŽYKOVÁ, Díla moravského vedutisty Johanna Venuta z auersperských sbírek, *Zprávy památkové péče* 66, 2006, pp. 310–317.
- NEBEHAY – WAGNER 1984:** Ingo NEBEHAY – Robert WAGNER, Bibliographie altösterreichischer Ansichtenwerke aus fünf Jahrhunderten. Die Monarchie in der topographischen Druckgraphik von der Schedel'schen Weltchronik bis zum Aufkommen der Photographie, Graz 1984.
- NEKUDA 1975:** Vladimír NEKUDA, Pfaffenschlag. Zaniklá středověká ves u Slavonic (Příspěvek k dějinám středověké vesnice), Brno 1975.
- NEUDERTOVIÁ – NEUDERT 2013:** Zdeňka NEUDERTOVIÁ – Jiří NEUDERT, Význam lokalit vzniklých po těžbě nerostů v chráněné krajinné oblasti Třeboňsko pro jednotlivé druhy obojživelníků a ohrožení těchto lokalit invazními alochtonními druhy ryb, in: Jezera a mokřady ve zbytkových jamách po těžbě nerostů. Sborník příspěvků 16.–18. dubna 2013, Hotel Cascade (Most), Třeboň 2013, pp. 208–212.
- NORA 1984–1992:** Pierre NORA, *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, Paris 1984–1992.
- NORBERG-SCHULZ 2010:** *Christian NORBERG-SCHULZ, Genius loci*, 2. ed., Praha 2010.
- NOVÁKOVÁ – NOVÁK – ŠAFRÁNKOVÁ 2008:** Kateřina NOVÁKOVÁ – Jan NOVÁK – Jitka ŠAFRÁNKOVÁ, Paleoekologický výzkum Velanské cesty u Českých Velenic: zachycení lidské činnosti, in: *Bioarcheologie v České republice*, ed. Jaromír Beneš – Petr Pokorný, Praha 2008, pp. 99–114.
- NOVÁKOVÁ – VALTR 1978:** Eliška NOVÁKOVÁ – Václav VALTR, Vývoj třeboňské krajiny, in: *Ekologie a ekonomika Třeboňska. Z výsledků stejnojmenného kolokvia, pořádaného Československou akademií věd a Federálním ministerstvem pro technický a investiční rozvoj I*, ed. Jan Jeník – Stanislav Přibil, Třeboň 1978, pp. 53–64.
- NOVÁKOVÁ 2005:** Renata NOVÁKOVÁ, Opatovický mlýn – na počátku byla grangie cisterciáků?, *Vlastivědný sborník Dačicka, Jindřichohradecka a Třeboňska* 17, 2005, pp. 7–33.
- NOVÁKOVÁ 2010:** Stanislava NOVÁKOVÁ, Krajířové z Krajku. Z Korutan do zemí České koruny, České Budějovice 2010.
- NOVOTNÝ 1972:** Josef NOVOTNÝ, Jihočeské rybníky, *Historická geografie* 8, 1972, pp. 153–174.
- NOVOTNÝ 2014:** Michal NOVOTNÝ, Kolonie Společnosti pro stavbu dělnických obydlí v Praze (Smíchov, Bubny), *Průzkumy památek* 21, 2014, no. 1, pp. 137–139.
- NOVÝ 1994:** Rostislav NOVÝ, Prameny k dějinám Táborska 1432-1433 (...) IV., *Táborský archiv* 6, 1994, pp. 151–192.
- NOŽIČKA 1957:** Josef NOŽIČKA, Přehled vývoje našich lesů, Praha 1957.
- OESTERREICHER 2006:** Jiří OESTERREICHER, K názvu vsi Rapšachu / Rapischachu / Rottenschachen na Suchdolsku. Příspěvek k dějinám Suchdolska a tzv. Českého Vitorazska, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 75, 2006, pp. 192–203.
- OLIVOVÁ-NEZBEDOVÁ a kol. 1995:** Libuše OLIVOVÁ-NEZBEDOVÁ a kol., Pomístní jména v Čechách. O čem vypovídají jména polí, luk, lesů, hor, vod a cest, Praha 1995.
- OLŠÁKOVÁ 2003:** Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, Dobová recepce školy Annales v českých historických časopisech v 60. letech 20. století, in: *Francouzská inspirace pro*

- společenské vědy v českých zemích, ed. Georges Mink et al., Praha 2003, pp. 179–196.
- OLŠÁKOVÁ a kol. 2015:** Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ a kol., Poručíme větru, dešti... Stalinský plán přetvoření přírody v Československu, Dějiny a současnost 37, 2015, no. 2, pp. 9–25.
- OPELÍK 2000:** Jiří OPELÍK a kol., Lexikon české literatury. Osobnosti, díla, instituce 3/I. M–O, Praha 2000.
- ÖSTERREICHISCH-UNGARISCHE MONARCHIE 1886–1902/I–XXIV:** Die Österreichisch-Ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild I–XXIV, Wien 1886–1902.
- OURODOVÁ-HRONKOVÁ 2011:** Ludmila OURODOVÁ-HRONKOVÁ, Dělení růží, in: Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 332–335.
- OURODOVÁ-HRONKOVÁ 2011a:** Ludmila OURODOVÁ-HRONKOVÁ, Veduta města Netolic s letohrádkem Kratochvíle, in: Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 144–145.
- OUŘEDNÍČEK 2001:** Martin OUŘEDNÍČEK, Teorie stádií vývoje měst a diferenciální urbanizace, Geografie – Sborník České geografické společnosti 105, 2001, pp. 361–369.
- OUŘEDNÍČEK 2012:** Martin OUŘEDNÍČEK, Sociálně prostorová struktura industriální Prahy, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K poctě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 263–283.
- PACÁKOVÁ-HOŠŤÁLKOVÁ a kol. 2000:** Božena PACÁKOVÁ-HOŠŤÁLKOVÁ a kol., Pražské zahrady a parky, Praha 2000.
- PACINA – NOVÁK – HANDRYCHOVÁ 2013:** Jan PACINA – Kamil NOVÁK – Barbora HANDRYCHOVÁ, Metody pro rekonstrukci zaniklé krajiny, Historická geografie 39, 2013, pp. 103–129.
- PALACKÝ 1848:** František PALACKÝ, Popis Království českého, Praha 1848.
- PALECZEK 2011:** Raimund PALECZEK, O začátcích „království Schwarzenberg“ v jižních Čechách. 350 let od příchodu Schwarzenbergů na Třeboň, Archivum Trebonense 12, 2011, pp. 283–304.
- PALOUŠOVÁ 2009:** Zdenka PALOUŠOVÁ, Kamenná boží muka v jižních Čechách a přilehlé Moravě, České Budějovice 2009.
- PÁNEK 1988:** Jaroslav PÁNEK, Die historisch-ökologischen Aspekte der Wasserwirtschaft in den böhmischen Ländern im 16. Jahrhundert, Historická ekologie 1, 1988, pp. 77–124.
- PAŘÍZKOVÁ 2010:** Kateřina PAŘÍZKOVÁ, Barokní poutní cesta do Hájků u Prahy, Folia Historica Bohemica 25, 2010, no. 2, pp. 113–153.
- PASÁKOVÁ 1995:** Jana PASÁKOVÁ, Josef Šembera (1794–1866). Praha a památná místa Království českého v grafice a kresbách, Praha 1995.
- PAUSER – SCHEUTZ – WINKELBAUER 2004:** Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.–18. Jahrhundert). Ein exemplarisches Handbuch, ed. Josef Pauser – Martin Scheutz – Thomas Winkelbauer, Wien – München 2004.
- PAVELEC 2011:** Petr PAVELEC, „Vo všelijakém rýsování“ v rožmberském dominiu, in: Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 564–573.
- PAVELKA 2003:** Karel PAVELKA, Fotogrammetrie, Plzeň 2003.
- PAVELKOVÁ – FRAJER – NETOPIL 2014:** Renata PAVELKOVÁ – Jindřich FRAJER – Patrik NETOPIL, Historické rybníky České republiky. Srovnání současnosti se stavem v 2. polovině 19. století, Praha 2014.

- PAVLÁTOVÁ – EHRLICH 2010:** Marie PAVLÁTOVÁ – Marek EHRLICH, Park Tereziino údolí a krajina buquouyského panství na Novohradsku, in: Komponovaná kulturní krajina a možnosti její obnovy a zachování. Přednášky z odborného semináře konaného v Olomouci ve dnech 22.–23. dubna 2010, Olomouc 2010, pp. 5–16.
- PELANT 2001:** Jan PELANT, Vyobrazení měst Plzně, Rokycan, Berouna a hradů Radyně, Žebráka, Točníka a Křivoklátu na vedutách Mathiase Gerunga z roku 1536, Západočeský historický sborník 7, 2001, pp. 107–178.
- PELC 2009:** Martin PELC, Umění putovat, Brno 2009.
- PELIKÁN 1947:** Josef PELIKÁN, Fary na Třeboňském panství v půli 16. stol., Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností 55, 1947, pp. 73–75.
- PELIKÁN 1949:** Josef PELIKÁN, Urbánní rejstřík třeboňského panství z r. 1555, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností 57, 1949, pp. 238–241.
- PEŠEK 1999:** Jiří PEŠEK, Od aglomerace k velkoměstu, Praha 1999.
- PEŠEK 2004:** Jiří PEŠEK, Pohled na Prahu 11. 12. 1536 aneb falckrabí Ottheinricha cesta do Krakova a zase zpátky, Pražský sborník historický 33, 2004, pp. 7–23.
- PEŠINA – MENCLOVÁ 1953:** Jaroslav PEŠINA – Dobroslava MENCLOVÁ, Obraz hradní kaple švihovské a začátky české krajinomalby, Umění 1, 1953, pp. 93–114.
- PEŠINA 1965:** Jaroslav PEŠINA, Obraz krajiny v české knižní malbě kolem r. 1400, Umění 13, 1965, pp. 233–289.
- PETRÁŇ a kol. 1983:** Josef PETRÁŇ a kol., Úvod do studia dějepisu. III. Nauka o historických pramenech, Praha 1983.
- PEXA 1974:** Herbert PEXA, Die Geschichte der Witigenenburg Ledenice, Jihočeský sborník historický 43, 1974, pp. 37–53.
- PEXA 2001:** Herbert PEXA, Die Lender die älteste bekannte Třeboňer Familie, Archivum Trebonense (9), 2001, pp. 35–47.
- PEYER 1885:** Gustav PEYER, Geschichte des Reisens in der Schweiz, Basel 1885.
- PLATOVSKÁ 2009:** Marie PLATOVSKÁ, Královské Vinohrady a jejich urbanizační vývoj v 19. a 20. století, Umění 57, 2009, pp. 236–247.
- PODLAHA – ZAHRADNÍK 1901:** Antonín PODLAHA – Isidor ZAHRADNÍK, Jana Willenberga pohledy na města, hrady a památné stavby Království českého z počátku 17. století, Praha 1901.
- POHLODKOVÁ 2007:** Klára POHLODKOVÁ, Sledování vývoje struktury krajiny v nivě Stěnavy v CHKO Broumovsko, Thesis, Fakulta lesnická a environmentální České zemědělské univerzity Praha 2007.
- POKORNÝ – ŠÍDA – KUNEŠ – CHVOJKA 2008:** Petr POKORNÝ – Petr ŠÍDA – Petr KUNEŠ – Ondřej CHVOJKA, Mezolitické osídlení bývalého jezera Švarcenberk (jižní Čechy) v kontextu vývoje přírodního prostředí, in: Bioarcheologie v České republice, ed. Jaromír Beneš – Petr Pokorný, Praha 2008, pp. 145–176.
- POLÁČEK 2000:** Broumovská skupina kostelů Kryštofa a Kiliána Ignáce Dientzenhofera, ed. Mojmír Poláček, Brno 2000.
- POLÁK 2000:** Jiří POLÁK, Města budoucnosti. Futurologické vize předků na pohlednicích z počátku 20. století, Ústí nad Orlicí 2000.
- POLIŠENSKÝ – BINKOVÁ 1989:** Česká touha cestovatelská, ed. Josef Polišínský – Simona Binková, Praha 1989.
- POLIŠENSKÝ 1983:** Josef POLIŠENSKÝ, Veduta jako historický a etnografický pramen, Umění 31, 1983, pp. 377–380.
- POLIŠENSKÝ a kol. 1971:** Josef POLIŠENSKÝ a kol., Minulost našeho státu v dokumentech, Praha 1971.

- POSPÍŠIL 1910:** Josef POSPÍŠIL, Památky Třeboně a okolí. Upraveno k poučným vycházkám studentským, in: Výroční zpráva c. k. vyššího gymnasia v Třeboni za školní rok 1909–10. (42. rok trvání ústavu.), Třeboň 1910, pp. 3–25.
- POSPÍŠIL 1911:** Josef POSPÍŠIL, Památky Třeboně a okolí. (Upraveno k poučným vycházkám studentským.) (Pokračování.), in: Výroční zpráva c. k. vyššího gymnasia v Třeboni za školní rok 1910–11. 43. rok trvání ústavu, Třeboň 1911, pp. 3–24.
- POSPÍŠIL 1914:** Josef POSPÍŠIL, Třeboňsko za povstání českého, Praha 1914.
- PREISS 2003:** Pavel PREISS, František Antonín Špork a barokní kultura v Čechách, Praha – Litomyšl 2003.
- PROKOP – KOTALÍK – SŮVA 2007:** Bohumír PROKOP – Jiří T. KOTALÍK – Pavel SŮVA, Broumovská skupina kostelů. Průvodce školou českého baroka v kraji pískovcových skal, Verněřovice 2007.
- PROKOP – KOTALÍK 2007:** Bohumír PROKOP – Jiří T. KOTALÍK, Broumovská skupina kostelů. Průvodce školou českého baroka v kraji pískovcových skal, Verněřovice 2007.
- PROKOPOVÁ 2000:** Zdeňka PROKOPOVÁ, Barokní poutní cesta z Českého Krumlova do Kájova, in: Státní okresní archiv v Českém Krumlově 1993–1998, Český Krumlov 2000, pp. 73–80.
- PROKOPOVÁ 2013:** Zdeňka PROKOPOVÁ, Každodenní život poutního místa Kájov v době baroka, in: 750 let Kájova, Kájov 2013, pp. 251–303.
- PŘIKRYLOVÁ 2012:** Miroslava PŘIKRYLOVÁ, Sběrka fotografií Archivu hl. města Prahy: o jejím původu a fotografech, Pražský sborník historický 40, 2012, pp. 349–390.
- PUMPR 2010:** Pavel PUMPR, Beneficia, záduší a patronát v barokních Čechách. Na příkladu treboňského panství na přelomu 17. a 18. století, Brno 2010.
- PURKYŇ 1925:** Cyril PURKYŇ, Jan Krejčí, Sborník Československé společnosti zeměpisné 31, 1925, pp. 65–66.
- RAMEŠ 2011:** Václav RAMEŠ, Rožmberské rybníkářství na Třeboňsku, in: Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 146–153.
- RBM:** Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae.
- REICH – REICHOVÁ 2005:** Jan REICH – Jana REICHOVÁ, Bohemia = Čechy = Bohemia = Böhmen = Bohême = Bohemia = Boemia, Praha 2005.
- REJL 2000:** Tomáš REJL, Broumov na historických pohlednicích, Hradec Králové 2000.
- RESLOVÁ 2009:** Martina RESLOVÁ, Vývoj broumovského panství na základě urbářů z let 1631–1676, Thesis, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Pardubice 2009.
- RETROSPEKTIVNÍ LEXIKON 1978:** Retrospektivní lexikon obcí Československé socialistické republiky 1850–1970, Praha 1978.
- RIGASOVÁ 2006:** Milada RIGASOVÁ, Přínos kardinála Františka Dietrichsteina pro krajinářské úpravy území mezi Mikulovem, Valticemi a Lednicí, in: Kardinál František z Ditrichštejna a jeho doba, Mikulov 2006 (= XXIX. mikulovské sympozium, 11.–12. října 2006), pp. 159–178.
- RIGASOVÁ 2006a:** Milada RIGASOVÁ, Vývoj přírodně krajinářského celku Mikulovska s důrazem na úpravy mezi Mikulovem a Sedlecem za panování Liechtensteinů (1249–1560) a Dietrichsteinů (1575–1945), disertační práce ZF MZLU Lednice 2006.
- RIGASOVÁ 2006b:** Milada RIGASOVÁ, Historická kulturní krajina za železnou oponou (Unikátní evropská kulturní krajina na moravsko-rakouské hranici), in: Historická krajina a mapové bohatství Česka. Prameny, evidence, zpřístupňování, využívání, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2006, pp. 122–131.

- ROBINSON 1989:** Arthur H. ROBINSON, Cartography as an Art, in: Cartography – Past, Present and Future, ed. David William Rhind – David Ruxton Fraser Taylor, London – New York 1989, pp. 91–102.
- ROČEK – FENCL – WAAGE 2001–2011/I–IV:** Ivan ROČEK – Petr FENCL – Vladimír WAAGE, Svědectví map I–IV, Praha 2001–2011.
- ROECK 2004:** Bernd ROECK, Das historische Auge. Kunstwerke als Zeugen ihrer Zeit. Von der Renaissance zur Revolution, Göttingen 2004.
- ROTH 2003:** Gunhild ROTH, Das „Heilige Grab“ in Görlitz, in: Der Jakobuskult in Ostmitteleuropa, ed. Klaus Herbers – Dieter R. Bauer, Tübingen 2003, pp. 259–283.
- ROUBÍK 1931:** František ROUBÍK, Plánky židovských obcí v Čechách s vyznačením židovských obydlí z roku 1727, Časopis Společnosti přátel starožitností českých 9, 1931, pp. 49–68.
- ROUBÍK 1933:** František ROUBÍK, Stichova mapa zemských stezek a celních stanic v Čechách z r. 1676, Sborník Archivu ministerstva vnitra 6, 1933, pp. 319–341.
- ROUBÍK 1938:** František ROUBÍK, Silnice v Čechách a jejich vývoj, Praha 1938.
- ROUBÍK 1940:** František ROUBÍK, Přehled vývoje vlastivědného popisu Čech, Praha 1940.
- ROUBÍK 1941:** František ROUBÍK, Příručka vlastivědné práce, Praha 1941.
- ROUBÍK 1952–1955/I–II:** František ROUBÍK, Soupis map českých zemí I–II, Praha 1952, 1955.
- ROUBÍK 1953:** František ROUBÍK, Šimona Podolského mapa okolí Nové řeky u Třeboně z r. 1613, Kartografický přehled 7, 1953, pp. 145–150.
- ROUBÍK 1953a:** František ROUBÍK, Zemští měřiči Matouš Ornys z Lindperka a Šimon Podolský z Podolí a dvě rukopisné mapy z let 1599 a 1600, Kartografický přehled 7, 1953, pp. 53–66, 97–103.
- ROUBÍK 1957:** František ROUBÍK, Tři nejstarší mapy jihočeské rybníční oblasti, Kartografický přehled 11, 1957, pp. 58–62.
- ROUBÍK 1959:** František ROUBÍK, Soupis a mapa zaniklých osad v Čechách, Praha 1959.
- ROUBÍK 1961:** František ROUBÍK, Rukopisné mapy od 16. do poloviny 18. století ve Státním ústředním archivu v Praze, Sborník archivních prací 11, 1961, pp. 138–186.
- ROUBÍK 1963:** František ROUBÍK, Příspěvky ke kartografii českých zemí v 17. a 18. století, Sborník archivních prací 13, 1963, pp. 247–271.
- ROUBÍK 1965:** František ROUBÍK, Zemští měřiči v Čechách v 16. až 18. století, Sborník archivních prací 15, 1965, pp. 269–301.
- ROUBÍK 1971:** František ROUBÍK, Spory jihočeských měst o směr obchodních cest ve 14. až 17. století, Jihočeský sborník historický 40, 1971, pp. 1–18.
- ROUBÍK 1972:** František ROUBÍK, Umělá výstavba jihočeských státních silnic v 18.–19. století, Jihočeský sborník historický 41, 1972, pp. 29–34, 75–85.
- ROYT 1995:** Jan ROYT, Římov. Poutní areál s loretou a kalvárií, Velehrad 1995.
- ROŽMBERSKÝ 1999:** Petr ROŽMBERSKÝ, Dvory plaských cisterciáků, Plzeň 1999.
- RUTH 1903:** František RUTH, Kronika královské Prahy a obcí sousedních I, Praha 1903.
- RYCHNOVÁ 2010:** Lucie RYCHNOVÁ, Filip Spannbrucker – ke vztahu stavitele a stavebníka v době vrcholného baroka, Z Českého ráje a Podkrkonoší 23, 2010, pp. 31–52.
- RYCHNOVÁ 2012:** Lucie RYCHNOVÁ, Stavebník František Josef Šlik, Východočeský sborník historický 21, 2012, pp. 163–196.
- ŘEPA – PŘIBYL – KLUIBER – ZACHOVÁ 2011:** Tomáš ŘEPA – Vladimír PŘIBYL – Tomáš KLUIBER – Hana ZACHOVÁ, Kaple Božího hrobu u Slaného, Slaný 2011.
- SÁDLO – GOJDA 1994:** Jiří SÁDLO – Martin GOJDA, Roztoky: pokus o geobotanickou rekonstrukci vývoje kulturní krajiny (raný středověk – současnost), Archeologické rozhledy 46, 1994, pp. 191–204.

- SÁDLO – HÁJEK 2004:** Jiří SÁDLO – Pavel HÁJEK, Česká barokní krajina: co to vlastně je? I. Kulturněantropologická východiska odpovědi; II. Jevy, procesy, interpretace, Dějiny a současnost 26, 2004, no. 3, pp. 29–33; no. 4, pp. 45–49.
- SÁDLO – KARLÍK 2002:** Jiří SÁDLO – Petr KARLÍK, Krajinně-ekologické interpretace starých map prostřednictvím geobotaniky: příklad Josefského mapování, in: Krajina 2002. Od poznání k integraci, Ústí nad Labem 2002, pp. 58–62.
- SÁDLO – POKORNÝ – HÁJEK – DRESLEROVÁ – CÍLEK 2005:** Jiří SÁDLO – Petr POKORNÝ – Pavel HÁJEK – Dagmar DRESLEROVÁ – Václav CÍLEK, Krajina a revoluce. Významné přelomy ve vývoji kulturní krajiny českých zemí, Praha 2005.
- SÁGNEROVÁ 2008:** Jana SÁGNEROVÁ, Osídlování Broumova v letech 1945–1947, diplomová práce FF UK Praha 2008.
- SEDLÁČEK 1882–1927/I–XV:** August SEDLÁČEK, Hrady, zámky a tvrze Království českého I–XV, Praha 1882–1927.
- SEDLÁČEK 1920:** August SEDLÁČEK, Snůška starých jmen, jak se nazývaly v Čechách řeky, potoky, hory a lesy, Praha 1920.
- SEDLÁČEK 1920a:** August SEDLÁČEK, Z dějin Vitorazska. Jak se tvořily a měnily meze Čech a Rakous Dolních, Tábor 1920.
- SEDLÁČKOVÁ 2005:** Libuše SEDLÁČKOVÁ, Aleje a obory – významné krajinné útvary, [Památková péče na Moravě](#) 10, 2005, pp. 75–84.
- SEIDLITZ 1844:** Julius Seidlitz, Wanderung durch Prag, Prag 1844.
- SEIFERT 1979:** Traudel SEIFERT, Karte als Kunstwerk, München 1979.
- SEMIAN 2012:** Michal SEMIAN, Název jako symbol regionu, Historická geografie 38, 2012, pp. 335–352.
- SEMOTANOVÁ – CHROMÝ 2012:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ – Pavel CHROMÝ, Development and Current Trends of the Czech Historical Geography, Historická geografie 38, 2012, pp. 9–34.
- SEMOTANOVÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2000:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ – Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Lexikon mapových archivů a sbírek České republiky, Praha 2000.
- SEMOTANOVÁ – ŠIMŮNEK 2014:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ – Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Historické krajiny obrazem a písmem, Akademický bulletin. Oficiální časopis Akademie věd České republiky 2014, no. 3, pp. 12–13 (<http://abicko.avcr.cz/2014/03/06/>).
- SEMOTANOVÁ 1990:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Prague – the town, space and society in cartographic representation, Hospodářské dějiny 18, 1990, pp. 247–273.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 1993:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Kartografie v hospodářském vývoji českých zemí v 19. a na počátku 20. století, Praha 1993.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 1994:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Kartografie v historické práci. Vademecum, Praha 1994.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2000–2001:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Méně známý pramen k historické geografii Karlínského okresu ze druhé poloviny 19. století, Středočeský sborník historický 26–27, 2000–2001, pp. 61–78.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2001:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Mapy Čech, Moravy a Slezska v zrcadle staletí, Praha 2001.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2002:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Historická geografie českých zemí, 2. aktual. vydání, Praha 2002.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2002a:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Atlas zemí Koruny české, Praha 2002.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2004:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Kdy zmizel ze starých map rybník Blato na Poděbradsku?, Z dějin geodézie a kartografie 12, 2004, pp. 30–38.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2005:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Proměny holešovického meandru na mapách a plánech, Documenta Pragensia 24, 2005, pp. 13–26.

- SEMOTANOVÁ 2006:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Čtvrtá krajina Libeňského ostrova - ad finitum?, in: Historická krajina a mapové bohatství Česka. Prameny, evidence, zpřístupňování, využívání, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2006, pp. 220–238.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2007:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Historická krajina, smysl, stopy, hledání a nalézání, in: Sborník prací Pedagogické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, řada společenských věd, 215, no. 22, Brno 2007, pp. 101–110.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2007a:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Vogtova veduta Lysé nad Labem: „naučná stezka“ Šporkovou barokní krajinou, in: Od knížat ke králům. Sborník u příležitosti 60. narozenin Josefa Žemličky, ed. Eva Doležalová – Robert Šimůnek et al., Praha 2007, pp. 494–514.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2010:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Prostor města a jeho fázový růst v českých zemích od konce 19. století, Historická geografie 36, 2010, pp. 225–254.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2010a:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Raně novověká krajina českých zemí, in: Společnost českých zemí v raném novověku, ed. Václav Bůžek, Praha 2010, pp. 19–53.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2011:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Kladské Vambeřice – osm století duchovní krajiny, in: Paměť míst, událostí a osobností. Historie jako identita a manipulace, ed. Milan Hlavačka a kol., Praha 2011, pp. 551–583.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2014:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Sentiment, realita a její odraz v turistických průvodcích Prahy z 19. století, nepublikovaná přednáška na 10. historickogeografické konferenci, Historické krajiny obrazem a písmem, Praha 29. ledna 2014.
- SEMOTANOVÁ 2015:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ, Různost a synergie historickogeografických pramenů. Topografie hospodaření v Praze po polovině 19. století, in: Ad honorem VN. K 65. narozeninám Věry Němečkové připravili vděční přátelé, kolegové a studenti, Červený Kostelec 2015, pp. 163–183.
- SEMOTANOVÁ a kol. 2015:** Eva SEMOTANOVÁ a kol., Ottův historický atlas Prahy. Krajina města, Praha 2015.
- SCHALLER 1785–1791/I–XVI:** Jaroslaus SCHALLER, Topographie des Koenigreichs Boehmen I–XVI, Prag 1785–1791.
- SCHAMA 2007:** Simon SCHAMA, Krajina a paměť, Praha 2007.
- SCHEUFLER 1985:** Pavel SCHEUFLER, Jindřich Eckert, Praha 1985.
- SCHIEßLER 1812:** pp. W. SCHIEßLER, Prag und seine Umgebungen. Ein Taschenbuch für Fremde und Einheimische I, Prag 1812.
- SCHMIDT 1900:** Valentin SCHMIDT, Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Deutschen in Südböhmen IV. Zur Geschichte des Brauwesens, Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen 38, 1900, pp. 6–51, 162–197, 287–336.
- SCHMIDT 1901:** Valentin SCHMIDT, Handelswege und Handelscentren in Südböhmen, in: Programm der deutschen k. k. Staats-Realschule in Budweis (1900)–1901, pp. 3–29.
- SCHMITT 1941:** Ausgar SCHMITT, Alte Grenzsteine und Grenzstritte im Braunauer Ländchen, Glatzer Heimatblätter 1941, pp. 49–52.
- SCHULZ 1990:** Jürgen SCHULZ, La cartografia tra scienza e arte: carte e cartografi nel Rinascimento italiano, Ferrara 1990.
- SIMMS – OPLL 1997:** Angrest SIMMS – Ferdinand OPLL, Historische Städteatlanten: Stadtgeschichte in Karten, in: Siedlungsforschung. Archäologie – Geschichte – Geographie 15, 1997, pp. 303–325.
- SIOSTRZONEK 2013:** Petr Prokop SIOSTRZONEK, Via Benedictina. Publikace k výstavě pořádané u příležitosti 800 let od příchodu benediktnů na Broumovsko, Broumov 2013.
- SKALICKÝ 1989:** Alexandr SKALICKÝ, Ikonografie broumovského kláštera, Náchodsko od minulosti k dnešku 3, 1989, pp. 155–163.

- SKALICKÝ 1993:** Alexandr SKALICKÝ, Historické veduty z Broumova, Muzejní a vlastivědná práce 31, 1993, no. 1, pp. 38–41.
- SKLENIČKA 2011:** Petr SKLENIČKA, Pronajatá krajina, Praha 2011.
- SKOPEC 1963:** Rudolf SKOPEC, Dějiny fotografie v obrazech od nejstarších dob k dnešku, Praha 1963.
- SLAVÍK – MACKOVČIN 2008:** Petr SLAVÍK – Peter MACKOVČIN, Souborná mapová díla v ochraně přírody a krajiny, in: Tvář naší země – krajina domova 2008, pp. 32–38.
- SLAVÍK 2009:** Jiří SLAVÍK, Jan Antonín Venuto – 175. výročí úmrtí, in: Chrám Svatého Ducha a královna Eliška Rejčka v Hradci Králové 1308–2008, ed. Jiří Štěpán, Hradec Králové 2009, pp. 137–153.
- SLIVKA 2004:** Michal SLIVKA, Hranice v mentálním chápání středověkého člověka, Archaeologia Historica 29, 2004, pp. 9–36.
- SMETÁNKA 1988:** Zdeněk SMETÁNKA, Život středověké vesnice. Zaniklá Svídna, Praha 1988.
- SOMMER 1833–1849/I–XVI:** Johann Gottfried SOMMER, Das Königreich Böhmen; statistisch-topographisch dargestellt I–XVI, Prag 1833–1849.
- SOUKUP – NECHVÁTAL 2010:** Mojmir SOUKUP – Marek NECHVÁTAL, Barokní sýpky na Jičínsku ve Střevači a Vokšicích, in: Od Ještěda k Troskám. Vlastivědný sborník Českého ráje a Podještědí 17 (33), 2010, pp. 229–231.
- SOUTHALL 2000:** Aidan SOUTHALL, The City in Time and Space, Cambridge 2000.
- SPECIAL ORTS-REPERTORIUM 1893:** Special Orts-Repertorium von Böhmen. Neubearbeitung auf Grund der Ergebnisse der Volkszählung vom 31. December 1890. Podrobný seznam míst v Čechách. Nově zpracován na základě výsledků sčítání lidu ze dne 31. prosince 1890, Wien 1893.
- SPERLING 2007:** Walter SPERLING, Bäume und Wald in den geographischen Namen Mitteleuropas. Die böhmischen Länder, Leipzig 2007.
- SPURNÝ 2006:** Proměny sudetské krajiny, ed. Matěj Spurný, Praha 2006.
- STATISTICKÝ LEXIKON 1934:** Statistický lexikon obcí v zemi české. Vydán Ministerstvem vnitra a Státním úřadem statistickým na základě výsledků sčítání lidu z 1. prosince 1930, Praha 1934.
- STÁTNÍKOVÁ – ŠEFCŮ – DRAGOUN 2013:** Pavla STÁTNÍKOVÁ – Ondřej ŠEFCŮ – Zdeněk DRAGOUN, Kamenný most v Praze. Obrazové svědectví historie Juditina a Karlova mostu, Praha 2013.
- STEHLÍK 2002:** Petr STEHLÍK, Letecké měřické snímky, Historická fotografie 2, 2002, no. 1, pp. 51–58.
- STEHLÍKOVÁ – ŠTĚPÁN 2014:** Jana STEHLÍKOVÁ – Luděk ŠTĚPÁN, Nasavrcké panství a slatiňanští Auerspergové. Utváření sídelní krajiny, Slatiňany 2014.
- STEJSKAL – STEJSKALOVÁ 2012:** Ryby a lidé. Rožmberkové a rybníkářství na jihu Čech a ve Waldviertlu, ed. Aleš Stejskal – Helena Stejskalová, České Budějovice 2012.
- STEJSKAL 2011:** Aleš STEJSKAL, Rožmberská teritoriální správa v raném novověku. Stavovská příslušnost, sociální status a sociální mobilita úředníků v letech 1550–1616, in: Rožmberkové. Rod českých velmožů a jeho cesta dějinami, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2011, pp. 122–127.
- STEJSKAL 2012:** Aleš STEJSKAL, Rožmberkové a rybníkářství na jihu Čech (Novohradsko – přehled), in: Ryby a lidé. Rožmberkové a rybníkářství na jihu Čech a ve Waldviertlu, ed. Aleš Stejskal – Helena Stejskalová, České Budějovice 2012, pp. 107–121.
- STILLENAU 1720:** Gottwald Caesar von STILLENAU, Leben Eines Herrlichen Bildes, wahrer und rechtschaffener Frömmigkeit: Welches Gott in dem Königreich Böhmen,

- in der Hohen Person Sr. Hoch-Gräfl. Excellenz, Herrn Herrn Frantz Antoni, Des Heil. Röm. Reichs Grafen von Sporck, Herrn derer Herrschafften Lyssa, Gradlitz, Konoged und Herschmanitz etc. Der Röm. Kayserl. Majestät würcklichen Geheimben Raths, Cammerern und Stadthaltern des Königreichs Böhmen etc. (...), o. O. 1720 (<http://digitale.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/vd18/content/titleinfo/2921385>).
- STOLÁROVÁ – VLNAS 2010:** Karel Škréta 1610–1674. Doba a dílo, ed. Lenka Stolárová – Vít Vlnas, Praha 2010.
- STOPP 1982–1985/I–XVI:** Klaus STOPP, Die Handwerkskundschaften mit Ortsansichten I–XVI, Stuttgart 1982–1985.
- STRUNA 1872:** Josef STRUNA, Popsání okresu Karlínského, Karlín 1872. Písemný operát reambulovaného katastru, Ústřední archiv zeměměřictví a katastru, Fond Stabilní katastr, jeho údržba a obnova (1824–1957), Písemný operát, B2/c/C (nezpracováno; bez sign.).
- STUHLÁ 2005:** 300 let poutního kostela Jména Panny Marie na Lomci. Sborník příspěvků z odborného semináře, konaného dne 14. září 2004 v Městské galerii ve Vodňanech u příležitosti kulatého výročí vysvěcení chrámu, ed. Pavla Stuchlá, Vodňany 2005.
- SUCHÁNEK 2006:** Pavel SUCHÁNEK, Barokní sochy v krajině a hledání jejich významu, Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity – F 55, 2006, no. 50, pp. 81–96.
- SUKOVÁ 2000:** Petra SUKOVÁ, Benediktinské gymnázium v Broumově v letech 1775–1810, in: Minulost, současnost a budoucnost gymnazijního vzdělávání. Sborník referátů z konference konané ve dnech 24.–25. června 1999 v Jičíně, Semily 2000 pp. 151–157.
- SVOBODA 2008:** Milan SVOBODA, Mariánské poutní místo Hejnice v historické paměti, in: Locus pietatis et vitae. Sborník příspěvků z konference konané v Hejnicích ve dnech 13.–15. září 2007, Praha 2008, pp. 255–280.
- SÝKORA 2002:** Suburbanizace a její sociální, ekonomické a ekologické důsledky, ed. Luděk Sýkora, Praha 2002.
- ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ 2014:** Markéta ŠANTRŮČKOVÁ, Krajinářská tvorba Jana Rudolfa Černína. Vznik a vývoj parků v Krásném Dvoře, Jemčině, Petrohradě a Chudenicích, Praha 2014.
- ŠEDA 1967:** Oldřich ŠEDA, Zaniklý rybník Hradeček u Třeboně, Jihočeský sborník historický 36, 1967, pp. 141–144.
- ŠEDA 1968:** Oldřich ŠEDA, Matěj Kozka z Rynárce a sekularizace borovanské augustiniánské řeholní kanonie v šedesátých letech 16. století, Jihočeský sborník historický 37, 1968, pp. 87–97, 133–143, 225–238.
- ŠEDA 1986:** Oldřich ŠEDA, Borovany a okolí v předbělohorském období a v době českého stavovského povstání, in: Borovany. Vlastivědný sborník k osmistému výročí první zprávy o obci, ed. Stanislav Malík a kol., Borovany 1986, pp. 65–100.
- ŠIMÁK 1930:** Josef Vítězslav ŠIMÁK, Soupis památek historických a uměleckých v okrese mnichovohradištském I, Praha 1930.
- ŠIMÁK 1931–1932:** Josef Vítězslav ŠIMÁK, Historický vývoj Čech severovýchodních do XV. věku, Česká Skalice [1931–1932].
- ŠIMEK 2004:** Tomáš ŠIMEK, Ilustrovaný Broumovský urbár z roku 1676, Sborník prací východočeských archivů 9, 2004, pp. 203–215.
- ŠIMŮNEK – ANTOŠ – HAVRLANT 2014:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK – Filip ANTOŠ – Jan HAVRLANT, Třeboňsko na I. vojenském mapování, Historická geografie 40, 2014, pp. 153–204.
- ŠIMŮNEK – LAVIČKA 2011:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK – Roman LAVIČKA, Páni z Rožmberka 1250–1520: Jižní Čechy ve středověku. Kulturněhistorický obraz šlechtického dominia ve středověkých Čechách, České Budějovice 2011.

- ŠIMŮNEK 2002:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Zlomky neznámé knihy register centrální rožmberské správy (ca. 1450–1465), Táborský archiv 11, 2002, pp. 67–108.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2003:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Unikátní dokumentace: Panství Třeboň 1420–1520 (S edicí pramenů z let 1493–1523?), Historická geografie 32, 2003, pp. 195–237.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2004:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Lesní správa na panství Choustník v polovině 15. století (s edicí rejstříku prodeje dřeva z roku 1447), Táborský archiv 12, 2004, pp. 87–150.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2005:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Správní systém šlechtického dominia v pozdně středověkých Čechách. Rožmberská doména 1418–1472, Praha 2005.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2006:** Historická krajina a mapové bohatství Česka. Prameny, evidence, zpřístupňování, využívání, ed. Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2006.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2007:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Pozůstalost Wolfganga z Krajku (†1491). Sídelní, krajinná a administrativní struktura šlechtického dominia v pozdním středověku, Historická geografie 34, 2007, pp. 45–92.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2009:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Krajina a příroda ve vnímání a myšlení středověkého člověka, Historická geografie 35, 2009, pp. 95–146.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2010:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Hrad jako symbol v myšlení české středověké šlechty, Český časopis historický 108, 2010, pp. 185–219.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2012:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Velkoplošný obraz krajiny jako reprezentativní dekorace interiéru. Mapa třeboňského panství z roku 1684, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 81–104.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2012a:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, The Landscape of the Czech Middle Ages in the Perspective of Modern Science, Historická geografie 38, 2012, pp. 35–62.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2013:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Kájov a Boletice ve středověku, in: 750 let Kájova, Kájov 2013, pp. 53–89.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2014:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Prospekty českých panství Sibylly Augusty Bádenské (1716), Průzkumy památek 21, 2014, no. 1, pp. 5–38.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2014a:** Town and its vicinity as spaces for sacral representation, Bohemia 1350–1600, in: Cities and Their Spaces. Concepts and Their Use in Europe, ed. Michel Pauly – Martin Scheutz, Köln etc. 2014, pp. 167–181.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2015:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Veselí, Mezimostí a okolní krajina ve středověku a raném novověku, in: Ročenka Husitského muzea v Táboře, Tábor 2015, in print.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2015a:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Kulturní krajina Černínů z Chudenic. Obrazová mapa panství Lnáře (1698) a nejstarší prospekt Lnář (1725), Jihočeský sborník historický 84, 2015, in print.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2015b:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Raně novověké veduty měst – dávné „panoramatické fotografie“?, in: Jak psát dějiny velkých měst?, ed. Radana Červená et al., Brno 2015 (= Brno v minulosti a dnes – Supplementum), in print.
- ŠIMŮNEK 2015c:** Robert ŠIMŮNEK, Kulturní krajina na starých vyobrazeních, Studia historica Nitriensia 19, 2015, in print.
- ŠLÉZAR 2007:** Pavel ŠLÉZAR, Sádky, kopy a „výprask na pamětnou“. Hranice ve středověké krajině Dražanské vrchoviny, Vlastivědný věstník moravský 59, 2007, pp. 155–161.
- ŠMEJDA 2009:** Ladislav ŠMEJDA, Mapování archeologického potenciálu pomocí leteckých snímků, Plzeň 2009.
- ŠPERK 2015:** Jan ŠPERK, Hlavní pohledové vazby v krajinářské kompozici Františka Josefa Šlika, Historická geografie 41, 2015, pp. 7–22.
- ŠTANZEL – VÁVROVÁ 2008–2009:** Tomáš ŠTANZEL – Petra VÁVROVÁ, Přehled historických fotografických technik, Historická fotografie 8–9, 2008–2009, pp. 18–67.

- ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ 1997:** Ludmila ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, Bavlnářské závody VEBA. (Přehled vývoje v letech 1949–1992), Sborník archivních prací 47, 1997, pp. 205–250.
- ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ 2001:** Ludmila ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, Řádové sestry v n. p. Veba Broumov podruhé, Východočeské listy historické 17–18, 2001, pp. 417–420.
- ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ 2007:** Ludmila ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, Mariánské bratrstvo v Broumově a Polici nad Metují v době baroka, in: Královéhradecko. Historický sborník pro poučenou veřejnost 4, 2007, pp. 425–436.
- ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ 2009:** Ludmila ŠTĚPÁNOVÁ, Vliv slezských válek v Kladském hrabství a na Broumovsku, in: 550 let Hrabství kladského 1459–2009, ed. Vladimír Wolf et al., Trutnov 2009, pp. 237–251.
- ŠTOVÍČEK 2002:** Ivan ŠTOVÍČEK, Zásady vydávání novověkých historických pramenů z období od počátku 16. století do současnosti, Praha 2002.
- ŠTOVÍČEK 2008:** Petr ŠTOVÍČEK, Zrození a proměny rožmberské tradice v Třeboni. Edice textů Třeboňských pamětí, diplomová práce FF JČU České Budějovice 2008.
- ŠTVERÁKOVÁ 2006:** Helena ŠTVERÁKOVÁ, Křížová cesta z Březnice na Svatou Horu, Podbrdsko 13, 2006, pp. 89–110.
- ŠTÝS – BÍZKOVÁ – RITSCHELOVÁ 2014:** Stanislav ŠTÝS – Rut BÍZKOVÁ – Iva RITSCHELOVÁ, Proměny Severozápadu, Praha 2014.
- ŠUSTA 1898:** Josef ŠUSTA, Fünf Jahrhunderte der Teichwirthschaft zu Wittingau. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Fischzucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gegenwart, Stettin 1898.
- ŠVÁBOVÁ – RYGL 2004:** Jana ŠVÁBOVÁ – Tomáš RYGL, Chráněná krajinná oblast a biosférická rezervace Třeboňsko. Panoramatická mapa a průvodce, Jihlava 2004.
- TALICH 2012:** Milan TALICH, Trendy výzkumu možností využívání starých map digitálními metodami, in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 373–386.
- TEUTEBERG 1983:** Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Historische und geographische Aspekte, ed. Hans Jürgen Teuteberg, Wien 1983.
- TIMMERMANN 2007:** Achim TIMMERMANN, The Poor Sinner's Cross and the Pillory: Late Medieval Microarchitecture and Liturgies of Criminal Punishment, Umění 55, 2007, pp. 362–373.
- TOMEK 1881:** Václav Vladivoj TOMEK, Příběhy kláštera a města Police nad Medhují, Praha 1881.
- TRENČANSKÁ – RŮČKOVÁ 2006:** Barbora TRENČANSKÁ – Libuše RŮČKOVÁ, 750 let Broumova v archivních dokumentech, Broumov [2006].
- TRNKOVÁ 2004:** Petra TRNKOVÁ, Club deutscher Amateurphotographen in Prag a jeho umělecké směřování na počátku 20. století, Historická fotografie 4, 2004, pp. 22–32.
- TRNKOVÁ 2011:** Petra TRNKOVÁ, Kouzlo staré fotografie a příběh moderního média. Krátká úvaha o proměnách zájmu o fotografii 19. století, in: V plném spektru: fotografie 1841–2005 ze sbírky Moravské galerie v Brně, ed. Antonín Dufek – Jiří Pátek – Petra Trnková, Brno 2011, pp. 42–47.
- TRNKOVÁ 2013:** Petra TRNKOVÁ, Podle přírody! Fotografie a umění v 19. století. Příklady z českých a moravských sbírek, Brno 2013.
- TRPÁKOVÁ – TRPÁK 2009:** Ivana TRPÁKOVÁ – Pavel TRPÁK, Proměny polabské krajiny národního hřebčína Kladruby nad Labem ve světle starých map a archivních podkladů, Historická geografie 35, 2009, pp. 199–212.
- TRPÁKOVÁ 2013:** Ivana TRPÁKOVÁ, Krajina ve světle starých pramenů, Praha 2013.
- TRUHLÁŘ 1880:** Urbář zboží Rožmberského z roku 1379, ed. Josef Truhlář, Praha 1880.
- TŘÍSKA 1957:** Karel TŘÍSKA, Staré rybníční hospodářství u Kardašovy Řečice, Jihočeský sborník historický 26, 1957, pp. 9–13, 40–45.

- TŮMOVÁ 2014:** Martina TŮMOVÁ, Město Opočno v topografických pramenech z 18. a 19. století, diplomová práce FF UK Praha 2014.
- TŮMOVÁ 2015:** Martina TŮMOVÁ, Mapy colloredo-mansfeldského panství Opočno z let 1749–1880, *Historická geografie* 41, 2015, pp. 23–45.
- UHLÍŘOVÁ – BRŮNA 2002:** Lenka UHLÍŘOVÁ – Vladimír BRŮNA, Soubory prvního a druhého vojenského mapování v prostředí geografického informačního systému, *Český časopis historický* 100, 2002, pp. 493–495.
- ÚLOVEC 1995–1996:** Jiří ÚLOVEC, Hrad Fuglhaus u Klece, *Táborský archiv* 7, 1995–1996, pp. 199–218.
- ÚLOVEC 2002:** Jiří ÚLOVEC, Tvrz ve Zvíkově, *Výběr* 39, 2002, pp. 175–189.
- URBAN 1999:** Jan URBAN, Dvůr Švamberk u Ševětína, *Zprávy památkové péče* 59, 1999, pp. 371–375.
- URFUS – VÍT – WIESER a kol. 2001:** Valentin URFUS – Jaroslav VÍT – Stanislav WIESER a kol., *Kamenné kříže Čech a Moravy, 2., revised ed.*, Praha 2001.
- VACEK 2014:** Lukáš VACEK, Genius Loci: integrální součást městského prostoru, in: *Krajina jako antropologická čítanka*, Praha 2014, in print.
- VALENTA 1965:** Miloš VALENTA, O Záblatském mlýně. Počátky a vývoj mlýnů na Třeboňsku, *Výběr* 2, 1965, no. 3, pp. 21–34.
- VANCE 1990:** James E. VANCE, *The Continuing City. Urban Morphology in Western Civilization*, London 1990.
- VANĚK 1984:** Václav VANĚK, Počátky Zlaté stoky, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 53, 1984, pp. 83–87.
- VANĚK 1985:** Václav VANĚK, Čtyři století Rožmberka, *Výběr* 22, 1985, pp. 100–107.
- VANĚK 1986:** Václav VANĚK, Spory o Novou řeku, *Jihočeský sborník historický* 55, 1986, pp. 1–10.
- VAŇURA 2007:** Oldřich VAŇURA, Špokův Kuks 1. poloviny 18. století, in: *Sborník Národního památkového ústavu, územního odborného pracoviště v Pardubicích za rok 2007*, s. 54–58.
- VAŠEK 1941:** Václav VAŠEK, *Historie kraje lišovského*, b. m. [1941].
- VÁVRA 1968:** Ivan VÁVRA, Uherská cesta, *Historická geografie* 1, 1968, pp. 43–61.
- VÁVRA 1969:** Ivan VÁVRA, Haberská cesta, *Historická geografie* 3, 1969, pp. 8–32.
- VÁVRA 1971:** Ivan VÁVRA, Trstenická stezka, *Historická geografie* 6, 1971, pp. 77–132.
- VÁVRA 1972:** Ivan VÁVRA, Polská cesta, *Historická geografie* 8, 1972, pp. 3–30.
- VÁVRA 1974:** Ivan VÁVRA, Žitavská cesta, *Historická geografie* 12, 1974, pp. 27–91.
- VÁVRA 1978:** Ivan VÁVRA, Srbská cesta, *Historická geografie* 17, 1978, pp. 369–432.
- VÁVRA 1979:** Ivan VÁVRA, Mostecká cesta, *Historická geografie* 18, 1979, pp. 351–382.
- VENCL a kol. 2006:** Slavomil VENCL a kol., *Nejstarší osídlení jižních Čech. Paleolit a mesolit*, Praha 2006.
- VEVERKA – ČECHUROVÁ 2012:** Bohuslav VEVERKA – Monika ČECHUROVÁ, Zaniklé rybníky uhříněveské na mapách O. B. Klausera a J. K. Müllera, in: *Krajina jako historické jeviště. K počtě Evy Semotanové*, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 143–158.
- VICHROVÁ – ČADA 2005:** Martina VICHROVÁ – Václav ČADA, Kartografické vyjadřovací prostředky a interpretace obsahu map druhého vojenského mapování, in: *Historické mapy. Zborník referátov z vedeckej konferencie*, Bratislava 2005, pp. 246–255.
- VICHROVÁ b. d.:** Martina VICHROVÁ, *Katalog objektů II. vojenského mapování (Františkova)*, unpublished manuscript (http://home.zcu.cz/~vichrova/clanky/Katalog_objektu_VII.pdf).

- VILÍMKOVÁ – PREISS 1989:** Milada VILÍMKOVÁ – Pavel PREISS, Ve znamení břevna a růží, Praha 1989.
- VILÍMKOVÁ 1986:** Milada VILÍMKOVÁ, Stavitelé paláců a chrámů, Praha 1986.
- VLČEK a kol. 1996–2000/I–IV:** Pavel VLČEK a kol., Umělecké památky Prahy I–IV, Praha 1996–2000.
- VLČEK a kol. 2012:** Pavel VLČEK a kol., Umělecké památky Prahy. Velká Praha A–L, Praha 2012.
- VLČKOVÁ 2010:** Martina VLČKOVÁ [RESLOVÁ], Benediktinské panství Broumov ve 2. polovině 17. století. Urbář jako pramen, Stopami dějin Náchodska 14, 2010, pp. 139–403.
- VLNAS 2001:** Sláva barokní Čechie. Umění, kultura a společnost 17. a 18. století, ed. Vít Vlnas, Praha 2001.
- VOGT 1712:** Johann Georg Mauritius VOGT, Das Jetzt-lebende Königreich Böhmen (...), Prag 1712.
- VOJTÍŠEK 1936:** Praha v obnoveném státě československém, ed. Václav Vojtíšek, Praha 1936.
- VÖLKEL 2001:** Michaela VÖLKEL, Das Bild vom Schloß. Darstellung und Selbstdarstellung deutscher Höfe in Architekturstichserien 1600–1800, München – Berlin 2001.
- VOLRÁBOVÁ 2007:** Václav Hollar 1607–1677 a Evropa mezi životem a zmarem, ed. Alena Volrábová, Praha 2007 (katalog výstavy Národní galerie v Praze).
- VOREL – KUPKA 2008:** Aktuální problémy ochrany krajinného rázu 2007, ed. Ivan Vorel – Jiří Kupka, Praha 2008.
- VOREL – SKLENIČKA 2006:** Ochrana krajinného rázu. Třináct let zkušeností, úspěchů i omylů, ed. Ivan Vorel – Petr Sklenička, Praha 2006.
- VOREL – VORLOVÁ – KUPKA a kol. 2010:** Ivan VOREL – Jana VORLOVÁ – Jiří KUPKA a kol., Preventivní hodnocení území CHKO Broumovsko z hlediska krajinného rázu, manuscript, [Praha] 2010.
- VOŠAHLÍKOVÁ a kol. 2004:** Pavla VOŠAHLÍKOVÁ a kol., Biografický slovník českých zemí, sv. A, Praha 2004.
- VRBOVÁ-DVORSKÁ – POKORNÝ 2001:** Jitka VRBOVÁ-DVORSKÁ – Petr POKORNÝ, Mrtvý les u Třeboně – netradiční doklad krajinných procesů na počátku středověké kolonizace jihočeských pánví, Archeologické rozhledy 53, 2001, pp. 704–716.
- VYSKOČIL 2012:** Aleš VYSKOČIL, The Tale of the Landscape in the Czech Lands in the 19th Century, Historická geografie 38, 2012, pp. 119–142.
- VYSKOČIL 2012a:** Aleš VYSKOČIL, Dělnické kolonie – sídelní fenomén industrializace (na příkladu Blanenska), in: Krajina jako historické jeviště. K poctě Evy Semotanové, ed. Eva Chodějovská – Robert Šimůnek, Praha 2012, pp. 245–262.
- VÝSLEDKY [po 1900]:** Výsledky šetření (anketa) poměrů hospodářských i kulturních zemědělského obyvatelstva v Království českém v letech 1898–1900, Praha [po 1900].
- WAAGE 2004:** Vladimír WAAGE, Z historie kamenných cest v Broumovských stěnách, Stopami dějin Náchodska 15, 2004, pp. 281–300.
- WAGENER 2012:** Symbole der Macht? Aspekte mittelalterlicher und frühneuzeitlicher Architektur, ed. Olaf Wagener, Frankfurt am Main 2012.
- WAGNER 1876:** Theodor WAGNER, Ein böhmischer Teich- und Landwirth im 16. Jahrhundert, Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen 14, 1876, pp. 245–267.
- WAGNER 1881:** Theodor WAGNER, Studien über die Befestigung der Stadt Wittingau und über deren Terrainumgebung, 1881 (manuscript, SOA Třeboň).

- WALTER 2014:** Vilém WALTER, Rekonstrukční virtuální modely města Brna, *Historická geografie* 40, 2014, pp. 7–18.
- WIRTH 1940:** Zdeněk WIRTH, Stará Praha. Obraz města a jeho veřejného života v 2. polovici XIX. století podle původních fotografií, Praha 1940.
- WOITSCH – BAHENSKÝ 2007:** Židovské obyvatelstvo v Čechách v letech 1792–1794, ed. Jiří Woitsch – František Bahenský, Praha 2007.
- WOLF 1801–1807:** Franz Karl WOLF, *Abbildungen sämmtlicher alten und neuen Schlösser in Böhmen*, Prag 1801–1807.
- WOODWARD 1987:** *Art and Cartography. Six Historical Esseys*, ed. David Woodward, Chicago – London 1987.
- WÜTHRICH 1993:** Lucas Heinrich WÜTHRICH, *Das Druckgraphische Werk von Matthaeus Merian d. Ae. Bd. 3: Die grossen Buchpublikationen 1: Die Merianbibel, Gottfrieds Chronik, Theatrum Europeum, De Brys Reisen, Archontologia Cosmica, Basler Totentanz, Verlagskataloge (ohne die Topographien)*, Hamburg 1993.
- ZÁLIŠ – OTTE 2013:** Jan ZÁLIŠ – Miroslav OTTE, Broumovsko. Krajina architektury & architektura krajiny, Broumov 2013.
- ZAP 1835:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Popsání král. hlavního města Prahy pro cizince i domácí, Praha 1835.
- ZAP 1846–1851:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Všeobecný zeměpis, Praha 1846–1851.
- ZAP 1848:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Průvodce po Praze. Potřebná příruční kniha pro každého, kdo se s paměťmi Českého hlavního města seznámiti chce, Praha 1848.
- ZAP 1848a:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, *Wegweiser durch Prag. Ein notwendiges Handbuch für Fremde, die sich mit den Merkwürdigkeiten der böhmischen Hauptstadt bekannt zu machen wünschen*, Prag 1848.
- ZAP 1849:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Základové všeobecného zeměpisu, Praha 1849.
- ZAP 1852:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, *Der kleine Wegweiser durch Prag*, Prag 1852.
- ZAP 1854:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, *Der kleine Wegweiser durch Prag, 2. verbesserte und vehrmehrte Auflage*, Prag 1854.
- ZAP 1863:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Starožitnosti a památky země české, Praha 1863.
- ZAP 1864–1868:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, *Historickomělecké památky pražské*, Praha 1864–1868.
- ZAP 1868:** Karel Vladislav ZAP, Praha. Popsání hlavního města Království českého, obsahující jeho dějiny, místopis, umělecké a archeologické památky a statistiku, Praha 1868.
- ZEMAN a kol. 2001:** Lubomír ZEMAN a kol., Dějiny města Ostrova, Ostrov 2001.
- ZEUNE 1997:** Joachim ZEUNE, *Burgen – Symbole der Macht. Ein neues Bild der mittelalterlichen Burg*, 2. ed., Regensburg 1997.
- ZIKMUND 2005:** Jiří ZIKMUND, Vesnický fotoateliér rodinné firmy Novotný v Dětenicích a v Libáni, *Historická fotografie* 5, 2005, pp. 16–23.
- ZMĚLÍK 2014:** Richard ZMĚLÍK, Literární geografie: problém Máchových krajín, *Historická geografie* 40, 2014, pp. 205–233.
- ŽEMLIČKA 2012:** Josef ŽEMLIČKA, Česká krajina ve středověké transformaci, *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica* 15, 2012, no. 1, pp. 7–43.
- ŽIŽKA 1998:** Jan ŽIŽKA, K podobě hospodářských dvorů na bývalých lichtenštejnských panstvích ve středních Čechách, *Památky středních Čech* 12, 1998, no. 1, pp. 1–35.
- ŽIŽKA 1999:** Jan ŽIŽKA, Hospodářské dvory na panství Zlonice, *Památky středních Čech* 13, 1999, no. 1, pp. 3–22.
- ŽIŽKA 2008:** Jan ŽIŽKA, K podobě schwarzenberských hospodářských dvorů, in: *Schwarzenbergové v české a středoevropské kulturní historii*, ed. Martin Gaži, České Budějovice 2008, pp. 47–78.

Web Map portals and digital archives

<http://www.chartae-antiquae.cz>

<http://www.staremapy.cz/>

<https://www.natur.cuni.cz/geografie/mapova-sbirka>

<http://mapire.eu/en/>

<http://oldmaps.geolab.cz/>

<http://historickemapy.cuzk.cz/>

<http://www.mza.cz/indikacniskici/>

<http://towns.hiu.cas.cz/>

<http://landscapes.hiu.cas.cz/>

<http://kontaminace.cenia.cz/>

www.mapy.cz

REGISTER

Abraham ben Jacob 52
Adršpašsko-teplické skály (sandstone rocks) 50
Allio Giovanni Battista 48
Allio Martin 47, 48, 63
Arbes Jakub 57
Aretin of Ehrenfeld Pavel 40
Auersperg (noble family) 16
Bečková Kateřina 56
Bechyně 12
Bělohav Josef 25, 57, 60
Bezděz 10
Bítov 22
de la Blache Paul Vidal 11
Boháč Zdeněk 6
Bohdašín 43
Borovany 31
Borový Karel 59
Botič (brook) 52
Božanov 40, 47, 49
Božanovský Špičák (hill) 42
Branské doubí (natural preservation) 38
Brno 18
Broumov (town, monastery) 39–51, 63, 64
Broumov (region) 11, 27, 28, 39–51, 63, 64
Broumov Hook see *Broumov* (region)
Broumov Walls see *Broumov* (region)
Břevnov (monastery) 28, 41, 43
Břilice 32
Buquoy (noble family) 16
Bzí 31
Córdoba 52
Criginger Johann 40
Czernin Johann Rudolf 14, 16
Czernin of Chudenice (noble family) 16
Čáslav (region) 21
České Budějovice 32, 36
Český Krumlov 16, 17, 34
Český ráj 9
Dalejský potok (brook) 52
Delsenbach Johann Adam 15
Dientzenhofer Christoph 28, 47, 48, 63
Dientzenhofer Kilian Ignaz 28, 47, 49, 63
Dietzler Johann Joseph 15, 47
Dobrá mysl (lusthaus) 34
Dolní Bělá 22
Dřevíč (river) 46
Duchcov 39

Dunajovice 35, 36
Dunajovická hora 35, 36
Dvorce (medieval village, later farmstead) 29
Eckert Jindřich 57
Ehrenfeld Pavel Aretin of see Aretin of Ehrenfeld Pavel
of Falkenberg Johann Benno 44
Ferdinand II (Austrian Archduke) 14
Ferdinand III (Bohemian King) 31
Fridrich František 57
Frýdlant (region) 45
Görlitz 16
Góry Stołowe (mountains) 42
Habry 20
Hájek 17
Heinzel František 49
Hejnice 17
Helmhacker Rudolf 58
Herold Eduard 57
Heřmánkovice 48, 49
Hesselius Johann Georg Albert 44–46, 48
Hodkovice 47
von Hochberg Konrad Ernst Maximilian 45
Honské sedlo (saddle) 43, 48
Horyna Mojmír 48
Hosák Ladislav 6
Hradeček (pond) 30
Hronov (town, region) 28, 43
Hubenov 22
Hurtig Alfred 57
Hvězda (hill and chapel near Broumov) 47–50
Hvězda (château near Prague) 14
Choceň 41, 43
Chotek Karel 54
Chudenice 16
Janovičky 40, 45, 49
of Jelčany Jakub Krčín of see Krčín Jelčany Jakub
Jemčina 14, 16
Jetřichov 44
Jezeří 39
Jičín 7, 14
Jílovice 31
Jindřichův Hradec 32
Kaceřov 22
Kačina 16
Kájov 16
Kaplice 32
Karel IV. / Charles IV (Bohemian King) 53
Kinski (noble family) 21
Kladruby nad Labem (region) 21
Klaudyán Nicolaus 40

Kłodzko (town; county) 16, 17, 40–42, 45
Kohout Jiří 56
Kolbe František Alois 45, 46
Kořistka Karel 59
Kosmas (chronicler) 12
Královská obora see Praha-Královská obora
Kramolín 31
Krásný Dvůr 16
Krašov 22
Kratochvíle (villa) 13, 34
Krčín of Jelčany Jakub 33, 34
Krejčí Jan 57, 58
Křinice 47, 48, 50
Kuks 15
Kupka Jiří 56
Labe (river) 60
of Landštejn Jan 31
of Landštejn Vilém 30
Ledenice 31
Lednice 15
Levý Antonín 57
Libín 29
Liebscher Adolf 57
Liebscher Karel 57
of Liechtenstein (noble family) 7, 15
of Liechtenstein Anton Florian 15
Lipno 10
Lišov 32, 36
Litvínov 15
of Lobkowicz (noble family) 15, 21
Lomnice nad Lužnicí 29, 31
Löw Jiří 10, 11
Lužnice (river) 29–31, 33
Lysá nad Labem 15
Lysý vrch (hill) 50
Macek Josef 13
Machov 43
Machovské sedlo (saddle) 42, 43
Machovský kříž 45, 48
Majdaléna 32, 35
of Malešov Mikuláš Ruthard see Ruthard of Malešov Mikuláš
Mariánská Týnice 22, 23
Martínkovice 40, 44, 47–49
Mathey Jean Baptiste 14, 15
Menšík of Menštejn Jakub 21
Meziměstí 43, 44, 49, 63
Mezimostí nad Nežárkou 32
Mikulov 15
Mladošovice 29
Most 9, 20

Müller Johann Christoph 40
Náchod (region) 28
Neruda Jan 60
Netolice (region) 13
Netolický Štěpánek see Štěpánek Netolický
Nežárka (river) 33
Nová Bystřice 35
Nová řeka (river) 28, 29, 33, 37, 38
Novák Jaroslav 10, 11
Nové Dvory 16
Nové Hrady 16, 30, 32, 35
Nový Vdovec (pond) 30
Ohrada (enclosure) 14
Olivětín 41, 49
Opatovice (medieval village, mill) 29, 31, 37
Orlické hory (mountains) 60
Osek (hill) 12
Ostaš (hill) 50
Ostrov 15
Otovice 44, 49, 50
Otto I (German Emperor) 52
Otto Jan 59
Pardubice (region) 30
Petrohrad 16
Plasy (monastery) 7, 21–23, 28
Plzeň (region) 19
Poděbrady (region) 21, 30
Police nad Metují 40, 43, 46, 48, 50
Pollack (family) 41
Prague see *Praha*
Praha (city and suburbs; agglomeration) 11, 12, 17, 18, 27, 28, 41, 52–62, 64, 65
Praha-Břevnov 28, 41, 43
Praha-Bubny 54, 58–60
Praha-Holešovice 54, 58–60
Praha-Hrad 52, 57
Praha-Hradčany 53
Praha-Hvězda 14
Praha-Josefov/Židovské město 54, 55
Praha-Karlín 53, 54, 56–58, 64
Praha-Královská obora / Stromovka (enclosure) 14, 54
Praha-Královské Vinohrady 54, 56, 59
Praha-Libeň 54, 56, 58, 59
Praha-Malá Strana 53, 57
Praha-Nové Město 53, 54, 58
Praha-Petřín (hill) 52, 57
Praha-Smíchov 53, 54, 56–59
Praha-Staré Město 52–54, 57
Praha-Střelecký ostrov (island) 57
Praha-Troja 15
Praha-Uhřetěves 21

Praha-Vítkov (hill) 52
Praha-Vršovice 59
Praha-Vysočany 59
Praha-Vyšehrad 53, 57–60
Praha-Žižkov 54, 56, 59
 of Prošovice Wolfgang Selender see Selender of Prošovice Wolfgang
 Přemyslovci / Přemysliden (dynasty) 14, 52
Rokytká (brook) 52
 Rosenberg (noble family) see Rožmberk
 Roubík František 6
 of Rožmberk (noble family) 27, 29–38
 of Rožmberk Petr Vok 29
 of Rožmberk Vilém 34
Rožmberk nad Vltavou 16
Rudolfovo 32
Ruprechtice 40, 48
Ruprechtický Špičák (hill) 42
 Ruthard of Malešov Mikuláš 33, 34
Římov 16
Saint-Germain-en-Laye 30
 Santini-Aichel Jan Blažej 22, 28
 Sartorius Tomáš 48, 49
 Sauer Carl O. 11
 Selender of Prošovice Wolfgang 44
 Schlick (noble family) 7, 21
 Schlick Franz Joseph 14
 Schroll (family) 41, 47
 Schroll Benedikt 49
 Schulten Friedrich Gottlieb 45
 of Schwarzenberg (noble family) 21, 27, 29–38
 Schwarzenberg Franz Adam 14
 Sibylle Auguste of Saxe-Lauenburg 15
Slatiňany 16
 Soběslav II (Bohemian Duke) 30, 31
Soběslav 32
 Sporck Franz Anton 14, 15
 Srp Jan 60
St Barbara (hermitry) 36
Stará Boleslav 17
Stará Hlína 32
Stěnava (river) 40, 42, 46, 48, 49, 63
 Sternberg Wenceslas Adalbert of 15
 von Stillenau Gottwald Caesar 15
 von Stillfried Joseph 45
Stojčín (medieval village, later pond) 34
Stolové hory see Góry Stołowe
Stráž nad Nežárkou 32
Stromovka see Praha-Královská obora
Střevač 14
Suchdol nad Lužnicí 32

Suchý Důl 48
Supí vrch (hill) 43
Svatá Hora 17
Šárecký potok (brook) 52
 Šimák Josef V. 6
Šonov 48, 49
 Štěpánek Netolický 33
 Šubrt František 59
Šumava 60
 of Švamberk (noble family) 29–38
 of Švamberk Jan Jiří 34
Švamberk (farmstead) 34, 37
Tábor (region) 60
Teplíce nad Metují 42
Trhové Sviny 32
Troja (château) 15
Trstenice 20
Třeboň (town, castle, monastery) 29–38
Třeboň (region; former estate) 11, 13, 27–38, 62
Třeboň Basin see *Třeboň* (region)
Třeboň-Kopeček 32
Třípanský kámen (boarderstone) 45
Uhříněves see *Praha Uhříněves*
Valdštejn see *Wallenstein*
Valdštejnsko (enclosure) 14
Valkeřice 15
Valtice 15
Vambeřice see *Wambierzyce*
 Vančura Jiří 56
 de Veerle Jindřich 14
Velíš 14
Velká Ves 41, 44, 49, 63
Verněřovice 40, 44, 48
Veselí nad Lužnicí 32, 34
 Věžník of Věžník (noble family) 16
Vienna see *Wien*
 Vítkovci / Wittigonen (noble family) 29
Vitoraz see *Weitra*
Vižňov 44, 48, 49
 Vlček Pavel 56
Vltava (river) 52–54
 Vogt Johann Georg Mauritius 15, 40
Vokšice 14
Vranín (medieval village, later farmstead) 29
Vrchy (farmstead) 29
Vysoká 15
Waldstein see *Wallenstein*
 of *Wallenstein* / *Waldstein* / *Valdštejn* (noble family) 7
 of *Wallenstein* / *Waldstein* Albrecht 7, 14
 of *Wallenstein* Franz Ernest 14

of Wallenstein Johann Joseph 15
Walzel Josef 49
Wambierzyce 16, 17, 42
Weitra / Vitoraz (region) 30
Wenzel Franz 47
Wien 41
Wittigonen see Vítkovci
Záblatí 29, 34, 37
Zap Karel Vladislav 57, 58
Zinke Otmar 45, 47, 48
Zittau 20
Zlatá stoka (drain) 29, 33, 37
Zvíkov 29
Zwettl (monastery) 31
Žimutice 31

Eva Chodějovská – Eva Semotanová – Robert Šimůnek

HISTORICAL LANDSCAPES IN BOHEMIA

Scientific Editor:

doc. PhDr. Martin Holý, Ph.D.

Translations Lucie Vidmar

Published by the Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences
Prosecka 76, 190 00 Prague 9, Czech Republic

(The Work of the Institute of History CAS,
Series A – Monographia, Vol. 61)
Prague 2015
112 pp.

ISBN: 978-80-7286-258-0

Address:

Institute of History CAS

Prosecka 76, 190 00 Prague 9

Phone./telefax: +420 286 887 513

E-mail – Secretariat: volesakova@hiu.cas.cz

<http://www.hiu.cas.cz/nakladatelstvi>