

Paper prepared for the
Fourth Euroacademia International Conference
Re-Inventing Eastern Europe

Krakow, 24 – 26 April 2015

This paper is a draft

Please do not cite

Bratislava Castle and Changes to the Methodological Approach of Monument Restoration in Correlation of Modern Europe

Anna Gondová

Faculty of Architecture of Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava

Abstract

Common roots, common history, spiritual and tangible architectural heritage is most explicitly demonstrated through the legacy of the ruling elite. Bratislava Castle was considered as a provincial castle, but in a wider context was bounded with western Europe. In 18th century, castle was a seat of vicegerent of Austria – Hungarian monarchy Albert Casimir, Duke of [Teschen](#), son – in – law of the great empress Maria Theresa. Presence of the empress in this period caused the greatest flourish of the Bratislava castle.

In 1811 castle burnt down by a tragic coincidence and till the middle of 20th century, when the large restoration began, ruins remained at the mercy of time. Lack of authentic elements and preserved interiors and exteriors as well lead to a question, how to stand up to the methodological matters of restoration of Bratislava castle, which was considered as highly important task even in a context of socialist Czechoslovakia. Task, that was supposed to represent country in the world. What kind of architectural means of expression should define the approach of young socialist nation, according to the state ideology and according to effort of presenting Slovaks as a modern european nation to the preservation of this monument? Modernism.

After the Velvet Revolution, borders were opened and in 2004 Slovakia became a part of European Union. Since 2008, last restoration of Bratislava Castle has been going on, while the methodological approach is entirely different. The image of Maria Theresa's Baroque castle is recovered. Governing representative interiors are changing from Modernistic to Rococo, while method of preservation are analogies with austrian examples. Could we consider, that one of the reasons of changing the methodology is fact, that Slovaks need no longer to define their cultural identity within specific style, but they are able to sense themselves as a part of wide european history?

Keywords

Bratislava Castle, restoration, methodology, modernism, historicism,

Introduction

„Hic sunt Leones“ – here are the lions, blank space, there is the end of a known world, this is where „terra incognita“ begins. In this way medieval maps used to display world from Vienna to the east. At some point we can use this sentence to describe the state of knowledge, that prevailed in western world about former Czechoslovakia.

Bratislava Castle, majestic monument, that is towering high upon the city, the capital city of Slovakia was since time immemorial, with its determining location and spatial domination, naturally perceived by people as the most significant element of an urban space. Marked by some art historians as an „embodiment of an European history“¹ with it's cosmopolitan significance as a part of a city, that was at the beginning of the 20th century not merely slovak, czech, german or hungarian, but it was altogether – international.

The fate of Bratislava Castle and historical built – up area of extramural settlement in 20th century reflects contradictory relationship of slovak society to its own past. It mirrors by excelent way the general position of monuments as a tools of achievement a wide variety of interests. From state representatives, who declared their political power on effort to define an official face of a cultural nation, to struggle of architects and art historians on reviewing the approach to the monuments restoration. Several generations tried to cope with the issue of the pitoresque castle ruin towering high upon the dynamically developing metropolis of Slovakia.² Restoration of Bratislava Castle is embodiment of „characteristic story of preservation of monuments in Slovakia, symptomatic for the development of society and preservation of monuments at the one hand, and preservation of monuments and contemporary art at the other hand.“³

This study deals with comparison of different methodological approaches, applied to two main restorations of the Bratislava Castle, that went on during two different social establishments. Aim is to analyse general attitudes and opinions of professional public (architects, art historians, conservationists) to these methodological approaches in social and cultural – historical context. This social discussion reflects search for a cultural identity of young European nation in correlation of modern Europe.

Recovery of a landmark

The whole narration has to be started in the 28th of May 1811. For a Bratislava Castle that day meant start of a new period as historical and art monument, when for a carelessness of military garrison, that was located there during the Napoleonic wars, the castle burnt out. Fire ruined almost everything except from military barracks, outbuildings by northern fortifications and few dozens of houses in extramural settlement. Afterwards, both The Habsburgs and the state lost any interest in maintaining and refurbishing the remains in the provincial city of Austria – Hungarian monarchy. During almost 150 years the ruins became the most typical visual symbol of the city. Their deplorable state was in strong contrast with dynamic modernisation of Bratislava in post-war period. This situation caused relatively lively a whole society discussion, when voices calling for reconstruction started to appear in public in 1920s. Three major approaches were crystallized out of these polemics:

- Substitution of the ruins with new contemporary architecture - represented by architects (D. Jurkovič, E. Belluš). They argued for economical aspects, pragmatism, utilitarianism and avant-garde, while ignoring symbolic and artistic value of the ruins.
- Conservation of the ruins - represented by art historians (G. Weyde, J. Hofman, H. Sedlmayer, K. M. Swoboda), while some restorational interventions, important from functional and economical point of view, were allowed. They argued for symbolic, artistic and historical value of the ruins (panorama as a monument), but also for economical benefits (monuments tourism – source of financial profit).
- Restore the ruin to its original Renaissance – Baroque image - represented by architects and artists (J. Alexy, A. Piffel, J. Lichner, E. Hruška, D. Martinček). This option came into discussion in the times of Slovak war state as a result of a new official nationalist ideology. These argued for ideology, value of a symbol and conservative point of view⁴.

During the war Slovak state in 1942 even ran an international architectural competition, which supposed to bring new ideas for solution of castle hill, extramural settlement and Bratislava castle itself. This was planned to be a centre of Slovak education and knowledge. New function reflected ideology of a young fascist Slovak state, when education was considered as the highest value and was defined as a new Slovak university campus and complex of hospitals. The winning proposal by Italian architects Ernesto La Padula and Atillio La Padula, planned to demolish the castle, except from a Crown tower (the oldest part of the castle) and substitute the remains with new monumental architecture. Lack of financial resources during the war times did not allow to materialize any of these alternatives.⁵

A turning point occurred in the year 1953, when Czech architect, conservationist and archeologist Alfréd Piffel with his academic team started to consolidate the ruin. Methodological approach to this restoration might be characterized as neo-romantic historical reconstruction, which went on through 1950s. After [imprisonment](#) of professor Alfréd Piffel for political reasons in 1957, another architects (Dušan Martinček, Ferdinand Milučký, Andrej Fiala)⁶ had been continuing in his work during times of socialist Czechoslovakia. They carried on with initiated methodology, but for several reasons (ideological, economical, pragmatical), the new architectural interventions were conceived in modernistic style. This stage of restoration of Bratislava Castle was finished in the late 1980s. After the Velvet Revolution and establishment of sovereign Slovak republic, during the 1990s the works on the castle related mainly to restoration of defunct or damaged baroque buildings, despite of absence of framework methodology. Between years 1985 and 2001 the new methodological approach was elaborated, that clearly defined any further procedure for restoration of a monument and methods of restoration of particular Baroque parts of an area. In the year 2002, complex restoration of the whole castle area started, as a result of poor condition of a monument and necessity of proper spaces for governmental representation. Objective was to eliminate non-conceptual interventions to the essence of the castle. This restoration is currently still on process and is continuing in the historicist tendency.⁷

Historism vs. Modernism

Rescue of the castle in the style of historicist Romanticism

Period of a first complex restoration of the Bratislava castle could be characterized as the entering of historicist Neo – Romanticism, initiated by professor Alfréd Piffel. By this methodology and other periods of castle restoration as well, is necessary to avoid flat and unambiguous judgments. As the archival documents are proving, the reality was much more polyvalent and dramatic, as it might be seemed at the first sight. The then and at the end to this day unceasing controversies, should be perceived at the background of social – political situation, that prevailed in the first half of 1950s, when the romantistic historical reconstruction lead by Alfréd Piffel started. Piffel made exact reconstructions by filling the missing parts, according to the last state known before the fire, which was supported by sufficiency of graphical and physically preserved tangible sources. That meant finishing the building's several internal parts and facades and reconstruction of western guardhouse of courtyard of honor.⁸

After imprisonment of professor Alfréd Piffel in 1957, the works on the final form of the castle were continued by architect Dušan Martinček. Historizing interventions originally planned by Piffel were firstly from ideological, secondly from pragmatically – economical causes realised in contemporary style, which supposed to express the zeitgeist – modernism. This period is characteristic with it's ambivalence in methodological approaches, while there should be taken into account a fact, that execution of a project took a long time and professional opinions were changed. Therefore at the very beginning of construction were some elements built in the style of Romanticism, and even by bringing foreign historizing elements. Later by reconstruction of defuncted constructions the effort to abandon attempt to reconstruct details was applied and use of details from other structures rather than reconstruct well known parts was applied as well.⁹

Professor Piffel went to the reconstruction spontaneously, without proper research and excavations. This approach was repeatedly reproached to him, called by many „partisan“, while the more difficulties increased by the reconstruction of a building, the number of allies decreased. Critical voices from the Association of Architects were rising, in the year 1955 Monuments Board dissociated and even the support from government circles cooled off.¹⁰

Critical voices from the board of architects were discussed at the conference, that took place in the year 1958, where fundamental question raised due to the conservation of Bratislava Castle were negotiated. *„...present approach to solving such responsible task, reaching out with it's significance framework of Bratislava and even Slovakia...is completely wrong...the whole process is accompanied with spontaneity...it is not considered to be correct to restore the castle puritanically to the form before the destruction...The castle should be restored according to needs, required by contemporary requirements, that correspond to the thinking of people of today...the creative method should be socialist realism, that has got permanent validity. Submitted proposal represents vulgarization of this method.“¹¹*

In the archives can be read, that the actors of restoration struggled with numerous complications: lack of money, lack of quality materials, when need for just a slightly different tiles, or different quality wood, that was supposed to be manufactured by planned economy was an insurmountable obstacle and had to be judged as a matter of political significance. Professional public was against them and so architects and conservationists had to compete for goodwill of the highest places and nurture their interest. So the works on the construction could go on.¹² Also opinions of some official functionaries, stated, that restoration of a castle steals the workers from the constructions of residential buildings and. Future use was in the proposals constantly changing. The last one was tightly connected with gaining the financial resources.¹³ When the takeover of a castle by the government for state representational purposes substantially improved funding system.

Romanticism vs. pragmatism or discussion about the roofing of the castle

Especially interesting was the discussion about the roofing of the Bratislava Castle, that scooped into relatively great dimension on the circumstances of the then society. Opinions could be divided into two groups:

- supporters of the conservative preservation of the ruin, which skyline was considered to be conventional and ruin itself to have an urbanistic value. In the society prevailed an opinion, that palace and its towers should be covered with flat terraces, so the appearance of a remains, reminding inverted table or bed will be preserved. So the romantic look of a ruin would be retained, but with glass windows and central heating inside.¹⁴
- second group consisted of those, who wanted to reconstruct the roof to the form, before the destructive fire. They argued not only from the point of view of ongoing methodology, but also for utility and usability. Appropriate commentary was given by architect Milan Beňuška, former student of Alfréd Piffil: *„...When we give to a castle a purpose of existence, is illogical to leave it with an appearance of a 150 years old ruin. Hereby is entirely inadequate an argument, that the skyline of a castle is convenient, because the roofing will become convenient during several years and people will be on the contrary proud, that our society was able to actively intervene the skyline of the city in a positive way, even in such controversial matter, as the castle obviously is. I stand in the line with those, who prefer to built up high roofs and towers.“*¹⁵
- Architect of a castle Dušan Martinček contributed to the discussion, asking: *„What will be bigger romanticism? Return the palace its historical silhouette or leave the external appearance of a restored building as ruin?“*¹⁶

Both Piffil and Martinček worked in their designs on different variations of the roofing, with various heights of gable roofs. Lastly the compromise between both groups was pursued. The new roof was built, which brought utilization of a new spaces (nowadays the deposits of Slovak National Museum are located there), but was not built in an original Baroque form. Roof was about a half of an original height lower, so the silhouette would still be able to be perceived in the skyline of the city.

Enter of a Modernism

The lines above show, that first restoration of a castle did not meet entirely positive response among professional public. On the conference, already mentioned above in the paper, that took place on november 1958, was reproached, to the works, that were done so far on the castle, their historizing concept and was defined a need to speak a language of by then contemporary art expression.¹⁷

An interesting and symptomatic example of an application of modernistic approaches is case study of a southern wing's court facade. This whole section of a southern wing was built in the first half of a 17th century and until the half of the 20th disappeared, except from a few load – bearing stone pillars at the ground floor level. This wall was never photographed nor measured, so there was no existing capture of its appearance. New form of the facade was designed yet in his proposals by Alfréd Piffil, in moderately historizing form. This design was further respected by Dušan Martinček, who reduced the shape in a modernistic style as a system of reinforced concrete arcade corridors and loggias over the entire height of the facade. Starting point were analogies with similar solution of arcade corridors on several Renaissance castles.¹⁸ Nowadays is this solution considered to be historic mistake and alogism, when the Renaissance arcades were built on the Baroque basement. New form regarded as an error was removed by latest restoration from 2001. Although among some theoretics of architecture and art historians this was considered to be high quality architectural intervention and mistake was do demolish it and replace with historicism.

Another example is also a demonstration of a closed borders and therefrom stemming consequences. When designing a railing on the originally Baroque staircase, was new railing proposed as a new form from white Siberian marble, although there were enough balustrade fragments found in the ruin and was known, that authentic material was limestone originated from close bearings in Austria. This intervention performs as an interference of socialist realism into Theresian rococo.¹⁹

When designing the interiors, the architects stood in front of a problem, that was not only methodological, but also economical and ideological. Outwardly medieval substance of a castle with the rendition of its period was sharply contrasting with cold modernistic interiors. There was not enough financial sources nor political will. Critics were restless, so the path of designing a contemporary expression was clearly chosen. A leitmotiv of multiple new interiors became an art works, as a part of a construction, above all mosaics,

tapestries and oil paintings from 20th century slovak artists. Furniture was conceived also in a contemporary style. Combination of monumental art works of socialist realism, „*specific type of historical revival, that as such mixed past with presence in order to construct the pretended reality*“²⁰, with austere, cold modernistic interiors, embedded into medieval respectively Baroque walls, acted at least controversially.

Both then and now were exceedingly positively rated interventions made by architect Ferdinand Milučký, one of the most important 20th century slovak architects, who creatively expressed himself mostly on designing the expositions for the Slovak National Museum and exposition of Treasury, where the most valuable archaeological findings from the castle excavations were and still are exhibited. Especially the Treasury, built in the late 1980s was with it's timeless aesthetics and quality of the design spared by the last restoration unlike another modernistic elements.

Disappearing Modernism and appearing historicism

In the 1980s was in close proximity of Bratislava Castle, in it's protection zone, despite of firmly established principles of heritage preservation for the requires of the National Council of the Slovak Republic built a new building. Nevertheless, that NC SR already did have appropriate spaces in the Archbishop's Palace, another object arose, that competes in spacial domination with the castle palace.²¹

Afterwards, political changes in 1989 and formation of Slovak Republic in the year 1993, brought unprecedented frequency of home and international meetings in the castle palace. Running of the first of the multilaterally negotiations already showed deficiencies of spacial and technical possibilities. The situation from the period of Maria Theresa replicated. Even in those times, when the only possible communication was through rooms formally aligned with each other (enfilade), was generated a need to built out an additional equipment, so the palace could meet it's essential function.²²

Replica of former Theresian building was decided to built a on the western terrace, which fulfilled the requirements with it's location and spacial options – reportedly it was the only realistic possibility. Construction was undertaken by architectual duo Peter Bouda and Ivan Masár, who had worked before in the 1980s in the studio of Ferdinand Milučký, when they were co – authors of already mentioned Treasury. These architects already in the times of democratic establishment were as if only continuing with the work initiated during former regime, without any public tender.

Ferdinand Milučký himself denied to reconstruct [an](#) extension of low Baroque wing on the western terrace of castle palace from respect to historically formed fundamental shapes, which lead him to cleanse the building from later additions, that did not bear the artistic and architectural identity and power.²³

The only from of societal debate on this issue was an internal competition in the late 1980s among the studios of „Stavoprojekt“ – national designing firm, after which evaluation was reportedly shown, that this was the only possible option. Likewise without any further social debate in the spirit of new framework methodology finished in 2001, were modernistic elements started to be liquidate. Mainly arcade of a southern wing's court facade and modernistic interiors, which is according to the speed of disappearance of modernistic architecture in Bratislava proof of an alarming situation.²⁴

This process was and still is criticized by professional public. Medievalist Dušan Buran in his critical paper „Schlossdebatte auf Slowakisch“²⁵, is reminding the dangerous precedent of disappearing of Bratislava's modernistic architecture and absence of any social debate in context of building of Slovak National Gallery, which although belongs to the most remarkable, but also to the most controversial architectures in Slovakia. Significant slovak art historian Ján Bakoš was even more critical: „...but last utilitarian point for all of the ideological manipulations with Bratislava castle was given by newly built buildings in the castle area. They were built after the novemner '89 for the requirements of parliament of sovereign Slovak Republic in remarkable illusive Neo – baroque style...But the most remarkable on the story of Bratislava castle is not the rape of past and exploitation of history for current goals of presence. More remarkable is how nationalization of the castle by the historizing reconstruction became after years axiomatic, how the whole original dispute over historizing alternative was forgotten, how massively utilitarian use for ideological needs of sovereign state after 1993 as if retrospectively legalized it. Extension in Neo – baroque style in the area were executed without any public discussion. The principle of thruth was in collective unconscious successfully substituted with the principle of usability.“²⁵

Architects Bouda & Masár justified their reconstructional approach to the restoration of monument with several arguments, while emphasized the analogie of their process with existing restoration of Bratislava castle in the methodology of reconstruction the missing parts, proposed by Alfréd Piffl. Valuable parts were restored in full range, while less valuable parts were approached from the point of view of contemporary requirements and opinions. They were aware, that they will be accused from archaism and lack of creativity. They reasoned also with making references to examples from Europe, where are such cultural reconstructions built regularly, like Warsaw's Rynek, Lisbon's Baixa district or several german cities.

They further highlighted typological uniqueness of the Teresian redesign of a castle, since with it's character is in the european area if not unique, but at least exceedingly interesting. Among the most important monarchs, that held the castle as their seat is necessary to mention Sigismund of Luxembourg, Holy Roman Emperor, who rebuilt the castle in the 15th century to the image of a large gothic residence for his own use. In 18th century it was vicegerent of Austria – Hungarian monarchy Albert Casimir, Duke of [Teschen](#), husband of the most beloved daughter of the great empress Maria Theresa, Maria Christina. Castle was rebuilt to a unique architectural typology of that period of time, since it was not common in Europe to convert such vigorous substance into residential palace and change functional priorities from fortificational to residentially – representative.²⁶

Architects also claim, that in architectural process in historical environment, is not the application of charters²⁷ and declarations what is primary, but at the end it is the architect and his creative abilities, what is important. When the architecture could be handled with virtuosity and lightness, or unprofessional and on low level. Despite of a phenomenon, that building is listed, could be seemed, that it practically should be conservated in time as a witness of history, but in reality it is still alive nad should be adapted to new requirements and reflect development of opinions on monument's restoration as such.^{28,29}

Castle as a tool of governing diplomacy

Restoration of the Bratislava Castle in terms of governing politics could be interpreted as „...*victory of silent alliance of nostalgic neo – romanticism and slovak nationalism with communism...by political decision to reconstruct the castle's historical appearance was not important the rescuing, but constructing a political symbol of independence...*“³⁰ Regarding to ideology, Bratislava Castle was embodiment of feudal exploitation, where „*Slovaks created exploited basement of the flourishing city built up by foreigners*“³¹, was not allowed to emphasize during the previous restorations, that castle used to be an official seat of Hungarian kings. It was emphasized, that castle also used to be a seat of catholic seminary, where Anton Bernolák and other figures, who took part in formation of Slovak culture studied.³² During the ideologically tense 1950s, attitude to legitimize restoration of a Bratislava Castle as a new symbol of Slovak nation characterizes a quote from professor Emanuel Hruška, significant Slovak urbanist in urban study about Bratislava castle and extramural settlement: „...*Bratislava is often marked and judged as a city without any relationship to slovak national history, as a non – national german – hungarian city, trade centre in Danube Region and Bratislava Castle as a „weekend“ for Habsburg monarchs and foreign nobility, and so nothing in here came out of slovak folk creation...However, i think, that such limited nationalistic view to a history of Bratislava has to be refused. To honor broad cultural traditions...working class is legal and universal heir of all cultural traditions...the city of Bratislava can not be perceived only as a city without any bond to it's national enviroment or without a relation to cultural progress at all, just because this city's enlightened enviroment of 18th and than 19th century, we were able to see development of matherial and cultural forces, that lead to fall of feudalism, to a new government of bourgeoisie and to a prosperity of city, that because of it's geographical position and tradition in Danube cultural region got the leading position in concentration of slovak cultural life. And the living proof of it is still here – the Castle!*“³³

Original function of restored castle was in 1950s defined for national geography museum resp. Monument of Slovak National Culture.³⁴ During advanced stage of reconstruction, when after builders were visible tangible results, was initiated confiscation of some spaces by Slovak National Council for state representation....*by resolution of the Presidency od SNC from the day 9. 1. 1965 was decided, that castle shall not be after reconstruction seat of a Slovak National Museum, which went to a position of a tenant, but it will representative seat of Slovak National Coucil...materialization of this neo – romanticistic nationalist dream was speeded up by fact, that communist chiefs stopped in the time of effort to enforce federalization to underline proletarian dimension of ideology. On the contrary, with gaining relative independence, they started to feel themselves as*

a successors of former rulers. Therefore they welcomed a possibility to built up new parliamnet right beside the Bratislava Caslte, high above civic city on the castle hill. ³⁵

The year 1968 was not only the year of an ending the first restoration of castle palace and castle area, but also on 30th October 1968 was the day, when government officials signed constitutional act about Czechoslovak Federation and the room on the 1st floor, where it was signed was memorially modified and gained name Federal Hall.³⁶ Governing representative spaces were designed in the style of modernism, while the decorations were formed with the art works designed in the style of socialistic realism. That was in sharp contrast with historical palace, although the architecture of interiors represented the top in the quality of contemporary architectural design.

Urgency of last complex restoration showed up during preparations for summit Bush – Putin in 2005, when just basic maintenance and setting out so – called „Potemkin village“³⁷ took over one month. During recent restoration the emphasis was given especially on representativeness of restored rooms³⁸, the „piano nobile“ and Baroque staircase were returned to the Rococo look on the basis of thorough restoration, architectural and historical researches and analogies with similar buildings in Austria, that used to be a residence of monarchs in the age of Maria Theresa and were designed by same architects as Bratislava Castle. Last few years, in particular, restoration took rapid pace, which was met with the release of financial resources. There could be seen an effort to catch closing date of slovak Presidency of Council of the European Union in 2016 with already restored castle as one of the highest symbols of political representation of Slovak Republic.

Results

When analyzing the opinions of professional public, based on professional affiliation and continuity over time it could be divided into three groups:

- Architects/ conservationists - advocates of historizing recent restoration of a Bratislava castle to the style from the period of it's last developmental stage (Teresian redevelopment), when it could be said about following – up the tendencies of historical architectural reconstructions in modern Europe³⁹. Methodology followed processes from 1950s, when the castle was restored in the style of historizing romantism, that was in those times ideologically unacceptable. After political changes in 1989 is also by this example noticeable tendency of ability to realize importance of its own history and correlation with European context. This group acknowledges historizing, staging interventions to the monument, that are in term of authenticity questionable, to modernistic elements, that were with a few exceptions liquidated.
- Architects/ theorists of architecture - advocates of Modernism and its' footprints left on the Bratislava Castle, that are programmatically rejecting current historizing restoration. Modernism from previous stages of restoration is considered to be most quality architecture and confidence demonstration, as a style that was supposed to define Slovaks as a young European nation.
- Art historians – who are calling for wider public disscusion regarding to the path of historizing reconstruction, that was undertaken on the castle. They criticize a liquidation of Modernism, that significantly entered the previous restoration with it's quality and despite of that, was torn down from day to day without any societal discussion. This phenomenon is particularly interesting in comparison with complexity of former debates about the questionable ruin, first approaches to the monument in 1950s and question about roofing of the castle.

But above all stands political will, that occasionally interfere into the castle restoration processes. In former regime was restoration of the Bratislava Castle tool of an ideological manipulations. In current situation is there an effort to present this monument as one the highest instances of political representation of Slovak Republic.

Conclusions

In this case a well known sentece: „Beauty is in the eye of beholder,“ from Plato is valid. Especially in architecture, one of the most subjective sciences, which evaluation depends personally on the architect himself, while to the evaluation equation enters except from subjectivity also his ego and professional inclination. For many architects is profoundly difficult to suppress their ego in the favor of monument, because the occupation of

an architect as such is in its substance enormously extroverted with urge to express itself. Architectural program of duo Bouda & Masár, creators of latest restoration of the castle is readable in their other buildings, where is obvious their respectful approach to the monuments restoration, while they are not afraid of historicizing forms, but in addition they are able to enforce themselves creatively. Accurate is a quote from Czech architect and theorist Pavel Janák: „...*The least to sacrifice and the most to preserve, ...Architect, that takes a monument into account should enforce himself at least. Where the old artform already is, do not intrude. The work of an architect is the best, when is not visible on the monument, that was brought back to life.*“⁴⁰ What was considered to be groundless romanticism by former generation of architects and conservationists, was shown in the designs of Bouda & Masár as the most viable solution. At the time when in other European countries, copies of historical objects destroyed during the second World War were built (Warsaw, Munich, Postdam, Dresden, Berlin), in Bratislava was long lasting tendency of inserting new buildings into preserved Gothic and Renaissance walls.⁴¹ Nowadays we live in a different time period, dividing boundaries, that were hiding us in front of the western world suddenly vanished. We are able to look on and judge the restoration of the castle from different perspective. It is not just a tool to define national consciousness. It is a valid part of European, and therefore also Slovak history.

We are living in a situation, when in Slovak architectural environment persists a myth of modernism, with emphasizing formal clarity, shape reduction and cult of originality and novelty. Aesthetic dogmatism of modernism until today survives not just among architects practitioners, but also in contemporary reflection on architecture. Dominance of modernistic oriented perception of reality despite of the experience of post – modernism, is displacing architectural design in historical environment on the edge of architectural discussion and designing restoration of a historical architecture is nowadays not considered to be equivalent with creating new architecture. Reflection of historicizing architectural design is on the periphery of professional interest of critics, historians and theorists of art and architecture. In Slovakia is missing evaluating reflection on this field of architecture, names like Alfréd Piffel or Dušan Martinček are missed from the publications reflecting architecture of 20th century in Slovakia.⁴²

Although at one hand, the raised trend of restoration of Bratislava Castle might be considered in positive boundaries, absence of public discussion by demolishing the castle's Modernism on the other hand, is an alarming precedent, that is not a display of healthy democracy in former socialist country.

„To the Residues of past was acknowledged status of values in particular historical moment, from particular social groups. And even selection of this values was changing in time.“⁴³

Ing. arch. Anna Gondová is an architect and graduate of the Faculty of Architecture STU in Bratislava in the field of architecture and urbanism. She studied at the Technical University of Technology in Dresden and is dedicated to an architectural design and restoration of monuments. Recently is her research within doctoral degree studies at FA STU focused on history of restoration of Bratislava castle.

References

1. Ján Bakoš. „Skorumpovaná minulosť – príbeh Bratislavského hradu“ in *Intelektuál a pamiatka* (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2004), 173 – 182.
2. Magdaléna Kvasnicová. „Na rozhraní dvoch svetov (Alfréd Piffel ako architekt a projektant)“ in *Professor Alfred Piffel: zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie*, ed. Anna Holmanová et al. (Bratislava, FA STU BA, 2008), 96 - 108
3. Bakoš. *Intelektuál a pamiatka*, 173 – 182
4. Bakoš. *Intelektuál a pamiatka*, 173 – 182
5. Slovak National Archive. „Architektonická súťaž na univerzitné mesto v Bratislave“, box 1 - 3
6. for more information about the architects and first complex restoration search for: Dušan Martinček. *Zápas o Bratislavský hrad* (Bratislava, MSPSaOP, 1988)
7. Jana Gregorová. „Bratislavský hrad – peripetie obnovy“ *Projekt 4/5* (2011): 19 - 25
8. Kvasnicová. *Professor Alfred Piffel: zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie*, 96 - 108
9. Andrej Fiala, Jana Šulcová a Peter Krútky. *Bratislavský hrad* (Bratislava, Alfa – press, 1995), 117 – 119
10. Kvasnicová. *Professor Alfred Piffel: zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie*, 96 - 108
11. Slovak National Archive. „Dušan Martinček – akademický architekt“, box 5

12. *„Dear comrade president od ČSR! Gladly accept as a sign of our thans for your enormous work, executed for Slovakia this proof of our common care about historical monuments, design proposal of a Bratislava castle, that is progressively under construction. We are writing new history, in which will be written for the future, that it was the period of your presidency, when 144 years after the fire of the Bratislava castle, was started with it's rescue. Please, accept this little favor of ours with such love, such with we are sending to you. In Bratislava, 1.12.1955, Janko Alexy, Šáry Alexy, Alfréd Piffel*
Alfréd Piffel, Zápas o Bratislavský hrad, „A letter to the president of ČSR Antonín Zápotocký /from the estate of a.piffel/“, (Bratislava, Marenčin PT, 2007), 82-83
13. Fiala, Šulcová, Krútky. Bratislavský hrad , 115
14. Štefan Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, (Bratislava, Perfekt, 2014), 80 - 102
15. Slovak National Archive. „Dušan Martinček – akademický architekt“, box 4
16. Dušan Martinček. Zápas o Bratislavský hrad (Bratislava, MSPSaOP, 1988), 34
17. Ján Lichner. „Náčrt stavebných dejín Bratislavského hradu“ in Bratislavský hrad (Bratislava, Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1960), 47 - 138
18. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
19. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
20. Bakoš, Intelektuál a pamiatka, 173 – 182
21. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
22. Fiala, Šulcová, Krútky. Bratislavský hrad , 122
23. Matúš Dulla. Ferdinand Milučky: architekt. „Hrad a hradný areál, Bratislava“ (Bratislava, SAS, 1998), 64
24. disappearance of an industrial architecture in Bratislava, „Forgotten moments.“ last modified April 12, 2015
https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=131&v=KRKR8hB_VSM
25. Bakoš, Intelektuál a pamiatka, 182
25. Dušan Buran. „Schlossdebatte auf Slowakisch.“ In Störkuhl, Beate (Hg.): Architekturgeschichte und kulturleses Erbe - Aspekte der Baudenkmalpflege in Ostmitteleuropa, (Frankfurt a.M. u.a.2006) 165-181
26. Peter Bouda and Ivan Masár. „Obnova bývalej tereziínskej budovy na západnej terase Bratislavského hradu“ in Architektonická tvorba v historickom prostredí, (Bratislava, FA STU BA, 2001), 63 - 68
27. here is meant an application of Venice charter, „International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites (the Venice charter 1964).“ last modified April 12, 2015
http://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf
28. Bouda and Masár. Architektonická tvorba v historickom prostredí, 63 – 68
29. briefly described current methodology of restoration of Bratislava castle by architect Ivan Masár and methodologist of monuments office Ivan Staník: „palace is to be restored to the style from the period of it's last developmental stage (Teresian redevelopment), while presenting all of the preserved values from the older periods, simultaneously was necessary to retain trail of a valuable inputs from previous reconstructions. From the point of methodology could be divided into three groups:
- Spaces, that were restored into the style of it's last developmental stage from the second half of 18th century (facades, staircase, 1st and 2nd floor, cour d'honneur)
 - Historical spaces, that had to be restored and presented (possibly their preserved fragments) and put the finishing touches with the language of contemporary architecture (the Renaissance entrance, basements, Knights' hall, Crown tower, basements below the court)
 - New forms (northern staircase and Music hall)
 - Spaces, that were retained from the previous restorations (Music hall, Treasury and partialy Knights' hall
- Ivan Masár, Ivan Staník, „covering text to the exhibition Restoration of castles in the central – european space“ (Bratislava , FA STU, 2015)
30. Bakoš, Intelektuál a pamiatka, 180
31. Slovak National Archive. „Dušan Martinček – akademický architekt“, box 4
32. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
33. Slovak National Archive. „Dušan Martinček – akademický architekt“, box 4
34. *„it would not be right to guess, that after finishing the reconstructional works will castle look like at the times of Maria Theresa. It would not be right from the view of contemporary methods of monuments' restoration, nor from the practical point of view, in those times castle executed funcion of a representational lordly residence, available only to a small amount of people, nowadays it should serve to a broad public as a cultural center for Slovak people“*
Ján Lichner. „Náčrt stavebných dejín Bratislavského hradu“ in Bratislavský hrad (Bratislava, Slovenské vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1960), 134
35. Bakoš, Intelektuál a pamiatka, 181
36. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
37. Ivan Masár. „Bratislavský hrad a jeho architektonické premeny“ Projekt 4/5 (2011): 40 - 51
38. Description of methodology in: Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102

39. Jana Gregorová, „Preferencia hodnotových systémov v jednotlivých kultúrnych kontextoch Európy“ in Prezentácia architektonického dedičstva II., ed. et al Jana Gregorová and Pavel Gregor, (Bratislava, Perfekt, 2008) 37 - 39
40. Pavel Janák. Obrys doby, ed. et al Vendula Hnídková (Prague, Arbor Vitae, 2009), 238
41. Holčík. Bratislavský hrad, 80 - 102
42. Kvasnicová. Professor Alfred Piffl: zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej konferencie, 96 - 108
43. Ján Bakoš, „Bitky o pamiatky“ in Intelektuál a pamiatka (Bratislava: Kalligram, 2004), 226.