



MOGUĆI STANDARDI MODERNE

MOGUĆI STANDARDI MODERNE  
GALERIJA MODULOR  
15.10.2014.



*Gdje je moja kuća?*

MOGUĆI STANDARDI MODERNE  
GALERIJA MODULOR  
15.10.2014.



Izdavač: Centar za kulturu Trešnjevka,  
Park Stara Trešnjevka 1, Zagreb  
Za izdavača: Ljiljana Perišić  
Voditeljica galerije: Saša Martinović Kunović  
Autorica koncepcije i teksta: Lijana Domić ©  
Fotografije: Rudolf Bladt ©  
Postav izložbe: Saša Martinović Kunović, Lijana Domić  
Grafički uredila i ilustrirala: Dora Mihaljević  
Oblikovanje kataloga: DiPro, Zagreb  
Tisak: Systema frontis  
U Zagrebu, listopad 2014.

Radno vrijeme: ponedjeljak - petak od 10 do 20 h  
subotom, nedjeljom i praznikom Galerija Modulor nije otvorena

Web: [www.cekate.hr](http://www.cekate.hr)  
Email: [modulor@cekate.hr](mailto:modulor@cekate.hr)

Izložba je organizirana uz potporu Gradskog ureda za kulturu Grada Zagreba i  
Ministarstva kulture Republike Hrvatske



MOGUĆI STANDARDI MODERNE



**Lilijana Domić****MOGUĆI STANDARDI MODERNE****Posveta**

Publicističko, medijsko promišljanje suvremene arhitekture u Hrvatskoj započeo je Antun Gustav Matoš raščlanjujući Kovačićev čuveni projekt za regulaciju Kaptola. Tako je 1908. godine odredio parametre za suvremenu kritiku arhitekture. (A. G. Matoš, **K izložbi nacrtu za regulaciju Kaptola, Hrvatski graditelj Viktor Kovačić**, Hrvatsko pravo 16.10.1908.) Stoga u Matoševoj jubilarnoj godini (Tovarnik, 13.VI.1873. – Zagreb, 1.III.1914.) izložbu **Mogućí standardi moderne** posvećujem A. G. Matošu... Toliko o posveti.

**Dvije zvijezde**

U nezaobilaznim tekstovima Tomislava Premerla (Tragovi moderne u poslijeratnoj arhitekturi Hrvatske, Arhitektura, 1986; Između moderne i avangarde, Peristil, 1988) iščitavamo parametre o mogućim standardima moderne koje valja zaštititi. Na primjeru Grada Zagreba<sup>1</sup> arhitektura moderne, novi standardi, preobrazili su tridesetih godina 20-og stoljeća periferiju i ruralnu suburbiju grada. Takvi su itinerari prepoznatljiviji i na području Trešnjevke gdje se iz Savske od nekadašnjeg Zagrebačkog Zbora, odvajaju ceste Kranjčevićeva i Tratinska s produžetkom Trešnjevački plac, potom Ozaljska... U fokusu ove izložbe, na primjeru *pars pro toto*, je ono što svjedoči moguće standarde, ono što nestaje u neprepoznavanju mogućega stila, Zapravo, u fokusu izložbe su vrata, (*pars pro toto*) četiri para vrata: ulazna vrata, u zgradu; vjetrobran, potom središnja, opet dvostruka vrata na katu koja iz sobe u sobu stana otvaraju mogućnosti

**Lilijana Domić****THE POTENTIAL STANDARDS OF THE CROATIAN MODERN ARCHITECTURE****Inscription**

The publicistic, media deliberation on the modern architecture in Croatia has been started by Antun Gustav Matoš, by means of decomposing the famous project of Viktor Kovačić on the regulation of the Zagreb Kaptol. Therefore, in 1908 he determined the parameters of the modern architecture criticism. (A. G. Matoš: **K izložbi nacrtu za regulaciju Kaptola (eng. Towards the Exhibition of the Regulation Plan for the Zagreb Kaptol)** by a Croatian architect **Viktor Kovačić**, Hrvatsko pravo, October 16th, 1908). Therefore, in the year of the anniversary of A.G. Matoš (born in Tovarnik, on June 13th, 1873 – died in Zagreb on the 1st of March, 1914) I dedicate the exhibition entitled **The potential Standards of the Modern Architecture** to A. G. Matoš... So much for the inscription.

**The two stars**

In the indispensable works of Tomislav Premerl (*Tragovi moderne u poslijeratnoj arhitekturi Hrvatske (eng. The Traces of the Modern Architecture in the Post-War Architecture in Croatia, Arhitektura, 1986; Između moderne i avangarde, (eng. Between Modernism and Avant-Garde), Peristil, 1988*) we can read about the parameters on the potential *Modernism standards* which need to be protected. We can see this on the example of the Town of Zagreb<sup>1</sup> The Modernist architecture and new standards have changed the look of the rural suburbs of the Town **in the 1930s**. Such itineraries are recognizable in the area of Trešnjevka (a Zagreb neighbourhood) as well, where the Street of S.S. Kranjčević and Tratinska Street split extending to the Trešnjevka Square, then Ozaljska Street and so on. The focal point of the exhibition, which can be seen from the example of „*pars pro toto*“ (eng. *a part (taken) for a whole*), is what reflects the potential standards, what disappears in the lack of recognition of the poten-



dobroga stanovanja; napokon, otvaramo ista takva, dvostruka vrata balkona s pogledom na... Kakav to krajolik, devastirani vrt, bespravno podignute šupe, štakorašnice. Iz prostora gdje u tlocrtu stana, rasporedu prostorija, u detaljima metalne ograde balkona oblikovane u širokom horizontalnim trakama, potom u drvenini... nalazimo funkcionalni i estetski smisao moderne. U naglašenim horizontalama spomenutih detalja, u pravokutnicima, prepoznajemo *art-deco* stil reduciran do moderne, do standarda. Izlazeći na takav balkon kroz takva dvostruka vrata, (i)li kroz ulazna vrata zgrade, vidimo kaos, zapravo, čitavo jedno stoljeće diskontinuiteta. Vidimo nekad ruralni krajolik i suburbiju, koja je mijenjajući se, mogući koncept „vrtinoga grada“ zamijenila koncepcijom „ničije zemlje“. Periferija koja se s **modernom tridesetih godina 20. stoljeća** našla u centru gtađevinskih poticaja, danas centar grada, nerijetko svjedoči nered unutar kojega još uvijek razaznajemo urbane itinerare, vrijednu arhitekturu, uočavamo moguće standarde; žalimo za njima; jer su na tragu tradicije moderne mogli odrediti moguću tipizaciju nerijetko ozloglašene estetike recentne, „urbane vile“. Spomenuta vrata s karakterističnim detaljima, u profilaciji, s umetnutim brušenim staklima simbolički kazano, ne vode nikamo, a nekad su vodila u novi grad, otkrivala su urbani okoliš određen novom estetikom, koja se ovdje, na Trešnji, u Zagrebu nije razmetala... Stilska figura „o vratima koja ne vode nikamo“ tek želi naglasiti da se dobra, čvrsta i elegantna vrata, izrađena u standardu moderne često, bez razloga, zamjenjuju jeftinijim, plastičnim vratima ili onim zastrašujućima u metalu koja asociraju na vrata bunkera. Nekad su se vlasnici natjecali naručujući svojevrstne moderne portale od kvalitetnoga drva s umetnutim transparentnim detaljima u brušenome staklu, sa zvjezdolikim blistavim simetrično postavljenim uresima. Narudžbe su podr-

tial style. Actually, the focal point of the exhibition is the door („*pars pro toto*“), that is the four pairs of doors, such as: the front door, the entrance door into the building; a windshield, then the central door, again a pair of doors on the upper floor, which create a range of opportunities for a good housing, going from one room into another one; at last, we open the same kind of door, i.e., another pair of doors to the balcony with a view of...a landscape of a devastated garden, unlawfully constructed sheds, now rat holes. From that area in the floor plan, room layout, openings, doors and windows, in the details of the metal railing formed of wide horizontal strips of metal, (pertaining to the aesthetics of Art Deco, reduced to the aesthetics of Modernism), we step out into a *chaos* which has been miraculously materialised. By stepping out onto such a balcony through such double door, we can see an entire century of discontinuity. We can see a once-rural landscape, the suburbs, which have changed over time, thus turning the concept of the „garden town“ into „no man’s land“. The outskirts which have found themselves at the centre of the construction incentives with the arrival of the **International Style of the Modern Architecture in the 1930s**, which are located today at the centre of the Town, often witness a disorder within which we can still discern urban itineraries, a valuable architecture; we discern the potential standards; regret them because in line with the Modernist tradition they could have determined the potential typing of an often notorious aesthetics of the recent „urban villa“. The above-mentioned doors, with the characteristic details made in the cut glass symbolically do not lead anywhere. Formerly, depending on its purpose, those doors used to lead towards the landscape determined by the new aesthetics, which was not showing off here in the neighbourhood of Trešnja or in Zagreb in general, but was in conformity with the original landscape. Using the figure of speech, such as the one about the doors that lead nowhere, we simply want to emphasise that good, solid and elegant doors, made according to the standards of the Modern Architecture, often without any visible reason, are replaced by cheap, plastic doors or even the horrifying ones made of metal, which remind of a bunker’s door. Formerly, the owners used to compe-





žavale standard dok danas neispravnim izmjenama, zatvaraju mogućnosti komunikacije... Vidljivo je to *in situ*, u Kranjčevićevoj i u Ozaljskoj ulici. Nadalje, prebrojila sam slijedeći Hinka Bauera<sup>2</sup> velikana zagrebačke moderne arhitekture, sve zvijezde u brušenoj staklu koje nestaju, ali i trešnje, orahe, višnje, samonikle jasene, smokve, bazgu, jabuke... tražeći urbanitet mogućega „vrtinoga grada“ koji se oslanjao na tradiciju malih vrtova (bili su to proizvođači **špajz cimera** naših baka). Doduše, Grad Zagreb je dao inicijativu za sadnju nekoliko vrsta ukrasnih trešanja u Parku Stara Trešnja, ali, samo je jedna jestiva trešnja privatno posađena u vrtu Ozaljska 43. Opet simboličko mjesto.

Devastirane fasade, uništeni ulazi, zatvaranje balkona, problematične nadogradnje na krovu, potom, *air condition* kutije, kao novo svjedočanstvo materijalnoga statusa „srednjega sloja“ koje narušavaju fasade a mogle su biti instalirane na bočnoj ili dvorišnoj strani, sve to uništava sliku urbaniteta grada, poništava moguće standarde moderne utemeljene u tridesetim godinama 20. stoljeća. Spomenuto simbolično mjesto devastacije, zvijezde u brušenom staklu ulaznih vrata koje nestaju, orasi i jaseni koji nestaju bez konzultacije sa stručnjacima u nadležnim službama Grada, čak bez znanja vlasnika ili suvlasnika vrtova. S njima nestaje priča o dobrom susjedstvu... Konceptija vrtinoga grada najkonzekventnije provedena u takozvanom Naselju Prve hrvatske štedionice mogla bi poslužiti kao primjer, jer vrtovi iza obiteljskih kuća u glavnoj ulici, primjerice Ozaljskoj, svjedoče više od planiranoga, svjedoče susret, ljubav ruralnoga predgrađa i vrtinoga grada. Gdje je nestala ljubav? Otkako se nepovlasno ruši ekološki vrijedno drveće, nestaju staništa ptica. Umukli su kosići, zaštitni znak europskih gradskih gajeva.

te among themselves, ordering various modern portals made of high quality wood, with transparent details inserted into the cut glass, and dazzling star-shaped symmetrically aligned adornments. The orders were in compliance with the standards, and today, by means of unlawful modifications, they have been preventing the possibility of communication... This can be seen *in situ* (eng. *on site*) in The Street of S. S. Kranjčević and Ozaljska. Furthermore, following Hinka Bauer<sup>2</sup> a distinguished representative of the modern Zagreb architecture, I have counted all the stars made in the cut glass which have been disappearing, as well as the cherry trees, walnuts, sour cherry trees, wild ash trees, fig trees, elderberry plants, apple trees... looking for the urbanity of the potential „garden town“ which used to rely on the tradition of small gardens. (These were the extensions of our grandmothers' **pantries**). The Town of Zagreb, however, has launched the initiative for the planting of several different species of ornamental cherry trees at the Stara Trešnja (eng. *The old Cherry*) Park, but there is only one edible cherry planted upon a private property in the garden of Ozaljska Street, number 43. This is another symbolic location.

Ruined facades, devastated entrances, the closing of balconies, questionable building extensions on the roof, then *box air conditioners*, as a new testimony of the financial state of the so-called „middle class“, which are ruining the facades, and which could have been installed onto a lateral wall or on the yard side of the building; it has all been ruining the image of the Town's urbanity, and invalidating the potential standards established in the 1930s. The previously mentioned symbolic place of devastation, the engraved glass stars on the front door which have been disappearing, walnuts and ash trees disappearing without having consulted the experts working at the competent Municipal institutions, even without the consent of the owner or the co-owner of the gardens. The story of a good neighbourhood disappears with them... The concept of the garden town, the most consistently carried out in the so-called neighbourhood of Prva hrvatska štedionica (eng. *The First Croatian Savings Bank*) could be used as an example, because the gar-





## Povijesni i urbani kontekst

„Arhitektura je **krajolik**. Tehnički krajolik manje ili više dobro integrirana u prirodni krajolik; i jedan i drugi percipiramo nesvjesno. Upravo ta nesvjesna recepcija arhitekture trajno određuje naš smisao za lijepo. Valter Benjamin istražujući utjecaj na publiku (tada, početkom 20 stoljeća) novog medija filma govori o nesvjesnoj recepciji. Zapravo, uspoređuje nesvjesnu recepciju filma s onom arhitekture. Uvijek prisutnu arhitekturu i **pokretnu sliku** stukturiranu u prizor, u priču, primamo otvorenih senzora htjeli mi to ili ne. Scenografija i priča čine život. Tako je Benjamin proniknuo u bit medijskih moći 20. stoljeća i novoga milenija. Inače nas takvo, **htjeli-ne htjeli pamćenje** odvodi dalje pa u rječniku suvremenih fraza nalazimo jednu prečesto korištenu sintagmu – kolektivno pamćenje. No, češće možemo govoriti o kolektivnom zaboravu koji između ostaloga prati i takozvanu **arhitekturu moderne između dva rata** u Zagrebu. Čak je i uži krug stručnjaka i znalaca, onih koji svjesno percipiraju, zatvarao oči, odnosno nisu imali mogućnosti utjecati na mehanizme svjesnoga pamćenja izgradnje. Stoga je svaki broj časopisa **Čovjek i prostor, Arhitekture, Orisa**, svaka knjiga o arhitekturi **moderne** dragocjena jer je odgađala, odgađa zaborav na ono nešto što Tomislav Premerl mudro naziva *novom tradicijom*<sup>3</sup>. Već spomenute Premerlove tekstove *Tragovi moderne u poslijeratnoj arhitekturi Hrvatske*, potom, *Između moderne i avangarde*, Peristil, 1988. pamtimo kao svjetionike, kao orijentire u pronalaženju pamćenja i kontinuiteta moderne.<sup>4</sup> Na tom tragu možemo govoriti o *standardima moderne* koje valja zaštititi prije nego se fasade i interijeri ne devastiraju, od zatvaranja balkona plastičnim konstrukcijama, do drugih nepovlasnih pregradnji. Nesvjesna recepcija otužnog, neuređenog krajolika, poglavito onog u Tratinjskoj i Ozaljskoj, u

dens behind the family houses in the main street, such as Ozaljska, witness more than it had been expected; they witness the encounter, that is, the love between the rural outskirts and the garden town. Where did the love go? Since the ecologically valuable trees have been torn down unlawfully, bird habitats are disappearing. Little blackbirds, which are the trademark of the European city groves have stopped singing.

## The historical and urban context

„The architecture is **landscape**. The technical landscape integrated more or less into the natural landscape; we perceive both of them unconsciously. The very unconscious reception of architecture permanently determines our sense of beauty. Examining the influence of film as a new medium on the audience (at that time, at the beginning of the 20th century), Valter Benjamin talks about the unconscious reception. In fact, he compares the unconscious reception of the film to the one of the architecture. The always present architecture and **the motion picture** structured into a scene, a story, we receive through open sensors, whether we like it or not, because the scenery and the story constitute life. Thus, Benjamin has deciphered the essence of the power of the media of the 20th century and the new millennium. Usually, such a **like-it-or-not memory** takes us further, so in the Dictionary of modern phrases we find a very common phrase, such as – the collective memory. However, you can often hear someone talk about the collective oblivion, which, among other things, has been accompanying the so-called **Modern architecture between the two wars** in Zagreb. Even a closer circle of experts and connoisseurs, the ones perceiving things at the conscious level, used to close their eyes, since they could not influence the mechanisms of the development of conscious memory. Therefore, all the issues of the architectural magazines such as **Čovjek i prostor (eng. The Man and the Space), Arhitekture (eng. The Architecture), and Oris**, all the books on the **Croatian Modern Architecture** are precious, because they used to postpone and are still postponing the oblivion of something that





užem centru grada, pretvorila je moguće standarde zagrebačke arhitekture **moderne** u ruine, obore, poligone za pregradnju.

### Antologijski primjeri

Kao da nije bilo onoga za Stoljeće važnog prijeloma na tragu konstruktivizma i funkcionalizma o kojem u nas govore granični primjeri zagrebačkih zdanja velikana Rudolfa Lubinskog i Viktora Kovačića. Primjerice, stara Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica u kasno-secesijskom stilu (1913), u rastvaranju fasada upućuje na **protomodernu**, na čistoću konstruktivizma kojeg je Lubinski dosegnuo u stambeno-poslovnoj zgradi u Gajevoj 5. (1935). Uzmemo li ova dva zdanja kao simboličke markacije, između njihovih nastanaka, gradnji, počinje se u hrvatskoj arhitekturi realizirati i granati **moderna**. A mogli smo složiti katalog uzoraka konstruktivizma i funkcionalizma, za pamćenje, učenje, izgradnju. Od **moderne** do **modernizma**, od Kovačića do Ostrogovića (ali nismo.) Zagreb je tada, na mapi povijesti arhitekture, europski centar. Egon Steimann, Ortopedska klinika na Šalati, 1928.; Ernest Weissmann, međunarodnom natjecanju nagrađeni projekt Židovske bolnice u Zagrebu, 1931.; Ivan Zemljak, osnovna škola na Jordanovcu, 1930.; Stjepan Planić, obiteljska kuća kruznoga tlocrta na Gornjem Prekrižju, 1935.; Bernard Lafaille, Le Corbusieov suradnik, Francuski paviljon s inovativnom nosivom konstrukcijom takozvanom obrnutom kupolom, koja je postavila standarde u građevinarstvu. 1936. Napokon je obnovljen 2014. - a svojedobno je bilo govora i o rušenju.<sup>5</sup> Sve su to estetski uzorci. No još postoje zaboravljeni primjeri kad otkrivamo, podcrtano u navodnicima, „*manje vrijednu arhitekturu*“, onu „bez potpisa arhitekta“ ali s potpisima iz biroa istih arhite-

Tomislav Premerl wisely calls *the new tradition*.<sup>3</sup> The previously mentioned texts of Tomislav Premerl - *Tragovi moderne u poslijeratnoj arhitekturi Hrvatske* (eng. *The Traces of Modern Architecture in the Post-War Architecture in Croatia*, then, *Između moderne i avangarde* (eng. *Between Modernism and Avant-Garde*), Peristil, 1988, we remember as being the lighthouses, the landmarks in looking for the memory and the continuity of the Croatian Modern Architecture. In line with this, we can discuss about *the Modernism standards* which are to be protected before the facades and the interiors become completely devastated by the closing of the balconies using the plastic architectural structures or some other unlawful reconstructions. The unconscious reception of the sad, disordered landscape, especially the one in Tratinska and Ozaljska Streets, in the centre of the Town, has turned the potential standards of the Zagreb **Modern** Architecture into ruins, corrals, reconstruction polygons.

### Anthology examples

As though there was no break which was vital for the Century, based on the constructivism and functionalism which are reflected in Croatia only in the marginal examples of the edifices in Zagreb, such as the ones designed by the masters Rudolf Lubinski and Viktor Kovačić. For instance, the old National and University Library, built in the late Secession style (1913), the opening of facades which resembles *the Protomodernism*, the purity of constructivism which was reached by Lubinski in designing the residential and business building in Gajeva Street number 5 (1935). If we consider these two buildings as symbolic marks, in between their building processes, *the Modern architecture* starts developing and branching out in Croatia. And we could have compiled a catalogue of constructivism and functionalism samples which we could have used with the purpose of remembering, learning and developing, from the **Modern Architecture** to **Modernism**, from Kovačić to Ostrogović (but we have failed to do that). Zagreb is located on the architectural history map as a central European town. Egon Steimann, the Orthopedic Clinic in Šalata, 1928; Ernest Weissmann,





kata, gdje se radilo na standardu, standardiziranju što vlasnici kuća, danas ne prepoznaju.

Rat koji uvijek ističemo kao opravdanje za zaborav, (i diskontinuitetom se može manipulirati), dakle drugi svjetski rat prekida nit promišljanja onoga što se zbivalo u Europi, u Zagrebu. Pokidale su se veze o kojima svjedoče ne samo utjecaji na hrvatsku arhitekturu, primjerice, utjecaj Adolfa Loosa kod kojeg su se školovali Zlatko Neumann i Vlado Potočnjak. Nastao je vakuum, kao da **knjiga Europa** danas Miroslava Krleže (1935.) nije napisana, gdje među tekstovima nalazimo i onaj **U spomen Adolfu Loosu**, kao da nije bilo **Zagrebačke škole** stožernoga mjesta *moderne* (1925.-36.) i angažmana Drage Iblera u grupi **Zemlja**. Kao da nije bilo Marijana Haberlea i Hinka Bauera arhitekata Zagrebačkoga zbora, tvoraca standarda.<sup>6</sup> To su bila vremena kad su o arhitekturi pisali književnici, filozofi, pravnici. Postojala je sinergija, na razini etike i estetike.

Stoga ću završiti citatom: "Često se u pregledima manifesta hrvatske arhitektonske moderne navode i kratki, ali značajni tekstovi Antuna Gustava Matoša i Miroslava Krleže. Krleža je 1934. pisao o Loosu, njegovom značaju i njegovim idejama, ocrtavajući uvjete u Beču pod kojima se Loos probijao, bez sumnje pritom misleći i na situaciju u Zagrebu. Osim što su ti tekstovi bogati biografskim podacima iz pojedinih životnih razdoblja Viktora Kovačića i Drage Iblera, oni otkrivaju intelektualnu prisnost između književnika i arhitekata moderne. Dapače, i Matoš i Krleža se u svojim tekstovima javljaju kao svojevrsni zagovaratelji nove arhitekture, ali i kritičari tekovina 19. stoljeća ili, kako ih Krleža naziva, *helmerfelnerijanskog hermanboleskog austromadžarskog provincijalnog graditeljstva*. Što je povezaloo hrvatske arhitekate moderne i knji-

the project of the Jewish Hospital in Zagreb, awarded at the International competition, 1931; Ivan Zemljak, the elementary school in Jordanovac, 1930; Stjepan Planić, the circular floor plan family house in Gornje Prekrižje, 1935; Bernard Lafaille, a collaborator of Le Corbusier, the French pavillion with the innovative bearing structure, the so-called inverted dome which has set the standards in civil engineering; reconstructed at last from 1936 to 1937, and formerly there used to be some talk about its demolition.<sup>4</sup> These are all the samples of aesthetics, the existing examples but the ones we forget when dealing with the „architecture of minor importance“, the one „with no signature“, without the personal signature, but having the signature of the Board of Architects and their associates, where they used to work on the standards and standardization.

The war that we like to take as a justification for forgetting about it (it is possible to manipulate the discontinuity as well), hence the Second World War breaks the thread of deliberation on what was hapenning in Europe and in Zagreb. The connections broke, the ones about which witness not only the influences on the Croatian architecture, such as the influence of Adolf Loos who was educated by Zlatko Neumann and Vlado Potočnjak. A vacuum appeared, as though the book **Europa danas** (eng. *Europe Today*) written by Miroslav Krleža (1935) has not been written at all, where among the other texts we also find the one dedicated to Adolf Loos (**U spomen Adolfu Loosu**), as though **the School of Zagreb**, the central place of *the Croatian Modern Architecture* (1925-36) and the engagement of Drago Ibler in the group **Zemlja** (eng. **The Earth**) have never existed. As though there was no Marijan Haberle and Hinko Bauer, the architects of the Zagreb Assembly of Architects, and the creators of the standards<sup>5</sup>... However, those were the times when writers and philosophers used to write on the architecture; there was a synergy at the level of both the ethics and aesthetics."

Therefore, I shall end with a quote: "In reviews of the manifesto of Croatian Modern Architecture often short but relevant texts written by Antun Gustav Matoš and



ževnike, primjerice, Matoša i Krležu? U prvom planu, to je potreba, u nekim slučajevima i kompleks, koji i Matoš i Krleža nose u sebi, boreći se s mišlju je li njihov Zagreb selo ili grad; gradić ili velegrad. To ih pitanje proganja, a u njima stvara interes prema urbanitetu i samom gradu, koji se i u Matoševo i u Krležino vrijeme mijenja, izgrađuje.<sup>7</sup> Nastavimo, što je to što danas kida prisnost između stanara i arhitekture, Grada **moderne arhitekture** i metropole; diskontinuiteti, ignorancija, neznanje, neimaština... produžena pitanja za vikendom produženi boravak u Gradu, u stanu, vrtu, parku, crkvi, kavani...

Lilijana Domić

Miroslav Krleža are quoted. Krleža wrote about Loos in 1934, his significance and his ideas, outlining the conditions in Vienna in which Loos climbed the ladder, no doubt, thinking at the same time of the situation in Zagreb. These texts, besides being rich with biographical details of certain periods in the lives of Viktor Kovačić and Drago Ibler, they reveal intellectual rapport between the writers and architects of the Modern Architecture. Indeed, both Matoš and Krleža speak out in their texts as advocates, so to speak, of the new architecture, but also as critics of the 19th century heritage or, as Krleža calls it *the Helmerfellnerian Hermanboleskian Austro-Hungarian provincial civil engineering*. What did connect together the Croatian modern architects and writers such as, for example, Matoš and Krleža? First and foremost, it is the need, in some cases even a complex one, which both Matoš and Krleža have, fighting with the thought if their Zagreb is a village or a town; a small city or a metropolis. This question haunts them, and within them creates the interest for urbanity and the city itself, which is changing and growing, both in the time of Matoš and Krleža.<sup>6</sup> Let us continue along this line. What is it today that breaks up the bond between the residents and the architecture, a city of modern architecture and a metropolis; discontinuities, ignorance, lack of knowledge, poverty... elaborate questions for an extended weekend in the Town, apartment, garden, park, church, coffee shop...

Lilijana Domić

<sup>1</sup> Tomislav Premerl, "Zagreb grad moderne arhitekture", Durieux, Zagreb, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Hinko Bauer, "Zagrebačke šetnje", Dora Krupićeva, Zagreb, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Tomislav Premerl, Hrvatska arhitektura između dva rata ili nova tradicija, Matica Hrvatska, 1988.

<sup>4</sup> Lilijana Domić U rotondi - Francuski Paviljon u Zagrebu, Antibarbarus, u pripremi, Zagreb, 2000 – 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Lilijana Domić, "U sjeni Francuskog paviljona", Galerija SC, 1992.

<sup>6</sup> Lilijana Domić, "Francuski paviljon", Galerija Modulor, 2005.

<sup>7</sup> Nikolina Šimetin Šegvić, "Kulturni, socijalni i intelektualni aspekti zagrebačke arhitekture moderne: ozdravljenje budućnosti", Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, 2012.

<sup>1</sup> Tomislav Premerl, "Zagreb grad moderne arhitekture", Durieux, Zagreb, 2002.

<sup>2</sup> Hinko Bauer, "Zagrebačke šetnje", Dora Krupićeva, Zagreb, 2012

<sup>3</sup> Tomislav Premerl, **Hrvatska arhitektura između dva rata ili nova tradicija**, Matica Hrvatska, 1988.

<sup>4</sup> Lilijana Domić, "U sjeni Francuskog paviljona", Galerija SC, 1992.

<sup>5</sup> Lilijana Domić, "Francuski paviljon", Galerija Modulor, 2005.

<sup>6</sup> Nikolina Šimetin Šegvić, "Kulturni, socijalni i intelektualni aspekti zagrebačke arhitekture moderne: ozdravljenje budućnosti", Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, 2012.



