

Translation and Analysis of Chosen Chapters from Kako čitati grad by Radmila Matejčić

Petrone, Vedran

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2021

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Rijeci, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:450389>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-27**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DIVISION OF TRANSLATOLOGY

**TRANSLATION AND ANALYSIS OF CHOSEN CHAPTERS FROM
“KAKO ČITATI GRAD” BY RADMILA MATEJČIĆ**

Vedran Petrone

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the M.A. in Division of Translatology

Supervisor:

doc. dr. sc. Anita Memišević

Rijeka, 2021

Abstract

This thesis will cover the translation and analysis of the two chapters “Izvan zidina, uz obalu” (Outside the walls, along the coast...) and “Sjaj pozornica” (Stage lights). In both texts the author talks about the history and architecture of Rijeka and its surroundings, while also including some commentary and facts about social the social life of the time. The analysis covers style, syntax and vocabulary. The section on vocabulary is further divided into subcategories, depending on the type of vocabulary. The thesis ends with a conclusion summarizing the translations, analyses and the process of translating as a whole.

Keywords: analysis, architecture, Croatian language, English language, history, translation

Contents

1 Introduction	1
2 Translations	6
Outside the walls, along the coast	6
The new facades of Rijeka	6
3 Analysis	69
3.1 Style.....	71
3.2 Syntax.....	73
3.3 Vocabulary	76
3.3.1 False friends	76
3.3.2 Architectural terminology	82
3.3.3 Miscellaneous terms	89
4 Conclusion.....	98
5 Appendices	99
Izvan zidina, uz obalu.....	99
Nova riječka pročelja.....	99
6 Bibliography.....	160

1 Introduction

This thesis covers the translation and analysis of the fifth and sixth chapters of the book “Kako čitati grad” (“How to read a city”) by Radmila Matejčić. In the book “Kako čitati grad” the author writes about the history of the city of Rijeka, shifting the central focus to the architecture of the city, whilst still covering general historic facts, including the social relations of the influential people of city from various time periods and still giving some personal commentary and thoughts on the aforementioned facts and the current state of the city. All of the above makes the book in question an interesting subject of analysis, but before delving into it, some fundamentals need to be addressed.

First off, a short preface about the author of the book, Radmila Matejčić, would be in place. Radmila Matejčić, a Croatian archaeologist and art historian, was born in Banja Luka, BiH on 7th October 1922 and died in Rijeka on 20th August 1990. She studied at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb, where she also gained her Ph.D. in 1977. From 1952 until 1980 she worked in The Maritime and Historic Museum in Rijeka, and from 1979 as a professor at the Pedagogical College in Rijeka. She conducted archaeological excavations and hydrogeological surveys in Kvarner, studied and evaluated the baroque arts in Istria and Croatia, and the cultural history, construction and spatial development of Rijeka, as well as modern art phenomena in general. She published a large number of scientific and professional papers, such as the following book: Baroque in Croatia, 1982; Crikvenica - area of the municipality, 1987; How to Read the City: Yesterday, today, 1988; The Church of Our Lady of Trsat and the Franciscan monastery, 1991, and she also wrote art reviews and prefaces to catalogues.¹

A proper beginning would be with a quote containing a question and answer to the question asked by the renowned professor of translation Peter Newmark “*What is translation? Often, though not by any means always, it is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text.*”² The quote briefly summarizes the job

¹Retrieved from Matejčić, Radmila. *Hrvatska enciklopedija, mrežno izdanje*. Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, 2021. Pristupljeno 4. 9. 2021. <<http://www.enciklopedija.hr/Natuknica.aspx?ID=39388>> Accessed September 2021, translated by V. Petrone

²Retrieved from Newmark, Peter. *A textbook of translation*. Vol. 66. New York: Prentice hall, 1988., p. 5 Accessed September 2021

of a translator, which is the transmission of the speaker's message, communicated in the source language, into the target language. It may seem like a simple and straight up task, but there is a lot more to it than meets the eye. The first thing one should ask himself when thinking about the translation process is – how does the translator even understand the source text, if it covers something more than just some common everyday topics, like the news, for example? How does a translator understand medical, or in this case, architectural and historic, texts to such a degree, that he can convey their meaning in a completely different language? The answer to that question is research. The first thing a translator does after he receives a new project is reading. Newmark mentions this also in the following statement “*You begin the job by reading the original for two purposes: first, to understand what it is about; second, to analyse it from a 'translator's' point of view, which is not the same as a linguist's or a literary critic's. You have to determine its intention and the way it is written for the purpose of selecting a suitable translation method and identifying particular and recurrent problems.*”³ The translator has to read the text a number of times, so as to assure himself that he truly is familiar with it and that no questions regarding it are left unanswered. Newmark also stated “Understanding the text requires both general and close reading. General reading to get the gist; here you may have to read encyclopaedias, textbooks, or specialist papers to understand the subject and the concepts, always bearing in mind that for the translator the function precedes the description”⁴ and “Close reading is required, in any challenging text, of the words both out of and in context. In principle, everything has to be looked up that does not make good sense in its context.”⁵ After reading, analyzing and establishing what kind of a text the translator is dealing with, he has to start deeper research into the topic of the text, in case he is only vaguely familiar or completely unfamiliar with it.

After reading and analyzing, one can come to the conclusion that the book in question, “*Kako čitati grad*”, belongs to expository text types, as its main purpose is to inform the reader about the history of the city and its architecture, instead of trying to tell a story. It should be noted that it also contains some slight commentary and backhanded comments, such as “*Kako bi od naših građana bilo učtivo kada u njezinom pasageu ne bi obavljali svoju ‘malu nuždu’!*”, where the author complains about the problem of public urinating, which

³ Retrieved from Newmark, Peter. *A textbook of translation*. Vol. 66. New York: Prentice hall, 1988., p. 11
Accessed September 2021

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

was an ongoing problem at the time, but has no direct correlation to the history of the architecture the chapter was covering. The text was also not written in a manner that would suit the common expository text, i.e., it does not simply state the necessary facts, but the author tries to coat them in a sort of story, so as to make it interesting to the reader, to take him on a journey through the city's history, where the author is his personal tour guide.

Keeping all of this in mind, the next step in translating the text is deciding upon which translation method should be used. Usually, when confronted with expository texts, such as scientific texts, medical or law texts, the translator tries to stick as close as possible to the original, almost copying the text word for word, i.e., he is trying to create a direct translation. The reason for such a way of translating is, because the primary focus of those texts is the information it carries, and not how it is being conveyed, those types of texts and translations try to be as transparent as possible. The translator has to keep an eye out for all kinds of specialized vocabulary, because it is the most important part of the text. One might think, though – but what about the aforementioned digressions in writing style? Are those also being accounted for when choosing the method of translation? The answer to that question is both a yes and a no. It is clear that the author tried to give the text a personal touch through the inclusion of those digressions, which is nothing unheard of or unacceptable, but the translator has to keep the readers in mind and the way they might interpret those digressions once they are transferred into the target language. Let us take, for example, the previously mentioned sentence “Kako bi od naših građana bilo učtivo kada u njezinom pasageu ne bi obavljali svoju “malu nuždu”!“ It is a snarky remark about a degrading public behavior and it leaves the translator with two options. The first one is to embrace the way in which it is written, especially the phrase “mala nužda” (a euphemism meaning “to urinate”) and translating it as “going number one” or “leaking”. The other option would be to be as transparent as possible and stick to the style of translating which was already applied throughout the rest of the text, which would result in a translation such as “How polite it would be of our citizens if they would refrain from urinating in the passage!” Keeping in mind that the translation is meant for readers outside not only of Rijeka, but Croatia and its neighbors as a whole, the latter of the two options seemed to be the appropriate one. The readers might not be familiar with what is commonly accepted or expected behavior in a city, region or country, because of which trying to be funny or witty might backfire and leave the reader confuse or misinformed. Luckily, the book does not contain too many such instances of subjective commentary and those which do

occur do not add all too much to the overall quality of the discourse, and, thus, they can be omitted and/or rephrased to better fit the general style of the book.

Another thing, which should be mentioned are the tools used for translating. Traditionally, the first thing that comes to mind when thinking about a translator's tools is a dictionary. Be it monolingual, for more detailed definitions of terminology, or bilingual, for the various equivalents found in the target language, a dictionary and a translator go hand in hand like bread and butter. It is the most basic and necessary tool one can equip himself with, when working this job, but it is far from the only one. As mentioned before, the job of a translator is not only to carry over a word from the source language into the target one, but to also convey the meaning of the message being translated, which is not possible if he himself does not understand the message. Because of that, the translator has to arm himself with knowledge and find ways of acquiring it. Various encyclopedias are always the way to go, given how many specialized volumes, dedicated to specific scientific fields, there are. They always prove themselves to be a great asset to a translator in need. However, they, as is the case with any physical copy of a book, may not always be available to everybody, or might be outdated to a degree. Because of the nature of physical books, they are prone to being outdated, given that once a copy is printed, it cannot be rewritten. Although these cons are most often negligible, a medium that does not suffer from them is the internet. It should be noted that the internet has its own problems, such as an abundance of unreliable sources, but to a clever and witty individual, with a bit of common sense, it can prove itself to be a reliable companion when embarking on the journey which is translation.

The most used web pages for this thesis were the *Hrvatski jezični portal* (The Croatian language portal), which is a vast virtual monolingual dictionary of the Croatian language that provides all kinds of information related to the term one looks up, such as declension, synonyms, phrases it is included in, its etymologic background, etc. It proved time and time again to be a reliable and useful source of information when faced with specialized terminology from the fields of architecture and history.

Another useful tool was the online version of the *Merriem-Webster Dictionary*, which is surprisingly free of charge. Much like the *Hrvatski jezični portal*, the *Merriem-Webster Dictionary* has everything a translator can wish for and more. Unlike the Croatian website, this dictionary would frequently provide example sentences in which the term in question was used, which made the term all the easier to understand and use properly.

Rounding up the biggest helpers used for translation is the *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik* (The big Croatian-English dictionary) by Željko Bujas. Željko Bujas was a renowned Croatian linguist and lexicographer, and his dictionary serves as a testament to his greatness. With its astounding size and countless number of terms, it was a big help in finishing this translation, although there were instances it suffered from the abovementioned problem of being outdated. However, a similar argument can be made about the internet as a whole being tricky to navigate from time to time. But, using online sources in conjunction with Bujas' dictionary proved to be the best way to go about circumventing the shortcomings of both methods and creating the best translation possible.

It should also be mentioned that besides the three major sources listed above, many other internet sources were used while researching various terms and concepts and that, with the use of common sense, some previously acquired knowledge and wit, the whole of the internet can become an endless stream of knowledge. It is up to the translator to be able to recognize false and incorrect information, to double or triple check sources in order to provide only the best and highest quality translation possible.

2 Translations

Outside the walls, along the coast...

The new facades of Rijeka

Construction of the Corso. After 1780, the construction of the Corso began to the west and east of the City Tower. A large number of newcomers to the city, attracted by the privileges of the free port, sought to make their new homes more beautiful and comfortable than those located in Rijeka's Old Town and the long-awaited permission to tear down the age-old belt around the confined space inside the *Terrae Fluminis* was greeted by them with enthusiasm.¹

Demolition of the ramparts. The moat in Predgrad began to be reclaimed as early as 1782 and very wisely at that. First, a canal with a vault was dug to drain dirty water and rainwater, then parts of the demolished barbican ramparts, various stones and building fragments were thrown into the Moat (Fosso) and lastly, everything was reclaimed, creating a new face of Rijeka in Predgrad. Everything on the stretch from the Vuković-Jurman House (Corso 2) to the house in which Radio Rijeka is located nowadays was built between 1787 and 1850. The style of the building's ranges from baroque to pre-revolution classicism. Among the first buildings to be constructed after the demolition of the city walls was the house of Josip Franjo Troyer, a Rijeka judge and rector. Next to it stood the *Marchioni* House, which housed the toll office until the middle of the 18th century and in 1787, after its façade got extended after the demolition of the barbican, it began peeking out onto the Corso. From 1796 to 1880, the famous Rijeka Café *della Dogana* was located in that house. Behind these two houses arose the new facades of houses, which, until the demolition of the ramparts, were only half as wide, and only their second and third floors looked upon the Corso, which became the main city street where many moved to or reopened their shops, cafes and pharmacies.²

The Troyer House. The *Troyer House* is a building of ambitious architecture on which the famous architect Anton Gnamb left his personal mark. This harmonious type of architecture could be found throughout all Central European cities during the end of the 18th and the

beginning of the 19th century, functionally adapted to the spirit of the time with two characteristic mansards ending in a soft, flat, baroque, more protruding cornice. After being repurposed to house a department store, this building represents a very elegant architectural accent next to the City Tower, which also has a softly bent cornice over the clock panels. A number of houses on the western stretch of the Corso was demolished; the fifth and sixth house were demolished first, to make room for the newly designed City Savings Bank in early 1914. In 1953, the fourth house was demolished (no. 16) in order to construct a new building, opposite of the City Tower,³ and in 1971 the third house (no. 14) was demolished, allowing the current building of the department store *Corso*, next to the Borovo House⁴, to be extended.

Naša Rijeka, year V, no. 54-55, July-August 1983

¹ G. Viezzoli, *Contributi alla storia di Fiume nel settecento*, Fiume-Rivista, Anno XI-XII, 1933-1934, Fiume 1936, 162-170

² G. Kobler, *Memorie per la liburnica citta di Fiume*, II, Fiume 1896, 46-47

³ The house was built according to the plans of Josip Petrak in 1953.

⁴ The house was built according to the project of the architect Eduardo Stipanović for *Magazzino Bata in 1938* in the style of *rationalism*. It was incorporated into the *Korzo* building by the architect Ada Felice-Rošić in collaboration with Zlatko Šneler, which opened on April 21st 1973

Once The Masaryk, and nowadays The Andrija Kačić Miošić Promenade

Belvedere - Baštijan and Laginjina streets

The Corso with the old Governor's Palace (in the foreground and to the right)

The administrative building of the former Sugar Refinery

A valuable cultural monument. The administrative building of the former Sugar Refinery in the Kidrič Street (present-day Krešimir Street) was the tallest palace built in Rijeka during the Josephine Baroque period. In fact, it was one of the largest buildings on the entire Croatian Littoral. The former Sugar Refinery complex was built along the sea shore and stretched all the way to the old Lazaretto. We can only imagine how beautiful this architecture, together with the green surfaces of Rijeka's Podbreg behind it, looked reflected on the surface of the sea. Nowadays it is integrated into the city's busiest street, separated from the Lazaretto complex by new buildings and completely stripped of its former baroque atmosphere. Still, it remains a witness to a great period in the Rijeka's development and an example of the *fin de siècle* style in its purest form.

Josephine Baroque. The baroque neoclassicism of this palace manifests itself through the closed composition and strict simplicity of the facade. It is a solid multi-story building with a spacious ground floor for warehouses and upper stories with an emphasized symmetry of the openings. The alternating triangular and segmental awnings of the first and second floor windows break the monotony of the symmetry. The steep roof and the cornice around it, as well as the tympanum at the head of the building show clear features of the neo-style of the 18th century. Only the balcony on the second floor has a dynamic line and shows just how vivid the Baroque tradition is. It rests on strong lush corbels, which, together with the herms replace the usual keystone above the door, making them the only plastic ornaments on this wide façade with accentuated cordon wreath decorations between its first and second floor. One irregularity can be spotted on the façade - a row of small windows between the ground and first floor, included because of the need for a high standing source of light for the warehouses, making it so that the door openings extend below the cordon cornice. The focal point of the building is its central protrusion, which is appropriately decorated. Like wings, new factory workshops were constructed to the left and right of that building and were connected to each other by strong stone portals that created dark ruptures on the ground floor level of the entire complex. No baroque building in all of Rijeka and the rest of the Croatian Littoral possesses a staircase as monumental as the one found in this palace. The staircase is in the middle, supported by pillars with alternating Ionian and Corinthian style heads. The white pillars stand in contrast with the iron fence, which possesses an accentuated line and texture of the bar. The plasticity is further accentuated by the simple stucco on the ceilings

consisting of framed, corner-reinforced inserts, finely integrated with the classicist pediments above the doors to the corridors. The baroque plasticity, the vertical and horizontal divides, as well as the lavish decoration all come to the fore in the Grand Salon on the second floor, which serves as a *piano nobile*.

Interior ornamentation. The same style of architecture used on the façade was also applied in the decoration of the Grand Salon. Wreaths, pediments, pilasters, capitals, arches and niches harmoniously fill the walls and are separated from the ceiling by a protruding cornice attached to small corbels. Above this wreath there is a groove and a stretched out barrel vaulted ceiling decorated with profiled stucco frames. Two large white faience-encased stoves were placed in the niches, which contribute to the monumental appearance of the hall with their classicist ornamentation and volume. The architectural consistency of stylistic purity can be felt in the Small Salon, where wall paintings were placed in framed panels, and the ceiling was decorated with oval shaped paintings and garlands. The salon dates back to 1784, while the rest of the building was completed in 1786, as can be seen from the inscription on the staircase. A few very nice examples of the ceiling stucco from the former Sugar Refinery can be found in the Grand Salon and the two administration rooms. We have not been able to discover who the author of these stuccoes was, but it would not be out of the question that it was one of the more famous Central European plasterers of the time. In the Grand Salon, the ceiling is divided into four parts with relief medallions, surrounded by trophies, depicting scenes from ancient military history. The story of warriors in armor and helmets taking part in the murder of a person is told through four medallions. The figures are somewhat awkwardly shortened, probably due to the height of the ceiling, but regardless of these shortcomings, they bring a tone of seriousness and solemnity to this otherwise unusually harmonious piece of architecture. In the administration rooms, the painted wall panels are framed in stucco, which also adorns the lintels, ceiling and the curb. Cameos and arabesques are placed between the leafy and floral plastic decorations. Unlike those in the Grand Salon, these stuccoes bear the hallmarks of the Rococo and represent a high level of art, equal to that of Central Europe. Despite our best efforts, it was not possible to discover the name of the artist who painted the extraordinary wall paintings in the Small Salon, which serves as an office in the „Rikard Benčić“ Factory. The surface of the wall is filled with decorations, the framed fields contain depictions of the ruins of an imaginary ancient city made in the style of the Josephine *Zopf*, and are dated to 1784 by an inscription in the corner by the front door. From this inscription, it is clear that the director Pierre de Vierendeels had this salon painted during the era of the

Emperor Joseph II. It is obvious that the paintings were created by an experienced painter with a refined taste and a sense for the classicist gamut of light and distribution of mass. This is typical architectural painting, very similar to scenographic templates. The analogy of elements, arches, pillars, arcatures, obelisks and statues suggest simple compositions. One can still feel the decorative spirit of the Rococo in the framework and although the forms are imitated, the fantasy is still alive with the help of artistic creativity. The purity of color, the perfection of perspective, can be felt, although in some places the monotony and coldness inherent to neoclassicism are present. The artist abandoned the veduta style and scenography of the late *Settecento*, and deprived the paintings of biblical decorative superstructures, because of which a strong influence of neoclassicism can be felt in them. It really is a pity that the name of the artist who created such extraordinary decorations of the highest level is still unknown. We should look for him among the Venetian neoclassicists who were active in the Austrian hereditary lands, because the imperial court itself took interest in the building of the Sugar Refinery.¹

Zuccheriera. Thanks to the Sugar Refinery, Rijeka broke through into the commercial and industrial world during the second half of the 18th century. The establishment of this refinery in Rijeka was connected with the beginnings of the development of the sugar industry in the Austrian monarchy. In Trieste, Count Rudolf Chotek developed a comprehensive program for the development and revitalization of the ports of Trieste and Rijeka, and in 1749 the Austrian administration launched an initiative to establish a cooperation with large trade and industrial associations from Antwerp, which would be based in the Croatian Littoral and called the *Haubt-Handlungs-Compagnie von Triest und Fiume* (Main Trade Association of Trieste and Rijeka). The trade companies Proli and Arnold from Antwerp joined this initiative. For twenty-five years the government helped the association. They provided them with work, industrial spaces for the production process and unhindered import of products into the territory of the Austrian hereditary countries. The company could import raw materials (sugar cane), build its own ships, dig coal, cut wood, etc. The Decree on Privileges was signed by the Empress Maria Theresa on October 1, 1750. The refinery, which the people of Rijeka called the *Zuccheriera*, employed 705 people working in warehouses, on transporting wood and coal and processing refined cane sugar. This imposing industrial plant produced 20 to 30 thousand cents of refined sugar and 8 to 9 tons of syrup per year. The capital of the association was based on shares, a total of two million forints, i.e. 2000 shares of 1000 forints each. The Empress herself had 12 shares, Count Chotek 3000, while the Dutch shareholders held 444

shares in the association. The first name of the association was *Urbano Arnold et Compagnie*; their management remained in Trieste when on April 25, 1752, a unified association was founded. The plants in Rijeka were built so quickly that already in 1754, enough sugar was produced in the Refinery to meet the national needs of the Austrian countries. The Empress extended the privileges to the association for the next twenty-five years, resulting in a revival of their activities. The director Pierre Vierendeels began building the administration building in question in 1782.² As a monument of profane baroque art, it deserves the care of its owners who should be proud to enjoy such a valuable cultural monument, which is more than two hundred years old.

Our Rijeka, yr. IV, no. 38, March 1982.

¹ R. Matejčić, Barok u Istri i Hrvatskom primorju, in: Barok u Hrvatskoj, Liber, Zagreb, 1982, 426, fig. 198-201; 523, 566, 612. Raffineria di Zucchero in Fiume, Fiume-Rivista, Anno X, 1932, Fiume, 1933, 190-198

The administrative building of the Sugar Refinery, which operated in Rijeka between 1750 and 1828

The massive building of the Sugar Refinery dominated Rijeka's coastline

The Sugar Refinery complex before the construction of the railway station on the embankment. In front of it Giovanni Fumi's *Allegory of summer*, a fresco on the ceiling of the former Sugar Refinery

The Sugar Refinery Complex Plan

From Dolac to Zagrad

The urbanization of the city center. Systematic urban construction of Rijeka can be traced back to the middle of the 18th century on the stretch from Rječina all the way to the Togliatti Square (present-day Adriatic Square). That stretch was laid out after Maria Theresa approved the plan for the construction of the New Town (*Civitatis novae*). The majority of construction took place on the existing terrain in front of the southern city walls or on the gradually filled up terrain along the sea shore. The construction of the first Governor's Palace on Andrejšćica initiated a whole row of construction work along the newly opened Governor's Road (*Via del Governo*) towards the former suburb (*borgo*), and after the demolition of the city walls in the Supilo Street, construction on both sides of this very noticeable ascent continued until the end of the 19th century, which shaped the direction and width of the street.

Vineyards as lookouts. In the old documents, the area from the western walls to Andrejšćica and Zagrad was called Brajda or Dolac. The Present-day Dolac Street was named after the latter of the two. In 1671, the Rijeka surgeon G. Genova published a graphic of Rijeka depicting it as a cultivated area planted with olive groves and vineyards. He recorded the vineyards wrongly as *vidigrad* (the correct term would be *vinograd*, while *vidigrad* could loosely be understood as a lookout). There was only one house in the whole area, since at that time it was still not allowed to build dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the walls.¹ On the plan of Rijeka made around 1760, the road along the western walls, stretching from the large fortress of St. Jerome to the Kirin Tower, was called the road to Drenova. The whole area is still overgrown with greenery in the middle of which a larger building is marked as *a garden and vineyard with the dwelling house of Baron Androcha*. Below the house is the source of an underground river with the description *water of St. Andrew*, called Andrejšćica, which springs from the hill under the garden and vineyard of Baron Androcha. The wide road leading to it is located on the stretch of the present-day Dolac Street. The houses of the settlement of Andrejšćica (as it was called in the registry books) were already built on the stretch from the source of the water, around the church of St. Andrew and all the way to the Capuchin monastery. All the houses built on the Gubernium Street all the way to the bridge that stretched over the stream near the café (*ex Zora*, *ex El Rio*) were also marked. This means that the ban on construction near the ramparts was tacitly ignored.² If we compare this draft with the one from 1872, which recorded living waters, we can notice much denser construction along the Gubernium Street; the road to Drenova was called the Municipal Street

(Via del Municipio), present-day Supilo Street, and the houses on its left side were built all the way to the present-day grammar school building. At the top the former house of Baron Androcha, then owned by the Meynier family, still stands. Behind that house (in the Dežman Street, present-day Kurelč Street, demolished after the Second World War) was a beautiful English park that reached as far as Zagrad.³

New parallel roads. With the arrival of Giovanni Ciotta to the position of the mayor of Rijeka, major urbanization work began on the area from Dolac to Zagrad and entire projects were made in the city's Construction Office for the opening of new parallel roads, all headed by Izidor Vauchnig. First the land of the Meynier family was purchased, allowing for the construction of the Clotilda Street and in 1883 a part of Baron Simeon Vranyczany's land was also bought, opening up the space for the construction of a new street, parallel to the aforementioned one, that was to connect the Municipium and St. Andrew Street (present-day Barčić Street).⁴ Even then, the need for a general construction plan became apparent, because many other roads were opened alongside the Dolac Street in order to connect the city with Brajda and the railway station.⁵ At the time, there was a huge increase in the population in Rijeka, which was caused mostly by officials and administrative officers who were not keen on uncomfortable apartments in the Old Town.⁶ The opening of the new Dolac Street (Via Clotilda inferiore), with plots at the ends of the street reserved for the construction of a primary school for boys and one for girls, provided an opportunity for the enterprising industrialist and landlord Robert Whitehead to invest his capital profitably into new construction along the street. At the same time, this made it possible for the architect Giacomo Zammatti, as the author of the project, to prove himself in the field of housing construction. On that street, Zammattio first designed Whitehead's own palace, the so-called *Casa veneziana*, followed by three more apartment buildings. In 1896, the Gradska štedionica (City savings bank) began the construction of its palace at the corner of the Erazmo Barčić Street and the Dolac Street, according to Zammatti's project. Thus, a large opus of this esteemed Rijeka builder and architect is housed on one street.⁷ All this would not have been possible without the cooperation of the mayor Ciotta, co-owner of the *Silurificia* (torpedo factory) in which Robert Whitehead was the majority shareholder.

An ambitious Englishman. Whitehead was a prominent and significant figure in the industrial development of Rijeka. By investing his capital in the construction of entire building blocks in Dolac and Brajda, he left an enormous mark on the urban development of

Rijeka. It is a fortunate circumstance that he chose Giacomo Zammatti as his architect, thus securing an enviable place for the architectural monumentalization of Rijeka in the history of high historicism.

Robert Whitehead was of English descent. He was born on January 3, 1823, in Balton-Le-Moors, Lancashire. His father James was the owner of a developed cotton processing manufactory. After graduating from Grammar-school he studied to be a mechanic and worked as an apprentice in the *Richard Ormund and son* machine factory in Manchester. He later gained additional education at the *Mechanics Institute*. In 1844 he worked as a technical draftsman in the *Taylor* factory in Marseilles and moved to Milan in 1847 where he devoted himself to silk-yarn machines. After the revolution in 1848 he moved to Trieste where, on the basis of excellent recommendations, he was accepted as a constructor in the *Austrian Lloyd*. In 1850, he became the director of the *Trieste Technical Company*. Since he was already well-known at the time, Gašpar Matković, an industrialist from Rijeka, invited him to our city to establish the Technical Company together. After initial success, the company went through a crisis in 1873, but Whitehead took over along with his son-in-law, Count George Hoyos. Together with Luppis, Ploech and Ciotta, they founded the *Silurificio* (Torpedo) in Rijeka, a venture into which Whitehead also included his older son John. He was so powerful that he managed to marry his granddaughter to Bismarc's son. Robert Whitehead died on November 16, 1905 in Becket Park in England, and was buried in his tomb in Rijeka's Kozala Cemetery.⁸ When considering this *curriculum vitae*, it becomes clear to us that Robert Whitehead was able to constantly follow everything that was happening in the field of contemporary architecture and wanted to help his business partner Giovanni Ciotta to realize his vision of turning Rijeka into a cosmopolitan urban center.

This cosmopolitanism can be felt in the choice of historical style elements in the architecture in the Dolac Street, from the Venetian Gothic, the High Renaissance models to Erlach's Viennese Baroque. G. Zammattio chose a historical style for a particular building and never mixed it with other styles, he was consistent in the implementation of concepts and skillfully and confidently mastered the repertoire of high historicism, which was to be expected, given his high quality education in Vienna. The architecture in the Dolac Street, the schools, banks and residential buildings can all be ranked among the best of his early works. Through them, inspired by the architecture of the Vienna Ring, he tried to bring the spirit of the metropolis that molded him to Rijeka. The successful collaboration between an industrialist and a talented architect resulted in one of the most beautiful streets Rijeka has ever seen, but as time went on, it was unfortunately turned into a parking lot.

- ¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. II, Fiume 1896, 35, Grafika G. Genova
- ² L. M. Torcoletti, *Tarsatica ed i primordi di Fiume*, Palermo 1950, 257, 259-260, fig. 69
- ³ Komunalni arhiv Rijeka, *Općina Rijeka*, 7/72
- ⁴ *Acquisto di realtà*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVII, Fiume, 3. III. 1884, no. 52, 2
- ⁵ *Lavori stradali*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVI, Fiume, 31. V. 1885, no. 122, 2
- ⁶ *Costruzioni di nuove case*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVI, Fiume, 13. III. 1883, no. 59, 2
- ⁷ A. Nezi, M. Zammattio, *L'architetto Giacomo Zammattio*, Bergamo 1931, 20-31.
- ⁸ S. Corvajo, *Quattro uomini e un siluro*, *Il Piccolo illustrato*, Anno 2, no. 36, Trieste, 8. IX. 1979, 8-13

The boy's school on Dolac, present-day Italian high school

The boy's school on Dolac was designed by Giacomo Zammattio in the style of the Florentine Renaissance

With its serious urbanism, Dolac hinted at the metropolitan appearance of Rijeka

Rijeka rooftops at the end of the 19th century

Dolac Street with the Girl's Primary School and Old *Bonavia* in the foreground and the facade of the old, wooden *Teatro Fenice* at the end of the street

The Austro-Hungarian Bank building was designed by Joseph Hubert and was built in 1914. Today it is the seat of FINA

The Radio Rijeka building

A prominent historical and cultural monument. On the barbican, next to the Great Fort (Velika utvrda) was the beautiful garden of pastor Monaldi whose house had an entrance by the monastery. After his death, the garden and the house were inherited by his nephew Franjo Troyer. Rijeka capitalists, led by Count Gjuro Vranyczany, founded the *Patriotic society* (Societa patriottica) and bought the garden on the barbican from its new owner with the intention of building the *Patriotic casino* (Casino Patriottico) in its place, all of which was funded by the twelve members of the society. The municipality, wishing to beautify the newly designed Corso and make it more magnificent, approved the construction on April 25, 1845. In fact, in 1808 the architect Giovanni Candido drafted a regulatory plan for the construction of the Corso, which also included that area. It should be noted that the city administration closely monitored construction in the area of the New Town and thus it was expected that such a respectable native society would commission a respectable and capable architect for the project. The job went to Anton Deseppi, the son of a Rijeka goldsmith-moretist, who was born in Rijeka on May 31, 1811, and died, also in his hometown, in 1874.¹

A unique building. The architect Deseppi was the city's aedile since 1863. He was elected for that position *as a person capable of properly performing official tasks*, which was a high assessment of expertise at the time. The design and construction of this unique building proved the assessment right. It is a public building intended for the gathering of citizens, entertainment and cultural events, which was not an easy task for a thirty-year-old architect. The stylistic contemporary features of the Central European community were synthesized into the building, while emphasizing the architectural manuscript of the pre-revolution period, which allowed this relatively monumental construction to perfectly fit in and shape the final part of the Corso. The construction of this building completely erased the characteristic features of buildings of local builders and masons of Rijeka's Old Town.

The passage - connecting the old and the new. On the attractive façade, the architect retained the predominant post-Biedermeier classicism in the vertical division of the main body on which he used half-columns with ionic heads. The protruding altana, a kind of balcony-terrace on a colonnade protruding onto the sidewalk, served at that time as a sort of counter-balance to the strong protrusion of the old post office onto the Corso. Identical altanas were built on several large buildings in the mid-19th century, and some of them have been

preserved to this day, mainly those on the buildings of Privredna banka in the Ivan Zajc Street and on the building on Riva Boduli. This suggests that those buildings can also be attributed to the architect Anton Deseppi. However, on this building, the architect left a *passage* between the Corso and the present-day Rijeka Resolution Square. This peculiarity, this wonderful connection between the main street and the square was made possible by a corridor with an entrance under the colonnade, allowing us to leave the glittering Corso and, through a dark narrow passage, go directly to the Rijeka Resolution Square. Such a unique connection between the street and the square could only have been made possible by a talented architect who felt the need to organically connect the old with the new and to bestow the future and present main street of Rijeka with this monumental building. Since he left the aisle opening in the central axis of the ground floor, the architect had to place the staircase to the left of the entrance, to the detriment of the scenery expected of such public architecture. Despite this, the staircase was made orderly and elegant, supported by pillars, giving it a solemn appearance. It has remained stylistically untouched to this day.

The hall - Rijeka's stage. The architecture of the great hall, which had a stage, which was of great importance and was used until its conversion into a television studio. The hall was a significant stage for Rijeka for a whole century, especially once the National Reading Room moved into the building. The idea behind the design of the building was to build a community centre, which was supposed to house the *Casino patriottico* (Patriotic Casino). At first it was the seat of the association, after which a part of the building was used by the *Gentlemen's Casino* (Casino degli Signori), later it became the *Craftsmen's casino* (Casino degli Artieri), and after the craftsmen moved out in 1889 the *Philharmonic-Drama Association* (Società Filodrammatica) finally settled down in it. With the music and stage association moving in, the premises of the society, especially the large event hall, were completely renovated and the ceiling decorations were made by the famous Rijeka painter Giovanni Fumi, the same person who simultaneously created their stage props. On this occasion, the Whitehead company introduced electric lighting to the building. Thus, Rijeka got a highly modernized theater chamber.² At the initiative of the Rijeka patrician and great patriot Erazmo Barčić, the members of the Croatian National Reading Room established a consortium, which bought the palace from Vranyczany Vio. In 1889 the Philharmonic-Drama Association, whose premises were being built on the Gubernial Street, had to leave the building, and the consortium gave it to the National Reading Room. Moving to this building, which housed a large hall for various artistic and theater performances, enabled the Reading Room to start hosting a rich variety of

national-cultural activities. The building, which had since been simply called the Reading Room and was set in a very prominent and convenient part of the city, became a national university, a theater, the seat of the editorial office of *Neven* and the seat of political rallies of Rijeka's Croats and other Slavs, all at the same time.³ Representatives of Dalmatian and Istrian Croats gathered in this hall in 1903, and in 1905 the *Rijeka resolution* was passed in it (hence the square at the back of the building is called the Rijeka Resolution Square). That building was the cradle of Supilo's new direction in popular politics.

A place for political and cultural gatherings. The most prominent actors from the Croatian National Theater from Zagreb and many famous musicians performed on the stage of the Reading room. Circle dances, balls and charity events were hosted in the hall. In 1911, a branch of the Prva hrvatska štedionica (First Croatian Savings Bank) moved into the ground floor of the building. As a result, all of our institutions were located there.

After the disintegration of Austro-Hungary in 1918, the National Council met on the premises of the Reading Room and made the decision that Rijeka would be annexed to the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Later, the events regarding Rijeka became more and more complicated and finally in 1924, it was annexed to the Kingdom of Italy. Since then, the climate for this distinctly national institution had become unbearable, which culminated in the unlawful eviction of the Reading Room from its own premises and the building being repurposed into the *Casa del Fascio* in 1927.⁴

From the liberation of Rijeka in the Second World War (May 3, 1945) to the handing over of the building to the Radio Rijeka, the event hall served as a venue for numerous political and cultural gatherings. The building housed the „Otokar Keršovani“ publishing house and even today, on the ground floor of this historic building, there is a reading room and a small salon of the Modern gallery. This elegant, old, architectural beauty that is located on Rijeka's Corso proudly stands as a prominent historical and cultural monument. How polite it would be of our citizens if they would refrain from urinating in the passage!

Our Rijeka, year 5, no. 59, November 1983

¹ R. Matejčić, Anton Deseppi, ad vocem, Likovna enciklopedija Jugoslavije, I, JLZ, Zagreb, 1984, 303

² F. Derenzini, Gli anuali della societa Filarmonico-drammatica, oggi Circolo Savoia, 1872, 1882, 1930, Fiume 1931

³ A memorial booklet issued by the committee on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Rijeka's Public Reading Room, Sušak, 1901

⁴ D. Gervais, Narodna čitaonica u Rijeci, Zbornik Rijeka, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1953, 460-465; La nuova Casa del Fascio, La Vedetta d'Italia, Fiume, 1. I. 1930, 2

The National Reading Room on the Corso

The National Reading Room on the Corso and the building of the old Post Office

Rijeka's Corso has always been *the jugular* of the city, and the National Reading Room has been the guardian of the Croatian spirit, even during difficult times

The National Reading Room before the erection of the building with the *Kraš* shop on the ground floor

In the ceremonial hall of the National Reading Room, under the large fresco of Giovanni Fumi, the famous Rijeka Resolution of 1905 was passed, which shook the stagnant Austro-Hungary

The ground floor of the National Reading Room usually housed good inns. Today it houses the Small Salon.

Rijeka's fountains

How did the city's wells of life disappear? Since prehistoric times, sources of drinking water in the area of Rijeka have been vital for the development of settlements along the Rječina river. Undoubtedly, an important water source was the strong source of the underground river in front of the Upper Town Gate, Lešnjak, with a stream so vast, it flowed downwards into the Rječina. Later on, the Lešnjak stream was redirected into the moat that surrounded the city walls and eventually flowed into the sea (in the Middle Ages, part of it probably flowed into the Moat and subsequently into the old course of the Rječina, i.e., the present-day Dead Canal near the Adamić House). Another strong source of water was located above the Dolac and, like the Andrejšćica stream, it flowed into the sea in the middle of the present-day Adriatic Square. There was a water source (the Žudinka stream) under the new building of the *Bonavia* hotel, which was already at the beginning of the 19th century flowing through ceramic pipes under the present-day Corso, Hencke and Zajc street to the then Ürmeny Square (present-day Theater Square), next to which the town and fish market are located (the present-day riverbed passes under the Square of the Republic of Croatia and ends at the port, along the west side of the pier of Karolina of Rijeka).

Indoor plumbing. The arrival of a large population from more urban areas to Rijeka created the need for a more suitable water supply network, larger fountains and laundry washing areas. Until the end of 18th century, the local population of the Old Town met their needs for water from their own wells, which were dug inside the houses themselves. A little digging into the living stone on the city's rocky soil, especially around Kaštel, Grivice and all the way to Gomila, would result in the discovery of very high-quality drinking water. These were stone-walled wells that were sometimes used by several households. One such very old well was discovered in the Užarska Street, and from it water was extracted through an opening in the side wall of the cellar. The excavated wells in the lowland area of the city, around the Congregational Church all the way to the present-day Rijeka Resolution Square, were often polluted with mud. The main source of drinking water was at *The Well (Pozzo)* behind the church of St. Jerome.

Representative fountains. Great advances in science, the fight against infectious diseases, especially cholera, which appeared cyclically in Rijeka, as well as major plans of the mayor Giovanni Ciotta to transform Rijeka into a cosmopolitan city, all presented problems to the

City Council: solving the water supply issue, constructing wells, distributing spring water throughout the city, monitoring the cleanliness of reservoirs in the Old Town, all of which led to the application of the existing scientific achievements. One of the first studies of its kind, conducted by professor Kottdorfer of the Maritime Academy in 1874 by order of the presidency of the City Council, was the *Chemical analysis of the water sources „Mustacchione“, Lešnjak and Zvir*. Between April 3 and October 8, 1874, he analyzed water samples and concluded that the water of the Lešnjak and Zvir springs was slightly better than that of the Beli kamik and Mustacchione springs, but all the springs met the criteria for good drinking water. Regarding the water supply, the head of the Construction Office in Rijeka, aedile Giuseppe Leard, found himself prompted to present the City Council with his own vision of the best solution for a radical overhaul of the then current shortcomings. He emphasized that except for Rječina, all the springs and waterways find their underground path through rock. Zvir, which flows into the Rječina River, follows the path nature laid out for it, as do other springs, turning immediately into small rivers and streams and, after a short flow, go into the sea. Given that the underground water passes through a natural filter, it is undeniably safe at the spring, as evidenced by the chemical analysis. However, the water in Rijeka's shallow wells was harmful to the health, especially in the flooded terrain, where it mixed with water from the septic tanks. The water in the renovated and rebuilt fountains was clean and good, thus he suggested that the water should be supplied from large springs by pipes and that wells be used only for the cleaning of streets or in the event of a fire. Giuseppe Leard fervently advocated the building of a pipeline that would connect the springs and thus enable the supply of the city and port with drinking water, until the construction on Zvir began. It should be noted that Leard's efforts did not pass without opposition, as evidenced by the signatures of citizens who did not agree with the proposal of building a fountain on present-day Kobler Square (formerly Piazza dell'Erbe). However, despite the resistance, the Council wholeheartedly supported Leard's projects. Since 1873, he and his team in the Construction Office managed to regulate the waters of Lešnjak, constructed the Beli kamik (*Sasso Bianco*) and Mustacchione fountains and built a truly representative fountain on Žabica. As a result, the period between 1873 and 1875 can be called the period of the aesthetic renovation of the city in the function of health, hygiene and communication.

The legendary spring. At the end of 1875, when Leard summarized his research during that year, it could be seen that a great deal had been done in the domain of public construction. The Cecilianovo Park (*Giardino pubblico*, present-day Mlaka Park) and the so-called Square

on the Ürmeny Square (square in front of the theater), which got a new fountain, were both renovated, benches were set up on the Deak Alley (Corsia Deak, present-day Krešimirova Street), while the Bolnička Street (present-day Ciottina Street) and the street in the direction of Volosko were both renovated and a project was developed for the fountain on present-day Kobler Square in the Old Town. All this work done in 1875 was a logical continuation of the work started by Giuseppe Leard, who immediately after the founding of the Municipality took over the Building Office, which, through a tender, found several talented builders and architects capable of meeting the new demands of the city's more demanding communal organization. It is only natural that one of those important tasks was the regulation of the water supply in accordance with the new hygienic, legally binding terms. The fear caused by the cholera outbreak from 1885, when negligence allowed the springs and reservoirs to be infected and caused the spread of the disease among the population, was still present in Rijeka. At that time, Perilo (Lavatoio) on Školjić, where the laundry from the military barracks and hospital was washed, was a hot spot.

The Royal Hungarian Railways, i.e. their department in Rijeka, were also interested in installing a water supply network, because the new railway station needed water for their passengers and steam locomotives. Therefore in 1873 work began on the Vranyczany spring on Mlaka, and the water in the railway park came from the fountain located at the beginning of present-day Zvonimir Street.¹ That fountain was dug below the road level and surrounded by a decorative stone balustrade. The Railway was equally interested in the water of the Sasso Bianco spring, which the people called Beli kamik. This spring was marked on the plans of Rijeka from the first half of the 19th century and was located across from the cafe and pizzeria bearing the same name in the Kidrič Street (present-day Krešimir Street). In 1873, in that location, the architect Filibert Bazarig designed a magnificent fountain for the Building Office, which directed water through special pipes directly to the railway station.² Beli kamik was also somewhat of a legendary spring. Josip Završnik said that foreigners who drank water from Beli kamik would fall in love with a Rijeka woman and stay in Rijeka forever.³ Bazarig designed the fountain on Beli kamik to be dug in below the road level and paved, its walls were covered with perfectly polished stone and its balustrade, arches and pilasters were made out of finely polished stones originating from Brijuni. This fountain was built in 1873 by the renowned stonemason Giorgio Polla.

Stylistically uniform fountains. Drafts of the fountain on the Rječina, the Mustacchione fountain at the corner of the Corso and the Republic of Croatia Square and the fountain at the

Žabica Square have been preserved in the records of the State Archives in Rijeka. All of them were designed in 1873 by Dr. Filibert Bazarig. They were stylistically uniform, and we can also say that the fountain on Beli kamik had the same features. All these projects did not go through easily. When the Mustacchione spring was being dug up, the family of Natale Pauletich protested, claiming that the commotion and gathering caused by servants coming to the fountain for water would be a great nuisance to them. But, regardless of these objections, Mustacchione was an extremely important spring for the water supply of ships in the port on Adamić's pier, thus in 1874 it was built. The city considered it its right to beautify public roads, to lower or raise them, and therefore did not engage in much discussion.⁴

All Bazarig's fountains in Rijeka possessed classicist early renaissance features, which was the general feature of his first buildings in Rijeka. He was still under the influence of his studies in Padua. In fact, he came up with numerous solutions for the water reservoir while still in Veneto, and it is really a great pity for the aesthetic appearance of Rijeka that all his fountains were removed between 1910 and 1913, because they allegedly interfered with traffic or were, after the construction of the city water supply, with its source at Zvir (*Acquedotto Ciotta*), deemed unnecessary and mainly served as laundry washing spots. Thus, the Mustacchione fountain was, by the decision of the Municipal Council, covered by a vault, because it no longer possessed *either aesthetic or practical value*. The only thing left was the lid on the sidewalk, for the watering of plants or the cleaning of the Corso.⁵ When the building (housing the Kraš store) next to the Radio Rijeka building was being built, the supply pipes and walls of that fountain were discovered. During the correction of the direction of present-day's Krešimir Street, it was decided that the Beli kamik fountain, which extended 2.5 meters over the line of the designed street, should be removed and this was done at the end of 1913.⁶

The best proof that the regulation of the streets was the reason for the removal of these distinctive and aesthetically valuable objects was the demolition of the so-called Monumental fountain (*Fontana monumentale*), erected in front of the building at the beginning of the Dositej Obradović Street (present-day I. Hencke Street) at the beginning of the second half of the 19th century (1857, demolished as early as 1874) in honor of the young Emperor Francis Joseph. The plastic of the fountain was made by the famous Rijeka sculptor Pietro Stefanutti. The Statue of Francis Joseph I, made out of white Carrara marble, was given to the City Museum, and is kept on the ground floor of the State Archives in Rijeka. It is a great pity that the entire plastic from that fountain was not moved to the City Museum. As a reminder of Mustacchione, it was relocated to an artificial cave in the Mlaka Park.

¹ DAR, JU 2, case H 7/1873.

² DAR, JU 2, case H 33/1873.

³ . Twardzik, Opis Rijeke s početka 19. stoljeća iz pera Josipa Završnika, Dometi, year 20, vol. 4, Rijeka, 1987, 267

⁴ DAR, JU 2, case H 11/1875.

⁵ DAR, JU 2, case H 113/1910.

⁶ DAR, JU 2, case H 15/1913.

Public laundry area on Školjić

Mlaka Park at the end of 19th century

Present-day Krešimir street at the site of Beli kamik

The Rijeka sculptor Pietro Stefanutti made the Great Fountain located on the axis of the City Tower, which was inaugurated on April 23, 1857. Its total height was 660 cm with a sculpture of the young emperor Francis Joseph I at the top. The fountain was dismantled in February 1874 for traffic reasons.

The Adamić House

Double the historical value. The straight line formed by the buildings on the Rječina is more than two centuries old. It was the city's facade until the second half of the 19th century, when the present-day port of Rijeka was finally built. The old port was at the estuary of the Rječina River, thus ships sailed up the river all the way to the present-day bridge. Two centuries ago, this coast was the life of the city and it was the focal point of everything related to the free port and maritime traffic. All wealthier citizens, mostly newcomers, who were not sentimentally attached to the Old Town, aspired to buy land on the newly reclaimed eastern part of the moat (present-day Vitezović Street) and build their houses on that stretch, which would serve as both a residential and commercial space, as well as give the owners a chance of becoming a part of the city council. All the houses in this area are of historic value, especially the so-called Adamić House. It is related to the highly influential Adamić family, which left a deep mark on Rijeka (the Paper mill), but it is also related to the historic Croatian Royal High School in Rijeka.

A network of secrecy. Since his arrival to Rijeka up until 1785, Simeon Adamić, a tobacco wholesaler and Rijeka landowner, accumulated a vast fortune through his skillful investment in the import of tobacco and into the tobacco industry, because of which rumors started circulating that he had a leprechaun helping him in his bold business ventures. The old Rijeka patricians considered themselves rich for just owning houses in the Old Town and vineyards on Brajda, which made Adamić's wealth seem mindboggling to them. It is no surprise that Simeon's wealth was shrouded in mystery. However, something then happened that shed new light upon his wealth. Simeon Adamić had a large estate in Martinšćica, named after the ancient chapel of St. Martin, which was located there. During some work in the chapel, Simeon found a buried treasure. He most probably came across an archeological site, since the prehistoric hillfort of Solin was above Martinšćica, and it was probably not a buried treasure that he found there. However, due to the imagination of the people, Simeon was accused of denying the national treasury a part of the findings. The authorities launched an investigation, and the prominent Rijeka wholesaler Simeon Adamić was imprisoned in Crikvenica. Shortly after, fourteen witnesses accused him of keeping the findings for himself. The son of Simeon, Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, a young and well-educated commercialist from Vienna, immediately went to the capital and obtained an audience with the Emperor Joseph II, managing to convince him that this was a mere archaeological find. The emperor made sure

that Simeon Adamić was immediately released from prison and was not harassed again. The imperial gesture was very calculated; the court took very good care of skillful importers and traders in tobacco and would not let a capable businessman languish in prison.¹

Heads of the fourteen witnesses. Simeon Adamić retaliated against the slanderers in Zeus-like fashion. Immediately after his release from prison (April 24, 1787), he bought a garden and a plot of land extending to the coast from the Benedictine nuns. In this busiest part of town, he built a family house so long that it could fit fourteen window openings; on the axis of each of those windows, Simeon placed a pillar next to the sidewalk and each of these pillars had a head of one of the fourteen witnesses carved on top of it. The municipality issued him a permission to build a house on Rječina on November 24, 1787; the appraisal of the value of the house was large for the time, amounting to 100378 forints. The city had no idea that Adamić would cunningly outwit them by placing a gallery of the citizens of Rijeka in front of his house: a fine lady with a high hairstyle, an officer, an elegant gentleman, a coachman, a maid and an old nanny. Every day they were seen by citizens and travelers who came to Rijeka by boats, which were moored across from the house. Although the pillars no longer stand in the same place, they have been preserved, and now, with the disappearance of one, thirteen of them are on display in the Archaeological Park of the Maritime and Historical Museum. After the Adamić House was sold off, these pillars remained in place until 1882, because they served as protection for pedestrians from horses on the street. That same year, mayor Giovanni Ciotta, who was also the grandson of Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, took his great-grandfather's witnesses and put them in the park of his villa. They were later transferred to the park in front of the Historical Archive and finally exhibited in the lapidary of the Maritime and Historical Museum as a testimony to a very important period of Rijeka's history.²

The great grammar school. If this historical detail was not known, one would blame the architect of the Adamić House for stretching it out so much, but he had to make room for such a large number of witnesses as per request of the client. This house on the Rječina river is the most stylistically expressive example of Baroque neoclassicism. Some of the plastic details, the head of the woman with a hat above the balcony door and the head under the rain gutters, were made in an excellent sculptural workshop, which also carved the heads of the witnesses. It is possible that their creator was Francesco Capovilla, a famous stonemason from the end of the 18th century and coworker of the architect Anton Gnamb, from whom Adamić most likely

commissioned the project of this elegant and noble building.³ Due to historical circumstances after the Croatian-Hungarian settlement and the “Rijeka Patch”, the government in Zagreb gave in to the pressure exerted by the city and decided to buy the former Adamić House from the naval captain Dionizij Jakovčić. Designed by the prominent Rijeka aedile and future freelance architect Giuseppe Chierega, in 1880 the house was extended by an addition of another floor, and thus the Royal Great grammar school in Rijeka moved into the newly adapted building. G. Chierego, as an old citizen of Rijeka, respected all the original baroque details of the Adamić House and very tactfully raised the house without destroying any of its originality. The general-education high school was located in that building up until 1896, when it was moved to the new general-education high school building in Sušak.⁴ From 1881 to 1896, during fifteen fateful years full of intricate historical events in Rijeka, many intellectuals who found a significant place in the cultural history of Croatia emerged from this building. All this is evidenced by only a single, rarely read stone tablet placed next to the portal.

Our Rijeka, yr. VI, no. 70, October 1984. p. 16.

¹ Giovanni Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. III, Fiume, 1896; 142-143

² Radmila Matejčić, *Lapidarij, Zbirka kamenih spomenika Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja Hrvatskog primorja*, Rijeka, 42/1964, 17

³ R. Matejčić, *Barok u Istri i Hrvatskom primorju*, in: *Barok u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 1982; 425

⁴ *Il trasloco d'un ginnasio*, La Bilancia, XXIX, Fiume, 7. IV. 1896, 79, 2. – M. Mezorana, *Borba hrvatske gimnazije u Rijeci*, Zbornik Rijeka, Zagreb, 1953, 530

The former Adamić House on the Dead Canal housed the Croatian general-education high school at the end of the 19th century

The Croatian general-education high school operated in this building from 1881 to 1896, after which it moved to a monumental, purpose-built building in Sušak.

Adamić's false witnesses, a series of statues that originally stood on Fiumara, today stand adjacent to the Governor's Palace

The Školjić - Luke district

How did the Rijeka oasis disappear? The Rijeka native, famous writer and chronicler, Josip Završnik, left in his 1816 hometown description some interesting information about the area between the northern city walls and Zvir. This area was called Luke (Meadows), above it was Otočac (from which the present-day name Školjić derived, while the name Luke completely disappeared)⁶. We have a visual depiction of the lower course area of the Rječina River on the oldest plan of Rijeka from 1580, depicting the following: the Rječina, Mlinovi, Otočac and a large area overgrown with lush vegetation surrounded by water from one of its three springs. Josip Završnik said the following about the ports: *That Luka or Luke, called Ravenica, between Rijeka (Fiumara) and Mount Calvary or Goljak (Mons Calvus), because it has no trees, has three springs or small streams on its upper and lower side (...) and since the land is very cold (... they fertilize it with manure and make it so fertile that in the summer, in the spring, in the autumn and in the winter, it supplies the whole of Rijeka and other nearby towns like Bakar and Danjni Sijenj with superb greens.*¹

The three districts. There are a lot of archival data about this area; the writings mention the estates of citizens, chapters and monks, and on the old graphics and city plans of Rijeka, from the 17th until the end of the 19th century, we can trace, at first a gradual, then a drastic disappearance of this beautiful oasis in which water and lush greenery created a natural work of art. In addition to the aforementioned vegetables, in Luka and on the slopes of the hills of Hlibac, Kalvarija and Goljak, grapevines were cultivated in abundance.² A large contributor to that fact was the water, as one of Rječina's forks flowed in a separate riverbed. The land was constantly being terraformed by the frequent floods, as well as by the separating streams, which would accumulate deposits of fertile silt and sand. The right bank of Rječina, beginning at the Hlibac hill and almost reaching the city walls and the sea, was divided into three areas: Zvir, Mlinovi and Luke. Zvir and Mlinovi were rich in mills, among which were the Royal Mill, the mills of Augustinians, of the Benedictine nuns, and of some bourgeoisie families.³ The road that stretched from the northern city gates below Goljak and Hlibac and extended towards Grohovo, was a royal one. It led to the mills and was called *contrada molendinarum* in the records.⁴ There were numerous gardens next to these mills whose wheels abundantly

⁶ TN: The names themselves mean island in Croatian. The Rječica River would bring along debris and sediments with it, creating little islands, of which Otočac/Školjić was the biggest one.

watered the crops. Zvir also had fulling mills, which were used even by the Boduli ⁷and Istrians for processing cloth and grinding grain.

Brajde furrowed with trellis beds⁸. The Luke district, *contrada dello luche*, differentiated itself from Zvir and Mlinovi through its lack of mills, but was rich in vineyard trellises and trellis beds of the citizens, fraternities, monasteries and chapels of Rijeka. This lush and green scenery at the mouth of the Rječina River was complemented by beautifully and properly cultivated Franciscan vineyard trellises on the location of the present-day Delta, as well as some smaller Franciscan trellises and vineyards below the Trsat hill, which stretched all the way to the Karolina Road. The Franciscan vineyard trellises on the Delta were enclosed by a wall. From 1675 to 1849, a Roman inscription excavated by the Franciscans was embedded into the wall and it mentioned a soldier from the 8th Roman cohort, which is proof that this area was part of the classical Tarsatic lands.⁵ In 1431, prince Martin Frankopan issued a document, by which the Franciscans received the western slope of the Trsat hill. The outskirts of the area encompassed the line from the chapel of St. George to the Rječina river, going on from the middle of the river to the so-called *lago marino*, to the west, and from the middle the *lago marino* towards the south, to the sea. From this, it can be concluded that in the 19th century, the mouth of the Rječina River was near Školjić. Due to floods, the sea lake disappeared and in the 16th century the location of the mouth of the Rječina River was slightly closer to the Jelačić Square than that of the present-day bridge.⁶ The process of sedimentation of materials continued and the surface of the present-day Delta advanced towards the sea. During the flood season, Rječina would form a knee near the bridge and turn towards the city, and the torrent would take a shorter path across the delta right into the sea, taking everything in its way along with it. That is why the authorities, despite huge financial sacrifices, decided to buy the trellises from the Franciscans and dig a new riverbed for the river to flow through during the flood season. Thus, in 1854 and 1855, the waters of Rječina flowed straight into the sea through what was once a vineyard, supported by wooden stakes modeled after the cultivated Franciscan vineyard trellises along the Adriatic coast. The river was regulated, but the typical Mediterranean scenery had disappeared - grapes, wine and friars. The west side of Brajda was given the name Delta, after the Greek letter it resembled following the excavation in 1854,⁷ while the eastern side, due to its reduced area, has kept the

⁷ TN: Boduli, in a broader sense, a name for islanders in the northern and central Adriatic, and in a narrower sense for the inhabitants of the island of Krk.

⁸ TN: Brajda - Trellis

name Brajdica to this day. From 1854 until the present day, with the filling up of both Delta and Brajdica, the mouth of the Rječina has significantly moved away from its initial location.

The shortcut. At the dawn of the 19th century, there was a great need for the construction of roads in Rijeka. A road towards Mlinovi via Školjić was made as early as 1806. This road separated Luke from Kalvarija, but there was also a shortcut, a shorter road along the bank of the Rječina River through which traffic took place until 1823, when a unique public promenade with a plane tree avenue was opened, a typical Biedermeier romantic avenue, with a monumental portal as its entrance, inscribed with the following: IVCVnDO sIngVLIIs ambVlaCro ... (Chronogram: MDCCLLVVVVIII - 1823). One of the plans of Rijeka (State Archives of Rijeka) contained a beautiful avenue, that other cities would be envious of. When the poplars were uprooted during a storm in 1852, they were replaced by plane trees and chestnuts, some of which, together with the coach house, still exist to this day.⁸ With the development of industry and the construction of a tram depot, this whole distinctive horticultural complex, the city's recreational content, gradually disappeared; there is no trace of it left, except for the street intersected by the railway overpass. Rijeka's rapid industrial development during the 19th century caused the disappearance of the city's promenade and greenery, especially in the areas where there was running water that initially served exclusively as a driving force for that same industry. It began in the late 18th century with the construction of a large leather factory in Školjić, then in 1821. Adamić built a paper mill under Trsat. Later, the Klačonica (abattoir) was built on Školjić, and finally Perilo (Lavatoio/Lavoir). Školjić was split in half by the new city road, the south side of which was full of residential buildings. Since the middle of the 19th century, Luke had been an interesting construction site, especially for the industrialists. Recreational areas were also planned. First came the construction of the *Bagno Ilona* public bath, and in 1904 came the Aquatorium, built in the Egyptian style, with twelve pools of sea water and six pools of fresh water, all according to the project of Eduardo Castiano.⁹

For centuries, the life-giving water fed the soil of Rijeka, gave strength to its greenery, vineyard trellises, vines and roses, and since the 19th century it became the driving force of its industrial plants whose products, especially paper, became internationally known and gained prominence. Since the second half of the 19th century, the calm, civic, idyllic lifestyle was replaced by a rat race, the opening of new plants, the typical cosmopolitan hustle and bustle, in which there was no room for moral scruples, let alone the greenery of the Franciscan Brajda, Luke, Mlinovi and Zvir.

- ¹ Waclaw Twardzik, *Opis Rijeke s početka 19. stoljeća iz pera Josipa Završnika*, Dometi, year 20, vol. 4, Rijeka, 1987, 267
- ² Vittorio Sablich, *Il distretto fiumano nel secolo XVI*, *Bullettino della Deputazione fiumana di storia patria*, Fiume, 1921, 21
- ³ Giuseppe Viezzoli, *Contributi alla storia di Fiume nel Settecento*, *Fiume-Rivista*, Anno X, Fiume, 1932, 47.
- ⁴ V. Sablich, *op. cit.*, 23.
- ⁵ Matija Mažić, *Dvije rimske ploče s Trsata i Sušaka*, *Novi list*, 3 and 4 XI 1934, 3
- ⁶ Guido Depoli, *La Provincia del Carnaro*, *Fiume-Rivista*, Anno V, 1927, Fiume 1928, 80-82
- ⁷ Giovanni Kobler, *Memorie (...)*, II, 54
- ⁸ G. Kobler, *op. cit.*, 58.
- ⁹ Acquatorio, *La Bilancia*, Anno XXVII, Fiume, 6. IX. 1904, no. 29, 2

The Paper Mill

One of the few industrial zones in Rijeka was on Školjić, at the foot of Trsat, dominated by the Paper Mill

The railway connection between Rijeka and Karlovac completely changed the appearance of Školjić in 1873

The Paper Mill and above it the old Louisiana Road

View from Trsat towards Školjić

The Jelačić Square

Developmental morphology. On the stretch from the Sokol Tower (Corso 2) to the end of the Pavao Ritter Vitezović Street, a moat filled with water, called the Moat or Fosso, stretched along the city walls. This moat was reclaimed after the imperial decision of 1784, which allowed the people of Rijeka to demolish the medieval walls in order to expand the city. During the period from 1785 to 1830, the people of Rijeka, mostly newcomers, built new houses on the foundations of these demolished walls. The direction of the buried moat determined the length and the design of the new street.

Three urban plans. From 1752 to 1785, three urban plans for the south and southeastern part of the city outside the ramparts were made. The final plan and urban regulation of this new city district was designed by the renowned imperial and royal building inspector at the Gubernium, Anton Gnamb, in 1785. He had to respect the spaces formed by necessity and among them was a large irregular square, simply called the Piazza della Fiumara (Square of the Rječina River), which was located in the old port and served as a dock and as an unloading point for sailing ships. As construction began outside the Old Town (Civitas vetus), the triangular space stretching from the present-day Republic of Croatia Square to Rječina began to be called *Civitas nova* (New Town). Modern architecture gave character to the New Town, the Gubernia Street, the Promenade and the street named after the moat-Via Fosso.¹ Among the people a part of the stretch was called the Moat (from the end of the Corso to the Slogar House, or from the Sokol Tower to the Lešnjak Tower, or from the present-day's Slogin Tower to the Agatić street). This parceled out triangle of Rijeka has remained the same to this day. As much as the newcomers were happy about the demolition of the city walls, the old citizens, the natives of Rijeka, did not like it because they thought that Rijeka would look like a village without its walls. For centuries these ancient walls instilled them with a sense of protection and courage, especially since the times of the Venetian incursions into Rijeka. They also doubted the water regulation system, about which they were not mistaken.

The 19th century Rijeka writer and chronicler, Josip Završnik, gave a precise description of a part of the Jelačić Square. At the beginning of the 19th century, he wrote: *Under Charles VI who had the road from Rijeka to Karlovac built, a large beautiful gate called the New Gate was opened and built with quadrangular stones, over which was the emperor('s) eagle and the crest, the crest of the great Austrian House (aquila imperialis et insigne gloriosae domus austriacae). These gates leading to Rijeckenjisće (Fiumera) that closed at night and opened to*

no one, were completely demolished in my time. To get out of the city, there was a bridge over the water of the Moat built, which was destroyed during my younger years.

The White Gate. This information of his inspired the idea that a part of the Belgrade Square (present-day Jelačić Square) should serve to accentuate the direction of a special street. That street began on Sušak, (the *finis Carolinae* (end of the Karolina Road) was on the Pyramid on Sušak), stretched along the bridge, went through the newly built city gate and the Užarska Street right into the city of Rijeka. On a plan of Rijeka from 1766, the gates were marked with the letter P, as the *Weises Thor* (White Gate), probably because the stone was white and new, and also because, in the plans, the tower behind the Church of the Assumption of Mary was sometimes called the White Tower.³

After 1725, Pannonian goods transported in merchant carriages from Karlovac to Rijeka entered the city, which was enclosed by its ramparts, through the White Gates and docked at the free port of Rijeka. It is, therefore, a focal point in the history of the city of Rijeka, which finally connected the city with Croatia and Hungary. This fact obliged the architects and the commission assigned with the renovation of the Corso to tackle the problem of the presentation of this facade of Rijeka, which, after moving the port from the Rječina River to the front of the city, had lost its original meaning. Equal care was taken to mark the route of the water filled moat (Završnik called it Rove) that went around the city walls at the edge of the Joisp Kraš Street (present-day Ante Starčević street) with a special row of candelabra.⁴

Riva Boduli. In the old plans of Rijeka, as well as on very old drawings and graphics, we can clearly follow the morphology of the development of the present-day Jelačić Square and Joisp Kraš Street (present-day Ante Starčević street). On a plan of Rijeka, made by the famous cartographer Ivan Klobučarić in 1580, we can find valuable information about the southern face of Rijeka. In front of the town were several barracks, two cottages, a shipyard, and on the shore *ladvas* (dugout boats) and a protruding wooden pier, the Riva Boduli. In front of the city gates was a cleared area where only the road to the ferry on Rječina was marked.⁵ Later graphics repeated this image, for which we are sure that it is not a forgery, since Ivan Klobučarić was a longtime monk and prior of the Augustinian monastery in Rijeka, as well as a reliable cartographer. A century later, in 1671, Rijeka surgeon Giorgio Genova had his

drawing of Rijeka printed in Venice. Across the road from the moat *an inn where the Uskoks⁹ stayed* was drawn.⁶

The plan of Rijeka from 1650, which is kept in the Vienna War Archives, shows the same situation, but with a long building, probably a port warehouse with several smaller buildings, almost certainly barracks, shown at the location of the present-day Jelačić Square. It is natural that this area became more significant in the third decade of the 18th century, after Rijeka was proclaimed a free port. Great attention was paid to the eastern and western banks of the Rječina, the riverbed was regularly cleaned, because during high waters the Rječina washed away large amounts of sediments. Its shores were originally fortified only with stakes, but by the end of the 18th century, Gnamb designed the stone-clad west bank, the same type of bank that the present-day's Dead Canal has. One watercolor painting of the Jelačić Square shows the port in Rječina, a square surrounded by houses, some of which have not changed to this day, and the same can be said about the square itself.⁷ That year, the mouth of the Rječina was in the same location as the present-day bridge at the end of the Zajc Street, which can be seen in the plans of Rijeka from 1766 and 1830. The irregular bank was reclaimed, and consequently the riverbed of the Rječina was extended, that is, its mouth was getting closer and closer to what is the end of the present-day Dead Canal.

The Rijeka triangle. The Belgrade Square (present-day Jelačić Square) and all surrounding streets lost all their significance as port and unloading point for goods immediately after the current riverbed of the Rječina was dug in the middle of the 19th century,⁸ that is, when the first part of the modern port (i.e., the pier next to the fish market, on the present-day northern part of the Boduli Riva, ed.no.) breakwater was built. The economic and maritime face of the town faced southwards, and the former mouth of the Rječina and the old port become the Dead Canal. Two hundred years have passed since the urban regulation of the Rijeka triangle, i.e., the Civitas nova. The streets, squares, lines of buildings, everything had remained unchanged. The architecture on the Josip Kraš Street (now the Ante Starčević street) and the Jelačić Square changed at the end of the 19th century; many Classicist buildings built between 1785 and 1830 were upgraded and modernized; they were built by Dr. Ivan Randić, Giacomo Zammattio, and more recently by Igor Emili. With the renovation of the Starčević Street and a

⁹ Uskoks - were irregular soldiers in Habsburg Croatia that inhabited areas on the eastern Adriatic coast and surrounding territories during the Ottoman wars in Europe. Etymologically, the word *uskoci* itself means "the ones who jumped in" ("the ones who ambushed") in South Slavic languages. Bands of Uskoks fought a guerrilla war against the Ottomans, and they formed small units and rowed swift boats. Since the Uskoks were checked on land and were rarely paid their annual subsidy, they resorted to acts of piracy. (Source: [Uskoks - Wikipedia](#))

part of the Jelačić Square, that elegant part of the city got some of its well-deserved splendour back.

Our Rijeka, yr. X, no. 120, December 1988. p. 12.

¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica citta di Fiume*, II, 48-49.

² W. Twardzik, *Description of Rijeka from the beginning of the 19th century by Josip Završnik, Dometi*, vol. 20, vol. 4, Rijeka, 1987, 270.

³ DAR, JU 51, Positional drafts, draft no. 4/2, Rijeka, 1766, corrections and additions until 1795.

⁴ W. Twardzik, *op. cit.* 270.

⁵ DAR, JU 51, Positional drafts, draft no. 1/2, Rijeka and Martinšćica, 1580, copy of the original from the War Archives in Vienna (Klobučarić).

⁶ G. Kobler, *op. cit.* II, 35.

⁷ Maritime and Historical Museum of the Croatian Littoral, Rijeka, Department of Cultural History, Collection of Watercolors and Graphics.

⁸ DAR, JU 51, Positional drafts, draft no. 10/2, Rijeka (Martvi kanal, Rječina - stari tok) 1850.

In a watercolor painting from 1832 C. Von Mayer showed the irregular square on the banks of the Rječina, the main port at the time.

The present-day Jelačić Square at the end of the 19th century

Wine from Krk and Dalmatia was the most traded commodity on the shores of the Dead Canal

A tram ran through the present-day Jelačić Square between 1899 and 1952

The bridges on the Rječina

The Rječina. From time immemorial, the crossing over the Rječina has been approximately in the same location as the present-day bridge, i.e., the Tito Square. The Roman road that connected Trieste (Tergeste) with Senj (Senia) passed along Rijeka's Old Town (Tarsatica) and continued beneath the Trsat Hill. In 1675, when the Franciscans were cultivating their vineyard on their property below the hill, which was named Brajda after that vineyard, they excavated a Roman tombstone with an inscription mentioning a soldier of the eighth cohort. Since the Romans buried their dead along the road, this finding was a confirmation that the Roman road passed there. There is no evidence that the Rječina was bridged during Roman times, because citizens were using cable ferries until the end of the 15th century. We must keep in mind that at that time the sea reached up to the foot of the Trsat hill and that the mouth of the river flowing into the sea was below present-day Školjić.¹ The Rječina is a karst river and the Sušica stream flows into it, bringing with it large amounts of sand and stones from Grobničko polje, after it swells from the melting of the snow or after heavy rain. The Rječina carries all this debris towards the sea and when it finally reaches Zvir, it starts flowing more easily into the plain, and sand and debris begin to settle and form islets, clusters around which the Rječina formed backwaters, the largest of which was, in historical sources, referred to as Otočac or Scoglietto.²

The wooden bridge. In this area, which can be considered the original mouth of the Rječina, the sea water mixed with the river water and, in a grant from 1431, through which prince Martin Frankopan donated the land to the Franciscans of Trsat, it was called *lago marino* (sea lake). As a result of floods, this sea lake disappeared, as can be seen from a depiction of Rijeka from the 16th century, on which the mouth of the Rječina is near the Belgrade Square (present-day Jelačić Square). In fact, the Rječina, having passed through Luke and Školjić, managed to collect its waters and flow into the sea through a flat riverbed. Up until the second half of the 18th century, a creek separated from it on Školjić and was directed into a moat under the wall located in the present-day P.R. Vitezović Street. Leaving the area overgrown with lush vineyards that belonged to the citizens of Rijeka and where the fulling mills, which were frequently visited by boats loaded with grain and cloth, were located, Rječina took on a new role, the riverbed at its mouth became the port of Rijeka. It is indisputable that Rijeka had a pier on the shore in front of the city on the so-called Boduli coast (Riva Boduli), where a wooden bridge, a breakwater, was located. The fishing boats moored next to this bridge were

mainly those of the islanders who supplied the Rijeka market. However, only the mouth of the Rječina could be a safe enough shelter for larger ships which were moored for a longer period of time. The flood sediments settled along the left bank of the river, so that its flow moved to the right towards the Old Town, which suited the business people of Rijeka, but the riverbed bent unnaturally in the shape of an elbow and continued its flow in a straight line in the direction of the sea. This elbow can be seen in all depictions of Rijeka from the 16th to the 18th century. On the veduta of Rijeka from 1579, ships can be seen in the Rječina and on the city plan from 1625, the lower course of the Rječina was explicitly called the Port (Porto).

Since 1575, the city was in charge of the administration over this port, collecting fees, but also, investing large amounts of money into the repair of the groynes on the coast, which ensured safe mooring on both its banks. The imperial treasury sometimes helped out with the maintenance and construction of the port, which is why the port was in such an excellent condition at the end of the 17th century. This was, of course, aided by the shipbuilders whose Brotherhood of St. Nicholas had a shipyard at the mouth of the Rječina, on the site of the present-day Jelačić Square.³

How the Dead Canal came into being. When Rijeka was declared a free port in 1719, the care of the Rječina riverbed became a state concern, so piers were built on both sides of the estuary and the pier on the left bank was extended by 47 meters. The more the mouth of the Rječina advanced towards the sea, the greater the danger at the entrance to the port became, because the sea sand, carried by the sirocco and the current, accumulated alongside the river deposits. Thus, the pier along the left bank extended further into the sea and was eventually, according to a project from 1856, turned towards the west, which was accomplished in 1871, and this was, in fact, the beginning of the Baross port.⁴

For centuries Rijeka suffered the floods of the Rječina. After one such strong flood, even stronger than the previous ones, when the water reached the Corso, it was decided to regulate the Rječina by digging a new riverbed, which would contain the river when it reached its highest water level. During such floods the Rječina simply penetrated the Franciscan Brajda, taking the shortest route possible to the sea, circumventing the artificially created elbow of the official riverbed. Thanks to a large financial investment, this canal was excavated in 1854 and 1855, redirecting the sea water into the old riverbed and creating the Dead Canal, while the new riverbed took the Rječina straight into the sea. To this day, the Dead Canal serves as a port for boats and smaller ships. After 1854, a triangular terrain remained between the Dead Canal and the new riverbed of the Rječina, which was named Delta due to its resemblance to

the Greek letter. This terrain has been regularly filled up since 1854, especially when the Hungarian state railways built their own transport system and railway bridge. In 1884, the Delta occupied an area of 26,684 square meters, which extended to 140,000 square meters in 1921. With the filling up of the Delta, the new riverbed of the Rječina was extended and the old name of the Franciscan Brajda was preserved in the name Brajdica.

Transport by ferry. When Rijeka passed its Statute in 1530, there was no bridge on the Rječina. The transport of passengers, animals and cars was conducted by a ferry. According to Article 15 of the Statute, the ferry on the Rječina was leased out. When the water swelled, there were real shipwrecks. To prevent such danger, a bridge was built in 1640 at the expense of the city and the Trsat monastery. Everyone paid a toll for crossing the bridge except for the people of Kastav during their procession in the honor of Our Lady of Trsat. At that time, there were only two houses and taverns on the left bank of the Rječina. One was owned by the owner of the monastery ferry and the other one was for the upper class. It was used as a toll collection office. In these taverns, wine was sold on the cheap, which angered the municipality, but not the people of Rijeka. On the plan of Rijeka from the 17th century, one of these taverns was marked as *Hosteria dove allogiano li Scochi*. The bridge was rebuilt in 1715, which was related to the construction of the Karolina Road which began at the Pyramid. Immediately after that, in 1717, the Jesuits erected a statue of St. John of Nepomuk on the bridge, because of which the area in front of the bridge on the Rijeka side began to be called The St. John Square. In 1753, the bridge was replaced by a drawbridge, allowing ships with high masts to enter deeper towards Školjić.⁵ The iron bridge was built after the Rječina riverbed was regulated in 1855. It was replaced by a new one, which was demolished on December 25, 1920. Later, the municipalities of Rijeka and Sušak built the so-called border bridge, which opened on December 31, 1926.⁶ In 1946, a new bridge (Tito's Square), which connected Rijeka with Sušak, was built in its place.

Thus, the urban image created over the centuries changed. A stone slab contains the historical message of Josip Broz Tito to the people of Rijeka, telling them to live in brotherhood, harmony and love, because that is the only way for Rijeka to prosper.

Our Rijeka, yr. VI, no. 71, November 1984.

¹ M. Mažić, Two Roman Plates from Trsat and Sušak, *Novi list*, 3rd and 4th. XI. 1934, 3.

² A. Depoli, Il confine orientale di Fiume e la questione del Delta della Fiumara, *Bulletino della deputazione fiumana di Storia patria*, V, Fiume, 1921, 31, 55.

³ V. Sablich, Il distretto fiumano nel secolo XVI, Bulletino della Deputazione fiumana di Storia patria, Fiume, 1921, 9-30.

⁴ N. Mancini, Portolano del mare Adriatico, Milano 1830, 50.

⁵ G. Viezzoli, Contributions to the History of Fiume nel Settecento, Fiume-Rivista, Anno X, 1932, 3-178.

⁶ Il ponte sull'Eneo aperto bal traffico, La Vedetta d'Italia, Fiume, 1 I 1927, 2

Aerial view of the Delta and the bridges over the Dead Canal and the Rječina

A modest metal bridge over the river. In the background are the entrance chapel of the Trsat Stairway, and the former Adamić House.

The Dead Canal

The new border bridge over the Rječina river was ceremoniously opened on December 31, 1926

Border on the bridge over the Rječina in the 1930s

Swing iron bridge over the Dead Canal behind the theater

A new bridge between Rijeka and Sušak in the 1960s

The rich history of the Pyramid

Two memorial inscriptions. Because the St. Carl's Lazaretto in Mandrač stopped working in 1816, because the port (present-day Croatian Post Office building near the railway station) could not accommodate large sailing ships, ships arriving in Rijeka from suspicious areas were quarantined in the port of Martinšćica. The construction of a lazaretto in Kraljevica was being considered, but it was instead built in Martinšćica and Andrija Ljudevit Adamić sold the coastal part of his estate in Martinšćica to the state for a significant amount of money. The new royal Lazaretto of St. Francis was opened on June 2, 1833 and could be reached by the new Dorothea road.

The Dorothea Road. The Dorothea Road was named in honor of the Archduchess Dorothea, wife of Archduke Joseph, the Palatine of Hungary. The road separated from the Karolina road on the Pyramid and went towards Martinšćica (present-day XIII. Division Promenade). It was built to connect the city of Rijeka with the lazaretto. Previously, the municipal road descended to Martinšćica and separated from the Karolina road on a hill (present-day Krimeja). Krimeja got its name because a large number of houses there were owned by native sailors, who became rich by offering transportation services during the Crimean War in 1855.¹ At the beginning of the new Dorothea road, right at the point where it separated from the Karolina road, a pyramid was erected as a monument. There were two memorial inscriptions on it dedicated to the construction of the road. The first reads:

MARIA DOROTHEA

VIA RATARIA

AB AUSPICATISS NOMINE

SERENISS A. D. AUSTR. JOSEPHI

REGNI HUNG. PALATINI

CONJUGIS OPTIMAE

VIA MARIA DOROTHEA

COMPELLATA

The road named after Maria Dorothea, the best wife of the most glorious palatine of the Kingdom of Hungary, Archduke of Austria, Joseph.

The second inscription reads:

MDCCCXXXIII

FRANCISCO I AUGUSTO

SCEPTRA HUNG. TENENTE

JOSEPHO A. D. A. PALATIN,

FRANCESCO AB ÜRMENY

LITTUS HUNGARIAE GUBERNANTE

VIA HAEC

ET INSTITUTUM QUO DUCIT

SURREXERE

1833, the magnificent Francis I, holding the scepter of Hungary, Archduke Palatine Joseph, Francis of Ürmény, Governor of the Hungarian Littoral, erected this road and the institute to which it leads.

Next to that Pyramid was an imperial milestone with the inscription:

CAROLINA

AUGUSTO JUSSU CAROLI VI IMP. MAX.

AB HOC FLUMINE AD PORTUM REG. ET UTRIUMQUE

TRANS ALPES ET CALAPIN PER LX PASS MILL.

APERT

*The Karolina, by order of the Exalted Charles VI, the great emperor, reaches from this Rijeka to
the Kupa 60,000 miles*

The new location of the Pyramid. This milestone was integrated into the current Pyramid, which had to be removed from its original location during the asphaltting of the main streets on Sušak during the 1930s. The construction office of the Sušak municipality, by order of the Mayor Juraj Ružić, prepared a project for the new location of the Pyramid, whose adaptation was carried out by the sculpture and stonemason's workshop of Rude Matković in Sušak. Sušak's public opinion was divided into those who were in favor of the relocation of the Pyramid and those against it. One group considered it a historical monument that should be preserved and highlighted as an urban sequence after which a part of Sušak, At the Pyramid (Na Piramidi), was named. The other group, in the spirit of the regime of the time, considered it a memorial evoking the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and believed that it should be removed. Fortunately, reason prevailed, preserving the imperial milestone at the beginning of the Karolina road. It is not necessary to point out what the construction of the Karolina road meant for the city of Rijeka during the period from 1725 to 1736. Under the management of the engineering Lieutenant Colonel Matija Antun Weiss, from Rijeka through Škrljevo-Zlobin-Fužine-Mrkopalj-Ravna Gora-Vrbovsko-Bosiljevo and Novigrad na Dobri to Karlovac, in the length of 117 kilometers, the first road connecting Karlovac with the sea was built and along it new settlements of colonists were constructed, of which Škrljevo, Krasica and Praputnjak were some of the more prominent ones in our municipality. These were a special type of villages created according to the project of the builder, who was in the position of the construction general-engineer of inner Austria. He was the person responsible for the construction of the first real mountain road; he did this work with great love and left an album of drawings of the road in the archives of the Court Chamber in Vienna.

The current location of the Pyramid. The current new location of this significant monument of road construction in our city was the only possible one, although the Karolina and Dorothea roads fork on the newly built bridge. It is now more of a sign after which a part of the city was named and we can be happy that it was presented in this manner.

Our Rijeka, yr. III, no. April 27, 1981

¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. II, Fiume, 1896, 64.

² A. Rački, *History of the City of Sušak*, Sušak, 1929, 174-175; I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski, *Nadpisi sredovječni i novovjeki ... u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji*, Zagreb, 1891, 274, inscription no. 924.

The pyramid, in fact a milestone, which changed its position several times

View of the Pyramid and two houses of the Ružić family

The Pyramid during World War II

Stage lights

Adamić's theater

An authentic work of art. After the 1750 earthquake, which destroyed and significantly damaged a large portion of Rijeka's Old Town, a new urban plan was adopted in 1755, depicting the lines of development of the so-called *civitas nova* on the coast in front of the city walls. The *civitas nova* would be built on backfilled land on the stretch from Rov to Andrejšćica (Fosso - Borgo S. Andrea). Later on, straight streets intersected by vertical roads in the direction of the sea were marked, as well as city *insulas*. The Mediterranean style of architecture was abandoned in the denser populated areas. The citizens who got rich through trade, shipping and industry had since decided to build their homes in the new part of the city. Thus, at the end of the 18th century and during the first decade of the 19th century Rijeka became a huge construction site. The Rijeka Pharmacist Carlo Pisanello wrote about this lush development of Rijeka in a letter to the Empress: *Trade is developing, the foreigners are attracted, all the streets will be so crowded that the happiness we live in will be remembered by the generations to come.*

From contract to opening - two years. The newly arrived citizens from Western Europe were in need of cultural entertainment, which could be found in theaters. It was a daring task to build a new theater in a city that had already set aside a lot of money for road construction, the backfilling of the sea and the building of the Long Pier (*Molo Longo*) for the port in front of the city. The task was bravely accepted by Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, a distinguished public figure, entrepreneur, member of the Hungarian parliament and freshly baked patrician of Rijeka.¹ In 1803, he finally decided to build a theater in Rijeka. The original plan for *Adamić's theater* was signed by A.L. Adamić himself, and on the basis of that signature alone, dr. Cvito Fisković claims that Adamić was also its architect.² However, it was customary for the owner to sign the official project along with the architect; therefore, that signature does not necessarily mean authorship. The only fact that has been confirmed using the data from the archive was that the builder of the theater was the Rijeka architect and surveyor Valentino Defranceschi, who in 1806 became Anton Gnamb's successor as the building inspector. As Gnamb's partner, Defranceschi made a geodetic plan of the new port (the current port, not the one on the Rječina) and many other constructions in Rijeka, and his architectural prowess is best evidenced by the opinion of A.L. Adamić himself, which he

expressed in a recommendation issued as an attachment to Valentino Defranceschi's application for the vacant seat of the aedile. That recommendation states: *Mr. Valentino Defranceschi not only has the skills of an architect, but he is also a capable designer, and above all it is his recommendable creativity, diligence and supervision of projects, which he showcased whilst participating in the construction of the new theater, that are proof of his expertise and diligence.*³ Such a flattering opinion from A.L. Adamić could only be obtained by an experienced architect who did not have to be a theater designer, but his role in the construction of that project was of utmost importance. That project was painted on a portrait of Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, which is exhibited in the Maritime and Historical Museum in Rijeka. In the portrait, Adamić holds the project of the theater facade with pride in his left hand, and points to the floor plan with the index finger of his right hand.⁴ According to a preserved photograph of the facade of Adamić's Theater, taken just before its demolition in 1883, the building was built somewhat narrower than designed, and the roof, as is common for the neoclassicist style, lacked a baroque crown with volutes. The contract between the municipality of Rijeka and A.L. Adamić on the construction of a new theater was concluded on November 10, 1803, and the theater was opened as early as October 3, 1805. In architecture, this was the period of Baroque neoclassicism, which was a precursor to the Empire style. With its noble façade, this representative building formed a small square where the Corso and the street named after the theater, Contrada del teatro (now the meeting point of the Scarpina, Gubec and the beginning of the Adamić street) met. This new scenography gave a certain Central European metropolitan tone to the whole newly built series of late baroque buildings on the Corso, which can be clearly seen in a graphic made after a watercolor by Ch. v. Mayr in 1833, which, we could say, depicts all of the *civitas nova* of Rijeka's Predgrad.⁵

A big role in social life. Andrija Ljudevit Adamić was a well-traveled man, having been all around Europe, and it cannot be excluded that he acquired an already finished project somewhere. This is further supported by the fact that the newly built building, with its huge rear, simply protruded beyond the line of the new Lido Street (present-day Zajc Street) and occupied the entire current street width. The coastal stretch of new houses on the Lido Street was determined by Gnamb's urban plan from 1782, while the theater on that same stretch with its huge size and volume did not look like a successfully realized urban sequence. Given that during the end of the 18th century and in the first three decades of the 19th century A.L. Adamić (1767.-1828) was the most influential person in Rijeka's political, industrial and economic life, he could have simply forced this project upon the city municipality. In fact, we

have seen that Gnamb's closest associate, and later on a building inspector, Defranceschi, was the contractor for that project. This means that a theater building was not envisaged at that location. The facade of that theater was especially valuable in the development of Baroque architecture in Rijeka. It bore the marks of Neo-Palladian Baroque classicism and, unfortunately, this authentic work of art created at the dawn of the 19th century, has not been preserved for us. This theater played a major role in the cultural history of Rijeka's artistic and social life. After 1805, theatrical drama and opera ensembles could visit Rijeka, and their theatrical performances, instead of being performed in an improvised wooden hut, could be enjoyed in a lavish ambience, much like in other major European cultural centers. After graduating from the conservatory, Ivan Zajc conducted the orchestra in that theater.

In addition, the theater building housed a casino, whose members were Rijeka's merchants and officials, citizens of the upper echelon of the society who, according to their interests, directed the politics of Rijeka as a cosmopolitan emporium. Waves of immigrants from Sarajevo to Tyrol, from the Czech Lands to Italy, Flanders and Great Britain poured into Rijeka, and they all came with the same goal – to get rich. The importance of this theater to the life of the port city is best shown by the fact that the municipality of Rijeka bought it from its heirs on March 25, 1845 after which it was named the Municipal Theater (Teatro comunale).

A harmonious whole. Along with the administrative palace of the former Sugar Factory and the old Governor's Palace, the building of Adamić's Theater is Rijeka's third monumental building built at the turn of the 20th century. It is only natural that its measures are incomparable to those of the architecture of civic homes and the style in which the façade of the theater was created was adjusted to fit the norms of the time. It was imitated, of course, in the same manner that constantly appears in the relation between the metropolis and the province, that is, between Trieste and Rijeka, two cities with the same status of a free port. On the ground floor, rustication with alternating smooth and rough squares was applied up until the first cordon cornice. Pilasters and three-quarter pillars with horizontal belts of rough rustication over them served as decoration leaning against the wall surface and standing around the openings of the entrance portals. This part of the building was influenced by the Mannerist Sanmikelian solutions characteristic of Venice, and revived in the European architecture during the second half of the 18th century. The middle protrusion, on the other hand, was vertically divided by pilasters and leaning pillars that crossed two floors and ended under a beam and a protruding cornice. An attic was recessed above the cornice, and pilasters

with atlases supporting the roof cornice were placed vertically between the windows. This horizontal and vertical division of the façade surface and the application of a giant order show that Palladio was the primary inspiration for the artistic aspect of the architecture, which is a basic trait of Baroque neoclassicism in Europe. This ambitious architecture is a reflection of Adamić's desire for appropriate luxury, a sight that would beguile every visitor. It is a harmonious whole and not a striking decor; it is a simplified style typical of the new bourgeoisie. This also proves that at the turn of the 19th century Rijeka was open to all European influences, which indirectly paved the way for the French neoclassicism through the Austrian Zopf-style. This was particularly evident in the wrought-iron lattices on balcony railings decorated with an infinite octagon ornament, characteristic of the said style. The city found it increasingly difficult to maintain this monumental building, mainly because of problems such as side exits for fire emergencies, problems with heating and lighting, etc. Less than eighty years had passed since the beginning of its construction, and according to the report of the city commission, it no longer complied with the regulations for theater buildings on the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The city was obliged to either renovate and modernize the building, or demolish it because of its dilapidated state and build a new contemporary theater. It was not a bad idea to build a new theater, but it was unfortunate that the beautiful facade of Adamić's theater could not have been adequately incorporated into the new building that was to be built in its place. However, it was decided that the old theater was to be demolished to its foundations and that the stone from its ruins would be used for the building of the new Municipal Theater. Work on the foundations for the new theater began in 1883, and at the same time the old one was being demolished. The Rijeka savings bank bought the land on which Adamić's theater was built from the municipality and constructed the Modello Bank Palace on it.⁶

Our Rijeka, yr. V, no. 45, February 1983.

¹ Riccardo Gigante, Stralcio dalla Corrispondenza di Lodovico Adamich col tenente Maresciallo Laval Nugent, Fiume-Rivista, Anno XV-XVI, 1937-1938, Fiume, 1940, 131-132

² Cvito Fisković, Staro kazalište u Rijeci, Zbornik Rijeka, Zagreb, 1953, 467-469

³ DAR, JU 2, The Minutes of the Session (...), Protocols: 1806, no. 96 from the 1st and 2nd V, list 42nd verso to the 43rd recto

⁴ Maritime and Historical Museum, Cultural History Department, Red Salon

⁵ Maritime and Historical Museum, Collection of Graphics.

⁶ Edilizia, La Bilancia, XVI (Fiume, 1. X. 1883.) 222, 2

Gustav Klimt, one of the greatest painters in history, created the painting Religious Music (oil on canvas) as one of his three works for the ceiling of the Rijeka Theater

Andrija Ljudevit Adamić drew the project for the theater, which he later had constructed with his own money in 1805

For eighty years (1805-1883) Adamić's Theater was the center of the city's social life

The facade of Adamić's theater just before its demolition. In its place the Modello Palace, which now houses the City Library, was erected in 1885.

Rijeka's temple of Thalia

How the municipal theater was built. At the beginning of 1883, the Rijeka Municipal Council conducted heated debates about the location of the new communal theater. It was clear to everyone that Adamić's old theater would not suffice for a developing city such as Rijeka and that the renovations of the building and fire precaution measures were only a temporary solution. The majority opinion was that the theater house should be built on a spacious square, that is, at its present-day location. The Council was in a hurry and already in March the blueprints were commissioned from the Viennese architects Fellner and Helmer, known for their projects of numerous theaters throughout the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.¹ A city that was soon to become an emporium should have a theater on par with Central European ones. Fellner and Helmer were feverishly finishing their work, as the Municipium was constantly rushing them, and finally the sketches arrived from Vienna. Podestà Giovanni commendatore Ciotta displayed those drafts to *satisfy the legitimacy of the citizens*. The budget for the building was 313 thousand forints. The city had to take out a loan at the Rijeka savings bank. The city council was still ready for huge sacrifices and had plans to invest into the the electric lighting of the theater from the get-go. They were thinking ahead.

Laying the groundwork. The digging of the foundations began in June. Two thousand poles had to be driven under the foundation, and it was done. It was clear to everyone that the costs were rising and that the construction was being prolonged, however, what had been started could not be halted, although some doubted the outcome. A theater is not only a building; it is also an ornament of the city, a sign of its culture and economic power. It was necessary to decorate it with works of art, to embellish its facade, to make the auditorium elegant and luxurious. The statues on the façade were to be made by a famous artist, the ceiling was to be painted by a renowned painter and the expenses kept rising. Precise analyses of plaster, concrete and stone were performed, and the construction of the walls began after the municipal architects finished their reports. There were discussions about the renovation of the square, the facades of the surrounding houses and the park in front of the theater. At the beginning of 1884, the building site was visited by Giovanni Ciotta and the President of the Magistrate E. Brelich. The construction of the building was going fast, the installation of the stone plinth had already begun and the iron for internal construction and the dome were arriving from England. The Viennese sculptor Völkel took over the sculptural works and the execution of the plastic ornaments. The outlines of the *magnificent building that together with*

the Municipal Bank would contribute to making the old Ürmeny Square the most beautiful and elegant city district were already discernible.

Under the roof. By early September, the building was built up to the roof. The roofing ceremony was marked by decorations, banners, the coat of arms of Rijeka and a large inscription saying *Long live Rijeka*. The authors of the decorations were already known: statues with pediments, a high relief of Apollo accompanied by nymphs was commissioned from the sculptors of the Vienna Sculpture Association Kauffungen and Fritsch, while the crenelation would be made by the famous Venetian sculptor Augusto Benvenuti, the author of the Giorgione monument in Castel Franco and the Garibaldi monument in Venice.² The post of the director-constructor of the theater was taken over by the architect Giacomo Zammattio, a Polytechnic student from Vienna, who settled in Rijeka on December 1, 1884, and left an exceptional mark on the residential districts of Dolac and Brajda. The interior of the theater was also included in the plans. The Theater Commission commissioned permanent stage scenery from the renowned Venetian set designer Pietro Bertoja, about whom La Bilancia wrote: *The good reputation which Mr. Bertoja enjoys is a deposit guaranteeing the perfection of his work.*³

In the spring of 1885, everyone was in a feverish hurry: Fellner and Helmer were designing the furniture, the curtain was being decorated by the Viennese painter Kott,⁴ the brothers Gustav and Ernest Klimt, together with their regular coworker Franz Matsch, had already completed the paintings for the ceiling and exhibited them at the Austrian Museum in Vienna. The *Neue freie Presse* wrote: *The new paintings are full of imagination, artistically composed, and painted with such bravado that one could only wish that these three esteemed artists will soon be offered the opportunity to perform similar work in Vienna.*⁵ A magical chandelier was placed in the middle of the ceiling and Matsch's paintings were conceived as allegories of operetta, dance, love, concert, religious and military music.

Grand opening. The Theater Commission convinced the Counsel that the opening of the theater should be marked by a spectacle that Rijeka would remember; they opted for operas (*Aida* and *Giaconda*) and invested 14 thousand forints into the shows, because that is the type of opening they envisioned for *the future of our theater. For the first season, the management selected two performances worthy of the opening of this temple of art and which would remain in the memories of those attending them.*⁶ What a sensation it was when electric lights lit up the theater! It was one of the biggest projects the Viennese company Kremenczky ever

had – the electrification of a building in a city without electricity! When the first lighting test was performed, *a faint white light spread throughout the theater and illuminated every corner of it*.⁷ Costs rose to 514,214.09 forints. Figural groups from Venice arrived, as well as the sculptor Benvenuti to *admire the beauty of his work*. The statue of Drama was placed on one side of the crown and the one of Music on the other, and the coat of arms of Rijeka was placed above the gable.

With the completion of the theater, the dream of the people of Rijeka had finally been realised. The handing over of the keys to mayor Ciotte was organized on October 3, 1885. On that occasion, the architect Fellner uttered these prophetic words: *It would be a devastating moral defeat if the paths for spiritual intuition and creativity in the intellectual field were not paved for the whole nation. That altar, upon which both heart and spirit will be educated, should be our theater*. And not only he, but also the representative of the performers rated the theater as *a work that is an honorable testimony of artistic efforts, solidarity and readiness for self-sacrifice of the citizens of this magnificent maritime city*.⁸

Our Rijeka, yr. III, no. 33, October!1981

¹ New Theater, La Bilancia, Year XVI, 3. III. 1883, no. 75, 2

² Nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVII, 2. XII. 1884, no. 277, 2-3; G.S., Lo scultore Augusto Benvenutti, L'illustrazione Italiana, Milano-Roma, 26. II. 1899; Il coronamento dell'edifizio, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 30. IX. 1885, 2

³ Gli scenari del Teatro Comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 21. VIII. 1885, no. 187, 2; G. Damerini, Scenografi veneziani dell'Ottocento, Francesco Bagnara, Giuseppe e Pietro Bertoja, Catalogo della Mostra, Fond. Giorgio Cini, Venezia, 1962, 18-26

⁴ Nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 3. III. 1885, no. 50, 2

⁵ Teatro Comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 27. III. 1887, no. 69, 2

⁶ Lo spettacolo d'inaugurazione del nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 19. VI. 1885, no. 136, 2

⁷ Prova dell'illuminazione elettrica bal nuovo teatro comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 19. VIII. 1885, no. 186, 2

⁸ O povijesnom razvoju kazališta u Rijeci see: R. Matejčić, Povijest gradnje općinskog kazališta u Rijeci, in: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR and NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka 1981, 13-23; R. Matejčić, Općinsko kazalište od osnutka do Drugoga svjetskog rata, in: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR and NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka, 1981, 27-37; S. Samani, Il teatro nella storia di Fiume, L.F. di Padova, Padova 1959., 9-30; E. Susmel, Un secolo di vita teatrale fiumana, Fiume, 1924, 9-11 The data provided by this author was used by the Enciklopedia dello spettacolo, V, FAN-GUARO, C. E. le Maschere, Roma, 1958

The prominent Viennese architects Fellner and Helmer built the Communal Theater and the Modello Palace in 1885.

The architects Fellner and Helmer erected more than fifty theaters across Europe. The one in Rijeka is very similar to the one in Brno, with a temple-shaped facade.

Between 1913 and 1945, the theater was named after Giuseppe Verdi

The Modello Palace

In the location of Adamić's Theater. Trieste had its own Modello Palace, and, given the competition between the two cities, Rijeka should have had one, too. One of the shareholders with the largest capital in the Rijeka savings bank was Giovanni Ciotta, the mayor of Rijeka. He was professionally obsessed with construction (he was a retired engineering major) and a man of great reputation among financial magnates. The banking council, at his suggestion, decided that the project for the bank's new palace should go to the *Wiener atelier Fellner-Helmer*, the same one that created the project for the new Municipal Theater, and later for the building of the Croatian National Theater in Zagreb. The *Wiener atelier Fellner-Helmer* was famous throughout Europe, from Hamburg to Odessa. The atelier had created projects for 53 European theaters, most of which were realized in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The work of the atelier was indicative of the general progress during the second half of the 19th century and the increased local patriotism of many larger cities.¹ Both played a role in the construction of the Modello Palace in Rijeka. Therefore, it is no surprise that despite huge sacrifices, Rijeka Savings Bank decided on this venture.²

The palace split in half. With the demolition of Adamić's Theater at the location between the present-day Ivan Zajc Street and centre of the Corso, a huge building was removed. Instead of using this place of historical value as a square, a monumental building with architecture of historical proportions, pretentious and aggressive, was simply forced into its place. It is not out of the question that the atelier already had a plan ready to go for this huge palace and that it was only adjusted to the needs of the bank by adding an extension towards the Ivan Zajc Street, because the client wanted to have a ceremonial hall for events, since the *Casino patriottico* (Patriotic Casino) was supposed to have its headquarters in that building.³ Just like the building of Adamić's Theater protruded beyond the strokes of the rest of the buildings on Zajc Street, so did this palace, only to a somewhat lesser degree. Even during its construction there were civil complaints that the palace, with its representative façade, was out of line with the sidewalk. In an extensive article in the *La Bilancia* newspaper Fellner tried to justify this as a desire to make the rectilinear stretch more dynamic, while still ensuring communication through a passage.⁴ If by any chance this building had been built in a more spacious location, it would have been like plastic, articulating the space around, the architectural details and the plastic decorating it would have created a never-ending play of light and shadow. When we look at the Modello Palace, we get the impression of a baroque palace sliced in half, with one

half being pushed towards the Ivan Zajc Street, while a Renaissance palace with an elegant portal on the Aldo Negri Street (present day Uljarska Street) is being pushed in between the two halves. While looking at the preserved original project in the Directorate for the Protection of Cultural and Natural Heritage (Rijeka Conservation Department of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia), it is clear that the building was planned to the smallest details. It is interesting to note that this large public building was built in less than two years with a three-month break during the cholera epidemic. It was built at the same time as the Municipal Theater, and both were completed in the same year (1885).⁵ This construction gathered a large number of Rijeka craftsmen and artists, the decorative plastic was made by the Rijeka sculptor Ignazio Doneghani and the wrought iron bars on the stair railing and on the ground floor windows were made in the famous workshop of Matija Dumičić. One of the best examples of craftsmanship were the bars on the inner door of the bank.

Transferring Vienna's Ring. Fellner and Helmer transferred the architecture of Vienna's Ring to Rijeka. The Municipal Theater and Modello Palace were two structures on par with metropolitan architecture. The covered markets were completed in 1881, thus, with the already built residential buildings, the frame for the theater square was systematized. That is exactly what Fellner envisioned, thus he placed the decorative emphasis on the prominent part of the palace, especially on its first floor, where he placed Venetian windows in the curved walls, and strong pillars on a ledge in the middle. Between the pillars there are windows and above them are the *ocula*. To reconcile the height of the baroque façade of this *piano nobile* with that of a building having a mezzanine and three stories, he placed a tent roof with lavishly decorated dormer windows over both baroque hemispheres of the palace. The two facades of the central part of the palace were designed in the same manner, in a pure renaissance style. It was only at the entrance portal that the baroque decoration came to the fore. The commemorative plaque placed in 1897, dedicated to the grand opening, shows how much mayor Ciotta cared about beautifying the city with such a magnificent building. His ambition as a builder played a huge role in the realisation of this project, as well as his vast capital. The inscription on the commemorative plaque reads:

NEL ANNO 1884
SOTO GLI AVSPICII
DEL MAGNIFICO PODESTA
GIOVANNI COMENDATORE DE CIOTTA

* * *

QVI DOVE
PERMVNIFICENZA
DEL SVO GRANDE AVO
PATRIZIO FIVMANO
NOBILE UNGARESE
ANDREA LODOVICO DE ADAMICH
AL PRINCIPIO DEL SECOLO
SORGEVA
SACRO ALLE MVSE
IL PRIMO TEATRO CIVICO
LA CASSA COMVNALE DI RISPARMIO
QUESTO EDIFIZIO
ALLA PERSIMONIA ALLA BENEFICENZA
DEDICATO
ERESSE

The commemorative plaque was made by Pietro Zamba.

Before the construction of its palace, the Rijeka savings bank built the covered markets and the city can be thankful to it for the construction of two schools in Dolac (present day University Library and the Italian Secondary School), markets and a large number of buildings in the Brajda residential area.

The old lady. The Modello Palace was given a new variegated attire that did not fit the old lady, which was built according to different harmonious aesthetic standards. The era of historicism utilized multicolored building materials, red facade bricks, white-gray stone, colorful ceramic tiles or richly painted ornamentation of distinctive compositions (the Turkish House on the Great Market). However, different colored plasters were not usually mixed with one another, nor was the plastic painted in dark tones. Although architectural plastic was very often made out of terracotta, it was very seldom left unpainted and after being applied to the

walls, it was painted over with the same color as the rest of the building or the color of stone. But the most important fact of all is that this important palace has been preserved.

Our Rijeka, yr. V, no. 50, March 1983.

¹ R. Matejčić, Povijest gradnje općinskog kazališta u Rijeci, in: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR and NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka, 1981, 16-17; R. Matejčić, Razvoj arhitekture 19. stoljeća u Rijeci, Dometi, no. 4-5, 1985., ICR, Rijeka, 50-51

² Il nuovo edificio della Cassa comunale di risparmio, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 17. XI. 1883, no. 262, 2

³ Edilizia, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 24. VIII. 1883, no. 191, 2

⁴ Il nuovo edificio della Cassa di Risparmio, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 13. IX. 1883, no. 207, 2; Edilizia, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 4. IX. 1883, no. 200, 2

⁵ Avviso, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 21. VII. 1885, no. 171, 2

The Modello Palace brought the spirit of Vienna to this fast-growing Kvarner city in 1885

The Grand Café (Caffè Grande) at which Frano Supilo had a private table for ten years straight.

Today, the City Library is located here.

Filodrammatica

A magnificent concert hall. During the second half of the 19th century the social standard of the bourgeoisie also rose sharply. A large influx of intellectuals, employed in state facilities and schools, brought some inactive communities back to life. With a lot of free time at the disposal of the citizens, new issues arose, mainly those concerning the accommodation of associations, clubs and societies, and the search for suitable premises for the performance of their, most often dilettante, activities. Parties, theater and musical performances, and carnival spectacles were among the favorite forms of gathering for a large number of members. In fact, at the end of the 18th century, the so-called *Philharmonic Society for Dilettantes* was founded in Rijeka. It became inactive and was re-established in 1872 as the *Philharmonic-Drama Society* with George Vranyczany at the helm. It was not until 1876 that the society obtained its statute. When the registered office of the society moved into the *Casino patriottico*, the Association of Craftsmen gave up their amateur music and stage activities in favor of them using the facilities, and thus the great hall of the Casino became the center of cultural and entertainment life of many prominent citizens of Rijeka. The hall and the stage were festively decorated by the famous painter from Rijeka Giovanni Fumi and the premises were opened in 1884. However, when a special consortium, made up of Croatian patriots, bought the Casino building for the accommodation of the Croatian National Reading Room, the Philharmonic-Drama Society had to move out. Since a large proportion of the Rijeka bourgeoisie were members of that society, they founded their own consortium, bought the Struppi house on the Gubernial Street and immediately began building a new building for their society. With the help of a loan from the Rijeka savings bank, as well as with the abundant help of the Industrialist Foundation of Hannibal Ploech and according to the project of the Rijeka architect Giacomo Zammatti, the construction of a truly magnificent building had started.¹

The harmony of the ambient. The architecture of this building, with its tall proportions compared to the neighboring residential constructions, stands out on the stretch of the most important pedestrian road in Rijeka. It was built in accordance with the needs of a large society, whose instrumental orchestra counted more than sixty members, but the architect also designed the building with the future in mind, making it very modern, with purposefully arranged smaller rehearsal spaces modeled after Central European music institutes. As a large part of the Society's activities were related to the field of music, we can safely say that the designer also planned a much needed concert hall, which Rijeka is still missing to this day. In

a year's time, Rijeka's builders and craftsmen built this cultural centre, which means that not only factories and shipyards were built in this most brilliant trend of the city's development, but also public music and stage venues, such as the Municipal Theater and this building, the *Filodrammatica*. The construction of such a building is important, as it fills a *lacuna* in the urban setting of a modern city, which Rijeka was turning into. In that building, the people of Rijeka were not passive observers like in theaters, but rather, they were participants, actively engaged in the creation of the program and cultural policy of the city. According to the historical data, the society's program was diverse and of high quality, and the possession of a well-arranged and stage-equipped event hall provided ample opportunities for hosting all kinds of talent - conductors, musicians, actors and composers. From the last generation of the members of the *Filodrammaticae* came renowned Rijeka artists, the writer Osvaldo Ramous and the conductor maestro A. Peterin.

An ornate beauty. The space the society bought for the building stretched towards the current University Library, thus the facade of the building looks like an ornate beauty that springs up onto the street displaying all its allure. Having studied in Vienna, where buildings of this kind were built in free spaces, he reconciled himself to the reality of Rijeka and made certain compromises, such as sacrificing the space meant for a grand staircase in favor of a café. Thus, the building got a modest staircase and a very cramped *foyer*. The lack of a pompous staircase was compensated by a great hall, which, in itself, is an astounding small theater, with decorations and a stage modeled after similar Viennese music halls. The rich Rococo stuccos with busts of musicians in their recesses were created by the Viennese sculptor Ludwig Strichtius. Everything is flowy and the wall canvases and the vault are full of delicate flowers and tendrils, rocailles, volutes and interweaving swirls. The space was expanded with mirrors. In the center of the ceiling is a large painted composition with allegories of music, dance and drama, the work of the architect's friend, the famous Trieste painter Eugenio Scomparini.² The whole hall is a synthesis of architecture, sculptures and paintings, but despite that, the emphasis on the author's firm constructive approach and construction logic can still be felt. It is due to the hall and the façade that we can see how much ahead of his time he truly was, for he transformed it into a contemporary piece of art, which even if stripped of its sculptural and artistic *décor*, would not lose any of its splendor.

Imagination of the painter/architect. On the façade of this lavish building, between the colossal pillars, which start from the balcony on the first floor and reach up to the wall plate

below the attic, Zammattio placed large windows with semicircular overhangs and reclining plastic figures besides them. The design was heavily inspired by Italian High Renaissance and Mannerism, but Zammattio purposefully softened his palette that time. He brought along the Rijeka painter Giovanni Fumi, who, according to the architect's design, painted the inter-window fields of the attic and gave it an artistic edge. He gave more impetus to his own expression and imagination, which was crucial for the style of this painter/architect. He transformed and molded classical architecture into his own artistic designs, adapting it to Rijeka, of which the street on which the *Filodrammatica* was peeking out was a part. This architecture is purposeful and authentic, thus it is still holds value and honorably serves Rijeka to this day.

Social anthem. At the inauguration of the building on November 30, 1890, the social anthem composed by Ivan Zajc resounded on the stage.³ In that hall, the people of Rijeka celebrated Zajc's sixtieth birthday with a big event, as their famous fellow citizen deserved.

Although he had a twenty-year career in Rijeka, where he designed and built numerous palaces, school buildings, a residential area and the Brajda market, the designer of this artistic centre built it while he was still "fresh", five years after his arrival to the city. The music of the Viennese *Musikhause* still echoed in his ears, which is only natural given that he received his education in an environment where public buildings were essential and therefore performed his task bravely and successfully. He created a magnificent concert hall in Rijeka. Fifteen years ago, the great hall was completely renovated, all its artistic and functional values were respected, and it can rightly be said that it was restored to the splendor it had on the day of its inauguration.

Our Rijeka, yr. VIII, no. 87, March 1986.

¹ F. Derenzioni, *Gli anuali della societa Filarmonico-drammatica, oggi Circolo Savoia, 1872, 1882, 1930*, Fiume 1931

² L'Edifizio della Filarmonico-drammatica, *La Bilancia*, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 11. VI. 1890, no. 130, 2;

L'Edifizio della Societa Filarmonico-drammatica, *La Bilancia*, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 14. VIII. 1890, no. 185, 2

³ L'inaugurazione della nuova sede della Societa Filarmonico-drammatica, *La Bilancia*, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 1. XII. 1890, no. 274, 2

The elegant *Filodrammatica* building was deftly integrated into the series of facades stretching along the Corso

The ceiling fresco by Eugenio Scomparini in the ceremonial hall of the *Filodrammatica*

Teatro Fenice

A place of spectacle. As soon as the public learned that the old Adamić theater was to be demolished and a new Communal theater would be built in three years time in its place, the business woman Caterina Riccotti decided to build a wooden theater in the garden of her house for the needs of the people of Rijeka. Thus, between 1881 and 1882, a very simple wooden structure was erected, consisting of stands for the visitors with a stage in a courtyard overgrown with lush treetops and a source of living water. In that theater, plays were performed mostly during the summer, because it had no roof. However, bad weather was a frequent occurrence even during the summer, thus the audience had to take shelter under the trees or squeeze against the wall of the fence, and if the show was particularly interesting, the spectators would, according to eyewitnesses, climb onto the stage during the show.¹

Wooden theater. The owner Caterina Riccotti and her sons tried to completely eliminate these shortcomings and in 1888, according to the project of the renowned Rijeka architect Nikola Predonzabij. They covered the theater with a canvas canopy, built a masonry stage and a courtyard with rooms for actors, choir members and staff.² They decided on this serious project after they came to the realisation that the wooden theater would still have its audience, even after the opening of the new Communal theater. At first it was simply called the *Teatro Riccotti*, and after the renovations it was given the sonorous name *Teatro Fenice*.

In this *luxurious* theater, in addition to the canvas canopy, which protected the audience from rain and sun, gas lighting was installed, upholstered chairs were set up in the park, the stage was raised, and in front of it there was a space for the orchestra. The stage included devices for the hanging of scenery and behind it there was a dressing room and a costume shop - in fact, all the amenities prescribed by theater regulations.

The decoration of the stage opening on the externally visible attic was subtly decorated with tasteful volutes, a medallion, garlands, and a prominent wreath in the center of it all. Likewise, the decoration of the courtyard facade was done in an early Renaissance style. All this can be discerned from the building plans and old photographs. To make the interior as appealing as possible, the canvas canopy was painted with floral decorations in medallions. The theater could accommodate around 500 people, 230 of them on the ground floor, and at least 200 spectators in the gallery.

Bizarre, but romantic. Over the years, the *Fenice* became such a well-established theater, that after the death of Caterina Riccotti, her sons decided to demolish this bizarre old edifice, an edifice with many flaws, but still a romantic one, set between the canopy of the trees and a water spring. It would be for the better if they had not decided on building a new modern theater.³ Their venture was understandable considering that this was the first decade of the 20th century and the city prospered economically, meaning all social strata craved spectacles suited to their education and social position. While the Communal theater had been civic since its inception, *Fenice* was a folk theater until it stopped operating during World War II.⁴ After the war it served as a theater for a short time and in it the actors of the later founded Italian Drama gave performances, before it was turned into a cinema hall.

The idea of Riccotti's heirs was beyond their means. In order to realize the idea of such a sweeping project, Riccotti's heirs, Caterina's sons, Mario and Arigo, pooled their capital with Venceslav Celligoi's Company and thus a Joint Stock Company named *Teatro Fenice* was founded. The company commissioned projects for two buildings, for the theater and for a Casino, from Venceslav's son, the architect Eugene Celligoi and his partner, the Viennese architect Theodore Traxler. Both buildings were designed in the style of the Vienna Secession, but the Casino remained unbuilt due to the outbreak of the First World War. The Viennese architect was a major contributor to the project because of his role as co-author.⁵ These buildings, had they both been built, would have become the social and cultural core at the center of modern Rijeka. Regardless, *Fenice* had been the centre stage for major cultural events for a long time.

Proto-Cubist tendencies. On the realized building of the *Teatro Fenice* the proto-cubist tendencies that emerged within the Vienna secession during that period came to the fore, especially in the architecture of Josef Hoffmann. Therefore, the building and its interior still look extremely functional and modern to this day. The architects minimized ornamentation and created a shallow geometric raster on the façade, and this reduction of ornamentation was present especially in the interior, in the auditorium, which was dominated by flat surfaces and clean lines. After the restoration, the majority of these features disappeared.⁶

The *Teatro Fenice* was famous for hosting theatrical dramas and opera performances with famous performers on one day (Zago, Benini) and circuses with trained horses, magicians and variety shows on the very next one. It also hosted the first film screening of the time. Unlike *the Communal theater*, the *Teatro Fenice* also hosted groups from non-Italian language areas, a fact extensively exploited by the Hungarians, especially their operetta

troupes and variety shows, from the end of the 19th century until the fall of the Monarchy. The Opera of the Croatian National Theater from Zagreb held a guest performance at the *Teatro Fenice* performing Gotovac's *Ero* in the 1940s.

For social classes. Generally speaking the *Teatro Fenice* was very democratic in its program orientation, open to the interests of all classes, but also satisfied the most refined of tastes. The theater was designed to be similar to the Politeama theater with the possibility of turning the auditorium into a ballroom. Under the auditorium the so-called *Sala Bianca* (White Hall) was built, with a small stage and a dance floor where dances were held and young people held their tea parties and social gatherings.⁷ It is interesting that as early as May 5, 1945, the Melody Orchestra, under the direction of Aleksandar Peterin, held a concert in that hall, which lasted until the *Sala Bianca* was turned into a nightclub.

This huge edifice was built, after the foundations were excavated, from June 1913 until April 1914, and on April 25, 1914, a temporary permit was issued for its use. At the same time, two new roads were built around the new building, a sewerage and water supply network was laid and a power plant was built for the needs of the theater, the street lights and the neighboring houses. If we take into account the volume of this building and the fact that the auditorium had room for 1958 guests, or 1258 seats and 700 standing places arranged on the ground floor, balcony and gallery, then we must admire the efforts of the contractors from Rijeka, Trieste, Vienna and Budapest put into completing this building in such a short time. The *Teatro Fenice* opened on May 2, 1914. It was one of the most modern theaters in Central Europe.⁸

Our Rijeka, yr. VIII, no. 86, February 1986.

¹ La demolizione del Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 4. I. 1911, no. 2777, Anno X, 2

² DAR, JU 51, Kazališta, case no. 1, The building of the present day Teatro Fenice cinema, plans, 1913 and 1914; Private residential buildings (...), plan no. 48/12/1913; JU 2, case I 318/1911

³ La ricostruzione del Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 30. VIII. 1911, no. 2877, 2

⁴ La seduta di ieri al Consiglio Municipale, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 11. I. 1912, no. 3095, 1. Permission for the opening of a new street

⁵ Dopo la demolizione del vecchio Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 13. IV. 1912, no. 3175, 2

⁶ Il palcoscenico del nuovo Politeama popolare, La sala che mancava a Fiume, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 14. IV. 1912, no. 3176, 2

⁷ Lo spettacolo d'inagurazione del Teatro Fenice, *La bilancia, Fiume*, 4. V. 1914, no. 98, 2

⁸ DAR, JU 51, Theaters, case no. 1, The building of the present day Teatro Fenice cinema, plans, 1913 and 1914; Private residential buildings (...), plan no. 48/12/1913; JU 2, case I 318/1911.

The old, wooden *Teatro Fenice*, at the beginning of the 20th century

The *Teatro Fenice* built out of reinforced concrete by the Viennese architect Theodor Traxler was a sensation in Europe when it opened in 1914

The Croatian Reading Room on Trsat

Cultural, artistic and entertainment center. During the Illyrian renaissance, reading societies began to be established on the Croatian coast and became nurseries of cultural, educational and social life. The first Reading Room was founded in Novi Vinodolski in 1845, followed by another one in 1849 in Rijeka. On Trsat, around 1877, patriots commenced the founding of such a reading society, through which cultural and entertainment life would be organized. They held their first meeting in 1887, at which they agreed on a draft of the society's rules and named it the Croatian Reading Room. There were 37 founding members. The Reading Room began operating on September 8, 1887, after the ban ¹⁰Khuen Hèdervary confirmed the society's rules. The following year, the society moved to the premises of a school building, where parties, and after the construction of a stage, amateur plays were organized. Works by Croatian and Italian authors were performed. In 1894, the “Jadranska vila” Singing Group from Sušak organized a concert in the Reading Room. The Reading Room also hosted educational lectures.

Due to spacial limitations, the society was prevented from organizing more various activities. In 1893, the president of the society, Josip Linić, proposed that the society should build its own centre and at the society assembly in 1895, with this goal in mind, Eugen Matković proposed the establishment of a construction committee, which included construction experts such as: Fran Matković, Tomo Matković, Ivan Šikić and Nikola Glavan, and Rude Linić as their lawyer. The building committee started operating in January 1895 and immediately secured investors and shareholders to finance the construction. A total of 49 shareholders responded and subscribed for 500 debentures. The debenture read: *Through enlightenment to freedom and Work brings salvation*. At an extraordinary meeting of the society on May 3, 1896, the Building Committee's report was accepted and a decision was made to begin the construction of the centre. Construction management was entrusted to Tomo Matković and it was built across the street from the yard of the Church of Our Lady of Trsat in the garden of Josip Linić and Tonka Kućel. Construction began on June 30, 1895, the cornerstone was laid on August 5 and the centre was built in just fifteen months.

Cvjetko Gruber, a professor at the Great general-education high school in Rijeka, said the following about the selection of the location in his Memorial *The Croatian Reading Room* in

¹⁰ Ban of Croatia was the title of local rulers or office holders and after 1102, viceroys of Croatia. From the earliest periods of the Croatian state, some provinces were ruled by bans as a ruler's representative and supreme military commander.

1898: *The people of Trsat could not have found a more beautiful location for their reading centre than this elevated place, from which the view down onto the sea islands could not be any more magical, as it breaches onto the Rječina, which flows through the valley and slowly makes its way towards our Croatian sea .*¹

Native architect. In 1887, the seat of the Trsat municipality moved to Sušak. Intense construction took place on Brajdica and in 1888, in Vienna, the academician Ivan Milčetić wrote in his letter: *You will not find buildings comparable to those in Sušak, with the exception of Zagreb and Osijek, in any Croatian city.* The construction in Sušak was based on the projects of excellent architects Randić, Ambrosini, Stanisavljević and Culotti, as well as one of our own, Mate Glavan, otherwise a prominent member of the Singing Group *Jadranska vila*. Therefore, it is not surprising that the people of Trsat turned to him to design the Social Centre of the Croatian Reading Room.² Tomo Matković, an experienced builder, entrepreneur and member of the Building Committee, also participated with his own ideas for this much-desired building. The collaboration between Mate Glavan and Tomo Matković resulted in an extraordinarily functional solution for the Community Center, which, in addition to the Reading Room and a large hall for spectacles, had a mandatory lounge, as well as the necessary rehearsal rooms for numerous music societies that had their headquarters at the Reading Room.

The architect Mate Glavan, a representative of the style of high historicism, very skillfully integrated this large building into its new location. The terrain descended steeply, so he took advantage of this by turning its narrower side towards the street leading to the Varoš, while the wider side, built on a pedestal, was turned towards the Bay of Rijeka. Thus, the restaurant and the terrace were set in an extremely attractive place. It also had a unique lookout from which one could see the Rječina canyon, the city of Rijeka and Kvarner. Unfortunately, the Reading Room, with its sheer volume, covered the view from Rijeka to the Church of Our Lady of Trsat, which dominated the Varoš plateau until the construction of the Reading Room. However, the Reading Room, as a symbol of national consciousness, imposed itself on the view, becoming a sight to behold for every patriot who looked upon it from Rijeka or the sea. The construction manager responsible for such a large building, Tomo Matković, had to have had extensive experience in building representative buildings in the style of historicism. This can be felt in the magnificent and harmonious application of the classical decorative repertoire of the Renaissance. The people of Trsat were able to visit the newly completed Reading Room on October 31, 1897. Srećko Gruber wrote in the above-mentioned article

about the enthusiasm of the people of Trsat: *Everyone admires and exalts the beautiful execution and how it stands as a proud testimonial to the effort, work and unity of the people of Trsat at this special place - a beautiful temple in honor of the educational culture and unity of Trsat.*

Cultural, artistic and entertainment center. Since its opening and up until the outbreak of the First World War, the Trsat Reading Room was a cultural, artistic and entertainment center not only for the people of Trsat and Sušak, but also for the many people of Rijeka and the Littoral. The centre hosted numerous societies, all of which were based in the Reading Room. It was the headquarters of the Croatian Singing Group *Primorski Hrvat* (1895), the Brass Band *Trsat* (1906), the Football Sports Club *Slavija* (1910) and the Workers' and Craftsmen's Support Society *Erazmo Barčić* (1913).

During the First World War, all large public buildings were requisitioned for the army, including the Croatian Reading Room on Trsat. It was first inhabited by the Austro-Hungarian army; during the occupation, the Italian army was stationed there from 1919 to 1923, after which the Yugoslav army was there until the autumn of 1924. The Centre was significantly damaged, the theater curtain was damaged and inventory was taken away. Out of the compensation of the Italian government and the rent paid for the stay of the Yugoslav army by the City Municipality of Sušak, the Centre was completely renovated and opened on December 26, 1925.

During the Second World War, the Centre was inhabited by Italian soldiers, and since 1943 by Germans. Before their escape, the Germans planted explosives that destroyed the right side at the front of the building. Immediately after the liberation, the National Liberation Committee started the renovation of the Centre, with the large hall being renovated first. Thanks to the diligent work, the renovation of the Centre progressed quickly and social and artistic life could take place in it once again as early as 1946. The large terrace in front of the Centre was widened and the view of Rijeka and the sea became even more spectacular.

Three painters. There are three famous painters, who decorated its interior, associated with the Centre. The first one was Marco Antonini whose works, wall decorations and stage curtain in the grand hall, were destroyed during the stay of the occupying army from 1919 to 1923. Marco Antonini was born in Gemona, Italy on September 7, 1849, and died in Zagreb on May 25, 1937. During his stay at the Vatican he met Count Nugent, who invited him, as a former student of the Roman Academy, to Croatia. He decorated the residence of Count

Nugent on Trsat and the premises of the museum in Kaštel. While working for the count in Kaštel, he met the people who started the construction of the Centre and they hired him to make the interior decorations and curtains. Antonini was otherwise known as a painter of wall decorations in castles and churches in Croatia. His works in Orosavlje have been preserved, as well as his theater decorations in Zagreb.³ It is a shame the same cannot be said about his works on Trsat.

The second artist associated with the Centre building is the painter Josip Moretti-Zajc. He was born in Bakar in 1882. After completing his nautical studies in Bakar, he studied in Venice at the Academy of Fine Arts. From Venice he went to Trieste, but returned to Rijeka and worked on the route Bakar-Sušak-Rijeka. He was known as an artist and art pedagogue. He died in Sušak in 1933. In 1925, he painted a new curtain for the Centre, which still exists today. With the great effort of the people of Trsat and great financial investments, a significant work in the opus of this distinctive artist, who gained his experience in decorative painting at the atelier of Giovanni Fumi in Rijeka, was created. He was an associate of E. Bellossa on the decoration of the *Miramare* castle in Trieste, which is reflected in the curtain of the Reading Room. It is indisputable that the great Trieste painter Eugenio Scomparini, author of the curtains and wall decorations of the Rijeka *Filodrammatica* palace, had a big influence on him. Moretti also worked with him in Trieste. Martin Koprivnikar also helped with the work on the curtain.⁴ The concept of Moretti's curtain is romantic, there are obligatory motifs of the revival, folk faes and the eternal fire, but motifs of the port of Baroš, the *Molo longo*, Učka and the Trsat Hillfort are also present.⁵ The third artist whose work is present in the Centre is the prominent Rijeka painter Vlado Potočnjak. In 1975, the *Adriamont* construction company completely renovated the restaurant premises on the ground floor of the Reading Room and opened a restaurant called *Tersatica*.⁶ At the time, *Tersatica* was one of the most beautifully decorated establishments in the city, and that was mostly because of the extremely successfully executed wall decorations based on a modern interpretation of folk tales, myths and legends from the time when the Kaštel was first built and the Frankopan family ruled these parts. The decorative ensembles of burnt and patinated wood with gilding liberated the space built in the late 19th century of the impression of staleness and conservatism. The ancient story of the origin of Trsat and Rijeka was freed from its bookish boredom. Luxury in the tones of gold and purple oozed from these murals, and mythological splendor blazed from the surfaces of the woodcuts, and thus these decorations permanently act as hieroglyphs specific to Rijeka, Trsat, Sušak and the Croatian Littoral. The Reading Room lives and thrives through music and art.

- ¹ Z. Matrljan, Narodna čitaonica, žarište kulture – čuvar materinje riječi i naše kulturne baštine – svjetionik rodoljublja – matica hrvatskih društava, in: Trsat od davnih do današnjih dana, Rijeka, 1982, 71-119
- ² A. Rački, Povijest grada Sušaka, Sušak, 1929, 296, reprint ICR, Rijeka, 1990
- ³ D. Kečkemet, Antonini, I. Marco, ad vocem, Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti, 1, A-Ćus, JLZ, Zagreb, 1959, 113
- ⁴ V. Tartaglia-Kelemen, Moretti-Zajc, Josip, ad vocem, Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti, 3, Inj-Portl, JLZ, Zagreb, 1964, 394
- ⁵ Lj. Pavešić, Na krilima romantike, in: Trsat od davnih do današnjih dana, Rijeka, 1982, 392
- ⁶ R. Matejčić, Rapsodičnost površine, Novi list, Rijeka, 20. and 21. XII. 1975., 9; M. Zinaić, Likovni kritičar Zinaić o unutrašnjem uređenju Tersatice, Adriamont, Rijeka, 1975., no. 7, 7; E(lio) F(araguna), Otvoren novi restaurant snack-bar Tersatica, Adriamont, Rijeka, 1975, no. 7, 7

The Croatian Reading Room on Trsat was built in 1897, according to the project of Mate Glavan

The Sušak architect Mate Glavan, in addition to the Croatian Reading Room on Trsat, also designed the Mlaka Oil Refinery, the Rice-husking factory, and the Continental Hotel in Sušak.

The Croatian Reading Room and the Church of Our Lady of Trsat

The center of Trsat at the end of the 19th century

3 Analysis

In the book “Kako čitati grad” the author, Radmila Matejčić, covers the topics of architecture, history, urbanism and social relations of the city of Rijeka. The book offers insight into the development of the city from the time before it became a part of the ancient Roman Empire, until the end of the 1980s. Although the book received some updates over the years, its core content remained the same as in its first publication, which is reflected in some of the information presented in it. For instance, it mentions the military barracks being located on Trsat, while, in fact, the University Campus has taken their place over a decade ago. Because of this, despite the slight retouching the book received over the years, its contents cannot be considered recent or accurate. This can present a potential problem for the translator, who might wish to correct the false or outdated information, but has to remember that his primary job is and always will be to simply convey the thoughts and ideas of the speaker from the source language into the target one, whilst not questioning the legitimacy of the given statements.

The book is separated into 11 chapters, each containing several subchapters. For this translation the chapters 5 and 6 were chosen. Some topics covered in the 5th chapter, “Izvan zidina, uz obalu...” (Outside the walls, along the coast...) are the water fountains, some famous houses, like the Troyer and Adamić House, the Jelačić Square and the Pyramid, while the 6th chapter, “Sjaj pozornica” (Stage lights), contains information on the Adamić Theater, the Municipal Theater, the Modello Palace, the Filodrammatica, the Teatro Fenice and the Croatian Reading Room. Both of the chapters require a certain degree of familiarization with the topics at hand by the translator, because there is a lot of terminology that may be new, vague or straight out confusing. While similar in style and in syntax, the two chapters do differ, which will be taken into account during the translation process. “False friends”, such as the word *gema* (meaning an oval shaped painting of various motives) used in the Croatian version and the word *gem* (a precious stone) in the English language, could also quite easily be encountered, and it is up to the translator to recognize them and do proper research to find the proper meaning and translation for the term at hand. Some other problems, which could be encountered along the way, were: clumsily formulated sentences, too long and drawn out sentences, strange, if not incorrect, word choices and many more, which will be covered in the following paragraphs.

The analysis of the text and translation will be broken up into analyses of syntax and vocabulary.

3.1 Style

One of the first steps a translator has to take before beginning his translation is to identify the type of text he is dealing with. There are multiple styles of text and writing, all of which come with their own unique features. These texts are unique in the sense that they generally fall into one category, but also contain features of others.

For the most part, the texts in question can be categorized as expository. That means that their main purpose lays in the information they are trying to convey to the reader, i.e., the historic and architectural facts stated in them. An example of such a sentence would be “Nakon potresa 1750. godine, koji je porušio i znatno oštetio veliki dio riječkog Starog grada, donesen je 1755. novi urbanistički plan na kojemu su ucrtane linije razvoja tzv. Novog grada na obali pred gradskim zidinama, i to tako da se zatrpavanjem mora dobiju nove površine od Rova do Andrejšćice (Fosso – Borgo S. Andrea).“ It is clear and transparent in the information it presents, leaving no room for second guessing. However, the same text features sentences such as „Bogate rokoko-štukature s poprsjima glazbenika u nišama izveo je bečki kipar Ludwig Strichtius. Sve je lepršavo, puno nježnih cvjetića i vitica, rokaji, volute i prepleti kovitlaju se po zidnim platnima i po svodu,“ which presents new features, like the addition of adjectives, whose purpose here could be considered superfluous, since they do not add anything in an informational sense, but they do, however, contribute to the atmosphere of the text, which is reminiscent of a more literary style. Then the author tries to enable the reader to visualize the grand architecture of the city, making him envision it in his mind in all of its beauty. Another feature of the literary style the author incorporated into the texts were subjective comments and remarks, such as the aforementioned “Kako bi od naših građana bilo učtivo kada u njezinom pasageu ne bi obavljali svoju “malu nuždu“, which is far from the expository style of writing.

Utilizing such a way of writing, mixing the formal and informative with the informative, casual and fun, the author managed to create a text which lures the reader in with its promises of grand architecture and interesting historical and present day commentary, while also providing him with all the information needed to make oneself familiar with the city and its history.

Approaching the translation of these text, all of the above mentioned was kept in mind, but as stated before, the primary purpose of the text was the information it tried to convey, and, as such, the text was translated with that point being the primary focus. The information it conveys and its transparency were always the focal point of the translations, but much effort was put into the perservation of the literary touch the author tried to implement in the source text. Some reformulation was done with, for instance, the remarks, in order to keep the text as civil and formal as possible, but they were not cut out, since it would mean the loss of the personal touch the author clearly tried to give to her work. The best way to approach the text was to stay as close as possible to the original, with only minor and few digressions, which still did not, in any shape or form, alter the contents and message of the texts.

3.2 Syntax

Regarding the syntax, it is in line with what one would expect of a professional journal. The book itself is a collection of the author's articles written for the magazine "Naša Rijeka" from the 1980s. It is written in a style that makes it easy to read, even for people who are not all too familiar with the topic, but still contains professional terminology and delves deeper into topics related to history, architecture and social relations.

The majority of the sentences are complex and contain at least one dependent clause in addition to the main one. Some contain only one dependent clause and are easy to read and grasp, such as: "Kuća *Troyer* spada u zgrade ambicioznije arhitekture kojoj je svoj osobni pečat dao glasoviti arhitekt Anton Gnamb.", which translates to: "The *Troyer House* is a building of ambitious architecture on which the famous architect Anton Gnamb left his personal mark.", while others are more on the complex side and can easily tire the reader, such as: "Taj je njegov podatak poslužio kao ideja da se u parteru pločnika na tom dijelu Beogradskog trga (sada Jelačićevog trga) naglasi pravac ulice koja je išla od Sušaka, gdje je bio na Piramidi *finis Carolinae* (kraj Karoline), pa preko mosta kroz novootvorena gradska vrata ulazila kroz Užarsku ulicu u grad Rijeku." At first glance, the meaning of the aforementioned sentence can be somewhat difficult to grasp, but it is even a bigger challenge to translate. The first problem that the translator encounters is the dependent clause "gdje je bio na Piramidi *finis Carolinae*". It refers to a part of Sušak, the Pyramid (Piramida), where the *finis Carolina* was located, but it is very clumsily formulated and the reader might not immediately connect the information that the Pyramid is a part of Sušak. Another problem is the part that follows the embedded clause, that is, "pa preko mosta kroz novootvorena gradska vrata ulazila kroz Užarsku ulicu u grad Rijeku", which is again very clumsy and breaks the already shaky flow of the sentence. The sentence was a major hurdle which needed to be overcome whilst translating and the final result of that effort is as follows: "This information of his inspired the idea that a part of the Belgrade Square (present-day Jelačić Square) should serve to accentuate the direction of a special street. That street began on Sušak, (the *finis Carolinae* (end of the Karolina Road) was on the Pyramid on Sušak), stretched along the bridge, went through the newly built city gate and the Užarska Street right into the city of Rijeka." The translation differs from the source material in several points. Firstly, it is separated into two sentences. The first sentence provides information about the part of the square that would serve to accentuate the direction of a special street, and it ends there, while the second sentence elaborates more on the direction of that street and uses brackets to fill the

reader in on the Pyramid and the *finis Carolinae*, which is a better solution than trying to use an embedded sentence. Cutting the sentence in half also allows for shorter, more concise and easier to read sentences, presents the reader with new information in a clear-cut fashion and keeps his train of thought going.

The previous sentence was long and convoluted, which is the primary reason for its clumsiness, but an example of a truly badly formulated and thought out one would be the following “Prema posljednjem nazivu dobila je današnja ulica ime Dolac.” To clarify, this sentence directly follows the sentence “U starim ispravama područje od zapadnih zidina do Andrejšćice i Zagrada zvalo se Brajda ili Dolac. “. Whilst reading the aforementioned problem sentence for the first time, one has to stop his reading, think for a bit and perhaps reread it in order to properly process and understand the given information. What the sentence tries to convey is that the present-day Dolac Street was named after the old Dolac area, which was the latter of the two areas listed in the first sentence. But the sentence is so badly structured that it is really hard to grasp its meaning. It is in no way the job of the translator to correct the source material, but under certain circumstances, if the client is also the author of the source material and is willing to cooperate, the translator might be able to suggest some changes, in order to make the source material a bit more comprehensive and smoother to read. A simple, yet effective alternative to the Croatian sentence would be along the lines of ”Današnja ulica Dolac dobila je ime po spomenutom području Dolac,“ which clearly transmits all the necessary information. However, since there is no way of influencing any kind of change of the source material in this text, it is the translator’s job to do the best he can and provide a translation, which would carry the meaning of the original, but in a more transparent fashion. The solution for this sentence is the following: “The present-day Dolac Street was named after the latter of the two. “ A simple, yet drastic improvement of the source material. Short and concise, it offers a simple solution to the problem, but it should be mentioned that this was mostly possible due to the English phrase *the latter of the two*, which in Croatian would be something along the lines of *posljednji od njih dvoje* or *posljednji od navedenih*, which is not entirely in the spirit of the language, and such phrases require the translator to possess a degree of innovativeness and creativity, so he can tackle the problem from various angles, in cases where direct translation is no longer a viable option.

These examples may seem nitpicky, but are actually common problems translators face on regular basis. They show us just how clever and witty translators can and have to be in

order to properly convey the meaning from the source language into the target one, while keeping the style of the source text, or in this case, improving upon it.

3.3 Vocabulary

Even though sentence structure is a common problem in translation, another one, that is even more widespread, is the vocabulary. When a translator delves into a new project, he has to familiarize himself with the source text, its themes and its vocabulary. In the case of the book “Kako čitati grad”, the translator has to primarily get acquainted with the fields of history and architecture in order to properly understand and translate the professional terms he will encounter throughout the text. If one, however, does not do so, he may find himself with various mistranslations and the wrong usage of vocabulary. The vocabulary encountered throughout the texts will be categorized into several subtypes, such as false friends, technical architectural terminology and miscellaneous terms. The analysis will also be subdivided into two parts, each covering the vocabulary of the individual chapters.

3.3.1 False friends

Izvan zidina, uz obalu...

Before delving into the false friends found in this text, let us define the term false friend. False friends are defined as *a word that is often confused with a word in another language with a different meaning because the two words look or sound similar.*¹¹ Although it may seem that it is a given, keeping an eye out for false friends is very important when translating, especially when translating a text in a field new to the translator. If one encounters a term they might be vaguely familiar with, or just thinks he knows the correct translation, the best course of action will always be to look the given term up in a dictionary, so as to be entirely sure that it is in fact not a false friend.

One of the first false friends that can be encountered in the text is the term *projektant*, which would be translated as *projector*, but wrongfully so. The Croatian term *projektant* is defined as *izrađivač, sastavljač projekta*¹² (someone who designs or assembles a project), while the English term *projector*, according to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, bears the following meanings: *one that plans a project* (specifically a promoter), *one that projects* (a device for projecting a beam of light, an optical instrument for projecting an image upon a surface or a machine for projecting motion pictures on a screen) and *an imagined line from an*

¹¹ Retrieved from [FALSE FRIEND | meaning in the Cambridge English Dictionary](#) Accessed August 2021

¹² Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=d19gXxI%3D&keyword=projektant Accessed August 2021

*object to a surface along which projection takes place.*¹³ As seen from the three different definitions of the word *projector*, the first one does indeed correspond with the meaning of the Croatian term *projektant*. So, how come those two terms are false friends? The answer is that the first definition of the term *projector*, in which it is defined as *one that plans a project*, is an archaic word, meaning that the definition is outdated and the word is no longer in frequent enough use in that form to be warranted as a proper translation. The current meaning of the term *projector* is that of a machine used for projecting images onto a surface. The proper translation of the term *projektant* would be, depending on the context, *architect* or *designer*, since both of those are terms used to name and describe a person that creates and carries out certain plans.

Another false friend that was difficult to identify as such was the term *elaborat*. The Croatian term *elaborat* means a written paper which professionally presents and thoroughly analyzes a specific subject. The English language possesses the term *elaborate*, which can be used as an adjective meaning *planned or carried out with great care or marked by complexity, fullness of detail, or ornateness*¹⁴, as well as a verb with the meanings *to expand something in detail, to become elaborate, to work out in detail, to produce by labor, to build up (something, such as complex organic compounds) from simple ingredients.*¹⁵ One may notice that the English word is only used as an adjective or a verb, but never as a noun, unlike the Croatian one. Thus, even though very similar in form, those words are clearly false friends, since none of their definitions even correspond to words in the same word categories. The solution for the term *elaborat*, which was used in this translation, were the terms *project* and *plan*, since they are defined as *a specific plan or design*¹⁶ (for the term *project*) and *a method for achieving an end*¹⁷ (for the term *plan*), and thus, fit the role perfectly.

A not so often seen, but still possible mistake is falling for the false friend pair of *aleja* and *alley*. In Croatian, *aleja* means *pravilan red zasađenih stabala*¹⁸ (a straight line consisting of planted trees) or *ulica, put, staza ili slična javna površina omeđena i ukrašena gradskim nasadima, drvoredima itd. [Aleja branitelja]*¹⁹ (a street, road, path or similar public area

¹³ Retrieved from [Projector | Definition of Projector by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

¹⁴ Retrieved from [Elaborate | Definition of Elaborate by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

¹⁵ Retrieved from [Elaborate | Definition of Elaborate by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

¹⁶ Retrieved from [Project | Definition of Project by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

¹⁷ Retrieved from [Plan | Definition of Plan by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

¹⁸ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f1ZjWg%3D%3D&keyword=aleja Accessed August 2021

¹⁹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f1ZjWg%3D%3D&keyword=aleja Accessed August 2021

enclosed and decorated with city plantations, tree lines, etc.), while *alley* means *a thoroughfare through the middle of a block giving access to the rear of lots or buildings*²⁰. This problem was quickly solved through the usage of the term *avenue*, which means *a broad passageway bordered by trees*²¹. Although minor, hiccups such as this pair of false friends can occur, and it is up to the translator to always be at the top of his game in order to notice potential mistakes in a timely fashion.

The aforementioned false friends, although not minor, were merely inconveniences, which just needed a sharp eye to be spotted and corrected. A much bigger obstacle to overcome was the pairs of *gema/gem* and *gimanzija/gymnasium*. The reason why these two were such a challenge is because even when they were spotted, they still required extensive research in order to find their respective translations, or even to be entirely sure that their false friend pair was incorrect. What was meant by that can be explained with the example of the pairing of *gimanzija/gymnasium*. The Croatian term *gimnazija* means *srednja općeobrazovna škola*²² (general-education secondary school) and the English *gymnasium* carries the meaning of *a large room used for various indoor sports (such as basketball or boxing) and usually equipped with gymnastic apparatus*.²³ Just by reading these two definitions, one can clearly see that these are two entirely different terms, bearing no connection to one another whatsoever. The interesting thing is, there is more than one correct solution for this translation. What the Croatian language calls a *gimanzija*, the English language would call many different names. American English would call it a *high school*, which would be correct in the context of adapting the term to an American audience, but it would not entirely suffice, since *gimnazija* is only one type of high school and there are many other types of vocational schools to choose from, besides *gimanzija*. Thus, it can be concluded that the term *high school*, while not inaccurate, lacks in descriptive power and is more of an umbrella term, but should in the context of this text better be avoided in favor of a more precise translation. British English, on the other hand, offers a wider variety of terms and thus, more possibilities. Tapping into the language's vocabulary repertoire, one can find the term *grammar school*, which is defined as *a secondary school emphasizing Latin and Greek in preparation for college*²⁴. This term is important because it emphasizes that we are talking about a general

²⁰ Retrieved from [Alley | Definition of Alley by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

²¹ Retrieved from [Avenue | Definition of Avenue by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

²² Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fFdjWxk%3D&keyword=gimnazija Accessed August 2021

²³ Retrieved from [Gymnasium | Definition of Gymnasium by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

²⁴ Retrieved from [Grammar School | Definition of Grammar School by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

education facility, the same type as a *gimanzija*. This, however, brings up new a new problem, and that problem is the possibility that one might equate a *gimazija* with a *grammar school*, thinking that both schools function on the same basis or that even both the Croatian and British school systems are the same. That is one of the reasons why one could use the target language's terminology when translating the term *gimnazija*, such as using the term *high school*, if translating for an American audience. Another, more general, but not frequently used or aesthetically pleasing solution, would be the term *general-education high school*, which does reference the American *high school*, but has the added *general-education*, which distinguishes it from a regular American high school and provides the reader with additional information about the educational facility. At the same time, it allows for much less room for inaccurate interpretation, unlike the term *grammar school*. Nonetheless, the chosen translation for this text was the term *grammar school*, instead of *general-education high school*, simply because the latter of the two is more descriptive in nature, thus making it a clumsy addition to the text and hampering its flow when reading. After determining which translation was adequate and which one was chosen over the others, there is still a need to talk about the term *gymnasium*. Even though the term does not carry the same meaning as the Croatian *gimanzija*, it is more and more often being used in the same context. The reason is that language is constantly changing and evolving, and the driving factor of that change are the speakers, i.e., the people. Some view language from a descriptive point of view, some from a prescriptive one. Prescriptivist would say that the term *gymnasium* could never be a used to describe an educational facility, but it is not up to them to decide the future of the terms meaning, well, not entirely. If more and more speakers start using the term incorrectly, over time, its meaning will change, because language is not a rigid structure, it is adaptive and free, and if the speakers decide to change it, no amount of forceful backlash will be able to prevent it. We can observe this change through the use of the internet. For instance, googling *Rijeka gymnasium* immediately provides us with a map of the city pointing out all of its grammar schools. Of course, one should not take Google's information for granted, but should also not deny the impact it has on speakers, because it normalizes the usage of the term *gymnasium* as a direct translation for the Croatian *gimanzija*, and, with enough time and traction, might just overshadow all the other terms in usage and become the default translation.

The second big challenge when talking about the false friends encountered in this text was the Croatian term *gema*, which has a false friend in the English language in the form of the term *gem*. The Croatian *gema* is defined as *aplikacija na najrazličitijim objektima ili kao*

*element ukrasa kod nakita*²⁵ (application on a variety of objects or as an element of decoration on jewelry) and as *poludragulj ili dragi kamen s urezanim likom; najljepše su antičke geme s likovima vladara u profilu*²⁶ (a semiprecious or precious stone with an engraved figure), while the English gem is *a precious or sometimes semiprecious stone cut and polished for ornament*²⁷ or *something prized especially for great beauty or perfection*²⁸. For further context, the sentence in which the term was used goes as follows “Dosljednost u stilskoj čistoći te arhitekture osjeća se u Malom salonu gdje su u uokvirenim panoima smještene zidne slike, a strop ukrašen gemama i girlandama. “. From the context itself, it is noticeable that the *gema* is a piece of decoration and it would not be far-fetched to think that the ceiling was indeed decorated with gems. To add further to the confusion, the text did not come with the appropriate pictures and illustrations, which the final print of the book will include, leaving it to the translator to explore and find possible pictures of the motives that the text is describing. After research, it was concluded that the aforementioned ceiling was, in fact, not decorated with gems, but rather with paintings. This revelation gave new insight into how to properly translate the term *gema*, resulting in the final translation “The architectural consistency of stylistic purity can be felt in the Small Salon, where wall paintings were placed in framed panels, and the ceiling was decorated with oval shaped paintings and garlands“. The solution was the term *oval shaped painting*, which was used because of a lack of a better term. The solution is perfectly adequate, even if it still leaves something to be desired, much like the case with the aforementioned *general-education high school*, but the translator has to make do with the tools at his disposal and the knowledge and wits he possesses.

²⁵Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fFdnWRI%3D&keyword=gema
Accessed August 2021

²⁶ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fFdnWRI%3D&keyword=gema
Accessed August 2021

²⁷Retrieved from [Gem | Definition of Gem by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

²⁸ Retrieved from [Gem | Definition of Gem by Merriam-Webster](#) Accessed August 2021

Sjaj pozornica

Although the first chapter *Izvan zidina, uz obalu...* (Outside the walls, along the coast...) had more prominent examples of false friends, the second one, *Sjaj pozornica* (Outside the walls, along the coast...), also provides a great pair, although only the one.

The term which can be classified as a false friend is the Croatian *niša*. The term is used in the following sentence “Bogate rokoko-štukature s poprsjima glazbenika u nišama izveo je bečki kipar Ludwig Strichtius.” The English “equivalent” that immediately comes to mind when hearing the word is the term *niche*. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary defines the term *niche* as follows: *a place, employment, status, or activity for which a person or thing is best fitted*²⁹, *a habitat supplying the factors necessary for the existence of an organism or species*³⁰ or *a specialized market*³¹, all of which are in line with the usually presumed definition of the term. However, the meaning of the Croatian term differs significantly from its presumed English counterpart. In Croatian it is defined as *arhit. udubljenje u zidu za smještaj kipova, vaza ili predmeta*³² (a recess in the wall to accommodate statues, vases or objects) or as *vojn. udubljenje pod prsobranom u šančevima, zaštićeno od neprijateljske vatre*³³ (a recess under the breastplate in the trenches, protected from enemy fire). The former of the two definitions is the appropriate one in the context of the sentence. As seen, the two terms, although very similar in form, bear different meanings. One’s meaning is related to architecture, while the second one defines a possible opening in a market. It should be noted that the term *niša* in the Croatian language has been slowly acquiring a new meaning, that of its English counterpart and false friend, due to how widespread the English language has become because of globalism and mass media. Although not yet formal, its new meaning has been steadily accumulating more and more traction and may one day become one of the official definitions of the term, much like the case of the false friend pair of *gimnazija* and *gymnasium*. Having that covered, the official and chosen solution

²⁹Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/niche> Accessed August 2021

³⁰ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/niche> Accessed August 2021

³¹ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/niche> Accessed August 2021

³² Retrieved from

https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=eF1hURM%3D&keyword=ni%C5%A1a Accessed August 2021

³³ Retrieved from

https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=eF1hURM%3D&keyword=ni%C5%A1a Accessed August 2021

for the term *niša* in this case is the English term *recess*, which means *a hidden, secret, or secluded³⁴ place or part or indentation, cleft³⁵*.

3.3.2 Architectural terminology

Having covered false friends, the next section in this analysis goes over terms native to the architectural vocabulary. While the translator has to always be cautious about false friends, so as to not fall for the illusion of a wrong translation, professional terminology, on the other hand, seldom leaves place for speculation. If the text the translator is working on is from a field which is new to him, he will most certainly encounter terms he has never heard before, and thus must be sure to familiarize himself with this novelty, so as to be able to deliver a proper and valid translation. The same is true for this text. This analysis will go over some of the more problematic terms related to architecture, which can be encountered in the text.

Having said all that, specialized dictionaries truly are a blessing upon translators, and society as a whole. With the help of tools such as HJP (Hrvatski jezični portal), the Merriam-Webster Dictionary and Željko Bujas' Croatian-English Dictionary, many of the terms that could have caused problems, like *barbicans*, *mansard*, *lintel*, *cameo*, *arcature* and many others, were reduced to a stroll in the park. This allowed for a major allocation of time resources, dedicating more attention to the more problematic parts of the texts.

Izvan zidina, uz obalu...

One such tricky term is the Croatian *vidigrad*. The term was incorrectly used, or better said, fabricated by the original author of the text, which the book included, or might even be a typo. In situations like these, it is up to the translator to use his intelligence, wits and cunning to properly translate the term. The person who used the term *vidigrad* evidently used it in place of the term *vinograd*, meaning *vineyard*. Since *vidigrad* is not officially a word, it is the translator's job to convey the meaning, although incorrect, into the target language. Looking at it, one of the solutions to this problem could have been *sightyard*, given that the *vino* (wine)

³⁴ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recess> Accessed August 2021

³⁵ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/recess> Accessed August 2021

in *vinograd* was replaced with *vidi* (see). Because of that change, the term strongly resembles the term *vidikovac* (lookout). The text also mentions that the whole area of the vineyards only had one house, because it was forbidden to build houses near the walls, which could allude to the fact that the structure at hand might be a lookout. Finally, in order to avoid silly plays on words, because their appropriateness is highly subjective, the solution of choice was the term *lookout*, since it best fits the context of the text.

The term *perilo* occurs several times throughout the text, but in different contexts. *Perilo* means a public washing area, and such areas were very common throughout Europe until the introduction and increase in the use of the washing machine. The direct translation for the word *perilo* would be the English term *lavoir* (or *wash-house*), which is also the chosen solution in this translation, but other acceptable translations would include *washing area* or *public washing area*. Some confusion may arise around the term *Perilo*, when written with a capital *P*, because it would signalize that we are no longer talking about a general *lavoir*, but a part of the city. Some research led to the conclusion that in this instance *Perilo* marks not only a wash-house, but also a spring, which supplies the location with water for the act of washing. Thus, the solution for this issue is to leave the Croatian name *Perilo*, but also keep the Italian name *Lavatoio* in brackets, which is often mentioned alongside it, as a consequence of the influence that the Italian language has had on the city of Rijeka.

Another term which required some research was the Croatian *stupe za sukno*. *Sukno* is defined as *teža tkanina, ob. od grebene vune*³⁶ (heavier fabric, usually made out of combed wool) and *stupa* is a contraption made for the processing of wool³⁷. Researching the terms *stupa* and *sukno* individually resulted in little success, but searching them together revealed to be a much better solution. The final translation of the term is the English term *fulling mill*, which could hardly be deciphered from the individual words themselves.

The term *komorna scena* was a tough challenge. The term *komorno* means *koji je namijenjen za malu prostoriju, za malobrojnu publiku [komorno kazalište]; kamerni*³⁸ (which is intended for a small room, for a small audience) and from here we find out that it can commonly refer to a theater. A direct translation would be something along the lines of

³⁶ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=d1phWxk%3D&keyword=sukno Accessed August 2021

³⁷ Retrieved from [Obrada sukna za izradu odjeće na našim područjima - Narodni.NET](https://www.narodni.net/obrada-sukna-za-izradu-odjece-na-nasim-podrucjima) Accessed August 2021

³⁸ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=elthXxM%3D&keyword=komorni Accessed August 2021

chamber scene, but that would not be fully accurate. Instead, we have to think about the word *scena* and realize it most probably refers to a stage, and a small one at that, because it is being paired with the adjective *komorno*. Going from there, we establish that the term at hand is a small stage, for a small audience – a claim supported by the aforementioned definition. At this point, the translator has to once again tap into his knowledge of language and culture, as well as use his wits to come up with a fitting translation. By taking the term *chamber scene* and replacing the word *scene* with the word *theater*, because it is a theater, a small one, we get the end result of a *theater chamber*, describing a small room serving as a theater for a limited audience.

The last term that should be mentioned in this segment of the analysis is the term *konoba*. The most common definition of the term *konoba*, especially in the continental part of the country, is *ugostiteljsko mjesto, po izgledu i izboru jela i pića nalik na konobu*³⁹ (an establishment, in appearance and choice of dishes and drinks resembling a tavern). There is a clear image in one's mind when the word is heard, thus, its use in this text can be a bit confusing or misleading. The context in which the term *konoba* was used is the following “U Užarskoj ulici otkriven je jedan takav veoma stari zdenac iz kojega se voda vadila kroz otvor u bočnom zidu konobe. “ Here *konoba* is presented as a part of the house, which might cause confusion, as in, is it a standard part of a house, or was it common for people to have taverns in their basements back then? The answer lies in the second definition of the term, which defines it as *prostorija u razizemlju primorske kuće u kojoj se drže bačve s vinom, ulje i trajne zalihe*, and that means that the *konoba* we all came to know draws its origins and design from these old cellars. Thus, it is only fitting that the translation for the term *konoba*, at least in this context, would be the English term *cellar*.

³⁹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=elplWhk%3D&keyword=konoba
Accessed August 2021

Sjaj pozornica

What the second chapter lacks in false friends, it definitely makes up in technical terminology. As its main topics are theaters and locations of social gatherings, it covers a variety of architectural and artistic terminology.

The first of those terms is the Croatian term *empire*. It is mentioned in the sentence “U arhitekturi to je razdoblje baroknog neoklasicizma i prethodnica empirea“. The term *empire* has not been made very clear and has the potential to confuse an unprepared reader, if he is not familiar with the various artistic periods of architecture. The term *empire* actually refers to *Empire*, i.e., *empirijski period* and the reason it might be problematic is the fact that it does not have roots in the Croatian language, but is directly taken from the French *style Empire*. It is defined as *pov. umj. stil Napoleonova vremena u Francuskoj (poč. 19. st.); imitacija je rimske umjetnosti carskog razdoblja, karakterističan po raskoši, pretrpanosti detaljima i kićenosti*⁴⁰ (an art style from the Napoleonic times in France (beginning of the 19th century); it is an imitation of the Roman art of the imperial period, characterized by splendor, cluttered with details and ornaments). With the aforementioned information in mind, it is only a matter of finding the term in a dictionary, as the chosen and proper translation is the English term *Empire style*.

The sentence “Taj je dio građevine bio pod utjecajem manirističkih sanmikelijanskih rješenja svojstvenih za Veneto, a oživljenih u europskoj arhitekturi u drugoj polovici XVIII. stoljeća.“ contains the term *maniristička sanmikelijanska rješenja*, which is not commonly found in the Croatian language at all. Researching the term *sanmikelijansko* was no fruitful endeavour, since it may as well not even exist, but this is where dictionaries and the miracle of the internet come into play. By researching the term *maniristički*, it was clear that it is an adjective which stems from the term *manirizam*, i.e., *umj. pravac i stil u umjetnosti na prijelazu od renesanse prema baroku (16. st.); prevladavaju patos, uznemirenost, koloristički kontrasti*. By finding out the meaning and proper translation of the term *maniristički*, the door was opened to conduct research on the second part of the term, i.e., *sanmikelijanski*. It turns out that *sanmikelijanski* does in fact not refer to a specific sub-period of Mannerism, but rather an active architect utilizing that very style. The architect in question is Michele Sanmicheli, *a Mannerist architect, especially noted for his original treatment of*

⁴⁰Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fFxIURM%3D&keyword=Empire
Accessed August 2021

*military fortifications*⁴¹. The final translation of the term *maniristička sanmikelijanska rješenja* ended up being *Mannerist Sanmikelian solutions*, and is another testament to how much research has to be done and how much wits and common knowledge a translator has to possess to properly translate the text that is his task.

Another great example of the fruits of research is the difference between the Croatian terms *timpan* and *zabat*. *Timpan* is defined as *pov. arhit. a. trokutasta ploha na pročelju i začelju zgrade, ob. hrama u staroj Grčkoj b. polukružna udubina iznad prozora i vrata (ob. u crkvama)*⁴² (**a.** a triangular surface on the front and back of a building, usual for ancient Greek temples **b.** a semicircular recess above the window and door, usual for church spaces) and *zabat* as *arhit. trokutasti dio zida na bočnim završecima krovišta*⁴³ (triangular part of the wall at the side ends of the roof). Looking at these two definitions, one can notice that they are very similar, both describing triangular surfaces on the end of a façade, but the translator has to see through these similarities and keep a keen distinction between them, as their similarities do not make them interchangeable. Thus, we distinguish the English terms *pediment* (the English equivalent of the Croatian term *timpan*) and *gable* (the English translation of the Croatian term *zabat*). It is another quite common pitfall for an untrained translator, while a more professional one will be alert to the potential problem, trying to immediately notice and solve it, before it compromises the quality of the rest of the assignment.

Showcasing how much of an important tool the internet has become is the translation of the Croatian term *serlijan*. The term could neither be found in the Croatia-English dictionary of Željko Bujas, nor on the websites of HJP. The website Struna provided some needed clarification and defined it as *trodijelni otvor kojemu je srednji širi dio zaključen lukom, a bočni su dijelovi zaključeni arhitravima*⁴⁴. The website even goes so far as to offer possible English translations, some of them being *Venetian door*, *Venetian window*, *Palladian window*, *serliana*. The problem which ensues here is picking the right translation. Further research into the topic led to a subcategory of Google named Google Scholar, which in turn led to the repository of the Faculty of Humanities and Social sciences of the University of Zagreb. A paper found in that repository mentions the term *serlijane* and gives an alternative

⁴¹ Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Michele-Sanmicheli> Accessed August 2021

⁴² Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19nXRB6&keyword=timpan Accessed August 2021

⁴³ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f15mXxh8&keyword=zabat Accessed August 2021

⁴⁴ Retrieved from <http://struna.ihij.hr/naziv/serliana/46459/#naziv> Accessed August 2021

name to the term - that being *venecijski prozori*.⁴⁵ With the help of the newly acquired information it was easy to narrow down the exact meaning, and therefore the translation of the term *serlijane*, which was finally translated as *Venetian windows*, making it a prime example of how much the internet has evolved and proved itself to be a great research tool not only for translators, but for all the people willing to use a bit of common sense when diving into the fields of their exploration.

The next term in line is *ugostiteljski obrt* and it appears in the following sentence “Iz suradnje Mate Glavana i Tome Matkovića izniklo je izvanredno funkcionalno rješenje Društvenog doma, koji je osim čitaonice i velike dvorane za spektakle imao obavezan ugostiteljski prostor, kao i najpotrebnije prostorije za uvježbavanje programa brojnih glazbenih društava koja su se okupila oko čitaonice“. It might seem simple to translate, but it is actually a pretty general term describing a specific area in a building. Directly translated, the term *ugostiteljski obrt* equates to something along the lines of a *catering* or *hospitality space* or *area*. Those translations immediately do not feel right, because when someone mentions the term *hospitality area*, although not an official name, one of the first things to come to mind is the hospitality industry, which looks to provide accommodation, food and drinks, entertainment, tourist plans, etc. From the given context, one can deduce that the *ugostiteljski prostor* mentioned in the sentence serves a similar purpose, i.e., it serves as an area of the facility in which guests would be entertained and seated throughout the day when socialising. Thinking about it, a room which serves the same purpose in a traditional family house would be the *dnevni boravak* (a living room), and in larger facilities, such as the headquarters of a society, it would be a *salon* (a saloon). After some further research and dictionary exploration, the settled upon term ended up being *lounge*, which is defined as *a room in a private home or public building for leisure activities or a room in a usually public building or vehicle often combining lounging, smoking, and toilet facilities*.⁴⁶ The latter definition perfectly describes the area at hand and is the reason it was picked over the term *saloon*, whose definition *a usually large public cabin on a ship (as for dining)*⁴⁷, although acceptable under certain circumstances, is not as accurate as *lounge*.

The term *mansardni prozor*, which appears in the sentence “Da bi pomirio visinu tog baroknog pročelnog *piano nobile* s visinom zgrade koja ima mezanin i tri kata, on je nad obje

⁴⁵ Retrieved from Strunje, Petar. "Palladio i Dioklecijanova palača", Zagreb, 2014. Accessed August 2021

⁴⁶ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lounge> Accessed August 2021

⁴⁷ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/salon> Accessed August 2021

barokne polutke palače stavio šatorasti krov s bujno dekoriranim mansardnim prozorima“ is also not quite clear. *Mansardni* is defined as *koji pripada mansardi, koji je na mansardi, koji je svojstven mansardi [mansardni stan]*⁴⁸ (which belongs to the mansard, which is on the mansard, which is inherent to the mansard), meaning one has to find out what the term *mansarda* stands for. *Mansarda* is defined as *arhit. tip krova, krov na prijelom*⁴⁹ (a type of roof, a mansard roof) or *čitav kat ili stan u potkrovlju; potkrovnica*⁵⁰ (an entire floor or apartment in the attic, attic). The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines the English term *mansard* as *a roof having two slopes on all sides with the lower slope steeper than the upper one*⁵¹ and deducing from that, the most common windows found on a mansard roof are *dormer windows* (a window set vertically in a structure projecting through a sloping roof)⁵², which are chosen as the translation in this text.

The Croatian term *vjenčanica* can be quite confusing. The primary meaning of the term is *isprava o vjenčanju*⁵³ (wedding certificate) or *haljina za vjenčanje, vjenčana haljina*⁵⁴ (wedding gown), meaning it most often alludes to a wedding gown. However, one has to, once again, take into account the context in which it was mentioned and that would be the following “Na pročelju te raskošne građevine postavio je Zammattio, između kolosalnih stupova, koji počinju od balkona na prvom katu i sežu do vjenčanice ispod atike, velike prozore s polukružnim nadlučenjima sa strana kojih su plastike ležećih figura.“ Without a doubt, it is either a mistake on the author's part or an architectural term, the latter of the two choices being the more likely one. Research provides us with yet another definition of the term *vjenčanica* and defines it as *a. greda koja na drvenim gradnjama zatvara vijenac b. greda povrh zida*⁵⁵ (**a.** a beam that closes a cornice on wooden constructions **b.** a beam on top of a wall), which fits perfectly into the context in which it is mentioned. Because

Retrieved from ⁴⁸ https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e1xjXhI%3D&keyword=mansardni Accessed August 2021

⁴⁹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e1xjXhE%3D&keyword=mansarda Accessed August 2021

⁵⁰ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e1xjXhE%3D&keyword=mansarda Accessed August 2021

⁵¹ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mansard> Accessed August 2021

⁵² Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dormer> Accessed August 2021

⁵³ Retrieved from

https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19vWxd%2F&keyword=vjen%C4%8Danica Accessed August 2021

⁵⁴ Retrieved from

https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19vWxd%2F&keyword=vjen%C4%8Danica Accessed August 2021

⁵⁵ Retrieved from

https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19vWxd%2F&keyword=vjen%C4%8Danica Accessed August 2021

the term could not be found in the available dictionaries, the internet proved to be a mighty ally, yet again. By searching for a term matching the definition given by the HJP website (*greda koja na drvenim gradnjama zatvara vijenac*), the following English term could be found. A wall plate is a horizontal structural member that provides bearing and anchorage especially for the trusses of a roof or the rafters⁵⁶, which matches the Croatian definition. This proved to be a great example on how to use the internet to reverse search terms, of which we do not know the name, but have a clear understanding of their definition and use.

A mistake which might occur if not noticed by a trained eye is the wrong translation of the Croatian term *krunište*. It is defined as *pom. pov. bogato izrezbaren najviši dio krme starih velikih jedrenjaka*⁵⁷ (carved highest part of the stern of old large sailing ships). The meaning is clear and its translation can easily be found, but the translator might always want to double-check it, so as to not leave any room for mistake. The matter of the fact is that the translation of the term *krunište* is the English term *crenellation*, but might get mistaken for the term *coronation*. Both terms are similar in form and even close in meaning, as *coronation* is defined as *the act or occasion of crowning*, and might lead the translator astray, due to the many similarities between the two terms.

3.3.3 Miscellaneous terms

Izvan zidina, uz obalu...

After covering false friends and architectural terms, it is time for the miscellaneous ones. The terms covered in this section fit in neither of the aforementioned categories, but still required extensive research and presented a notable challenge during the translation of the text.

One of those terms is *predmartovski klasicizam*. When trying to find what period the *predmartovski klasicizam* encompasses, one might find himself at a dead end. To properly translate this term, deduction and research are required. Since the articles in the book were published during the 80's of the 20th century, the usage of Serbian was not an uncommon sight in language and explains the term *martovski*, referring to the month of March. The

⁵⁶ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/wall%20plate> Accessed August 2021

⁵⁷ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=elhvUBU%3D&keyword=kruni%C5%A1te Accessed August 2021

classical period in architecture began in the middle of the 18th and lasted until the late 19th century.⁵⁸ Knowing the time period of classicism helps narrow down all the events, which could have caused a split in the period. Notably, two big March revolutions were the Russian revolution in 1917 and the Springtime of the peoples in 1848. Comparing the respective time periods of the revolutions gives us a clear answer, which is, that the March revolution we are looking for is the latter of the two, i.e., the Springtime of the peoples in 1848. Knowing now what is meant by the term *predmartovski*, it is up to the translator to decide how he will adequately translate it. To keep things simple, but also keeping in mind that the average reader of the book will probably have some prior knowledge of history and architecture, the solution to this translation was the *pre-revolution classicism*, keeping it simple, yet letting the reader know which event was the cut off point for the period of classicism.

Another unfamiliar term and item is the *majolikarna peć*. *Majolika* is defined as *kem. posebnim postupkom pečena i pocakljena glina*⁵⁹ (clay which has been glazed and baked through a special process). Given that this clay requires a furnace for it to be used, the question arises - is this furnace meant to be used for the processing of clay, or is it decorated with it? For that we need the context in which the term is mentioned, which is the following sentence “U nišama su postavljene dvije velike bijele majolikirane peći koje svojom klasicističkom ornamentikom i volumenom pridonose monumentalnom izgledu dvorane. “ The sentence gives us information about the area in which the furnace is located and what its primary purpose is, which is not baking, but decoration. The furnace serves as a piece of the room’s decoration, giving it a special touch. Keeping everything aforementioned in mind, the translation for *majolikarna peć* which was used for this text was *faience-encased stove*, because even though it could potentially be used for the baking of clay, without any real pictures or the ability to see it in person, it is presumed that it is decorated in the *faience* (direct translation of the term *majolik*) style.

The term *gremij* means *radno tijelo koje odlučuje, oni koji su najvažniji u donošenju konačnih odluka u upravljanju poduzećima i službama, »trust mozgova«*⁶⁰ (a decision-making body, those most important in making final decisions in the management of enterprises and

⁵⁸ Retrieved from [Classical / Classical Revival / Neo-Classical: an architectural style guide \(architecture.com\)](https://www.architecture.com/Classical/Classical-Revival/Neo-Classical)
Accessed August 2021

⁵⁹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e11uXxQ%3D&keyword=majolika
Accessed August 2021

⁶⁰ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fV9IXhM%3D&keyword=gremij
Accessed August 2021

services, a think-tank). According to the Bujas dictionary, *gremij* is translated as *a conference of department heads*⁶¹, but this doesn't suit the context in which it was used, i.e., "Svi su imućniji građani, uglavnom novodošli, koji nisu bili sentimentalno vezani uz starogradsku kolijevku, težili da nakon zatrpavanja istočnog poteza rova (sada Vitezovićeve ulica) kupe građevinsko zemljište i na novoprojektiranom potezu sagrade svoju kuću koja je istodobno značila stambeni i poslovni prostor, a i licencijat da se uđe u gremij riječkih građana." The sentence makes it clear that *gremij* in this context is no conference of department heads, but rather a sort of council of citizens. Taking all that into account, the translation for the term *gremij* is not a direct one, nor does it follow a dictionary, but is rather a descriptive one, which tries to blend into the context of the sentence and the text itself. The chosen translation is *city council*, a term marking a group which fulfills a similar role in the city to that described in the Bujas dictionary.

The term *legat* is also an interesting one, because of its meaning, or better said, because of the multitude of them. The first and apparently most frequent definition is *onaj kojega šalje papa s posebnim zadatkom; izaslanik, poslanik*⁶² (one sent by the pope on a special assignment; emissary, delegate), which would be directly translate as *legate* or *emissary*, but that would not be correct. The sentence which contains the term *legat* is the following "Međutim, mašta puka je radila, optužili su Simeona da je zatajio dati eraru određeni legat od ukupne vrijednosti nalaza." According to the context of the sentence, it is clear that the author was not talking about some sort of emissary, but rather a share, which Simeon had to give. This goes hand in hand with the second definition of the term *legat*, which is also *odredba kojom oporučitelj ostavlja nekoj osobi, na teret svoga nasljednika, određenu stvar ili pravo iz ostavštine*⁶³ (a provision by which the testator leaves to a person, at the expense of his heir, a certain thing or right from the inheritance). This makes much more sense, but it is still not quite accurate, because it defines it more as an inheritance or a legacy, instead of a share of the found treasure. This again called for the translator's ingenuity and wits, resulting in the term *legat* being translated as *a part of*. Although a direct translation of the term *legat* was not used, the term *part* is perfectly valid and fills the spot just fine. It

⁶¹ Retrieved from Bujas, Zeljko. "Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik." *Nakledni zavod Globus: Zagreb* (1999), p. 369 Accessed August 2021

⁶² Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e19nXhI%3D&keyword=legat Accessed August 2021

⁶³ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=e19nXhI%3D&keyword=legat Accessed August 2021

should also be noted that the term *share* would also be a fitting solution and both translations are interchangeable in this context.

Another interesting term is the Croatian word *brajda*. The website Hrvatski jezični portal defines it as *stupovi s poprečnim žicama i sl., po kojima se penje vinova loza [podignuti brajdu; loza s brajde; loza na brajdi]; odrina*. The Bujas Croatian-English dictionary translates it as *espalier, trellis (-work), trellised arch; (od loze) grape arbor*⁶⁴. The term *brajde* can simply be translated as *trellis*, but the translator should also take into account that when using the term, the average speaker does not only mean the framework, but also the vines growing around them. Thus, when translating, the chosen solution was *vineyard trellis*, implying they are used for the cultivation of grape vines, which is also their most common use in the region, unlike, kiwi trellis, for example. There are also instances of the term being written with a capital *B* and those were not translated, because it is the name of a part of the city of Rijeka named Brajda, which got its name after the Franciscan vineyards that once occupied the area.

The term *lehe* also presented a challenge, not a major one, but a challenge nonetheless. The term in its presented form is hard to find in any modern Croatian dictionary, as well as the Hrvatski jezični portal website. The more common and apparently correct form is *lijeha*, which requires some research to find out, especially if one is not familiar with the field of gardening. The term *lijeha* is also synonymous with the term *greda*, which can either be defined as *dem. od greda*⁶⁵ (dim. form of the word beam) or *komad obrađene zemlje za uzgajanje povrća ili cvijeća; lijeha*⁶⁶ (a piece of cultivated land for the growing of vegetables and flowers; trellis), the latter of which is applicable in this context. The most common translation of the term *greda*, or in this case, the term *lijeha*, is *flower bed*. While not incorrect, the term *flower bed* is not accurate enough, which prompts a slight change, resulting in the final translation to be *trellis beds*.

An interesting term that came up twice in the text is *rodosćitje*. The reason the term is interesting is because it cannot be found in any dictionary, nor does it appear to have any matches online. Having found no lead on the term in formal literature, the translator has to,

⁶⁴ Retrieved from Bujas, Zeljko. "Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rjecnik." *Nakledni zavod Globus: Zagreb* (1999), p. 117 Accessed August 2021

⁶⁵ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fV9lXRc%3D&keyword=gredica Accessed August 2021

⁶⁶ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=fV9lXRc%3D&keyword=gredica Accessed August 2021

yet again, use his wits and knowledge of language and culture, as to decipher the meaning out of the context in which the term was used. The first appearance of the term *rodosćitje* is in the sentence “*Pod Karlom VI. koji cestu od Reke do Karlovca dade uzgraditi, bijahu otvorena i cetironuglenima kamenima uzidana velika krasna vrata koja se zвахu nova vrata, nad koji(h) bijase cesar(s)ki oro i rodosćiče, rodosćitje slavne kuće austrijanske (aquila imperialis et insigne gloriosae domus austriacae).*” The text mentions the *rodosćitje* being located above a great door, together with the royal eagle, a symbol of the royal family. Deducting from the aforementioned information, to most common thing, which could be found in such a location would be a crest, a family crest, to be more precise. The *rod* in *rodosćitje* most presumably implies it is related to family, further driving the belief that the term in question is a family crest, prompting the translation to be just that, the term *crest*.

The last term which will be covered in the analysis of this chapter is the Croatian term *barka-skela*. The term *barka* is defined as *pom. općenit naziv za manji brod za plovidbu morem, prisutan na cijelom području Sredozemlja; brodić, čamac*⁶⁷ (a general name for a smaller seagoing ship, present throughout the Mediterranean; boat, craft) and the term *skela* as *plovilo za prijevoz preko rijeke koje se kreće vezano na užu s jedne obale na drugu*⁶⁸ (a river transport vessel moving tied to a rope from one bank to another). The definitions of the two terms are very clear, but a combination of them is uncommon in use, to say the least. The most optimal procedure in such a situation is, again, research. And through said research it can be learned that it's a *boat*, which is one of the possible translations of the term *barka*, which is being used as a *ferry*, the translation of the term *skela*. The final translation of the term *barka-skela* is *cable ferry*, since it is a ferry, but needs the additional information the word *cabel* provides, as it is not meant for the usage on the open sea, but utilizes a cable stretching from one shore to the other, which provides further safety for the passengers and the transported goods.

⁶⁷ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=eFdmXA%3D%3D&keyword=barka
Accessed August 2021

⁶⁸ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=d15kWxc%3D&keyword=skela
Accessed August 2021

Sjaj pozornica

The author mentions the Croatian term *zatrpavanje* in the context of the sentence “Nakon potresa 1750. godine, koji je porušio i znatno oštetiio veliki dio riječkog Starog grada, donesen je 1755. novi urbanistički plan na kojemu su ucrtane linije razvoja tzv. Novog grada na obali pred gradskim zidinama, i to tako da se zatrpavanjem mora dobiti nove površine od Rova do Andrejšćice (Fosso – Borgo S. Andrea).“ The term means **a.** *prekriti ili napuniti što čim, nabacujući što kruto ili sipko; zasuti* **b.** *potpuno ispuniti prostor; zakrčiti, zagušiti*⁶⁹(**a.** cover or fill up with rigid or grainy material **b.** completely fill up the space; obstruct, jam), and in the context of this sentence it refers to the covering of the sea with earth in order to extend the area of the city and thus allowing for further construction to take place. The term *zatrpati* can be directly translated as *bury, fill or overwhelm*, but none of these translations fits this particular instance. It is one of the very frequent situations in which the translator has to set aside time meant for the translation of the text and, yet again, do research. Through the use of the internet and various dictionaries one can find out that there are many forms of “burying” and that the one needed here, where parts of the coast are being drowned in earth, as to create new terrain, also has a proper name. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary lists this type of burial as *reclamation* and even gives a useful example in *pumped water out of the field as part of the land reclamation program designed to provide farmers with more farmland*⁷⁰, which is very similar to the context in which the term appears in the text.

Another term which was mentioned in the text was the Latin *civitas nova*. The term has a clear translation, that being *New town*. It is quite often used when talking/writing about Rijeka and refers to the new part of town. The case with such terms, which are neither in the source nor target language, is that the translator may decide whether he wants to leave them be, or translate them. The case for leaving them be in their original form, Latin in this case, is that the author intentionally wrote them as such in that particular language, probably because of emphasis, or because it may refer to some old documents in that language, which mention the term. The author may also not know the language in which the term is mentioned and out of fear that he might mistranslate it, either by finding a false equivalent in the target language or by misinterpreting the context, in which it is mentioned, leave it in its original form. The author of this text, however, mentions the new part of town as both *civitas nova* and *Novi*

⁶⁹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f15kUBZ8&keyword=zatrpati Accessed August 2021

⁷⁰ Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reclamation> Accessed August 2021

grad, even in the same chapter. This can be seen in the sentence “Nakon potresa 1750. godine, koji je porušio i znatno oštetiio veliki dio riječkog Starog grada, donesen je 1755. novi urbanistički plan na kojemu su ucrtane linije razvoja tzv. Novog grada na obali pred gradskim zidinama, i to tako da se zatrpavanjem mora dobiju nove površine od Rova do Andrejšćice (Fosso – Borgo S. Andrea).“ where it is referred to as *Novi grad* and in “ Stvorena je scenografija koja je cijelom tom novosagrađenom nizu kasnobaroknih zgrada na Korzu dala određeni srednjoeuropski velegradski ton, što se lijepo vidi na jednoj grafici izvedenoj po akvarelu Ch. v. Mayra 1833. godine, na kojoj je, mogli bismo reći, jednim pogledom obuhvaćena civitas nova na riječkom Predgradu.“ where it is called *civitas nova*. Usually it is not up to the translator to decide which term is more suitable for the situation, since his job is to translate the thoughts and ideas of the client from the source language into the targeted one, but there can be some exceptions, as is the case with this one. The whole paragraph interchangeably uses the terms *civitas nova* and *Novi grad*, which is just a clumsy decision at best, thus the decision was made that the translation of the text would lean only towards one of those terms, for stylistic purposes. The choice fell on the term *civitas nova*, since it is obvious that the term was introduced to the source text for the purpose of aesthetics and the Latin touch it gives to the text would benefit the translation, as much as it did the source material, if not more so, because the translation uses it consistently.

The author mentions the term *variete* in the context of the sentence “U Teatru *Fenice* priređivale su se dramske i operne predstave s glasovitim izvođačima (Zago, Benini), ali su već idući dan znali nastupati cirkusi s dresiranim konjima, mađioničari ili pak *variete*.“ This term became problematic, as it is not commonly used in everyday language and has a specific meaning, referring to a specific idea, but even more so, because it is misspelled. It might be the influence of the Serbo-Croatian language, which was common during the 80’s, when this text was written, or it might have been a typo. Using primarily Croatian-English dictionaries and basing one’s search on the presumption that the source material is written in Croatian, might lead to some problems, when faced with terms such as the aforementioned *variete*. Because of this, the translator might need to set aside more time for research than initially intended, which was the case with this term. After a long time of searching, one will surely find the right answer, that being the Croatian term *varijetet*, with just a slight modification in the addition of the letter *j*, which means the world trying to make a proper and exact translation. The term is defined as *kazalište ili noćni lokal s programom plesnih, glazbenih i*

*akrobatskih predstava*⁷¹ (a theater or nightclub with a program of dance, music and acrobatic performances), which ties into the context of the sentence mentioning it. Having found the proper Croatian term, all that is left is finding its equivalent in the target language, i.e., English, which, at this point, is nothing more than a formality. Finally, the proper translation is the English term *variety show*, meaning *theatrical entertainment of successive separate performances (as of songs, dances, skits, and acrobatic feats)*⁷².

An interesting term that appears in the text is the Croatian word *vjenčić*. The most common meaning of the term is either *dem. od vijenac*⁷³ (dem. form of the word wreath), and the meaning of the term *vijenac* is *ukras od cvijeća ili lišća spleten u obliku kruga*⁷⁴ (an ornament of flowers or leaves woven in the shape of a circle), or *bot. biljka (Sherardia arvensis) iz porodice broćeva (Rubiaceae); koljenac*. These two definitions differ greatly from one another, thus the translator needs to look up the context in which the term is mentioned. “Ispod gledališta je izgrađena tzv. *Sala Bianca* (Bijela dvorana) s malom pozornicom i s plesnim podijem u kojoj su se održavali redutni plesovi i gdje je mladež održavala svoje čajanke i vjenčiće.” The sentence clearly refers to *vjenčić* as a form of social gathering, which does not fall in line with either of the two definitions, one being a decoration made out of flowers, while the other is a literal flower. Luckily, the HJP website also mentions the syntagm *plesni vjenčić*, i.e., ***plesni vjenčić*** **1.** društvena čajanka **2.** zast. prvi ples mladića ili djevojke u javnosti⁷⁵ (**1.** a tea party **2.** the first public dance of a young woman or man), which fits perfectly with the context of the sentence. It is a social gathering at which the participants dance, which is easy to understand, but unfortunately lacks a direct counterpart in the English language. So as not to further confuse the reader, and since the term itself has no significant impact on the sentence, or the text, one of the better choices a translator can make in such a situation is to simply translate the term in a descriptive manner. Thus, the term *vjenčić* was simply translated as a *social gathering*.

⁷¹ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19hXhh9&keyword=varijete Accessed August 2021

⁷² Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/variety%20show> Accessed August 2021

⁷³ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19vWxd1&keyword=vjen%C4%8Di%C4%87 Accessed August 2021

⁷⁴ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19uXx11&keyword=vijenac Accessed August 2021

⁷⁵ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=f19vWxd1&keyword=vjen%C4%8Di%C4%87 Accessed August 2021

The same sentence which mentioned the term *vjenčić*, also mentioned the term *redutni ples*. The term *redutni ples* does not have a direct translation into the English language, thus, further research was required. The adjective *redutni* stems from the word *reduta*, which means *vojn. u fortifikacijskoj arhitekturi utvrda namijenjena obrani u povlačenju; može biti stalna, mobilna i poljska*⁷⁶ (in fortification architecture a fortress intended for defense in case of retreat; it can be permanent, mobile or in an open field), or *zabava s maskama, krabuljni ples*⁷⁷ (a masquerade) or *dvorana u kazalištu koja služi publici za odmor*⁷⁸ (a theater hall, which serves for the audience to rest). Out of all these definitions, the most suitable would be the second one. It is a somewhat broad term that covers all kinds of dances and masquerades, but since the translator cannot be too sure about all the events which were hosted there, the safest option would be to translate it in an appropriate manner, but now delving too deep into details. The resulting translation for the term *redutni ples* ended up being a *dance*, since much like the term *vjenčić*, going beyond just that would not add anything of significance to the text, and the reader can understand the given information just fine with the ground knowledge provided by these translations.

⁷⁶ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=dlplWBk%3D&keyword=reduta Accessed August 2021

⁷⁷ Retrieved from https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=dlplWBk%3D&keyword=reduta Accessed August 2021

⁷⁸ https://hjp.znanje.hr/index.php?show=search_by_id&id=dlplWBk%3D&keyword=reduta Accessed August 2021

4 Conclusion

Summarizing the translations of the two texts, it can be said that both were challenging and rewarding and the same time. Since, for the most part, they were straightforward and to the point, there was little room for doubt and second guessing, but the light literary touch the author gave to them, coupled with architectural terminology, made them a formidable challenge.

Much time was set aside just for research purposes, since reading and soaking up as much information about the field to which the text one is about to translate belongs is one of the most crucial steps a translator has to take before even thinking about beginning the translation. Various dictionaries and intelligent use of the internet proved to be of great help in successfully completing this step.

As a whole, translating these two texts can be described as an interesting and useful experience, which really showcased what is expected of a translator and pointed out the potential flaws and shortcomings in one's own knowledge, but it was also a great asset in making up and overcoming them. It also provided a feeling of great satisfaction, which only a translator, who has finally found the perfect translation or solution to a complicated or clumsily formulated sentence, could understand, making him feel as if he is standing on top of the world.

It is a hard and demanding job, but as many other jobs out there, it has its perks, which make up for its shortcomings, such as finally viewing the completion of one's hard and diligent work, as the one presented in this thesis.

5 Appendices

Izvan zidina, uz obalu...

Nova riječka pročelja

Izgradnja Korza. Zapadno i istočno od Gradskog tornja započela je izgradnja poteza Korza tek nakon 1780. godine. Veliki broj pridošlih stranaca, privučeni privilegijama slobodne luke, težio je svoje nove domove učiniti ljepšim i udobnijim nego što su bile zgrade u riječkom Starom gradu. Dugo očekivano dopuštenje za rušenje vjekovnog opasača oko omeđenog prostora unutar *Terrae Fluminis* svi su došljaci s oduševljenjem pozdravili.¹

Rušenje bedema. Rov na Predgradu počeo se zatrpavati već 1782. godine i to veoma mudro. Prvo je iskopan kanal na svod za odvod prljave i oborinske vode, potom su u Rov (Fosso) ubačeni dijelovi porušenih bedema barbakana, razni kameni i građevni fragmenti i naposljetku je nabijena zemlja. Tako je na Predgradu uređena nova fasada Rijeke. Cijeli potez, od kuće Vuković-Jurman (Korzo 2) do kuće u kojoj je Radio Rijeka, sagrađen je u razmaku od 1787. do 1850. godine. Stil svih građevina kreće se od baroknog pa sve do predmartovskog klasicizma. Među prvim zgradama izgrađenim netom nakon rušenja gradskih zidina je kuća Josipa Franje Troyera, riječkog suca i rektora. Do te zgrade bila je kuća *Marchioni* u kojoj je bio ured mitnice sve do polovice XVIII. stoljeća, a kad je 1787. godine proširena za širinu barbakana i ona je novim pročeljem provirivala na Korzo. U toj je kući, od 1796. do 1880. godine, bila poznata riječka Kavana *della Dogana*. Iza tih dviju kuća redom su provirivale nove fasade kuća koje su do rušenja bedema bile za polovicu uže i samo su svojim drugim i trećim katom gledale na Korzo koje postaje glavna gradska ulica gdje se mnogi preseljavaju ili iznova otvaraju brojne trgovine, kavane i ljekarne.²

Kuća Troyer. Kuća *Troyer* spada u zgrade ambicioznije arhitekture kojoj je svoj osobni pečat dao glasoviti arhitekt Anton Gnamb. To je skladna arhitektura kakvu na kraju XVIII. i početkom XIX. stoljeća srećemo u svim srednjoeuropskim gradovima, funkcionalno prilagođenima duhu vremena s dvije karakteristične mansarde završene mekanim, poleglim, baroknim, jače isturenim vijencem. Ta zgrada, nakon obnove za robnu kuću, predstavlja vrlo elegantan arhitekturni naglasak uz Gradski toranj, koji također ima nad pločama za ure takav mekano savijen vijenac. Jedan dio kuća na zapadnom potezu Korza je porušen; prvo su

srušene peta i šesta kuća u nizu, da se početkom 1914. godine napravi mjesta za novoprojektiranu Gradsku štedionicu; 1953. godine srušena je četvrta kuća (br. 16) da bi se sagradila zgrada na Korzu nasuprot Gradskog tornja,³ a 1971. godine srušena je treća kuća (br. 14) da se uz kuću⁴ Borovo dogradi sadašnja zgrada Robne kuće *Korzo*.

Naša Rijeka, god. V, br. 54-55, srpanj-kolovoz 1983.

¹ G. Viezzoli, *Contributi alla storia di Fiume nel settecento*, Fiume-Rivista, Anno XI-XII, 1933-1934, Fiume 1936, 162-170.

² G. Kobler, *Memorie per la liburnica citta di Fiume*, II, Fiume 1896, 46-47.

³ Kuća je sagrađena po projektu arhitekta Josipa Petraka 1953. godine.

⁴ Ta je kuća sagrađena po projektu arhitekta Eduarda Stipanovića za *Magazzino Bata* 1938. u stilu *razionale*. Uklopljena je u novogradnju Robne kuće *Korzo*, arhitektice Ade Felice-Rošić u suradnji sa Zlatkom Šnelerom, otvorene 21. travnja 1973.

Nekada Masarykovo, a danas Šetalište Andrije Kačića Miošića

Belveder – Baštijanova i Laginjina ulica

Korzo sa starom Guvernerovom palačom (u prvom planu s desne strane)

Upravna zgrada bivše Rafinerije šećera

Vrijedan spomenik kulture. Najvelebnija palača nastala u Rijeci u doba jozefinskog baroka i jedna od najvećih zgrada u čitavom Hrvatskom primorju jest upravna zgrada bivše Rafinerije šećera u Kidričevoj ulici (danas Krešimirovoj). Kompleks bivše Rafinerije šećera bio je izgrađen duž morske obale i sezao je sve do starog Lazareta. Možemo zamisliti kako se ova arhitektura zrcalila na morskoj površini dok se iza nje nalazio zeleni prostor riječkog Podbrega. Sada je uklopljena u najprometniju ulicu, odvojena od kompleksa Lazareta novogradnjama, tako da je barokni ugođaj potpuno iščezao. Unatoč svemu ona ostaje svjedokom jednog velikog razdoblja u razvoju grada Rijeke i primjer čistog stila *fin de siècle*.

Jozefinski barok. Barokni neoklasicizam kod te se palače očituje u zatvorenoj kompoziciji i strogoj jednostavnosti pročelja. To je čvrsta višekatnica s prostranim prizemljem za skladišta i katovima kod kojih je naglašena simetrija otvora. Izmjenični trokutni i segmentni nadstrešnici prozora prvog i drugog kata prekidaju monotoniju simetrije. Strmi krov i vijenac oko krova te timpan na čelu zgrade pokazuju jasne značajke neostila XVIII. stoljeća. Jedino je balkon na drugom katu nemirne linije i pokazuje koliko je živa barokna tradicija. On počiva na snažnim bujnim menzolama koje su uz herme na mjestu ključnog kamena nad vratima jedini plastični ukrasi na širokom pročelju s naglašenim jakim kordonskim vijencima između prvog i drugog kata. Na tom pročelju opaža se jedna nepravilnost, a to je umetnuti red malih prozora između prizemlja i prvog kata, nastao uslijed potrebe da se stvore visoka svijetla skladišta, tako da otvori vrata sežu ispod kordonskog vijenca. Središnje izbočenje dominira i na njemu su smješteni ukrasni elementi. Od te su se zgrade kao krila razvijale tvorničke radionice vezane međusobno jakim kamenim portalima koji su stvarali tamne rupture u dugačkom potezu prizemlja čitavog kompleksa. Ni u jednoj baroknoj zgradi u Rijeci i Hrvatskom primorju nismo naišli na monumentalno stubište kakvo ima ova palača. Stubište je smješteno u sredini, nošeno je stupovima na kojima se, od dolje prema gore, izmjenjuju jonska i korintska glavica. Bijeli stupovi su u kontrastu sa željeznom ogradom na kojoj se osjeća naglašena linija i faktura šipke. Plasticitet je još naglašen jednostavnom štukaturom na stropovima koja se sastoji od uokvirenih, na uglovima ojačanih uklada koje su fino pomirene s klasicističkim frontonima iznad vrata u hodnike. Barokni plasticitet, okomita i vodoravna raščlamba i raskošna dekoracija došli su do izražaja u Svečanom salonu na drugom katu, koji ima ulogu *piano nobile*.

Unutrašnja ornamentika. Arhitektura pročelja primijenjena je u dekoraciji Svečanog salona. Vijencima, frontonima, pilastrima, kapitelima, lukovima i nišama zidovi su ispunjeni veoma skladno i odvojeni od stropa isturenim vijencem na konzolicama. Nad tim je vijencem užljebina i razvučen bačvasti svod ukrašen profiliranim okvirima za štukature. U nišama su postavljene dvije velike bijele majolikirane peći koje svojom klasicističkom ornamentikom i volumenom pridonose monumentalnom izgledu dvorane. Dosljednost u stilskoj čistoći te arhitekture osjeća se u Malom salonu gdje su u uokvirenim panoima smještene zidne slike, a strop ukrašen gemama i girlandama. Salon je datiran 1784., dok je cijela zgrada dovršena 1786. godine, što se vidi iz natpisa na stubištu. Veoma lijep primjer štukatura na stropovima bivše Rafinerije šećera nalazi se u svečanoj dvorani i dvjema sobama uprave. Nije nam uspjelo otkriti autora tih štukatura, ali se može pomišljati na jednog od poznatijih štukatera koji su ukrašavali monumentalne palače u Srednjoj Europi. U svečanoj dvorani strop je podijeljen na četiri dijela u kojima su, okruženi trofejima, smješteni reljefni medaljoni sa scenama iz antičke vojne povijesti. Ratnici u oklopima i kacigama sudjeluju u ubojstvu neke ličnosti, a taj je događaj ispričan u četiri kruga. Figure su ponešto nespretno skraćene, vjerojatno zbog visine stropa, ali bez obzira na te nedostatke one unose ton ozbiljnosti i svečanosti u tu inače neobično skladnu arhitekturu. U sobama uprave štukature uokviruju oslikane zidne panoe, njima su ukrašeni nadvratnici, strop i rubni vijenac. Između lisnatih i cvjetnih plastičnih dekoracija smještene su kameje i arabeske. Za razliku od onih u svečanoj dvorani, te štukature nose obilježja rokoka i predstavljaju visoku razinu ove umjetnosti u srednjoeuropskim razmjerima. Unatoč velikim nastojanjima, nije nam bilo moguće otkriti ime slikara izvanrednih zidnih slikarija u Malom salonu, koji služi kao ured u Tvornici "Rikard Benčić". Dekoracije su smještene po cijeloj površini zida, u uokvirenim poljima su prikazi ruševina zamišljenog antičkog grada izrađene u stilu jozefinskog *Zopfa*, a datirane 1784. godine, zapisom u uglu kod ulaznih vrata. Iz tog se zapisa razabire da je direktor Pierre de Vierendeels dao naslikati taj salon u doba cara Josipa II. Očito je slike radio rutinirani slikar s istančanim ukusom i smislom za klasicističku svijetlu gamu i s finim osjećajem za raspored masa. Riječ je o tipičnom arhitekturnom slikarstvu veoma bliskom scenografskim predlošcima. Jednostavne kompozicije sugerirane su analogijom elemenata, lukovima, stupovima, arkaturama, obeliscima i kipovima. Osjeća se još uvijek dekorativni govor rokoka u okvirnim rokajima, fantazija je živa, iako su oblici imitirani, no ne mehanički već s umjetničkom kreativnošću. Osjeća se čistoća boje, perfektnost perspektive, ponegdje ima monotonosti i hladnoće svojstvene neoklasicizmu. Slikar je izišao iz obitelji slikara veduta i scenografija kasnog *Settecenta*, slike je lišio bibijenske dekorativne nadgradnje i na njima se

osjeća snažan utjecaj neoklasicizma. Zaista je šteta što se ne zna ime slikara tih izvanrednih dekoracija izvedenih na najvišoj razini. U svakom ga slučaju moramo tražiti među venecijanskim neoklasičarima koji su djelovali u austrijskim nasljednim zemljama, jer se za gradnju Rafinerije šećera neposredno zanimao sam cârski dvor.¹

Zuccheriera. Zaslugom Rafinerije šećera ime Rijeke prvi se put proširilo u trgovačkom i industrijskom svijetu u drugoj polovici XVIII. stoljeća. Osnivanje ove rafinerije u Rijeci bilo je vezano za početke razvoja industrije šećera u austrijskoj monarhiji. Grof Rudolf Chotek je u Trstu razradio opsežan program razvoja i oživljavanja tršćanske i riječke luke, pa je austrijska uprava od 1749. godine pokrenula inicijativu da se u suradnji s velikim trgovačkim i industrijskim udruženjima iz Antverpena osnuje u Primorju *Haupt-Handlungs-Compagnie von Triest und Fiume* (Glavno trgovačko udruženje Trsta i Rijeke). Toj su se inicijativi odazvale trgovačke tvrtke Proli i Arnold iz Antverpena. Vlast je povlasticama pomogla ovo udruženje, u trajanju od dvadeset i pet godina bio im je osiguran rad i proizvodnja u slobodnoj zoni te nesmetan uvoz proizvoda na teritorij austrijskih nasljednih zemalja. Kompanija je mogla uvoziti sirovinu (šećernu trsku), graditi vlastite brodove, kopati ugljen, sjeći drva, itd. Dekret o povlasticama potpisala je carica Marija Terezija 1. listopada 1750. godine. U toj je rafineriji, koju su Riječani zvali *Zuccheriera*, radilo 705 osoba raspoređenih u skladištima, na prijevozu drva i ugljena te u procesu rafiniranja šećera iz trske. Taj impozantan industrijski pogon proizvodio je godišnje 20 do 30 tisuća centi rafiniranog šećera i 8 do 9 tona sirupa. Kapital udruženja skupljen je na osnovi dionica do visine dva milijuna fiorina, odnosno od 2000 dionica po 1000 fiorina. Sama je carica imala 12 dionica, a grof Chotek 3000, dok su nizozemski dioničari imali 444 akcije u udruženju. Prvi je naziv udruženja bio *Urbano Arnold et Compagnie*; uprava društva ostala je u Trstu kad je 25. travnja 1752. godine utemeljeno jedinstveno udruženje. Postrojenja u Rijeci bila su tako brzo građena da je 1754. godine proizvedeno već dovoljno šećera iz Rafinerije da se zadovolje nacionalne potrebe austrijskih zemalja. Carica je udruženju produžila povlastice (privilegije) za idućih dvadeset i pet godina pa dolazi do novog oživljavanja aktivnosti. Direktor Pierre Vierendeels počinje 1782. godine graditi upravnu zgradu o kojoj je bilo riječi.² Kao spomenik profane barokne umjetnosti zaslužuje skrb vlasnika koji trebaju biti ponosni što uživaju takav vrijedan spomenik kulture, star više od dvije stotine godina.

Naša Rijeka, god. IV, br. 38, ožujak 1982.

¹ R. Matejčić, Barok u Istri i Hrvatskom primorju, u: Barok u Hrvatskoj, Liber, Zagreb, 1982., 426., sl. 198-201; 523, 566, 612. Raffineria di Zuccherò in Fiume, Fiume-Rivista, Anno X, 1932, Fiume, 1933, 190-198.

Upravna zgrada Rafinerije šećera koja je u Rijeci djelovala između 1750. i 1828. godine

Masivna zgrada Rafinerije šećera dominirala je riječkom obalom

Kompleks Rafinerije šećera prije podizanja željezničkog kolodvora na nasutom terenu ispred nje
Giovanni Fumi *Alegorija ljeta*, freska na stropu nekadašnje Rafinerije šećera

Plan kompleksa Rafinerije šećera

Od Dolca do Zagrada

Urbanizacija središta grada. Sustavna urbanistička izgradnja Rijeke može se pratiti od polovice XVIII. stoljeća na potezu od Rječine pa sve do Trga Togliatti (današnjeg Jadranskog trga). Taj je potez trasiran od Marije Terezije odobrenim planom izgradnje Novoga grada (*Civitatis novae*). Koncentracija izgradnje bila je na postojećem terenu ispred južnih gradskih zidina ili pak na postupno nasipanom terenu uz morsku obalu. Gradnja prve Guvernerove palače na Andrejšćici povukla je izgradnju duž novoootvorene Gubernijalne ceste (*Via del Governo*) prema nekadašnjem predgrađu (*borgo*), ali se nakon rušenja gradskih zidina u Supilovoj ulici izgradnja s obje strane tog vrlo uočljivog uspona nastavila pa će se do pred kraj XIX. stoljeća jasno uobličiti smjer i širina te ulice.

Vinogradi kao vidigradi. U starim ispravama područje od zapadnih zidina do Andrejšćice i Zagrada zvalo se Brajde ili Dolac. Prema posljednjem nazivu dobila je današnja ulica ime Dolac. Riječki kirurg G. Genova je 1671. godine objelodanio grafiku s prikazom Rijeke na kojoj je to područje prikazano kao kultivirana zona zasađena maslinicima i vinogradima. On vinograde ubilježava krivo kao *vidigradi*. Na čitavom tom području samo je jedna kućica budući da još u to doba nije bilo dopušteno graditi nastambe u neposrednoj blizini zidina.¹ Na planu Rijeke načinjenom oko 1760. godine put uz zapadne zidine, od velike utvrde sv. Jeronima do Kirin-kule, naziva se cesta prema Drenovi; cjelokupno je područje i dalje obraslo zelenilom usred kojeg je veće zdanje označeno kao *vrt i vinograd s kućom za stanovanje baruna Androche*. Ispod te kuće vidljivo je obilježen izvor ponornice s objašnjenjem *voda sv. Andrije*, nazvana Andrejšćica, koja izvire od brijega pod vrtom i vinogradom baruna Androche. Do tog je izvora vodio širok put na potezu današnje Ulice Dolac. Od izvora te vode pa oko crkve sv. Andrije sve do kapucinskog samostana već su tada bile izgrađene kuće naselja Andrejšćice (tako se naziva u matičnim knjigama). Ubilježene su i kuće izgrađene u Gubernijalnoj ulici sve do mosta koji je prelazio preko potoka kod kavane (*ex Zora, ex El Rio*). To znači da je zabrana gradnje u blizini bedema prešutno zanemarena.² Ako usporedimo taj nacrt sa stotinu godina kasnije načinjenim nacrtom iz 1872. godine, u kojem su ubilježene žive vode, možemo zapaziti da je gušća izgradnja uz Gubernijalnu ulicu; cesta prema Drenovi naziva se Municipalna ulica (*Via del Municipio*), sada Supilova ulica, a s njene lijeve strane izgrađene su kuće sve do visine gdje je sada zgrada gimnazije. Na gornjem je dijelu još uvijek nekadašnja kuća baruna Androche, ali tada u vlasništvu obitelji Meynierovih. Iza te kuće (u

Dežmanovoj ulici, danas Kurelčevoj, srušena nakon Drugog svjetskog rata) bio je uređen prekrasan engleski park koji je sezao do Zagrada.³

Nove usporedne ceste. Dolaskom Giovannija Ciotte za gradonačelnika Rijeke započinju veliki radovi na urbanizaciji područja od Dolca do Zagrada, a cjelokupni elaborati za otvaranje novih usporednih cesta napravljeni su u gradskom Građevinskom uredu kojemu je na čelu bio Izidor Vauchnig. Zapravo, prvo je bilo otkupljeno zemljište od Meynierovih za otvaranje Ulice Clotilda, a od 1883. godine otkupljen je teren na zemljištu baruna Simeona Vranczyanya da se otvori nova paralelna ulica koja je trebala povezivati Municipij i Ulicu sv. Andrije (sada Barčićeva ulica).⁴ Već se tada pokazala potreba za izradom generalnog plana izgradnje, jer su se uz Ulicu Dolac otvarale i druge prometnice kako bi se povezao grad s Brajdom i željezničkim kolodvorom.⁵ U Rijeci je u to doba bio ogroman porast stanovništva, posebno činovnika, administrativnih službenika kojima nisu odgovarali neudobni stanovi u Starom gradu.⁶ Otvaranjem nove Ulice Dolac (Via Clotilda inferiore), na čijim su krajevima bile rezervirane parcele za izgradnju Osnovne škole za dječake i Osnovne škole za djevojčice, pružila se prilika poduzetnom industrijalcu i posjedniku Robertu Whiteheadu da unosno uloži svoj kapital u novogradnju duž te ulice. Istodobno je omogućio arhitektu Giacomu Zammattiju, kao autoru projekata, da se iskaže i na polju stambenog graditeljstva. Zammattio je u toj ulici za Whiteheada projektirao najprije vlastitu palaču, tzv. *Casa veneziana*, a zatim još tri stambene zgrade. Gradska je štedionica 1896. godine, po projektu Zammattija, počela gradnju svoje palače na uglu Ulice Erazma Barčića i Ulice Dolac. Tako je u jednoj ulici smješten velik opus cijenjenog riječkog graditelja i arhitekta.⁷ Sve to ne bi bilo moguće ostvariti bez suradnje gradonačelnika Ciotte, suvlasnika *Silurificia* (tvornice torpeda) u kome je Robert Whitehead imao najveći broj dionica.

Ambiciozni Englez. Whitehead je bio osebujna ličnost, jedna od najznačajnijih u industrijskom razvoju Rijeke. Ulaganjem svog kapitala u izgradnju čitavih blokova zgrada na Dolcu i Brajdi, nezaobilazan je trag ostavio u urbanističkom razvoju Rijeke. Sretna je okolnost što je za svog arhitekta izabrao Giacoma Zammattija pa je tako kvalitetnoj graditeljskoj monumentalizaciji Rijeke osigurao zavidno mjesto u povijesti visokog historicizma.

Robert Whitehead je podrijetlom bio Englez. Rođen je 3. siječnja 1823. godine u Balton-Le-Moorsu u Lancashireu. Njegov otac James bio je vlasnik razvijene manufakture za preradu pamuka. Nakon što je završio Grammar-school učio je za mehaničara i kao naučnik

radio u tvornici strojeva *Richard Ormund i sin* u Manchesteru. Kasnije je stekao dodatnu naobrazbu u *Mechanics Institutu*. Radio je 1844. kao tehnički crtač u tvornici *Taylor* u Marseillesu da bi se 1847. godine preselio u Milano gdje se posvetio strojevima za pređu svile. Nakon revolucije 1848. godine prelazi u Trst gdje je na temelju odličnih preporuka bio primljen kao konstruktor u *Austrijski Lloyd*. Već je 1850. godine postao direktor *Tršćanskog tehničkog poduzeća*. Budući da je već tada bio poznato ime, Gašpar Matković, industrijalac iz Rijeke, pozvao ga je u naš grad da zajedno osnuju Tehničko poduzeće. Ta je tvrtka nakon početnih uspjeha došla 1873. godine u krizu, ali ju je Whitehead preuzeo zajedno sa svojim zetom, grofom Georgom Hoyosom. Oni su uz Luppisa, Ploecha i Ciottu osnovali riječki *Silurificio* (Torpedo) u koji je uključio i starijeg sina Johna. Toliko je bio moćan da je uspio udati svoju unuku za Bismarckova sina. Robert Whitehead umro je 16. studenoga 1905. godine u Becket Parku u Engleskoj, a sahranjen je u svojoj grobnici na riječkom groblju Kozala.⁸ Kad uzmemo u obzir ovakav *curriculum vitae*, onda nam postaje jasno da je Robert Whitehead bio u stanju neprekidno pratiti sve što se događa na polju suvremene arhitekture i da je svom poslovnom partneru Giovanniju Ciotti želio pomoći u ostvarenju vizije o pretvaranju Rijeke u kozmopolitsko urbano središte.

Taj se kozmopolitizam upravo osjeća u izboru elemenata povijesnih stilova na arhitekturi u Ulici Dolac, od venecijanske gotike, visokorenesansnih uzora do Erlachova bečkog baroka. G. Zammattio je odabrao povijesni stil i nikad ga na istoj zgradi nije miješao s drugima, bio je dosljedan u provedbi koncepcije, vješto je i sigurno vladao repertoarom visokog historicizma budući da je u Beču završio dobru školu. Arhitektura u Ulici Dolac, škole, banka i stambene zgrade mogu se svrstati u najbolja djela u njegovoj prvoj fazi djelovanja, kad je, nadahnut arhitekturom bečkog Ringa, nastojao u Rijeku unijeti duh metropole u kojoj se formirao. Iz sretne suradnje jednog industrijalca i nadarenog arhitekta nastala je jedna od najljepših riječkih ulica koju smo, na žalost, pretvorili u parkiralište.

Naša Rijeka, god. VIII, br. 89, svibanj 1986.

¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. II, Fiume 1896, 35, Grafika G. Genova.

² L. M. Torcoletti, *Tarsatica ed i primordi di Fiume*, Palermo 1950, 257, 259-260, fig. 69.

³ Komunalni arhiv Rijeka, Općina Rijeka, 7/72.

⁴ *Acquisto di realtà*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVII, Fiume, 3. III. 1884, br. 52, 2.

⁵ *Lavori stradali*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVI, Fiume, 31. V. 1885, br. 122, 2.

⁶ *Costruzioni di nuove case*, *La Bilancia*, Anno XVI, Fiume, 13. III. 1883, br. 59, 2.

⁷ A. Nezi, M. Zammattio, *L'architetto Giacomo Zammattio*, Bergamo 1931, 20-31.

⁸ S. Corvajo, *Quattro uomini e un siluro*, *Il Piccolo illustrato*, Anno 2, br. 36, Trieste, 8. IX. 1979, 8-13.

Muška škola na Dolcu, danas Talijanska gimnazija

Mušku školu na Dolcu projektirao je Giacomo Zammattio u stilu firentinske renesanse

Dolac je svojim ozbiljnim urbanizmom dao naslutiti velegradski izgled Rijeke

Riječki krovovi krajem XIX. stoljeća

Ulica Dolac sa Ženskom osnovnom školom i starom *Bonaviom* u prvom planu, te fasadom starog, drvenog *Teatro Fenice* na kraju ulice

Zgradu Austro-ugarske banke projektirao je Joseph Hubert, a sagrađena je 1914. godine. Danas je u njoj sjedište FINA-e

Zgrada Radio Rijeke

Istaknuti povijesni i kulturni spomenik. Na barbakanu do Velike utvrde bio je lijep vrt župnika Monaldija čija je kuća imala ulaz od strane samostana. Nakon župnikove smrti taj je vrt zajedno s kućom naslijedio njegov nećak Franjo Troyer. Riječki kapitalisti, na čelu s barunom Gjurom Vranyczanyjem, osnovali su *Domoljubno društvo* (Societa patriottica) te su od novog vlasnika otkupili vrt na barbakanu s namjerom da na tom mjestu izgrade *Domoljubni kazino* (Casino Patriottico) s akcijama njih dvanaestorice. Općina, u želji da se novozacrtani Korzo uljepša i učini velebnijim, odobrila je gradnju zdanja 25. travnja 1845. godine. Zapravo od 1808. postojao je regulacijski plan izgradnje Korza koji je izradio arhitekt Giovanni Candido, a u kojemu je bio uključen i taj dio. Mora se naglasiti da je gradska uprava strogo pazila što će se i gdje graditi na prostoru Novog grada pa je stoga prirodno da je tako ugledno zavičajno društvo kod dobrog i sposobnog arhitekta naručilo izradu projekta. Taj je posao dobio Anton Deseppi, sin riječkog zlatara-moretista, rođen u Rijeci 31. svibnja 1811., a umro, također u rodnom gradu, 1874. godine.¹

Jedinstvena građevina. Arhitekt Deseppi je od 1863. godine bio gradski edil. Na to je mjesto izabran *kao osoba sposobna i kadra dolično obavljati službene zadatke*, što je za ono doba bila visoka ocjena stručnosti. Tu ocjenu potvrđuje projekt i izvedba ove jedinstvene građevine. To je javni objekt namijenjen okupljanju građana, rasonodi i kulturnim priredbama, nimalo jednostavan zadatak za tridesetogodišnjeg arhitekta. Na toj su građevini sintetizirane stilski suvremene osobine srednjoeuropskog zajedništva, naglašen je graditeljski rukopis predmartovskog razdoblja, pa se stoga ta razmjerno monumentalna gradnja uklopila i oblikovala završnu točku Korza. Izgradnjom tog zdanja potpuno je izbrisano obilježje svojstveno za građevine domaćih palira i zidarskih majstora u riječkom Starom gradu.

Prolaz – veza između starog i novog. Na privlačnom pročelju arhitekt je zadržao kao prevladavajući postbidermajerski klasicizam u vertikalnoj raščlambi glavine na kojoj je primijenio polustupove s jonskim glavicama. Isturena altana, jedna vrsta balkona-terase na kolonadi isturenoj na pločnik, za ono je doba pomirila jači istup zgrade stare pošte i linije Korza. Na nekoliko velikih građevina sagrađenih polovicom XIX. stoljeća postavljene su istovrsne altane koje su se sačuvale do danas na zgradi Privredne banke u Ulici Ivana Zajca i na zgradi na Rivi Boduli. To upućuje da se i te zgrade atribuiraju arhitektu Antonu Deseppiju. Međutim, na ovoj zgradi na Korzu arhitekt je ostavio *passage* između Korza i sadašnjeg Trga Riječke rezolucije. Ta osobitost, ta divna veza glavne ulice i trga riješena je hodnikom u koji

se ulazi ispod kolonade, te se s blještavila Korza ulazi u tamni uski prohod iz kojeg nam se, idući naprijed, otvara pogled na bjelinu Trga Riječke rezolucije. Takva jedinstvena veza ulice i trga mogla se kao ideja roditi u glavi nadarenog arhitekta koji je osjećao potrebu da organski poveže staro s novim i da tom monumentalnom građevinom uveliča buduću, a i sadašnju glavnu ulicu u Rijeci. Budući da je u prizemlju u središnjoj osi zgrade ostavio otvor prolaza, projektant nije mogao ulaz na katove postaviti osovinski pa je stubište postavio lijevo od ulaza na štetu prizoritosti, koja se očekuje kod javne arhitekture. Unatoč tome stubište je riješeno s puno reda i elegancije, podržavaju ga stupovi i na taj ga način čine svečanim. Ono je do danas ostalo stilski nedirnuto.

Dvorana – scena Rijeke. Veće je značenje imala arhitektura velike dvorane s pozornicom koja je korištena sve dok nije pretvorena u televizijski studio. Ta je dvorana bila jedno cijelo stoljeće značajna scena Rijeke, posebno od trenutka kad je u tu zgradu uselila Narodna čitaonica. Idejna zamisao kod projektiranja ove zgrade bila je izgradnja društvenog doma u kojem je sjedište trebao imati *Casino patriottico* (Domoljubni kazino). U prvo je vrijeme tu bilo sjedište tog udruženja, kasnije je dio zgrade bio na korištenju *Gospodskog kazina* (Casino degli Signori) pa je postao *Obrtnički kazino* (Casino degli Artieri), da bi se po iseljenu obrtnika 1889. godine u tu zgradu uselilo *Filharmonijsko-dramsko udruženje* (Società Filodrammatica). Useljnjem ove glazbeno-scenske udruge, prostorije društva, osobito velika dvorana za priredbe, potpuno su obnovljene, stropne dekoracije izveo je poznati riječki slikar Giovanni Fumi. On je istodobno izradio inscenacije za pozornicu. Tim je povodom tvrtka Whitehead uvela u zgradu električno osvjetljenje. Tako je Rijeka dobila veoma osuvremenjenu komornu scenu.² Na inicijativu riječkog patricija i velikog rodoljuba dr. Erazma Barčića osnovan je konzorcij od članova hrvatske Narodne čitaonice koji je od vlasnika (Vranyczany Vio) otkupio ovu palaču pa je 1889. godine Filharmonijsko-dramsko društvo, kojemu su se gradile prostorije u Gubernijalnoj ulici, moralo napustiti tu zgradu, a konzorcij ju je predao na korištenje Narodnoj čitaonici. Preseljnjem u ovu zgradu, u kojoj je bila velika dvorana za priredbe i kazališne predstave, čitaonica je razvila bogatu aktivnost na nacionalno-kulturnom planu. Ta je zgrada, koja se od tada nazivala jednostavno Čitaonica, postavljena na vrlo istaknutom i podesnom mjestu u gradu, postala istodobno narodno sveučilište, kazalište, uredništvo *Nevena* i sjelo političkih skupova riječkih Hrvata i ostalih Slavena.³ U toj su se dvorani 1903. godine okupili predstavnici dalmatinskih i istarskih Hrvata, donesena je u njoj 1905. *Riječka rezolucija* (stoga trg na začelju zgrade nosi naziv Trg Riječke rezolucije). Iz te je zgrade krenuo Supilov duh novog smjera u narodnoj politici.

Mjesto političkih i kulturnih skupova. Na pozornici čitaonice nastupali su najugledniji glumci Hrvatskog narodnog kazališta iz Zagreba, koncertirali su glasoviti glazbenici. U dvorani su se održavala *kola*, balovi i dobrotvorne priredbe. U prizemlje zgrade uselila se 1911. godine filijala Prve hrvatske štedionice, tako da su u njoj bile smještene sve naše institucije.

Nakon raspada Austro-Ugarske 1918. godine u prostorijama Čitaonice zasjedalo je naše Nacionalno vijeće koje je donijelo odluku o pripojenju Rijeke novoosnovanoj Kraljevini SHS. Kasnije su događaji oko Rijeke postajali sve složeniji pa je naposljetku 1924. godine ona anektirana Kraljevini Italiji. Od tada je postala nesnošljiva klima za tu izrazito nacionalnu ustanovu da bi konačno 1927. godine na neprimjeren način Čitaonica bila izbačena iz svojih prostorija,⁴ a zgrada se preuredila kao *Casa del Fascio*.

Od oslobođenja Rijeke u Drugom svjetskom ratu (3. svibnja 1945.) do predaje te zgrade na korištenje Radio Rijeci, dvorana za priredbe služila je kao mjesto brojnih političkih i kulturnih skupova, u zgradi je bilo sjedište izdavačke kuće “Otokar Keršovani”, a još i danas se u prizemlju te povijesne građevine nalaze čitaonica i Mali salon Moderne galerije. Ova elegantna arhitekturna starica na potezu riječkog Korza stoji s puno dostojanstva kao istaknuti povijesni i kulturni spomenik. Kako bi od naših građana bilo učtivo kada u njezinom pasageu ne bi obavljali svoju “malu nuždu”!

Naša Rijeka, god. V, br. 59, studeni 1983.

¹ R. Matejčić, Anton Deseppi, ad vocem, Likovna enciklopedija Jugoslavije, I, JLZ, Zagreb, 1984., 303.

² F. Derenzini, Gli anuali della societa Filarmonico-drammatica, oggi Circolo Savoia, 1872, 1882, 1930, Fiume 1931.

³ Spomen knjiga koju je prigodom pedesete godišnjice Narodne čitaonice Riečke izdao odbor, Sušak, 1901.

⁴ D. Gervais, Narodna čitaonica u Rijeci, Zbornik Rijeka, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1953., 460-465; La nuova Casa del Fascio, La Vedetta d'Italia, Fiume, 1. I. 1930, 2.

Narodna čitaonica na Korzu

Narodna čitanica na Korzu sa zgradom stare Pošte

Riječko Korzo oduvijek je bila *žila kucavica* grada, a Narodna čitaonica čuvar hrvatskog duha i u najtežim vremenima

Narodna čitaonica prije podizanja zgrade s prodavanicom *Kraš* u prizemlju

U svečanoj dvorani Narodne čitanice, ispod velike freske Giovannija Fumija, donesena je slavna Riječka rezolucija 1905., koja je prodrmala učmalu Austro-Ugarsku

Prizemlje Narodne čitaonice obično je bilo prepušteno dobrim gostionicama. Danas je to prostor Malog salona.

Riječke fontane

Kako su nestali gradski zdenci života? Izvori pitke vode na području Rijeke bili su od prapovijesti životvorni za razvitak naselja uz Rječinu. Među njima je neosporno vitalnu ulogu imao snažan izvor ponornice ispred Gornjih gradskih vrata, Lešnjak, čija je voda bila toliko obilata da je kao potok tekla nizbrdo prema Rječini. Kasnije je voda Lešnjaka svedena u jarak koji je opasivao gradske bedeme, i naposljetku se ulijevala u more (u srednjem vijeku dio je vjerojatno pritjecao u Rov, kasnije izravno u stari tok Rječine, odnosno u Mrtvi kanal kod Adamićeve kuće). Drugi snažan izvor bio je iznad Dolca i kao potok Andrejšćica ulijevao se u more na sredini današnjeg Jadranskog trga. Ispod nove zgrade hotela *Bonavia* izviralala je voda (potok Žudinka) koja je već početkom XIX. st. bila keramičkim cijevima vođena, preko današnjeg Korza, Henckeove i Zajčeve ulice do tadašnjeg Trga Ūrmeny (danas Kazališni trg), pokraj kojeg su smještene gradska tržnica i ribarnica (današnje korito prolazi ispod Trga Republike Hrvatske i završava u luci, uz zapadnu stranu Gata Karoline Riječke).

Voda u samim kućama. Dolazak brojnog stanovništva iz urbanijih sredina u Rijeku uvjetovao je izgradnju prikladnije vodovodne mreže i otvaranje većih fontana i perila za rublje. Sve do kraja XVIII. st. domaće je stanovništvo u Starom gradu zadovoljavalo svoje potrebe za vodom iz vlastitih zdenaca, koji su bili iskopani u samim kućama. Na stjenovitom tlu grada, posebno oko Kaštela, Grivice, pa sve do Gomile, gdje se god malo dublje zakopalo u živi kamen, došlo se do pitke vode vrlo dobre kvalitete. Bili su to kamenom obzidani zdenci kojima se znalo služiti i nekoliko kućanstava. U Užarskoj ulici otkriven je jedan takav veoma stari zdenac iz kojega se voda vadila kroz otvor u bočnom zidu konobe. Iskopani zdenci u nizinskom području grada, oko Zborne crkve pa sve do današnjeg Trga Riječke rezolucije, bili su često zagađeni blatom. Glavni izvor pitke vode bio je na Na bunaru (*Pozzo*) iza crkve sv. Jeronima.

Reprezentativne fontane. Veliki napredak znanosti, borba protiv zaraznih bolesti, koje su se u Rijeci ciklično pojavljivale, osobito kolera, a usto veliki planovi gradonačelnika Giovannija Ciotte da Rijeku što prije učini kozmopolitskim gradom, postavili su pred Gradsko zastupstvo mnoge probleme: rješavanje vodoopskrbe, uređenje zdenaca, razvođenje izvorske vode po gradu, nadzor nad čistoćom vodosprema u Starom gradu, a sve je to vodilo primjeni znanstvenih dostignuća u postojećim elaboratima. Jedan od prvih elaborata te vrste, koji je izradio profesor Pomorske akademije dr. Kottdorfer 1874. godine po narudžbi predsjedništva Gradskog zastupstva, bila je *Kemijska analiza izvora 'Mustacchione', Lešnjak i Zvir*. On je

između 3. travnja i 8. listopada 1874. godine analizirao uzorke vodâ i došao do zaključka da su vode izvora Lešnjak i Zvir nešto bolje od onih iz izvora Beli kamik i Mustacchione, no, da sve vode tih izvora odgovaraju kriterijima za dobru pitku vodu. U vezi s gradskom vodoopskrbom šef Građevnog ureda u Rijeci, edil Giuseppe Leard, našao se ponukanim da Gradskom zastupstvu izloži vlastito viđenje najboljeg rješenja za radikalni popravak aktualnih nedostataka. On naglašava da osim Rječine svi ostali izvori i vodene žile nalaze svoj podzemni put kroz stijene. Tu prirodnu sudbinu ima i Zvir, koji se ulijeva u Rječinu, a tako je i s ostalim izvorima koji se odmah pretvaraju u male rijeke i potoke te se nakon kratkog toka ulijevaju u more. Kako voda ponornica prolazi kroz prirodni filter, ona je na izvoru neosporno zdrava pitka voda, što dokazuju kemijske analize. Međutim, voda u riječkim bunarima, iskopanima veoma plitko, štetna je za zdravlje, osobito ona na naplavljenom terenu, gdje se miješa s vodom iz septičkih jama. Voda u obnovljenim i nanovo izgrađenim fontanama čista je i dobra. Stoga predlaže da se voda cijevima dovodi iz velikih izvora, a da se bunari koriste samo za pranje i čišćenje ulica ili u slučaju požara. Giuseppe Leard vatreno se zalagao za uređenje cjevovoda koji bi spajao izvore i time omogućio opskrbu grada i luke pitkom vodom, dok se ne počne podizati Zvir. Sva ta stručna nastojanja pouzdanog Learda nisu prolazila lako, bilo je i otpora, o čemu svjedoče potpisi građana koji se nisu slagali s prijedlogom da se na današnjem Koblerovom trgu (svojedobno Piazza dell'Erbe) podigne fontana. Međutim, uza sve otpore, Zastupstvo je s puno razumijevanja podržavalo Leardove projekte. Njemu i njegovoj ekipi u Građevnom uredu uspjelo je od 1873. godine regulirati vode Lešnjaka, urediti fontane Beli kamik (*Sasso Bianco*) i Mustacchione, izgraditi zaista reprezentativnu fontanu na Žabici, tako da se razdoblje između 1873. i 1875. godine može u Rijeci nazvati razdobljem estetskog uređenja grada u funkciji zdravlja, higijene i komunikacija.

Legendaran izvor. Kada je krajem 1875. godine Leard rezimirao rezultate postignute u toj godini, moglo se vidjeti da je na području javnog graditeljstva učinjeno zaista mnogo. Uređen je Park na Cecilinovu (*Giardino pubblico*, danas Park Mlaka), tzv. Square na Trgu Ūrmeny (trg pred kazalištem), fontana na tom trgu, postavljene su klupe na Aleji Deak (Corsia Deak, danas Krešimirova ulica), uređena je Bolnička ulica (danas Ciottina ulica) i ulica u pravcu Voloska, a izrađen je i projekt za fontanu na današnjem Koblerovom trgu u Starom gradu. Svi su ti poslovi, obavljani u 1875., bili logičan nastavak radova započetih odmah nakon što je Giuseppe Leard osnutkom Municipija preuzeo Građevni ured, u kojemu se preko natječaja našlo nekoliko nadarenih građevinara i arhitekata sposobnih da odgovore novim zahtjevima urgentnije komunalne organizacije grada. Prirodno je da je jedan od bitnih zadataka bio

uređenje vodoopskrbe po novim higijenskim, zakonom obvezujućim uvjetima. U Rijeci je još bio prisutan strah od kolere iz 1885., kada je upravo nemar u čuvanju izvora i vodosprema od zaraze prouzročio njezino haranje među stanovništvom. Tada je bilo zaraženo osobito Perilo na Školjiću, gdje se pralo rublje iz vojarne i vojne bolnice.

Za uređenje vodovodne mreže bile su zainteresirane i Kraljevske ugarske željeznice, odnosno njihova sekcija u Rijeci, jer je novi željeznički kolodvor trebalo opskrbiti pitkom vodom potrebnom putnicima i parnim lokomotivama. Stoga se već 1873. počeo uređivati izvor Vranyczany na Mlaki s tim da se na području željezničkog parka voda tog izvora dovodila iz fontane koja se nalazila na početku današnje Zvonimirove ulice.¹ Ta je fontana bila ukopana ispod razine ceste, ograđena okolo kamenom ukrasnom balustradom. Jednako je tako Željeznica bila zainteresirana za vodu izvora Sasso Bianco, koji je puk zvao Beli kamik. Taj je izvor ucrtan na planovima Rijeke iz prve polovine XIX. stoljeća, a nalazio se preko puta dugo godina istoimene kavane i pizzerije u Kidričevoj ulici (danas Krešimirovoj ulici). Na tom je mjestu arhitekt dr. Filibert Bazarig projektirao 1873. u Građevnom uredu reprezentativnu fontanu, odakle je voda posebnim cijevima dovedena na sâm željeznički kolodvor.² Inače je Beli kamik bio pomalo legendaran izvor. Josip Završnik priča da se stranac koji je pio vodu iz Belog kamika redovito zaljubio u koju lijepu *Riješkinju* i zauvijek ostao u Rijeci.³ Bazarig je na Belom kamiku projektirao fontanu ukopanu ispod razine ceste, bila je popločena, zid joj je bio pokriven savršeno uglačanim kamenom, a posebno je bila fino obrađena balustrada, lukovi i pilastri izrađeni od brijunskog kamena. Tu je fontanu izradio 1873. vrlo sposoban klesar Giorgio Polla.

Stilski ujednačene fontane. U fondu Državnog arhiva u Rijeci sačuvani su nacrti fontane na Rječini, fontane Mustacchione na uglu Korza i Trga Republike Hrvatske i fontane na Trgu Žabica. Sve ih je 1873. projektirao dr. Filibert Bazarig. One su stilski ujednačene, a možemo reći da je i fontana na Belom kamiku bila jednakih stilskih i kvalitetnih osobina. Svi ti zamašni radovi nisu išli posve lako. Kada se uređivao izvor Mustacchione pobunila se obitelj Natalea Pauleticha s tvrdnjom da će im smetati udaranje maštela i graja služavki koje će dolaziti po vodu. No, bez obzira na te prigovore, Mustacchione je kao snažan izvor bio izuzetno važan za snabdijevanje Adamićeva gata vodom za brodove u pristaništu, pa je 1874. došlo do njegove realizacije. Grad je smatrao svojim pravom da uljepša javne ceste, da ih snizi ili povisi te se stoga nije upuštao u velike diskusije.⁴

Sve Bazarigove riječke fontane bile su izgrađene s pretežno klasicističkim ranorenesansnim oznakama, što je i bila opća oznaka njegovih prvih gradnji u Rijeci. Još je

bio pod svježim utjecajima ponesenim sa studija u Padovi. U svojem je pamćenju, zapravo, imao brojna rješenja vodosprema u Venetu, i za estetski izgled Rijeke zaista je velika šteta što su sve njegove fontane u razmaku od 1910. do 1913. godine uklonjene, jer su navodno smetale prometu ili su nakon izgradnje gradskog vodovoda s izvora Zvir (*Acquedotto Ciotta*) postale nepotrebne pa su služile uglavnom kao perila. Tako je fontana Mustacchione, jer više nije bila *ni od estetske ni praktične vrijednosti*, po odluci municipalnog Zastupstva pokrivena svodom. Ostavljen je samo poklopac na pločniku kad je trebalo crpsti vodu za zalijevanje i pranje Korza.⁵ Kada se gradila kuća (u kojoj je prodavaonica Kraš) do zgrade Radio Rijeke, otkrivene su dovodne cijevi i zidovi te fontane. Prilikom korekcije pravca današnje Krešimirove ulice, kako je fontana Beli kamik izlazila 2,5 metra u liniju projektirane ulice, odlučeno je da ju se ukloni, što je urađeno krajem 1913.⁶

Da je regulacija ulica bila povod za uklanjanje tih osebnih i estetski vrijednih sadržaja, najbolji je dokaz rušenje tzv. Monumentalne fontane (*Fontana monumentale*) podignute pred zgradom na početku Ulice Dositeja Obradovića (današnje Ulice I. Henckea) početkom druge polovice XIX. st. (1857., srušene već 1874.) u čast mladog kralja Franje Josipa. Plastikou fontane izradio je glasoviti riječki kipar Pietro Stefanutti. Lik Franje Josipa I., izveden u bijelom kararskom mramoru, bio je predan Gradskom muzeju, i danas se čuva u prizemlju Državnog arhiva u Rijeci. Velika je šteta što sveukupna plastika s te fontane nije bila preseljena u Gradski muzej. Kao svojevrsno podsjećanje na Mustacchiona postavljena je na umjetnoj pećini u parku na Mlaki glava tog riječkog *Brkonje*.

Naša Rijeka, god. XI, br. 121, siječanj 1989, str. 12.

¹ DAR, JU 2, predmet H 7/1873.

² DAR, JU 2, predmet H 33/1873.

³ W. Twardzik, Opis Rijeke s početka 19. stoljeća iz pera Josipa Završnika, Dometi, god. 20, sv. 4, Rijeka, 1987., 267.

⁴ DAR, JU 2, predmet H 11/1875.

⁵ DAR, JU 2, predmet H 113/1910.

⁶ DAR, JU 2, predmet H 15/1913.

Park na Mlaci krajem XIX. stoljeća

Današnja Krešimirova ulica na lokalitetu Beli kamik

Riječki kipar Pietro Stefanutti izradio je Veliku fontanu postavljenu u osi Gradskog tornja i svečano otvorenu 23. travnja 1857. godine. Ukupna visina bila je 660 cm sa skulpturom mladog cara Franje Josipa I. na vrhu. Fontana je demontirana u veljači 1874. zbog prometnih razloga.

Kuća Adamić

Dvostruka povijesna vrijednost. Pravocrtni potez zgrada na Rječini star je više od dva stoljeća. On je do druge polovice XIX. stoljeća, kad je napokon izgrađena sadašnja riječka luka, imao ulogu fasade grada. Stara je luka, naime, bila na ušću Rječine pa su brodovi ulazili u Rječinu sve do današnjeg mosta. Prije dva stoljeća ta je obala značila život grada, na njoj se sve, vezano uz slobodnu luku i pomorski promet, zbivalo u punom zamahu. Svi su imućniji građani, uglavnom novodošli, koji nisu bili sentimentalno vezani uz starogradsku kolijevku, težili da nakon zatrpavanja istočnog poteza rova (sada Vitezovićeve ulica) kupe građevinsko zemljište i na novoprojektiranom potezu sagrađe svoju kuću koja je istodobno značila stambeni i poslovni prostor, a i licencijat da se uđe u gremij riječkih građana. Na tom su prostoru sve kuće povijesne, no, jedna od njih, tzv. kuća Adamić ima dvostruku povijesnu vrijednost. Vezana je uz veoma značajnu obitelj Adamić, koja je u Rijeci ostavila dubokog traga (Tvornicu papira), a i uz povijesnu hrvatsku Kraljevsku veliku gimnaziju u Rijeci.

Mreža tajnovitosti. Simeon Adamić, veletrgovac duhanom i riječki veleposjednik, bio se, od svog dolaska u Rijeku do 1785. godine, silno obogatio spretnim ulaganjem u uvoz duhana i duhansku industriju, tako da su u puku kružile priče da on ima svoga malika koji mu pomaže u tim smionim pothvatima. Naime, stari riječki patricijat smatrao se dovoljno bogatim ako je posjedovao kuću u Starom gradu i vinograd na Brajdi pa mu se takvo bogatstvo činilo basnoslovno. Nije ni čudno da se oko Simeonova bogatstva plela mreža tajnovitosti. Tada se, međutim, zbilo nešto što na njegovo bogatstvo baca novo svjetlo. Simeon Adamić imao je veliki posjed u Martinšćici, na kojemu se nalazila drevna kapela sv. Martina, koja je zaljevu dala ime. Prigodom nekih radova u kapeli, Simeon je pronašao zakopano blago. Najvjerojatnije je naišao na arheološko nalazište, budući da je iznad Martinšćice prehistorijska gradina Solin, i da se o zakopanom blagu uopće nije ni radilo. Međutim, mašta puka je radila, optužili su Simeona da je zatajio dati eraru određeni legat od ukupne vrijednosti nalaza. Vlasti su poduzele istragu pa se ugledni riječki veletrgovac Simeon Adamić našao u zatvoru u crikveničkom katedralnom kaštelanatu. Začas su se našla četrnaestorica svjedoka koji su ga teretili za utaju legata. Sin Simeonov, Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, inače mlad i u Beču školovan komercijalist, odmah se uputio u prijestolnicu, isposlovao audijenciju kod cara Josipa II. i uspio ga uvjeriti da se radilo o pukom arheološkom nalazu. Car se pobrinuo da se Simeon Adamić odmah pusti iz zatvora s

posebnom preporukom da mu se dalje ne smeta. Carska je gesta bila vrlo proračunata, dvor je itekako vodio brigu o spretnim uvoznicima i trgovcima duhanom da bi pustio da u zatvoru čami sposoban poduzetnik.¹

Glave četrnaest svjedoka. Simeon Adamić uzvraća tada klevetnicima na Zeusov način. Odmah po izlasku iz zatvora (24. travnja 1787.) on od benediktinki kupuje vrt i parcelu koja se pruža do obale i odlučuje upravo na tom najprometnijem mjestu sagraditi obiteljsku kuću, dugačku toliko da na nju može staviti četrnaest prozorskih otvora; u osovini svakog od njih Simeon stavlja uz pločnik stupić na kojem je dao isklesati glave četrnaest svjedoka. Općina mu je izdala dopuštenje da sagradi kuću na Rječini 24. studenoga 1787. godine; procjena vrijednosti kuće bila je za ono vrijeme povelika, iznosila je 100378 fiorina. Grad nije ni slutio da će ih Adamić tako lukavo nadmudriti stavivši pred svoju kuću galeriju riječkih građana: finu damu visoke frizure, časnika, elegantnog gospodičića, kočijaša, služavku i staru dadilju. Svaki ih je dan gledalo stanovništvo i gosti, pridošli u Rijeku brodovima koji su se privezivali preko puta kuće. Ti su se stupići na sreću, doduše ne više na istome mjestu, sačuvali te je sada, s nestankom jednoga, njih trinaest izloženo u arheološkom parku Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja. Nakon što je kuća Adamić prešla u druge ruke, ostali su ti stupići i dalje na svome mjestu sve do 1882. godine, jer su služili uz ostale stupiće kao zaštita pješaka od nasrtaja konja. Riječki gradonačelnik Giovanni Ciotta bio je unuk Andrije Ljudevita Adamića te je navedene godine izvadio pradjedove svjedoke i stavio ih u perivoj svoje vile. Kasnije su preneseni u park pred Povijesnim arhivom i naposljetku su izloženi u lapidariju Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja kao svjedočanstvo jednoga, za povijest Rijeke, veoma značajnog vremena.²

Velika gimnazija. Kad se ova povijest ne bi znala, moglo bi se arhitektu kuće Adamić zamjeriti što ju je razvukao u dužinu, no on je po želji naručitelja morao načiniti mjesta za toliku skupinu svjedoka. Ta je kuća na potezu Rječine stilski najizrazitiji primjer baroknog neoklasicizma. Neki njeni plastični detalji, glava žene sa šeširom nad balkonskim vratima i glava ispod strehe za odlijevanje kišnice, proizvod su odlične kiparske radionice u kojoj su isklesane i glave svjedoka. Nije isključeno da ih je izrađivao Francesco Capovilla, poznati klesar s kraja XVIII. stoljeća, suradnik arhitekta Antona Gnamba, kod kojeg je Adamić najvjerojatnije naručio projekt te elegantne plemenitaške zgrade.³ Stjecajem povijesnih okolnosti nakon hrvatsko-ugarske nagodbe i Riječke krpice, vlada u Zagrebu popustila je pred pritiskom grada pa je odlučila otkupiti od pomorskog kapetana Dionizija Jakovčića bivšu

kuću Adamić. Po projektu uglednog riječkog edila, a kasnije slobodnog arhitekta Giuseppea Chierega, 1880. godine podignut je još jedan kat pa se u tako adaptiranu građevinu preselila Kraljevska velika gimnazija na Rijeci. G. Chierego je, kao stari Riječanin, poštovao sve barokne izvorne detalje na kući Adamić i vrlo je odmjereno povisio kuću ne uništivši ništa izvornog. U toj je zgradi smještena hrvatska gimnazija sve do 1896. godine kada je preseljena u novu zgradu gimnazije na Sušaku.⁴ Od 1881. do 1896. godine, znači petnaest sudbonosnih godina zamršenih povijesnih zbivanja u Rijeci, u toj su se zgradi iznjedrili brojni intelektualci koji su u kulturnoj povijesti Hrvatske našli svoje značajno mjesto. O tome svjedoči samo jedna kamena ploča uz portal koju rijetko tko od prolaznika pročita.

Naša Rijeka, god. VI, br. 70, listopad 1984. str. 16.

¹ Giovanni Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. III, Fiume, 1896; 142-143.

² Radmila Matejčić, *Lapidarij, Zbirka kamenih spomenika Pomorskog i povijesnog muzeja Hrvatskog primorja*, Rijeka, 42/1964., 17.

³ R. Matejčić, *Barok u Istri i Hrvatskom primorju*, u: *Barok u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 1982.; 425.

⁴ *Il trasloco d'un ginnasio*, La Bilancia, XXIX., Fiume, 7. IV. 1896, 79, 2. – M. Mezorana, *Borba hrvatske gimnazije u Rijeci*, Zbornik Rijeka, Zagreb, 1953., 530.

Nekadašnja Adamićeva kuća na Mrtvom kanalu udomila je Hrvatsku gimnaziju krajem XIX. stoljeća

Hrvatska gimnazija djelovala je u ovoj zgradi od 1881. do 1896., kad je prešla u monumentalnu, namijenski građenu zgradu na Sušaku

Adamićevi lažni svjedoci, niz kipova koji je originalno stajao na Fiumari, danas je uz Guvernerovu palaču

Predio Školjić – Luke

Kako je nestala riječka oaza? Riječanin, poznati pisac i kroničar, Josip Završnik, ostavio je u svom opisu rodnoga grada iz 1816. godine zanimljive podatke o prostoru između sjevernih gradskih zidina i Zvira. Taj se prostor nazivao Luke, iznad njega bio je Otočac (od čega je nastao današnji naziv Školjić, dok je naziv za lokalitet Luke potpuno iščezao). Vizualnu predodžbu o predjelu donjeg toka Rječine imamo na najstarijem nacrtu Rijeke iz 1580. gdje se vide: Rječina, Mlinovi, Otočac te velika površina obrasla bujnim raslinjem oko kojeg teče voda iz jednog od triju izvirova. Josip Završnik o Lukama kaže: *Ona Luka ili Luke, ozvana Ravenica, među Rijekom (Fiumara) i gorom Kalvarijom ili Goljkom (Mons Calvus), jer ne imade lijesa, ima od gornje i donje strane tri izvira ili mala potoka (...) i budući da zemlja je mnogo ladna (...đubrom nju nagnjoje i tako plodnu učine da i u premaljetu i u letu i u jeseni i u zimi oskrbi svu Rijeku i druge bližne gradove kano Bakar i Danjni Sijenj vele dobrom zelenilom.*¹

Tri predjela. O tom terenu ima dosta arhivskih podataka, u spisima se spominju imanja građana, kaptola i redovnika, a na starim grafikama Rijeke i planovima grada, od XVII. do konca XIX. stoljeća, možemo pratiti u početku postupno, a kasnije drastično nestajanje ove predivne oaze u kojoj su voda i bujno zelenilo činili zajedničko djelo prirode. Osim spomenutog uzgoja povrća, na Lukama i dalje, na padinama brda Hlibac, Kalvarije i Goljaka, uzgajala se obilato vinova loza.² Tome je također pogodovala i voda, budući da je jedan rukavac Rječine tekao odvojenim koritom. Zemljište se stalno obnavljalo čestim poplavama, potoci bi se razdvojili pa su se nagomilale naslage plodnog mulja i pijeska. Desna obala Rječine, od Hlibca pa skoro do gradskih zidina i mora, dijelila se na tri predjela: Zvir, Mlinovi i Luke. Zvir i mlinovi bili su bogati vodenicama među kojima je bio Kraljevski mlin, zatim mlinovi augustinaca, benediktinki, a i pojedinih građanskih obitelji.³ Cesta koja je išla od sjevernih gradskih vrata ispod Goljaka i Hlibca i produžavala se put Grohova, bila je kraljevska, njome se stizalo do mlinova te ju u spisima nazivaju *contrada molendinarum*.⁴ Uz te su mlinove bili brojni vrtovi, a kotači tih mlinova obilno su lijevali vodu po usjevima. Na Zviru su bile i stupe za sukno, pa su mlinove i stupe posjećivali Boduli i Istrani s barkama natovarenim žitom ili tkaninama za preradu.

Brajde izbrazdane lehama. Predio Luke, *contrada dello luche*, razlikovao se od Zvira i Mlinova nedostatkom mlinova, no bio je bogat brajdama, izbrazdanim lehama riječkih građana, bratovština, samostana i kaptola. Ta slika bujnog zelenila na ušću Rječine bila je

dopunjena lijepo i pravilno uređenom franjevačkom brajdom na današnjoj Delti, kao i malom franjevačkom brajdom i vinogradima ispod Trsatskog brijega sve do ceste Karoline. Franjevačka brajda na Delti bila je ograđena zidom. U taj je zid bio od 1675. do 1849. godine ugrađen rimski natpis, koji su iskopali franjevci, a u njemu se spominjao vojnik VIII. rimske kohorte, što je dokaz da je ta površina dio klasičnog tarsatičkog tla.⁵ Diplomom iz 1431. godine franjevci su od kneza Martina Frankopana dobili zapadni obronak Trsatskog brijega, od kapele sv. Jurja pravocrtno na Rječinu, odatle sredinom rijeke do tzv. *Iago marino* prema zapadu i od polovice jezera prema jugu do mora. Iz toga se može zaključiti da je u XIX. stoljeću ušće Rječine bilo u blizini Školjića. Slijedom poplava morsko jezero je iščezlo pa je u XVI. stoljeću ušće Rječine bilo nešto niže od današnjeg mosta, odnosno blizu Jelačićevog trga.⁶ Proces taloženja materijala se nastavio i površina današnje Delte napredovala je prema moru. U vrijeme poplava, budući da je Rječina kod mosta tvorila koljeno i skretala prema gradu, bujica se kretala kraćim putem i preko delte se ulijevala u more noseći sve pred sobom. Zato su vlasti, uz velike novčane žrtve, odlučile od franjevaca otkupiti brajdu kako bi se Rječini iskopalo novo korito u smjeru u kojem bi se ona za visokog vodostaja ulijevala u more. Tako je 1854. i 1855. voda Rječine skrenula pravocrtno u more preko nekoć uređenog vinograda, poduprtog drvenim koljem po uzoru na kultivirane franjevačke brajde uz jadransku obalu. Rječina je regulirana, no nestala je tipična mediteranska ambijentalna slika – grožđe, vino i fratri. Zapadna strana Brajde dobila je, zbog trokutastog oblika nakon prokopa iz 1854.,⁷ naziv Delta po grčkom slovu takva izgleda, dok je istočna strana, zbog toga što je ostala smanjene površine, zadržala do danas naziv Brajdica. Od 1854. godine do danas, nasipavanjem i Delte i Brajdice, ušće Rječine se neobično udaljilo od prirodnog.

Prečica. Na osvit XIX. stoljeća osjećala se u Rijeci silna potreba za gradnjom prometnice. Već je 1806. bio napravljen put prema Mlinovima preko Školjića. Taj je put odvojio Luke od Kalvarije, ali je postojao i jedan prečac, bliži put uz obalu Rječine preko kojega se promet odvijao do 1823. godine, kada je tu otvoreno jedinstveno javno šetalište s drvoredom platana, tipična bidermajerska romantična aleja, u koju se ulazilo kroz monumentalni portal s natpisom: IVCVnDO sIngVLIIs ambVIaCro... (Kronogram: MDCCLLVVVVIII - 1823). Na jednom planu Rijeke (Državni arhiv Rijeka) ucrtana je ta predivna aleja za kojom Rijeka može samo žaliti. Kada su, naime, 1852. u vrijeme jednog nevremena iščupani jablanovi, oni su nadomješteni platanama i kestenovima, od kojih neki uz remizu još i danas postoje.⁸ Razvojem industrije, izgradnjom remize za tramvaje, cijeli je taj osebujni hortikulturni sklop, kao gradski rekreativni sadržaj, postupno nestajao; o njemu, osim ulice koju presijeca

željeznički nadvožnjak, nema nikakva traga. Rijeci je u XIX. stoljeću nagli razvoj industrije bezdušno oduzeo šetalište i zelenilo, posebno u onim predjelima gdje je bilo tekuće vode koja je na početku služila isključivo kao pogonska snaga u industriji. Počelo je koncem XVIII. stoljeća izgradnjom velike Tvornice kože na Školjću, zatim 1821. Adamić podiže Tvornicu papira ispod Trsata. Kasnije je na Školjću izgrađena Klaonica i najzad Perilo (Lavatoio). Školjić je presjekla nova gradska prometnica na čijoj su južnoj strani nicali stambene zgrade. Luke su od polovice XIX. postale zanimljive građevne parcele za koje su se otimali industrijalci, no, ne samo oni. Mislilo se ipak i na rekreaciju. Izgrađeno je javno kupalište *Bagno Ilona*, pa je čak 1904. u egipatskom stilu, s dvanaset bazena morske i šest bazena slatke vode, izgrađen Akvatorij, po projektu Eduarda Castiana.⁹

Životvorna voda stoljećima je napajala riječki ager, davala snagu njenom zelenilu, brajdama, trsima i ružama, da bi od XIX. stoljeća postala motorna snaga njenih industrijskih pogona čiji su proizvodi, osobito papir, stekli međunarodno značenje i ugled. Od druge polovice XIX. stoljeća smireni građanski idilični život zavičaja nadomješta se utrkom za profit, za otvaranjem novih pogona, tipičnom kozmopolitskom užurbanošću, u kojoj nije bilo mjesta ni za moralne skrupule, a kamoli za zelenilo franjevačke Brajde, Lukâ, Mlinova i Zvira.

Naša Rijeka, god. XII, br. 133, siječanj 1990.

¹ Waclaw Twardzik, *Opis Rijeke s početka 19. stoljeća iz pera Josipa Završnika*, Dometi, god. 20, sv. 4, Rijeka, 1987., 267.

² Vittorio Sablich, *Il distretto fiumano nel secolo XVI*, Bullettino della Deputazione fiumana di storia patria, Fiume, 1921, 21.

³ Giuseppe Viezzoli, *Contributi alla storia di Fiume nel Settecento*, Fiume-Rivista, Anno X, Fiume, 1932, 47.

⁴ V. Sablich, nav. dj., 23.

⁵ Matija Mažić, *Dvije rimske ploče s Trsata i Sušaka*, Novi list, 3. i 4. XI. 1934., 3.

⁶ Guido Depoli, *La Provincia del Carnaro*, Fiume-Rivista, Anno V, 1927, Fiume 1928, 80-82.

⁷ Giovanni Kobler, *Memorie (...)*, II, 54.

⁸ G. Kobler, nav. dj., 58.

⁹ Acquatorio, *La Bilancia*, Anno XXVII, Fiume, 6. IX. 1904, br. 29, 2.

Jedna od nekoliko riječkih industrijskih zona bila je na Školjiću, u podnožju Trsata, gdje je dominirala Tvornica papira

Povezivanje Rijeke željeznicom s Karlovcem posve je promijenilo izgled Školjića 1873. godine

Tvornica papira i nad njom stara Lujzinska cesta

Pogled s Trsata na Školjić

Jelačićev trg

Morfologija razvoja. Na potezu od Sokol-kule (Korzo 2) do kraja Ulice Pavla Rittera Vitezovića prostirao se uz gradske zidine jarak ispunjen vodom, zvan Rov ili Fosso. Taj je jarak zatrpan nakon carske odluke iz 1784. godine kojom je Riječanima dopušteno rušenje srednjovjekovnih zidina radi proširenja grada. Na temeljima tih srušenih zidina sagradili su Riječani, mahom novodošli stranci, nove kuće u razdoblju od 1785. do 1830. godine. Pravac zatrpanog Rova odredio je protezanje i uređenje nove ulice.

Tri urbanistička plana. Od 1752. do 1785. godine izrađena su tri urbanistička plana dijela grada izvan južnih i jugoistočnih bedema. Konačan plan i urbanističku regulaciju te nove gradske četvrti projektirao je, za Rijeku i njezin razvoj neobično zaslužni c. i kr. inspektor gradnji pri Guberniju, Anton Gnamb, 1785. godine. On je morao poštivati prethodno po logici nužde oblikovane prostore, a među njima je bila veća nepravilna površina trga, zvanog jednostavno Piazza della Fiumara (Trg Rječine), koji se nalazio u staroj luci i koji je bio pristanište jedrenjaka i stovarište robe. Čim se počelo graditi izvan Starog grada (Civitas vetus) počeo se dotad brisani trokutni prostor, koji se protezao od današnjeg Trga Republike Hrvatske do Rječine, nazivati *Civitas nova* (Novi grad). Moderna arhitektura dala je obilježje tom Novom gradu, Ulici Gubernija, Korzu i ulici koja se po rovu nazvala Via Fosso.¹ U puku se dio poteza zvao Rov (od kraja Korza do kuće Slogar, ili od Sokol-kule do kule Lešnjak, ili od današnje Slogin kule do Agatićeve ulice). Taj isparcelirani riječki trokut ostao je do danas jednak. Koliko su god novodošli stanovnici sa zadovoljstvom primili odluku o rušenju gradskih bedema, starograđanima, starosjediocima Rijeke to nije bilo po volji jer su smatrali da će Rijeka bez zidina izgledati otvorena kao selo. Ti su im drevni zidovi stoljećima ulijevali osjećaj zatvorenosti i hrabrosti, osobito od vremena mletačkog upada u Rijeku, a sumnjali su i u regulaciju vodâ, u čemu se nisu prevarili.

Pisac i kroničar Rijeke u XIX. stoljeću, Josip Završnik, daje precizan opis dijela Jelačićevog trga. Početkom XIX. st. Završnik piše: *Pod Karlom VI. koji cestu od Reke do Karlovca dade uzgraditi, bijahu otvorena i cetironuglenima kamenima uzidana velika krasna vrata koja se zвахu nova vrata, nad koji(h) bijase cesar(s)ki oro i rodosćice, rodosćitje slavne kuće austrijanske (aquila imperialis et insigne gloriosae domus austriacae). Ova vrata koja vode na Rijekenjiscé (Fiumeru) i kano druga po noći zatvarahu i nikomu otvarahu se, bijahu u moju dobu posvemu srušena. Za izlazit s' grada bijahu ondi jedan most priko vode Rove uzidan i u moju mladu dobu razoren.*²

Bijela vrata. Taj je njegov podatak poslužio kao ideja da se u parteru pločnika na tom dijelu Beogradskog trga (sada Jelačićevog trga) naglasi pravac ulice koja je išla od Sušaka, gdje je bio na Piramidi *finis Carolinae* (kraj Karoline), pa preko mosta kroz novootvorena gradska vrata ulazila kroz Užarsku ulicu u grad Rijeku. Na jednom planu Rijeke iz 1766. godine nova su vrata označena slovom P, kao *Weises Thor* (Bijela vrata), vjerojatno zato što je kamen bio bijel i nov, a i stoga što se ponekad u planovima kula iza crkve Uznesenja Marijina nazivala Bijelom kulom.³

Kroz Bijela vrata je, dakle, nakon 1725. godine u Rijeku, još uvijek isključivo smještenu unutar svojih bedema, ulazila na trgovačkim kočijama panonska roba prevezena od Karlovca ovamo, na tom je mjestu izravno stizala roba u slobodnu riječku luku. To je, znači, neuralgična točka u povijesti grada Rijeke, mjesto preko kojega je konačno uspostavljena veza s Hrvatskom i Ugarskom. Ta je činjenica obvezivala arhitekta i komisiju za uređenje Korza da se malo više prihvate problema predstavljanja tog pročelja Rijeke, koje je, nakon preseljenja luke iz Rječine u novu luku pred gradom, bilo izgubilo svoje prvotno značenje. Jednako se tako vodila briga da se trasa jarka koji je išao oko gradskih zidina i kroz koji je tekla voda, kako je Završnik naziva Rove, označi u parteru Ulice Joispa Kraša (sada Ante Starčevića) posebnim redom kandelabara.⁴

Riva Boduli. Na starim planovima Rijeke, kao i na veoma starim crtežima i grafikama, možemo zorno pratiti morfologiju razvoja današnjeg Jelačićevog trga i Ulice Joispa Kraša (sada Ante Starčevića). Na nacrtu Rijeke, koji je načinio poznati kartograf Ivan Klobučarić 1580. godine, nailazimo na dragocjene podatke o južnom pročelju Rijeke. Pred gradom je bilo nekoliko baraka, dvije kućice, brodogradilište, a na obali su *ladve* i istureni drveni gat, Riva Boduli. Ispred gradskih vrata je brisani prostor na kojemu je ucrtan jedino put prema trajektu na Rječini.⁵ Kasnije grafike ponavljaju ovu sliku, za koju možemo biti sigurni da nije plod mašte, budući da je Ivan Klobučarić bio dugogodišnji redovnik i prior u augustinskom samostanu u Rijeci, a k tome pouzdani kartograf. Stoljeće poslije, godine 1671., riječki kirurg Giorgio Genova daje u Veneciji otisnuti svoj crtež Rijeke. Preko puta Rova bila je ucrtana *gostionica u kojoj odsjedaju uskoci*.⁶

Na planu Rijeke iz 1650., koji se čuva u bečkom Ratnom arhivu, vidi se ista situacija, s tim da je na sadašnjem Jelačićevom trgu urisana poduža građevina, vjerojatno lučko skladište s nekoliko manjih građevina, sigurno baraka. Prirodno je da je taj prostor postao značajniji u trećem desetljeću XVIII. stoljeća, nakon proglašenja Rijeke slobodnom lukom. Istočnoj se i zapadnoj obali Rječine posvećuje velika pažnja, korito se redovito čisti, jer u vrijeme visokih

voda Rječina ispire velike količine materijala. Njene su obale prvotno učvršćene samo kolcima, ali već potkraj XVIII. stoljeća Gnamb projektira kamenom presvučenu zapadnu obalu, kakva je i danas obala Mrtvog kanala. Na jednom akvarelu Jelačićevog trga vidi se luka u Rječini, trg okružen kućama, od kojih neke do danas nisu izmijenile svoje lice, a što je najvažnije, njegov je prostor isti sve do sada.⁷ Ušće je Rječine te godine bilo na mjestu gdje je novi most na kraju Zajčeve ulice, što se vidi na planovima Rijeke iz 1766. i 1830. godine. Nepravilna se obala zatrpavala, a shodno tome produžavalo se korito Rječine, odnosno, njeno se ušće sve više približavalo današnjem kraju Mrtvog kanala.

Riječki trokut. Beogradski trg (sada Jelačićev trg) i sve ulice oko njega gube svoje značenje pristaništa i stovarišta roba odmah nakon što je prokopano sadašnje korito Rječine polovicom XIX. stoljeća,⁸ odnosno, kad je u isto vrijeme izgrađen prvi dio tadašnjeg lukobrana u modernoj luci (tj. gata pored ribarnice, na današnjem sjevernom dijelu Rive Boduli, op. ur.). Gospodarsko i pomorsko pročelje okreće se prema jugu, a bivše ušće Rječine i stara luka postaju Mrtvi kanal. Prošlo je dvije stotina godina od urbanističke regulacije riječkog trokuta, odnosno Civitas novae. Ulice, trgovi, linije zgrada, sve je ostalo nepromijenjeno. Arhitektura se u Ulici Josipa Kraša (sada Ante Starčevića) i na Jelačićevom trgu izmijenila koncem XIX. stoljeća, mnoge su klasicističke građevine, izgrađene između 1785. i 1830., nadograđene i modernizirane; gradili su ih dr. Ivan Randić, Giacomo Zammattio, a u novije vrijeme Igor Emili. Uređenjem Starčevićeve ulice i dijela Jelačićevog trga vratila se tom otmjenom dijelu grada zaslužena raskoš.

Naša Rijeka, god. X, br. 120, prosinac 1988. str. 12.

¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la storia della liburnica citta di Fiume*, II, 48-49.

² W. Twardzik, *Opis Rijeke s početka 19. st. iz pera Josipa Završnika*, Dometi, god. 20, sv. 4, Rijeka, 1987., 270.

³ DAR, JU 51, Položajni nacrti, nacrt br. 4/2, Rijeka, 1766., ispravci i dopune do 1795.

⁴ W. Twardzik, nav. dj., 270.

⁵ DAR, JU 51, Položajni nacrti, nacrt br. 1/2, Rijeka i Martinšćica, 1580., kopija originala iz Ratnog arhiva u Beču (Klobučarić).

⁶ G. Kobler, nav. dj., II, 35.

⁷ Pomorski i povijesni muzej Hrvatskog primorja, Rijeka, Odjel za kulturnu povijest, Zbirka akvarela i grafika.

⁸ DAR, JU 51, Položajni nacrti, nacrt br. 10/2, Rijeka (Mrtvi kanal, Rječina – stari tok) 1850.

C. Von Mayer na akvarelu iz 1832. godine prikazao je nepravilan trg na obali Rječine, tadašnje glavne luke

Današnji Jelačićev trg krajem XIX. stoljeća

Na obali Mrtvog kanala najviše se trgovalo vinom s Krka i iz Dalmacije

Današnjim Jelačićevim trgom prometovao je tramvaj između 1899. i 1952. godine

Mostovi na Rječini

Rječina. Od pamtivijeka prijelaz preko Rječine bio je otprilike na istom mjestu gdje je današnji most, odnosno Titov trg. Rimska cesta koja je spajala Trst (Tergeste) sa Senjom (Senia) prolazila je uz riječki Stari grad (Tarsatica) i nastavljala pravcem ispod Trsatskog brijega. Kada su franjevci 1675. godine uređivali vinograd na svom posjedu ispod brijega, koji se po tom vinogradu zvao Brajda, otkopali su rimski nadgrobni kamen s natpisom u kojemu se spominje vojnik osme kohorte. Kako su Rimljani zakapali svoje mrtve uz cestu, taj je nalaz potvrda da je tim pravcem vodila rimska cesta. Nema dokaza da je Rječina u rimsko doba bila premoštena, najprije su se služili barkom-skelom, što se zadržalo sve do kraja XV. stoljeća. Moramo imati u vidu da je more sezalo do pred sami Trsatski brijeg, a ušće rijeke u more bilo je ispod današnjeg Školjića.¹ Rječina je kraška rijeka, na putu od svog izvora prima potok Sušicu koji nakon topljenja snijega ili poslije obilnih kiša strahovito nabuja i sa sobom ponese velike količine pijeska i kamenja s Grobničkog polja. Sav se taj materijal Rječinom kotrlja prema moru pa kad nakon niza prepreka ona stigne do Zvira, u ravnicu poteče laganije, a pijesak i otpaci se počnu taložiti i stvarati otočiće, nakupine oko kojih je rijeka stvarala rukavce, a na samom ušću se nagomilao najveći među njima, u izvorima nazivan Otočac i Scoglietto.²

Drveni most. Na tom dijelu, koji se može smatrati prvotnim ušćem Rječine, miješala se morska voda s riječnom te se u jednoj darovnici, kojom knez Martin Frankopan 1431. godine daruje trsatskim franjevcima posjed, za to područje upotrebljava naziv *lago marino* (morsko jezero). Slijedom poplava nestalo je to morsko jezero, što se vidi iz jednog prikaza Rijeke iz XVI. stoljeća, na kojemu je ušće Rječine blizu Beogradskoga (današnjeg Jelačićevog trga). Zapravo, Rječina je, prošavši kroz Luke i Školjić, uspjela sakupiti svoje vode i poteći ravnim koritom u more. Samo se sve do druge polovice XVIII. stoljeća od nje kod Školjića odvajao jedan rukavac koji je bio usmjeren u rov ispod zida u današnjoj Ulici P. R. Vitezovića. Ostavivši područje obraslo bujnim vinogradima riječkih građana, mlinove i stupe, do kojih su prodirale barke pune žita i sukna, Rječina poprima novu ulogu, njeno korito do ušća postaje riječka luka. Neosporno je da je Rijeka imala pristanište na žalu pred gradom na tzv. Bodulskoj obali (Riva Boduli) gdje je bio drveni most, palada. Uz taj su se most privezivali uglavnom ribarski brodovi otočana koji su opskrbljivali riječku tržnicu. Međutim, sigurno sklonište za veće brodove, koji su se privezivali na duže vrijeme, moglo je biti isključivo u ušću Rječine. Nanosi od poplava taložili su se uz lijevu obalu rijeke, tako da se njen tok

pomicao udesno prema Starom gradu, što je poslovnim Riječanima odgovaralo, ali se korito na taj način neprirodno savilo u lakat i pravocrtno nastavilo u pravcu mora. Taj se lakat vidi na svim prikazima Rijeke od XVI. do XVIII. stoljeća. Na veduti Rijeke iz 1579. godine vide se brodovi u Rječini, a na planu grada iz 1625. godine donji tok Rječine izričito se naziva Luka (Porto).

Od 1575. godine grad nad tom svojom lukom vodi administraciju, ubire pristojbe, ali jednako tako, uz ogromne novčane izdatke, vrši popravke okolčene obale i osigurava sigurne priveze na obje njene obale. U održavanju i izgradnji luke ponekad se pojavljuje i carska blagajna, tako da je već krajem XVII. stoljeća luka bila odlično uređena i održavana. U tome su naravno pomagali brodograditelji čija je Bratovština sv. Nikole imala škver na ušću Rječine, na mjestu današnjeg Jelačićevog trga.³

Kako je nastao Mrtvi kanal. Kad je Rijeka proglašena slobodnom lukom 1719. godine, briga o uređenju korita Rječine postaje državnom brigom pa se na ušću s obje strane grade gatovi, od kojih je gat na lijevoj obali produžen za 47 metara. Što je više ušće Rječine napredovalo prema moru opasnost na ulazu u luku bivala je veća, jer se uz nanose rijeke gomilao morski pijesak nošen jugom i strujom. Tako se sve više gat uz lijevu obalu produžavao u more da bi, po projektu iz 1856., bio zaokrenut prema zapadu, što je ostvareno 1871. godine, a to je, zapravo, prvi početak kasnije Luke Baross.⁴

Rijeka je stoljećima trpjela od poplava Rječine. Poslije jedne takve jake poplave, jače od prethodnih, kad je voda dosegla do Korza, odlučeno je da se Rječina regulira, i to tako što će se iskopati novo korito po pravcu toka rijeke za njenog najvišeg vodostaja. U tim slučajevima Rječina je preko franjevačke Brajde naprosto prodirala najkraćim putem prema moru ne poštujući umjetno stvoreni lakat službenog korita. Uz veliko ulaganje taj je kanal iskopan 1854. i 1855. godine, tako da je u staro korito puštena morska voda pa je nastao Mrtvi kanal, a novo korito je odvelo Rječinu pravo u more. Mrtvi kanal do danas služi kao luka za barke i manje brodove. Nakon radova iz 1854. godine ostao je između Mrtvog kanala i novog korita Rječine teren trokutastog oblika koji je zbog sličnosti s grčkim slovom dobio naziv Delta. Taj je teren od 1854. godine zatrpavan posebice kad su mađarske državne željeznice gradile svoj prometni sustav i željeznički most. Delta je 1884. godine zauzimala prostor od 26684 četvorna metra, a 1921. godine njena je površina iznosila već 140 tisuća četvornih metara. Uz nasipavanje Delte produžavalo se novo korito Rječine, a stari naziv franjevačke Brajde sačuvao se u imenu Brajdica.

Prijevoz skelom. Kada je 1530. godine Rijeka dobila Statut, nije još bilo mosta na Rječini. Prijevoz putnika, životinja i kola obavljan je skelom. Prema čl. 15. Statuta skela na Rječini davana je u najam. Kad bi voda nabujala, dolazilo je do pravih brodoloma. Da se ta pogibelj spriječi podignut je 1640. godine most na račun erara i trsatskog samostana. Svi su plaćali daću za prijelaz preko mosta osim Kastavaca kad su išli u procesiji Gospi Trsatskoj. Tada su na lijevoj obali Rječine bile samo dvije kuće s krčmama. Jedna je bila od prijevoznika samostanske skele, a druga gospoštijaska. U njoj su se ubirale daće za mostarinu. U tim krčmama prodavalo se vino na malo po jeftinijim cijenama što je srdilo općinu, ali ne i Riječane. Na nacrtu Rijeke iz XVII. stoljeća jedna od tih krčmi označena je kao *Hosteria dove allogiano li Scochi*. Most je ponovno obnovljen 1715. godine, što je bilo u vezi s gradnjom Karlove ceste koja je počinjala na Piramidi. Odmah su nakon toga 1717. godine isusovci podigli na mostu kip sv. Ivana Nepomuka pa se prostor pred mostom s riječke strane počeo nazivati Trg sv. Ivana. Taj je most 1753. zamijenjen pokretnim kako bi brodovi s visokim jarbolima mogli ulaziti dublje prema Školjiću.⁵ Željezni most podignut je nakon što je regulirano korito Rječine 1855. godine. On je zamijenjen novim, koji je srušen 25. prosinca 1920. godine. Kasnije su riječka i sušačka općina zajednički podigle tzv. pogranični most, koji je otvoren 31. prosinca 1926. godine.⁶ Na njegovu je mjestu 1946. godine projektiran most (Titov trg) koji je na jedinstven način fizički sjedinio Rijeku i Sušak.

Tako se izmijenila urbanistička slika stvarana stoljećima. Na kamenoj ploči zapisana je povijesna poruka Josipa Broza Tita Riječanima da žive u bratstvu, slozi i ljubavi, jer je to jedino jamstvo da će izgraditi Rijeku.

Naša Rijeka, god. VI, br. 71, studeni 1984.

¹ M. Mažić, Dvije rimske ploče s Trsata i Sušaka, Novi list, 3. i 4. XI. 1934., 3.

² A. Depoli, Il confine orientale di Fiume e la questione del Delta della Fiumara, Bulletino della deputazione fiumana di Storia patria, V, Fiume, 1921, 31, 55.

³ V. Sablich, Il distretto fiumano nel secolo XVI, Bulletino della Deputazione fiumana di Storia patria, Fiume, 1921, 9-30.

⁴ N. Mancini, Portolano del mare Adriatico, Milano 1830, 50.

⁵ G. Viezzoli, Contributi alla Storia di Fiume nel Settecento, Fiume-Rivista, Anno X, 1932, 3-178.

⁶ Il ponte sull'Eneo aperto bal traffico, La Vedetta d'Italia, Fiume, 1. I. 1927, 2.

Pogled iz zraka na Deltu i mostove preko Mrtvog kanala i Rječine

Skromni metalni most preko Rječine. U pozadini su ulazna kapela Trsatskih stuba, te nekadašnja kuća Adamić.

Mrtvi kanal

Novi pogranični most preko Rječine svečano je otvoren 31. prosinca 1926. godine

Granica na mostu preko Rječine tridesetih godina XX. stoljeća

Okretni željezni most preko Mrtvog kanala iza kazališta

Novi most između Rijeke i Sušaka šezdesetih godina XX. stoljeća

Bogata povijest Piramide

Dva memorijalna natpisa. Kad je poslije 1816. godine prestao s radom riječki Lazaret sv. Karla u Mandraču, jer ta lučica nije mogla primiti velike jedrenjake (sada je na tom mjestu zgrada Hrvatskih pošta, kraj željezničkog kolodvora), brodovi koji su stizali u Rijeku iz sumnjivih područja odlazili su u karantenu u luku Martinšćica. Razmišljalo se da se organizira lazaret u Kraljevici, ali je prevagnuo projekt da se lazaret izgradi u Martinšćici, a Andrija Ljudevit Adamić je državi prodao za znatan iznos primorski dio svog posjeda u Martinšćici. Tu je 2. lipnja 1833. godine proradio novi kraljevski Lazaret sv. Franje do kojeg se moglo doći kopnenim putem novom cestom Dorotheom.

Cesta Dorothea. Cesta Dorothea je tako nazvana u čast nadvojvotkinje Dorotheje, žene nadvojvode Josipa, palatina Ugarske. Cesta se odvajala na Piramidi od Karolinske ceste i išla prema Martinšćici (sada Šetalište XIII. divizije). Sagrađena je da se može povezati grad Rijeku s Lazaretom. Prije je u Martinšćicu silazila općinska cesta koja se od Karolinske ceste odvajala na uzvišici koja se danas zove Krimeja. Krimeja je dobila taj naziv, jer je veliki broj kuća bio vlasništvo moreplovaca iz mjesta, koji su se obogatili od transporta za vrijeme Krimskog rata 1855. godine.¹ Na početku nove ceste, Dorotheje, upravo na mjestu gdje se ona odvajala od Karolinske ceste, podignuta je piramida kao znamenje. Na njoj su bila dva memorijalna natpisa koji govore o gradnji ceste. Prvi glasi:

MARIA DOROTHEA

VIA RATARIA

AB AUSPICATISS NOMINE

SERENISS A. D. AUSTR. JOSEPHI

REGNI HUNG. PALATINI

CONJUGIS OPTIMAE

VIA MARIA DOROTHEA

COMPELLATA

Kolna cesta nazvana Marija Dorothea po imenu najbolje supruge presvijetlog palatina Kraljevine Ugarske, nadvojvode austrijskog, Josipa.

Drugi natpis glasi:

MDCCCXXXIII

FRANCISCO I AUGUSTO

SCEPTRA HUNG. TENENTE

JOSEPHO A. D. A. PALATIN,

FRANCESCO AB ÜRMENY

LITTUS HUNGARIAE GUBERNANTE

VIA HAEC

ET INSTITUTUM QUO DUCIT

SURREXERE

1833., veličanstveni Franjo I., koji drži žezlo Ugarske, nadvojvoda Palatin Josip, Franjo od Ürmenyja guverner ugarskog Primorja ovu cestu i zavod prema kojemu ona vodi zajednički podigoše.

Kod te Piramide bio je carski miljokaz na kojemu je bio uklesan natpis:

CAROLINA

AUGUSTO JUSSU CAROLI VI IMP. MAX.

AB HOC FLUMINE AD PORTUM REG. ET UTRIUMQUE

TRANS ALPES ET CALAPIN PER LX PASS MILL.

APERT

Karolina po zapovijedi uzvišenog Karla VI. velikog cara od ove Rijeke do Kupe 60000 milja dokučila.²

Novi smještaj Piramide. Taj je miljokaz bio integriran u sadašnju Piramidu koja je za vrijeme asfaltiranja glavnih ulica u Sušaku morala biti uklonjena sa svog prvotnog mjesta – tridesetih godina XX. stoljeća. Građevinski je ured sušačke općine, po nalogu gradonačelnika Jurja Ružića, sačinio elaborat za novi smještaj Piramide, a njenu je adaptaciju izvela kiparsko-klesarska radionica Rude Matkovića u Sušaku. Javno mnijenje Sušaka bilo se podijelilo na piramidone i antipiramidone. Prvi su smatrali da je to povijesni spomenik koji valja sačuvati i istaknuti kao urbanističku sekvencu po kojoj se dio Sušaka naziva Na Piramidi. Drugi su pak u svom režimskom oduševljenju smatrali da je to spomen-obilježje koje evocira Austro-Ugarsku Monarhiju i da ga valja ukloniti. Srećom, pobijedilo je razumno gledanje na spomeničku vrijednost Piramide, i tom je prilikom carski miljokaz na početku Karoline bio respektiran. Nije potrebno isticati što je značila za grad Rijeku, od 1725. do 1736. godine, izgradnja Karolinske ceste. Pod upravom inženjerskog potpukovnika Matije Antuna Weissa, od Rijeke preko Škrljeva-Zlobina-Fužina-Mrkoplja-Ravne Gore-Vrbovskog-Bosiljeva i Novigrada na Dobri do Karlovca, u duljini od 117 kilometara, kao prvi cestovni spoj Karlovca s morem građena je cesta i uz nju su nikla nova naselja kolonista, od kojih su u našoj općini karakteristična Škrljevo, Krasica i Praputnjak. To je posebni tip sela nastalih po projektu tog građevinara, koji je bio na funkciji zemaljskog vrhovnog inženjera unutrašnje Austrije. Njemu se može zahvaliti gradnja prve prave planinske ceste; on je taj posao obavljao s velikom ljubavlju te je ostavio album crteža same ceste u arhivu Dvorske komore u Beču.

Sadašnji smještaj Piramide. Sadašnji novi smještaj tog značajnog spomenika cestogradnje u našem gradu je jedino moguć, premda se Karolinska i cesta Dorothea račvaju na novosagrađenom mostu. To je sada više znamenje po kojemu je dio grada dobio naziv te možemo biti zadovoljni da je na taj način predstavljen.

¹ G. Kobler, *Memorie per la liburnica città di Fiume*, Vol. II, Fiume, 1896., 64.

² A. Rački, *Povijest grada Sušaka*, Sušak, 1929., 174-175; I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski, *Nadpisi sredovječni i novovjeki... u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji*, Zagreb, 1891., 274, br. natpisa 924.

Piramida, u stvari miljokaz, koji je nekoliko puta mijenjao svoj položaj

Pogled prema Piramidi i dvije kuće obitelji Ružić

Piramida tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata

Sjaj pozornica

Adamićevo kazalište

Autentično umjetničko djelo. Nakon potresa 1750. godine, koji je porušio i znatno oštetiо veliki dio riječkog Starog grada, donesen je 1755. novi urbanistički plan na kojemu su ucrtane linije razvoja tzv. Novog grada na obali pred gradskim zidinama, i to tako da se zatrpavanjem mora dobiju nove površine od Rova do Andrejšćice (Fosso – Borgo S. Andrea). Kasnije su zacrtane ravne ceste presječene okomitim prometnicama u pravcu mora i određene gradske *insulae*. Napušten je mediteranski govor gradnji u aglomeracijama. Trgovinom, pomorstvom i industrijom obogaćeni su građani od tada mahom odlučivali podizati svoje domove u novom dijelu grada pa je koncem XVIII. stoljeća i prvih desetak godina XIX. stoljeća Rijeka postala ogromno gradilište. Riječki ljekarnik Carlo Pisanello o tom bujnom razvoju Rijeke u jednom pismu carici piše: *Trgovina se razvija, privučeni su stranci, sve će ulice biti tako napućene da će svatko vidjeti osiguranu javnu sreću na način da će naši potomci zadržati u sjećanju jednu tako sretnu epohu.*

Od ugovora do otvorenja – dvije godine. Novodošlo, iz zapadne Europe prispjelo stanovništvo trebalo je kulturnu razbibrigu, a tada je to mogao pružiti teatar. Bilo je presmiono usuditi se podići zidano kazalište u gradu koji je mnogo novca izdvajao za izgradnju cesta, nasipavao more i počeo graditi Dugi gat (*Molo Longo*) za luku ispred grada. Taj je rizik hrabro prihvatio Andrija Ljudevit Adamić, osebujna ličnost, poduzetnik, zastupnik u ugarskom parlamentu i svježi riječki patricij.¹ On je 1803. godine konačno odlučio u Rijeci sagraditi kazališnu kuću. Originalni nacrt za *Adamićevo kazalište* potpisao je sâm A. L. Adamić, pa samo na temelju toga potpisa dr. Cvito Fisković tvrdi da je on ujedno i projektant.² Međutim, običaj je bio da se na službenom projektu uz arhitekta potpiše i vlasnik; stoga taj potpis ne mora značiti i autorstvo. Jedino je arhivski potvrđena činjenica da je graditelj tog teatra bio riječki arhitekt i geometar Valentino Defranceschi, osoba koja je 1806. godine naslijedila Antona Gnamba u svojstvu građevinskog inspektora. Defranceschi je kao suradnik A. Gnamba izradio geodetski plan nove luke (sadašnja luka, za razliku od luke u ušću Rječine) i mnoge gradnje u Rijeci, a o njegovim sposobnostima arhitekta najbolje svjedoči mišljenje samog A. L. Adamića koje je izrazio u preporuci, izdanoj kao prilog molbi Valentina Defranceschija za slobodno mjesto edila. U toj preporuci između ostalog stoji: *Gospodin Valentino Defranceschi ne samo da ima sposobnosti arhitekta, on je valjan crtač, a*

*iznad svega se preporuča njegova plodnost, marljivost i nadzor nad izvedbama pa budući da je on, na opće zadovoljstvo javnosti sudjelovao kod izvođenja gradnje novog teatra, pružio je dovoljno dokaza svoje stručnosti i radinosti.*³ Tako laskav sud A. L. Adamića mogao je dobiti samo prokušani arhitekt koji ne mora biti i projektant teatra, ali je u izvedbi tog projekta njegova uloga bila jako značajna. Taj je projekt naslikan na portretu Andrije Ljudevita Adamića koji je izložen u Pomorskom i povijesnom muzeju u Rijeci. Adamić tu, s gordošću, u lijevoj ruci drži projekt pročelja teatra, a kažiprstom desne ruke pokazuje na tlocrt.⁴ Prema sačuvanoj fotografiji pročelja tog Adamićeva teatra, učinjenoj neposredno prije njegova rušenja 1883. godine, zgrada je bila izgrađena nešto uža od projektirane, a na krovu je izostalo barokno krunište s volutama, vjerojatno pod utjecajem neoklasicizma. Ugovor između općine Rijeka i A. L. Adamića o gradnji novog teatra bio je sklopljen 10. studenoga 1803., a kazalište je otvoreno već 3. listopada 1805. godine. U arhitekturi to je razdoblje baroknog neoklasicizma i prethodnica empirea. Ta je reprezentativna zgrada svojim plemenitim pročeljem oblikovala mali trg na kojemu su se sastajale ulice – Korzo i po teatru nazvana ulica Contrada del teatro (sada završetak Scarpine, Gupčeve i početak Adamićeve ulice). Stvorena je scenografija koja je cijelom tom novosagrađenom nizu kasnobaroknih zgrada na Korzu dala određeni srednjoeuropski velegradski ton, što se lijepo vidi na jednoj grafici izvedenoj po akvarelu Ch. v. Mayra 1833. godine, na kojoj je, mogli bismo reći, jednim pogledom obuhvaćena civitas nova na riječkom Predgradu.⁵

Velika uloga u društvenom životu. Andrija Ljudevit Adamić bio je svjetski čovjek, putovao je po Europi i nije isključeno da je negdje nabavio gotov projekt. Tome u prilog govori činjenica da je novosagrađena zgrada svojim ogromnim volumenom začelja naprosto stršala izvan linije nove Ulice Lido (današnja Zajčeva ulica) i zauzimala čitavu današnju uličnu širinu. Obalni potez novih kuća u Ulici Lido određen je bio Gnambovim urbanističkim planom od 1782. godine, dok korpus teatra u tom potezu svojim ogromnim gabaritom i obujmom nije djelovao kao sretno ostvarena urbanistička sekvenca. Kako je na kraju XVIII. i u prva tri desetljeća XIX. stoljeća A. L. Adamić (1767.-1828.) bio najutjecajnije osoba u riječkom političkom, industrijskom i uopće gospodarskom životu, mogao je naprosto nametnuti gradskoj općini taj projekt. Dapače, vidjeli smo da je i Gnambov najbliži suradnik, a kasnije građevinski inspektor Defranceschi, bio izvođač tog projekta. Znači da prethodno urbanistički plan nije predviđao zgradu teatra na tom mjestu. U razvoju baroknog graditeljstva u Rijeci osobito je vrijedno bilo pročelje tog teatra. Ono je nosilo oznake neopaladijevskog baroknog klasicizma a, na žalost, kao autentično djelo nastalo na osvit XIX. stoljeća nije

nam se sačuvalo. Taj je teatar u kulturnoj povijesti grada Rijeke odigrao u umjetničkom i društvenom životu veliku ulogu. U Rijeku su poslije 1805. godine mogli svraćati kazališni dramski i operni ansambli, tako da se kazališna predstava, umjesto u improviziranoj drvenoj baraci, mogla gledati u raskošnom ambijentu jednako kao u drugim većim europskim kulturnim središtima. U tom je teatru, nakon svršenog konzervatorija, ravnao orkestrom Ivan Zajc.

Uz to u zgradi teatra bio je smješten casino, čiji su članovi bili riječki trgovci i činovnici, kulturni sloj građana, koji je po svojim interesima usmjeravao politiku Rijeke kao kozmopolitskog emporija. U Rijeku su se slijevali valovi doseljenika od Sarajeva do Tirola, od Češke do Italije, Flandrije i Velike Britanije, a svi su bili zaokupljeni istom željom – bogaćenjem. Koliko je važan za život lučkog grada bio taj teatar najbolje nam govori činjenica da ga je riječka općina 25. ožujka 1845. otkupila od nasljednika i od tada je dobio ime Općinski teatar (Teatro comunale).

Skladna cjelina. Uz upravnu palaču bivše Tvornice šećera i staru Guvernerovu palaču, zdanje riječkog Adamićeva teatra treća je monumentalna građevina nastala u na prijelazu XIX. u XX. stoljeće. Prirodno je da su njene mjere u odnosu na novu arhitekturu građanskih domova neusporedive, isto kao što je na pročelju teatra bio primijenjen stil sveden u norme vremena u kojem je građen. Oponašalo se, naravno, u srazmjeru koji stalno struji između metropole i pokrajine, odnosno između Trsta i Rijeke, dvaju gradova s istim statusom slobodne luke. U prizemlju je do prvog kordonskog vijenca bila primijenjena rustika s naizmjeničnim glatkim i hrapavim kvadrima. Uz zidnu plohu i oko otvora ulaznih portala prislonjeni su pilastri i tročetvrtinski stupovi preko kojih prelaze vodoravni pojasevi hrapave rustike. Taj je dio građevine bio pod utjecajem manirističkih sanmikelijanskih rješenja svojstvenih za Veneto, a oživljenih u europskoj arhitekturi u drugoj polovici XVIII. stoljeća. Srednje pak izbočenje okomito je razdijeljeno pilastrima i prislonjenim stupovima koji prelaze dva kata i završavaju ispod gredlja i isturenog vijenca. Nad vijencem je bila uvučena atika, okomito između prozora postavljeni su pilastri s atlantima koji pridržavaju krovni vijenac. Ta vodoravna i okomita podjela plohe pročelja i primjena gigantskog reda govori da je za rješenje likovnog teksta arhitekture bio uzor Palladio, a to posezanje za Palladijem osnovna je oznaka baroknog neoklasicizma u Evropi. Ta ambiciozna arhitektura odraz je Adamićeve želje za primjerenom raskoši, za prizorom kojim treba djelovati to pročelje na posjetioca. Ono je skladna cjelina a ne upadljiv dekor, radi se naprosto o pojednostavljenom stilu svojstvenom novome građanskom staležu. To ujedno dokazuje da je Rijeka na pragu XIX. stoljeća bila

otvorena svim europskim uplivima, od kojih je nama neoklasicizam stizao iz Francuske posredno preko austrijskog Zopf-stila. To je osobito dolazilo do izražaja na rešetki od kovanog željeza na balkonskoj ogradi ukrašenoj ornamentom beskonačne osmice, svojstvene za spomenuti stil. Gradu je bilo sve teže održavati tu monumentalnu zgradu, postojali su problemi sporednih izlaza u slučaju požara, problemi zagrijavanja i osvjetljenja. Nije prošlo ni osamdeset godina od početka njene gradnje, a prema izvještaju gradske komisije ona nije više odgovarala propisima koji su vladali za kazališne zgrade na tlu Austro-Ugarske Monarhije. Grad je bio obavezan ili obnoviti zgradu i modernizirati je, ili je srušiti kao dotrajalu i graditi novi suvremeni teatar. Nije bilo loše što su odlučili izgraditi novo kazalište, ali je bilo loše što to prekrasno pročelje nije moglo biti primjereno uklopljeno u zgradu koja se na mjestu Adamićeve teatra trebala graditi. Međutim, bilo je odlučeno da se stari teatar poruši do temelja, a da se kamen iz ruševine iskoristi za gradnju novog Općinskog kazališta. Radovi na temeljima za novo kazalište su počeli 1883. godine, a istodobno se rušilo ovo staro. Riječka je banka i štedionica od općine kupila zemljište na kojem je stajao Adamićev teatar i na njemu je počela gradnja bankovne palače Modello.⁶

Naša Rijeka, god. V, br. 45, veljača 1983.

¹ Riccardo Gigante, Stralcio dalla Corrispondenza di Lodovico Adamich col tenente Maresciallo Laval Nugent, Fiume-Rivista, Anno XV-XVI, 1937-1938, Fiume, 1940, 131-132.

² Cvito Fisković, Staro kazalište u Rijeci, Zbornik Rijeka, Zagreb, 1953., 467-469.

³ DAR, JU 2, Zapisnici sjednica (...), Protokoli: 1806., br. 96 od 1. i 2. V, list 42. verso do 43. recto.

⁴ Pomorski i povijesni muzej, Kulturno-povijesni odjel, Crveni salon.

⁵ Pomorski i povijesni muzej, Zbirka grafika.

⁶ Edilizia, La Bilancia, XVI (Fiume, 1. X. 1883.) 222, 2.

Gustav Klimt, jedan od najvećih slikara u povijesti, izveo je Religioznu glazbu (ulje na platnu) kao jedno od tri svoja djela za strop riječkog kazališta

Andrija Ljudevit Adamić nacrtao je projekt za kazalište koje je potom i podigao svojim novcem 1805. godine

Adamićevo kazalište osamdesetak godina (1805.-1883.) bilo je centar društvenog života grada

Fasada Adamićevog kazališta neposredno prije rušenja. Umjesto te zgrade podignuta je palača Modello 1885., u kojoj je danas Gradska knjižnica.

Riječki hram Thalije

Kako se gradilo općinsko kazalište. U osvit 1883. godine riječko Municipalno zastupstvo vodilo je žučne rasprave o mjestu gdje će se započeti graditi novo komunalno kazalište. Bilo je svima jasno da staro Adamićevo kazalište neće moći zadovoljiti grad u razvoju i da su prepravci njegove zgrade i protupožarno osiguranje samo privremeno rješenje. Pobjedilo je mišljenje da se kazališna kuća treba graditi na prostranu trgu, na današnjem mjestu.

Zastupstvo je žurilo, u ožujku su naručeni nacrti kod bečkih arhitekata Fellnera i Helmera, poznatih po projektima brojnih kazališta diljem Austro-Ugarske Monarhije.¹ Grad pred kojim je stajala budućnost emporija nije smio imati kazalište manje vrijedno od ostalih u gradovima Srednje Europe. Fellner i Helmer su grozničavo dovršavali posao, Municipij ih je nervozno poticao te su napokon iz Beča prispjele skice. Podestat Giovanni komendator Ciotta izlaže te nacрте da *zadovolji legitimnost građana*. Proračun za to zdanje je iznosio 313 tisuća fiorina. Grad je trebao podignuti zajam kod Riječke banke i štedionice. Gradsko je zastupstvo i dalje pripravno na ogromne žrtve, tako da od prvog trenutka pomišlja i na električno osvjetljenje kazališne zgrade. Misli se na budućnost.

Udareni temelji. U lipnju počinje kopanje temelja. Ispod temelja trebalo je zabiti dvije tisuće kolaca, no i to je učinjeno. Svima je jasno da troškovi rastu, da se gradnja produžuje, međutim, ne može se zaustaviti započeto, premda neki sumnjaju u ishod. Kazalište nije samo građevina, ono je i ukras grada, znak njegove kulture i gospodarske moći. Valja mu dodati umjetnička djela, obogatiti pročelje, učiniti elegantnim i raskošnim gledalište. Odmah se pomišlja da kipove na pročelju izradi poznati umjetnik, da strop oslika priznati slikar. I to podiže cijenu. Obavljaju se precizne analize žbuke, betona i kamena i tek nakon referata općinskih arhitekata počinje gradnja zidova. Razmišlja se o uređenju trga, o pročeljima okolnih kuća, o perivoju pred kazalištem. Početkom 1884. godine građevinu posjećuje Giovanni Ciotta s predsjednikom Magistrata E. Brelichem. Na zgradi se ubrzano radi, počelo je postavljanje kamenog sokla, iz Engleske stiže željezo za unutrašnju konstrukciju i kupolu. Kipar Völkel iz Beča preuzeo je kiparske radove i izvedbu plastičnih ukrasa. Već se razabiru obrisi *velebne zgrade koja će zajedno s Komunalnom bankom pridonijeti da stari Trg Ürmeny postane najljepša i najelegantnija gradska četvrt*.

Pod krovom. Početkom rujna zgrada je bila sagrađena do pod krov. Svečanost pokrivanja krova bila je obilježena ukrasima, transparentima, riječkim grbom i velikim natpisom Živjela Rijeka. Već su se znali autori dekoracija: kipove na timpanu, visoki reljef Apolona s nimfama

naručen je kod kipara bečke kiparske udruge Kauffungena i Fritscha, skupinu na kruništu radit će glasoviti venecijanski kipar Augusto Benvenuti, autor spomenika Giorgioneu u Castel Franco i Garibaldiju u Veneciji.² Dužnost direktora-konstruktora kazališta preuzima arhitekt Giacomo Zammattio, đak bečke Politehnike, koji će se od 1. prosinca 1884. godine sudbinski vezati za Rijeku i u stambenim četvrtima Dolac i Brajda ostaviti izuzetan pečat svoje darovitosti. Uz to, misli se i na opremu unutrašnjosti kazališta. Kazališna komisija naručuje stalne inscenacije kod glasovitog venecijanskog scenografa Pietra Bertoje, za kojega je La Bilancia pisala: *Dobar glas koji uživa gospodin Bertoja polog je da će radovi biti perfektni.*³

U proljeće 1885. godine svi su u grozničavoj žurbi: Fellner i Helmer rade nacрте za namještaj, zastor je dekorirao slikar Kott iz Beča,⁴ braća Gustav i Ernest Klimt, zajedno sa stalnim suradnikom arhitekata Franzom Matschom, već su dovršili slike za strop i izložili ih u Austrijskom muzeju u Beču. Neue freie Presse je pisala: *Nove su slike pune mašte, komponirane su umjetnički, a obojene s tolikom bravurom da treba poželjeti da ovoj trojici cijenjenih umjetnika brzo bude ponuđena prilika da izvedu slično djelo u Beču.*⁵ U sredini stropa postavljen je čaroban luster, a Matschove slike zamišljene su kao alegorije operete, plesa, ljubavi, koncerta, religiozne i vojne glazbe.

Svečano otvorenje. Kazališna je komisija uvjerala Zastupstvo da otvorenje kazališta treba obilježiti spektaklom kojeg će Rijeka pamtiti; odlučili su se za opere (*Aida* i *Giaconda*) i dodijelili su 14 tisuća fiorina za ostvarenje predstave, jer su u takvom početku gledali *budućnost našeg kazališta. Uprava je za prvu sezonu odabrala dvije predstave dostojne otvaranja hrama umjetnosti, koje će ostati u općinskim analima.*⁶ A tek kakva je senzacija bila kada je u kazalištu zablistala električna rasvjeta! Bečka tvrtka Kremenczky za to je doba ostvarila zamašan projekt – elektrifikaciju zgrade u gradu bez struje! Kada je obavljena prva proba rasvjete, *blaga bijela svjetlost rasprostrla se po čitavom prostoru kazališta i osvijetlila svaki ugao.*⁷ Troškovi su se popeli na 514 214,09 fiorina. Stigle su i figuralne skupine iz Venecije, te kipar Benvenuti *da se može diviti prelijepom učinku što proizvodi njegovo djelo.* Na jednu stranu kruništa postavljena je Drama, a na drugu Muzika, a iznad zabata riječki grb.

Kazalište je bilo dovršeno, ostvaren je san Riječana. Predaja ključeva u ruke gradonačelnika Ciotte priređena je 3. listopada 1885. godine. Arhitekt Fellner tom prigodom izriče proročanske riječi: *Bilo bi neotклонivo moralno uništenje kada se za sav narod ne bi utrlji putovi za duhovnu intuiciju i stvaralaštvo na intelektualnom polju. Taj žrtvenik, na kojem će se obrazovati i srce i duh, treba biti naše kazalište.* A ne samo on, već i predstavnik

izvođača ocjenjuje kazalište kao *djelo koje je časno svjedočanstvo umjetničkih nastojanja, osjećanja solidarnosti i pripravnosti na žrtvu građana ovog veličanstvenog pomorskog grada.*⁸

Naša Rijeka, god. III, br. 33, listopad 1981.

- ¹ Nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, 3. III. 1883, br. 75, 2.
- ² Nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVII, 2. XII. 1884, br. 277, 2-3; G.S., Lo scultore Augusto Benvenuto, L'illustrazione Italiana, Milano-Roma, 26. II. 1899; Il coronamento dell'edificio, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 30. IX. 1885, 2.
- ³ Gli scenari del Teatro Comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 21. VIII. 1885, br. 187, 2; G. Damerini, Scenografi veneziani dell'Ottocento, Francesco Bagnara, Giuseppe e Pietro Bertoja, Catalogo della Mostra, Fond. Giorgio Cini, Venezia, 1962, 18-26.
- ⁴ Nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 3. III. 1885, br. 50, 2.
- ⁵ Teatro Comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 27. III. 1887, br. 69, 2.
- ⁶ Lo spettacolo d'inaugurazione del nuovo teatro, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 19. VI. 1885, br. 136, 2.
- ⁷ Prova dell'illuminazione elettrica bal nuovo teatro comunale, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 19. VIII. 1885, br. 186, 2.
- ⁸ O povijesnom razvoju kazališta u Rijeci vidi: R. Matejčić, Povijest gradnje općinskog kazališta u Rijeci, u: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR i NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka 1981., 13-23; R. Matejčić, Općinsko kazalište od osnutka do Drugoga svjetskog rata, u: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR i NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka, 1981., 27-37; S. Samani, Il teatro nella storia di Fiume, L.F. di Padova, Padova 1959., 9-30; E. Susmel, Un secolo di vita teatrale fiumana, Fiume, 1924, 9-11. Podacima ovog autora služi se Enciklopedia dello spettacolo, V, FAN-GUARO, C. E. le Maschere, Roma, 1958.

Ugledni bečki arhitekti Fellner i Helmer podigli su 1885. godine Komunalno kazalište i palaču Modello

Arhitekti Fellner i Helmer podigli su više od pedeset kazališta diljem Europe. Riječko je vrlo slično onom u Brnu, s pročeljem u obliku hrama.

Između 1913. i 1945. godine kazalište je nosilo ime Giuseppe Verdija

Palača Modello

Na prostoru Adamićeva teatra. Trst ima svoju Palaču Modello, a trebala ju je s obzirom na konkurenciju tih dvaju gradova imati i Rijeka. Među akcionarima Ri-ječke banke i štedionice s velikim kapitalom bio je Giovanni Ciotta, onodobni gradonačelnik Rijeke. On je bio profesionalno zanesen gradnjama (umirovljeni inženjerijski bojnik), čov-jek velikog ugleda među financijskim magnatima. Bankovni savjet, po njegovom prijedlogu, odlučuje da projekt za novu pa-laču banke izvede *Wiener atelier Fellner-Helmer*, onaj isti koji je sačinio projekt i za novo Općinsko kazalište, a kasnije i za zgradu Hrvatskog narodnog kazališta u Zagrebu. *Wiener atelier Fellner-Helmer* bio je slavan u cijeloj Europi, od Hamburga do Odese. Atelje je izradio projekte za 53 europska ka-za-lišta od kojih je najveći broj ostvaren na području Austro-Ugar-ske Monarhije. Djelatnost tog ateljea tumači se općim na-pretkom u drugoj polovici XIX. stoljeća i poraslim lokalpatrio-tiz-mom mnogih većih gradova.¹ I jedno i drugo igralo je ulogu u gradnji Palače Modello u Rijeci. Stoga nije čudno da se uz og-romna odricanja Riječka banka odlučila na ovaj pothvat.²

Prepolovljena palača. Rušenjem Adamićeva teatra s prostora između današnje Uli-ce Ivana Zajca i korijena Korza, uklonjeno je jedno ogromno zda-nje, pa umjesto da se to mjesto povijesnih stilova ostavi kao trg, na uglu je naprosto ugurana monumentalna građevina, arhitektura historijskih stilova, pretenciozna i u prostoru agresivna. Nije isključeno da je za tu ogromnu palaču u ateljeu postojao gotov nacrt i da je samo pri-lagođen potrebama banke dodavanjem produžetka prema Uli-ci Ivana Zaj-ca, jer je naručitelj želio imati svečanu dvoranu za priredbe, budući da je društvo *Casino patriottico* (Domoljubni kazino) trebalo u toj zgradi imati sjedište.³ Kao što je zgrada Ada-mićeva teatra stršala izvan poteza zgrada, Zajčeve ulice, tako i ova palača, samo u nešto manjem opsegu, prodire kroz tu liniju. Još dok se zgrada gradila bilo je građanskih prigovora što palača reprezentativnim pročeljem prodire preko širine no-gostupa. Fellner je u opširnom članku u novinama *La Bilan-cia* pokušao obrazložiti to željom da se pravocrtni potez dinami-zira, a komunikacija je zajamčena pasażom.⁴ Da je kojim sretnim sluča-jem ta zgrada bila sagrađena na prostranom mjestu, dje-lovala bi kao plastika, bila bi oko nje postignuta takva ar-ti-kulacija prostora da bi svi arhitektonski detalji i plastika na njoj uz pomoć svjetlosti stvarali nepres-tanu igru. Kad promatramo Palaču Modello stječemo dojam da je jedna barokna pa-lača prepolovljena, pa njena polovica pogurana naprijed pre-ma Ulici Ivana Zaj-ca, a između tih dviju polovica kao da je utis-nuta druga, renesansna palača s elegantnim portalom u Ulici Aldo Negri (sada

Uljar-skoj ulici). Prema sačuvanom izvornom projektu u Upravi za zaštitu kulturne i prirodne baštine (Konzervatorski odjel Ri-jeka Ministarstva kulture Republike Hrvatske) jasno se vidi da je zgrada izvedena do detalja. Zanimljivo je da je ta velika javna građevina izgrađena za nepune dvije godine uz prekid od tri mjeseca za vrijeme haranja epidemije kolere. Ona je građena kad i Općinsko kazalište, a iste su godine (1885) i dovršene.⁵ Ta je gradnja okupila velik broj riječkih obrtnika i umjetnika, tako da je dekorativnu plastiku izveo Riječanin, kipar Ignazio Doneghani, a rešetke od kovanog željeza na ogradi stubišta i na prozorima prizemlja glasovita radionica Matije Dumičića. Među najkvalitetnijim primjerima izdvaja se rešetka na unutrašnjim vratima banke.

Prenijeti bečki Ring. Fellner i Helmer su u Rije-ku pre-nijeli arhitekturu beč-kog Rin-ga. Općin-sko ka--zalište i Palača Modello dva su djela ravna ar-hi-tek-turi metropole. Pokrivene tržnice bile su gotove 1881. go-dine, tako da se od tog poteza siste-ma-tizirao, skupa s već izgrađenim stambenim zgradama, okvir za kazališni trg. Upravo je to Fellner imao pred očima pa je stoga dekorativni naglasak stavio na istaknuti dio palače, osobito na njen prvi kat, gdje je u zaobljenjima zidova smjestio serlijane, a u sredini, na izbočenju, jake stupove. Između stupova su prozori iznad kojih su *ocula*. Da bi pomirio visinu tog baroknog pročelnog *piano nobi-le s* visinom zgrade koja ima mezanin i tri kata, on je nad obje barokne polutke palače stavio šatorasti krov s bujno dekoriranim mansardnim prozorima. Istom su dosljednošću u čistoj renesansi projektirana dva pročelja središnjeg dijela pa-lače. Jedino je na ulaznom portalu barokna dekoracija došla do punog izražaja. Na spomen-obilježju postavljenom 1897. godi-ne, kao uspomena na otvorenje, vidi se koliko je gra-donačelniku Ciotti bilo stalo da grad ukrasi velebnim zdanjem, u čemu je ogromnu ulogu igrala upravo njegova ambicija graditelja, ali i poveliki kapital u blagaj-nama banke. Natpis na ploči glasi:

NEL ANNO 1884
SOTO GLI AVSPICII
DEL MAGNIFICO PODESTA
GIOVANNI COMENDATORE DE CIOTTA

* * *

QVI DOVE
PERMVNIFICENZA
DEL SVO GRANDE AVO

PATRIZIO FIVMANO
NOBILE UNGARESE
ANDREA LODOVICO DE ADAMICH
AL PRINCIPIO DEL SECOLO
SORGEVA
SACRO ALLE MVSE
IL PRIMO TEATRO CIVICO
LA CASSA COMVNALE DI RISPARMIO
QUESTO EDIFIZIO
ALLA PERSIMONIA ALLA BENEFICENZA
DEDICATO
ERESSE

Ploča je djelo Pietra Zambe.

Riječka je banka i štedionica prije gradnje svoje palače gradila po-kri-vene tržnice, a njenom zala-ga-nju Rijeka može zahvaliti za izgradnju dviju škola na Dolcu (sada zgrada Sveučilišne knjižnice i Talijanske gimnazije) te tržnice i velikog broja zgrada u stambenom bloku Brajda.

Stara dama. Palača Modello dobila je novo na-šarano ruho koje ne odgovara staroj dami građenoj drugim harmoničnim estetskim mjerilima. U epohi historicizma pri-mje-njivana je višebojnost građevinskog materijala, crvena pro-čelna opeka, bijelosivi kamen, šarene kerami-čke pločice ili slikana bogata ornamentacija osebujnih skladbi (na Velikoj trž-nici Turska kuća). Međutim, nisu se rado slagale razne boje žbuke, niti je plastika bojena u tamno. Iako je arhitekturna pla-stika bila vrlo često izvođena od terakote, ona nije ostajala u prirodnoj boji, već je nakon primjene na zidovima bojena jedin-stve-nom bojom zgrade ili bojom kamena. Najbitnije u svemu jest da je ta značajna palača konzer-virana.

Naša Rijeka, god. V, br. 50, ožujak 1983.

¹ R. Matejčić, Povijest gradnje općinskog kazališta u Rijeci, u: Narodno kazalište Ivan Zajc, ICR i NK Ivan Zajc, Rijeka, 1981., 16-17; R. Matejčić, Razvoj arhitekture 19. stoljeća u Rijeci, Dometi, br. 4-5, 1985., ICR, Rijeka, 50-51.

² Il nuovo edifizio della Cassa comunale di risparmio, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 17. XI. 1883, br. 262, 2.

³ Edilizia, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 24. VIII. 1883, br. 191, 2.

⁴ Il nuovo edificio della Cassa di Risparmio, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 13. IX. 1883, br. 207, 2; Edilizia, La Bilancia, Anno XVI, Fiume, 4. IX. 1883, br. 200, 2.

⁵ Avviso, La Bilancia, Anno XVIII, Fiume, 21. VII. 1885, br. 171, 2.

Palača *Modello* donijela je 1885. godine duh Beča u brzo rastući grad na Kvarneru

Velika kavana (Caffe Grande) u kojoj je desetak godina Frano Supilo imao rezervirani stol. Danas je u tom prostoru Gradska knjižnica.

Filodrammatica

Velebna koncertna dvorana. I u drugoj polovici XIX. stoljeća društveni je standard građanske klase naglo porastao. Veliki priliv inteligencije, zaposlene u državnim ustanovama i školama, aktivirao je neka zamrla udruženja. Slobodno vrijeme građana nametalo je društvenim čimbenicima brigu oko smještaja uprave društava i pronalaženje prikladnih prostorija za obavljanje najčešće diletantskih aktivnosti. Zabave, dramske i glazbene priredbe, karnevalski spektakli, bili su osobito omiljen oblik okupljanja većeg broja članova. Zapravo, u Rijeci je već krajem XVIII. stoljeća osnovano tzv. *Filharmonijsko društvo za diletante*, koje je zamrlo pa je 1872. godine osnovano ponovno *Filharmonijsko-dramsko društvo* s Jurjem Vranyczanyjem na čelu. Tek 1876. godine to društvo dobiva svoj statut. Kad se sjedište društva smjestilo u *Casino patriottico*, Udruženje obrtnika se u njegovu korist odreklo amaterske glazbeno-scenske djelatnosti pa je velika dvorana Kazina postala središte kulturno-zabavnog života brojnih uglednih Riječana. Dvoranu i scenu svečano je ukrasio glasoviti riječki slikar Giovanni Fumi, tako da su prostorije otvorene 1884. godine. Međutim, kad je posebni konzorcij, sastavljen od hrvatskih rodoljuba, otkupio za hrvatsku Narodnu čitaonicu zgradu Kazina, Filharmonijsko-dramsko društvo moralo se iseliti iz te zgrade. Kako je veliki dio riječke buržoazije bio član tog društva, mnogi su se dogovorili, osnovali svoj konzorcij, otkupili u Gubernijalnoj ulici Kuću *Struppi* i odmah na njezinom mjestu započeli graditi svoj društveni dom. Uz pomoć kredita od Riječke banke i štedionice, kao i uz obilnu pomoć zaklade industrijalca Hanibala Ploecha, započela je, po projektu riječkog arhitekta Giacoma Zammattija, gradnja velebne zgrade.¹

Ambijentalna usklađenost. Arhitektura te zgrade se na potezu najvažnije riječke pješačke prometnice izdvaja svojim višim svojstvima od susjednih stambenih zgrada. Ambijentalno je usklađena za potrebe jednog velikog društva u kojemu je instrumentalni orkestar brojao više od šezdeset članova, no arhitekt je zgradu projektirao i za budućnost, veoma suvremeno, sa svrsishodno raspoređenim manjim prostorima za uvježbavanje po uzoru na srednjoeuropske glazbene zavode. Kako je jedan veliki dio djelatnosti tog društva bio na glazbenom polju, mogli bismo mirno reći da je projektant imao na umu da projektira koncertnu dvoranu kakva je bila potrebna tadašnjoj, ali i sadašnjoj Rijeci. Za godinu dana riječki su graditelji i obrtnici podigli taj dom kulture, što znači da se u najblistavijem trendu razvoja grada nisu gradile samo tvornice i brodogradilišta, već i glazbeni i scenski javni objekti, kao Općinsko kazalište i ova zgrada *Filodrammaticae*. Gradnja tog zdanja značajna je kao popunjenje *lakune* u

urbanističkom sadržaju jednog modernog grada, u što se Rijeka pretvarala. U toj zgradi Riječani nisu, kao u kazalištu, bili pasivni promatrači, već obratno, sudionici, osobno aktivno angažirani u stvaranju programa i kulturne politike grada. Prema povijesnim podacima program društva bio je raznolik i kvalitetan, a posjedovanje dobro uređene i scenski opremljene dvorane za priredbe pružalo je široke mogućnosti iskazivanja brojnih talenata – dirigenata, glazbenika, glumaca i skladatelja. Iz posljednje generacije članova Filodramaticae izišli su priznati riječki stvaraoci, književnik Osvaldo Ramous i dirigent maestro A. Peterin.

Kitnjasta ljepotica. Prostor koji je društvo otkupilo za zgradu svojom se dužinom pružao prema sadašnjoj Sveučilišnoj knjižnici pa nam se pročelje te zgrade čini kao kitnjasta ljepotica koja izviruje u svojoj raskoši na ulicu. Školovan u bečkoj sredini, gdje su se građevine takve vrste gradile kao po pravilu na slobodnom prostoru, on se pomirio s riječkom zbiljom i učinio određene kompromise, osobito kad je žrtvovao mjesto za svečano stubište u korist prostorije za kavanu. Tako je ta zgrada dobila skromno stubište postavljeno sa strane i vrlo skućeni *foyer*. Nedostatak tog pompoznoeg stubišta nadomješten je sjajnom dvoranom, pravim malim kazalištem, čije su dekoracije i scena bile rađene po uzoru na slične bečke glazbeno-scenske prostore. Bogate rokoko-štukature s poprsjima glazbenika u nišama izveo je bečki kipar Ludwig Strichtius. Sve je lepršavo, puno nježnih cvjetića i vitica, rokaji, volute i prepleti kovitlaju se po zidnim platnima i po svodu. Prostor je proširen ogledalima. U središtu stropa je velika slikana kompozicija s alegorijama glazbe, plesa i drame, rad arhitektova prijatelja, poznatog tršćanskog slikara Eugena Scomparinija.² Cijela je dvorana sinteza arhitekture, skulpture i slikarstva, ali unatoč tome naglašen je autorov čvrst konstruktivni zahvat i logika građenja. On je u dvorani, kao i na pročelju naslutio budućnost, povijesno je pretočio u suvremene sadržaje, u tom djelu struji nov životni impuls, nova nadahnuća, tako da ta arhitektura ne bi ništa izgubila kada bismo je lišili kiparskog i slikarskog dekora.

Imaginacija slikara-arhitekta. Na pročelju te raskošne građevine postavio je Zammattio, između kolosalnih stupova, koji počinju od balkona na prvom katu i sežu do vjenčanice ispod atike, velike prozore s polukružnim nadlučenjima sa strana kojih su plastike ležećih figura. Uzor je preuzet iz talijanske visoke renesanse i manirizma, ali je Zammattio na toj zgradi svjesno omekšao svoju paletu. Uveo je u igru riječkog slikara Giovannija Fumija koji je po arhitektovu nacrtu oslikao međuprozorska polja na atici i tako učinio fasadu slikarskom. Dao je više maha vlastitom izrazu, imaginaciji, koja je u tog slikara-arhitekta bila presudna. Sve je pretočeno iz klasičnog repertoara na njegov likovni govor, razumljiv riječkoj sredini, ulici na

koju *Filodrammatica* proviruje. Ta je arhitektura namjenska i autentična, stoga je i danas vrijedna i služi na čast Rijeci.

Društvena himna. Kada je 30. studenoga 1890. godine svečano otvorena ta zgrada, na njenoj je pozornici odjeknula društvena himna koju je skladao Ivan Zajc.³ U toj je dvorani Rijeka slavila Zajčevu šezdesetogodišnjicu života velikom priredbom, kako je to i zaslužio njihov glasoviti sugrađanin.

Premda je projektant ovog doma umjetnosti u svojoj dvadesetogodišnjoj riječkoj karijeri projektirao i izgradio brojne palače, školske zgrade, stambeni blok i tržnicu Brajda, on ju je gradio svjež, pet godina nakon što je došao u Rijeku. Još je u njegovim ušima odjekivala glazba iz bečkih *Musikhausa*, bio je školovan u jednoj sredini u kojoj su zgrade javne koristi bile bitan sadržaj i stoga je hrabro i uspješno obavio svoj zadatak. U Rijeci je ostvario velebnu koncertnu dvoranu. Prije petnaestak godina velika je dvorana potpuno obnovljena, sve njene likovne i funkcionalne vrijednosti su poštovane, pa se s pravom može reći da joj je vraćen sjaj koji je imala na dan svoje inauguracije.

Naša Rijeka, god. VIII, br. 87, ožujak 1986.

¹ F. Derenzioni, Gli anuali della societa Filarmonico-drammatica, oggi Circolo Savoia, 1872, 1882, 1930, Fiume 1931.

² L'Edifizio della Filarmonico-drammatica, La Bilancia, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 11. VI. 1890, br. 130, 2;
L'Edifizio della Societa Filarmonico-drammatica, La Bilancia, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 14. VIII. 1890, br. 185, 2.

³ L'inaugurazione della nuova sede della Societa Filarmonico-drammatica, La Bilancia, Anno XXIII, Fiume, 1. XII. 1890, br. 274, 2.

Elegantna zgrada *Filodrammatice* spretno je uklopljena u niz fasada na Korzu

Stropna freska Eugenija Scomparinija u svečanoj dvorani *Filodrammatice*

Teatro Fenice

Mjesto spektakla. Čim se u javnosti doznalo da se staro Adamićevo kazalište namjerava srušiti i da će se u tijeku tri godine izgraditi novo Komunalno kazalište, poslovna gospođa Caterina Riccotti odlučila je u vrtu svoje kuće izgraditi drveno kazalište za potrebe Riječana. Tako je između 1881. i 1882. godine podignuta vrlo jednostavna drvena konstrukcija, neka vrsta tribina s pozornicom u dvorištu obraslom bujnim krošnjama drveća uz izvor žive vode. U tom su teatru izvođene predstave uglavnom ljeti, jer je bilo nepokriveno. No, i ljeti je znalo doći do nevremena pa se publika morala skloniti ispod stabala ili stisnuti uza zid ograde, a ako je predstava bila osobito zanimljiva gledaoci su se znali, prema zapisima očevidaca, popeti na pozornicu, dok se predstava nastavljala.¹

Drveno kazalište. Vlasnica Caterina Riccotti i njezini sinovi nastojali su te nedostatke potpuno otkloniti pa su 1888. godine, po projektu uglednog riječkog arhitekta Nikole Predonzabija, napeli platnenu nadstrešnicu, izgradili zidanu pozornicu i dvorišni dio s prostorijama za glumce, koriste i osoblje.² Na taj ozbiljan zahvat odlučili su se nakon što su iskustvom došli do spoznaje da, unatoč novom Komunalu, drveno kazalište i dalje ima svoju publiku. Na početku ga se nazivalo jednostavno *Teatro Riccotti*, da bi nakon preuređenja dobilo zvučno ime *Teatro Fenice*.

U tako *komfornom* kazalištu, osim platnenog nadstvođenja, koje je publiku štitilo od kiše i sunca, bila je uvedena plinska rasvjeta, u parku su bile postavljene tapecirane stolice, pozornica je bila povišena, a ispred nje je bio uređen prostor za orkestar. Na pozornici su bili uređaji za vješanje kulisa, a iza toga garderoba i krojačnica – zapravo svi sadržaji propisani pravilnikom o kazalištima.

Dekoracija otvora pozornice na izvana vidljivojatici bila je umjereno ukrašena ukusnim volutama, medaljonom, girlandama i jakim vijencem koji se u središtu nadlučivao. Jednako je tako i dekoracija dvorišnog pročelja bila izvedena u stilu rane renesanse. Sve se to može razaznati iz projekata i starih fotografija. Da bi unutrašnjost bila što dopadljivija, platnena je nadstrešnica bila oslikana cvjetnim dekoracijama u medaljonima. U taj je teatar moglo stati oko 500 osoba, i to 230 na sjedećim mjestima u parteru, a na galeriji je moglo sjediti najmanje 200 gledalaca.

Bizarno, ali romantično. Tijekom godina, *Fenice* je bio tako uhodan teatar, da su nakon smrti Caterine Riccotti njezini sinovi odlučili srušiti to bizarno staro zdanje, zdanje s puno nedostataka, ali romantično, postavljeno između krošanja drveća uz izvorsku vodu. Danas

bismo bili sretni da tu odluku da izgrade novo moderno kazalište³ nisu donijeli. Njihov je pothvat razumljiv kad se uzme u obzir da je upravo u prvom desetljeću XX. stoljeća grad gospodarski naglo napredovao, da su svi društveni slojevi imali potrebu za spektaklima koji su odgovarali njihovoj naobrazbi i društvenom položaju. Dok je Komunalno kazalište bilo od osnutka građansko, *Fenice* se održalo kao pučki teatar sve do prestanka njegova djelovanja za vrijeme Drugog svjetskog rata.⁴ Nakon rata je kratko vrijeme služilo kao teatar i u njemu su glumci kasnije osnovane Talijanske drame davali predstave, da bi uskoro bilo pretvoreno u kino-dvoranu.

Jedno je ideja nasljednika Riccotti, a drugo su mogućnosti. Naime, da bi se ostvarila ideja o tako zamašnom projektu, nasljednici Riccotti, Caterinini sinovi, Mario i Arigo, udružili su svoj kapital s Poduzećem Venceslava Celligoija pa je osnovano Dioničarsko društvo *Teatro Fenice* koje je od Venceslavova sina, arhitekta Eugenija Celligoija i njegova suradnika, bečkog arhitekta Theodora Traxlera, naručilo projekt za dvije zgrade, za kazalište i za Casino. Obje zgrade, od kojih je uslijed izbijanja Prvog svjetskog rata Casino ostao neizveden, projektirane su u stilu bečke secesije. Nije isključeno da je tome najviše pridonio bečki arhitekt kao koautor.⁵ Te su zgrade, da su obje izgrađene, trebale postati društvena i kulturna jezgra u središtu moderne Rijeke. Bez obzira na to, *Fenice* je dugo vremena bio pozornica velikih kulturnih događaja.

Protokubističke tendencije. Na ostvarenoj zgradi Kazališta *Fenice* došle su do izražaja protokubističke tendencije koje su se tih godina pojavile unutar bečke secesije, osobito u arhitekturi Josefa Hoffmanna. Stoga ta zgrada i danas djeluje izvanredno funkcionalno i suvremeno, osobito u svojoj unutrašnjosti. Na pročelju su arhitekti minimalizirali ornament, stvorili su plitak geometrijski raster, a ta redukcija ornamenta bila je prisutna osobito u unutrašnjosti, u samom gledalištu, gdje su prevladavale ravne plohe i čiste linije. Nakon obnove mnogo je od toga nestalo.⁶

U Teatru *Fenice* priređivale su se dramske i operne predstave s glasovitim izvođačima (Zago, Benini), ali su već idući dan znali nastupati cirkusi s dresiranim konjima, mađioničari ili pak variete. I prve kino predstave davane su u tom ambijentu. Za razliku od *Comunala*, u kazalištu *Fenice* mogle su nastupiti i skupine s netalijanskog jezičnog prostora, čime su se od konca XIX. stoljeća pa do pada Monarhije, koristili uvelike Mađari, posebice njihove operetne družine i varijeteji. Opera HNK iz Zagreba gostovala je u Teatru *Fenice* s Gotovčevim *Erom* četrdesetih godina XX. stoljeća.

Za sve slojeve pučanstva. Općenito uzevši Teatar *Fenice* bio je po svojoj programskoj orijentaciji vrlo demokratičan, bio je otvoren interesima svih slojeva pučanstva, ali je zadovoljavao i najprofinjnije ukuse. Kad je tek teatar projektiran, zamišljen je kao Politeama s mogućnošću da se gledalište pretvori u plesnu dvoranu. Ispod gledališta je izgrađena tzv. *Sala Bianca* (Bijela dvorana) s malom pozornicom i s plesnim podijem u kojoj su se održavali redutni plesovi i gdje je mladež održavala svoje čajanke i vjenčice.⁷ Zanimljivo je da je već 5. svibnja 1945. godine u toj dvorani Melodijski orkestar, pod ravnanjem Aleksandra Peterina, održao svoj koncert, a tako se nastavilo sve dok *Sala Bianca* nije bila pretvorena u noćni lokal.

Taj je ogroman korpus građen, nakon što su iskopani temelji, od lipnja 1913. do travnja 1914., pa je 25. travnja 1914. godine izdata privremena dozvola za njegovo korištenje. Usporedo su izgrađene dvije nove ceste oko novogradnje, položena je kanalizacija i vodovodna mreža, izgrađena je električna centrala za potrebe kazališta i ulica te susjednih kuća. Ako se uzme u obzir volumen te građevine i činjenica da je u gledalištu bilo mjesta za 1958 posjetilaca, odnosno 1258 sjedećih i 700 stajaćih mjesta, raspoređenih u parteru, na balkonu i na galeriji, onda se mora diviti naporu izvođača iz Rijeke, Trsta, Beča i Budimpešte da tu zgradu dovrše u tako kratkom roku. Kazalište *Fenice* otvoreno je 2. svibnja 1914. godine. Bilo je to jedno od najmodernijih kazališta u Srednjoj Europi.⁸

Naša Rijeka, god. VIII, br. 86, veljača 1986.

¹ La demolizione del Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 4. I. 1911, br. 2777, Anno X, 2.

² DAR, JU 51, Kazališta, predmet br. 1, Zgrada današnjeg kina Teatro Fenice, nacrti, 1913. i 1914.; Privatne stambene zgrade (...), nacrt br. 48/12/1913; JU 2, predmet I 318/1911.

³ La ricostruzione del Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 30. VIII. 1911, br. 2877, 2.

⁴ La seduta di ieri al Consiglio Municipale, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 11. I. 1912, br. 3095, 1. Dozvola za otvaranje nove ulice.

⁵ Dopo la demolizione del vecchio Teatro Fenice, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 13. IV. 1912, br. 3175, 2.

⁶ Il palcoscenico del nuovo Politeama popolare, La sala che mancava a Fiume, *Il Popolo, Fiume*, 14. IV. 1912, br. 3176, 2.

⁷ Lo spettacolo d'inaugurazione del Teatro Fenice, *La bilancia, Fiume*, 4. V. 1914, br. 98, 2.

⁸ DAR, JU 51, Kazališta, predmet br. 1, Zgrada današnjeg kina Teatro Fenice, nacrti, 1913. i 1914.; Privatne stambene zgrade (...), nacrt br. 48/12/1913; JU 2, predmet I 318/1911.

Stari, drveni *Teatro Fenice*, početkom XX. stoljeća

Armirano-betonski *Teatro Fenice* bečkog arhitekta Theodora Träxlera bio je senzacija u europskim okvirima kad je otvoren 1914. godine

Hrvatska čitaonica na Trsatu

Kulturno-umjetničko i zabavno središte. U doba ilirskog preporoda u Hrvatskom se primorju počinju osnivati čitaonička društva, koja su postala rasadišta kulturno-prosvjetnog i društvenog života. Čitaonica se prvo osniva u Novom Vinodolskom 1845. i potom 1849. godine u Rijeci. Na Trsatu su domoljubi takvu akciju osnivanja čitaoničkog društva, preko koga bi se organizirao kulturno-zabavni život, započeli oko 1877., ali su sastanak održali tek 1887., na kojemu su se dogovorili o nacrtu pravila društva davši društvu ime Hrvatska čitaonica. Članova utemeljivača bilo je 37. Čitaonica je počela s radom 8. rujna 1887. godine nakon što je ban Khuen Hèdervary potvrdio društvena pravila. Iduće godine društvo se preselilo u prostorije jednog krila školske zgrade, gdje su se priređivale zabave, a izgradnjom pozornice i diletantski igrokazi. Izvodila su se djela naših i talijanskih autora. Pjevačko društvo Jadranska vila iz Sušaka priredilo je 1894. godine u Čitaonici koncert, a organizirala su se i poučna predavanja.

Zbog skučenosti prostora bila je onemogućena svestranija djelatnost društva. Predsjednik društva Josip Linić dao je već 1893. ideju da društvo izgradi vlastiti dom, pa je na skupštini društva 1895. Eugen Matković s tom namjerom predložio osnivanje građevnog odbora u koji su ušli građevinski stručnjaci: Fran Matković, Tomo Matković, Ivan Šikić i Nikola Glavan, a kao pravnik Rude Linić. Građevni je odbor djelovao od siječnja 1895. godine i odmah je osigurao ulagače i dioničare koji će financirati izgradnju. Javilo se 49 dioničara koji su upisali 500 zadužnica. Na zadužnici je stajalo: *Prosvjetom slobodi i U radu je spas*. Na izvanrednoj sjednici društva 3. svibnja 1896. godine prihvaćen je izvještaj Građevnog odbora te je donijeta odluka da se dom počne graditi. Vodstvo gradnje povjereno je Tomi Matkoviću, a lokacija je izabrana preko puta dvorišta crkve Gospe Trsatske u vrtu Josipa Linića i Tonke Kućel. Radovi započinju 30. lipnja 1895. godine, a kamen-temeljac je postavljen 5. kolovoza da bi dom bio izgrađen za svega petnaest mjeseci.

O izboru lokacije Cvjetko Gruber, profesor Sušačke gimnazije, u svom Spomen-spisu *Hrvatska čitaonica* 1898. godine nadahnuto kaže: *Ljepšega svomu čitaoničkom domu Trsaćani ne mogaše naći položaja, nego ga podigoše sbilja na mjestu, odkuda je vidik dole k morskom otočju čaroban, da čarobniji biti ne može, kao i u prodorje Rječine, što se u razvalenoj kotlini valja, a onda se lagadno izvaljuje u to široko hrvatsko nam more.*¹

Domaći sin. Od 1887. godine u Sušak se preselilo sjedište trsatske općine. Na Brajdici se intenzivno gradilo te je akademik Ivan Milčetić u svom dopisu tiskanom u Viencu 1888.

mogao napisati: *Zgrada kakvima se Sušak ponosi, ne ćeš naći, izuzevši Zagreb i Osijek, ni u kojem gradu hrvatskom.* Sveukupna građevinska djelatnost u Sušaku bila je utemeljena na projektima odličnih arhitekata Randića, Ambrosinija, Stanisavljevića i Culottija, a među njima se pojavio i domaći sin, Mate Glavan, inače veoma marni član pjevačkog društva *Jadranska vila*. Stoga nije čudno da su se Trsaćani obratili upravo njemu da im projektira Društveni dom Hrvatske čitaonice.² Svojom idejom o toj toliko željenoj zgradi sudjelovao je i iskusni graditelj i poduzetnik, član Građevnog odbora, Tomo Matković. Iz suradnje Mate Glavana i Tome Matkovića izniklo je izvanredno funkcionalno rješenje Društvenog doma, koji je osim čitaonice i velike dvorane za spektakle imao obavezan ugostiteljski prostor, kao i najpotrebnije prostorije za uvježbavanje programa brojnih glazbenih društava koja su se okupila oko čitaonice.

Arhitekt Mate Glavan, predstavnik stila visokog historicizma, veoma je vješto smjestio ovu veliku zgradu u prostor. Teren se strmo spuštao pa je on to iskoristio okrenuvši je užom stranom prema ulici koja vodi na Varoš, dok širu, izgrađenu na podanku, okreće prema Riječkom zaljevu. Tako su restoran i terasa postavljeni na izuzetno privlačnom mjestu. Iskorišten je jedinstven vidikovac prema kanjonu Rječine i prema gradu Rijeci i Kvarneru. Čitaonica je, na žalost, kao masa pokrila pogled iz Rijeke prema crkvi Gospe Trsatske, koja je do njene izgradnje dominirala na platou Varoši. Međutim, čitaonica se kao simbol nacionalne svijesti nametnula pogledu postavši privlačna za svakog domoljuba koji ju je gledao iz Rijeke ili s mora. Odgovorni voditelj gradnje te velike građevine Tomo Matković morao je imati veliko iskustvo u građenju reprezentativnih objekata u stilu historicizma. To se osjeća u izvanredno odabranoj i u modularnim odnosima skladnoj primjeni klasičnog dekorativnog repertoara renesanse. Pučanstvo Trsata moglo je razgledati netom dovršeni čitaonički Dom 31. listopada 1897. godine. Srećko Gruber u spomenutom spisu o oduševljenju Trsaćana kaže: *Sve mu se divi, sve ga uznaša, kako je krasno izveden i kako stoji slavan svjedok mara, rada i sloge Trsaćana na osobiti ures mjesta – divni hram podignut prosvjetnoj kulturi i združnom životu mjesta Trsata.*

Kulturno-umjetničko i zabavno središte. Od otvorenja pa sve do izbijanja Prvog svjetskog rata, trsatska je čitaonica bila kulturno-umjetničko i zabavno središte ne samo Trsaćana i Sušačana već i brojnih Riječana i Primoraca. Dom je ugošćavao brojna društva kojima je čitaonica bila matica. U Domu su sjedište imali: Hrvatsko pjevačko društvo *Primorski Hrvat* (1895.), Limena glazba *Trsat* (1906.), Nogometni sportski klub *Slavija* (1910.) te Radničko-obrtničko potporno društvo *Erazmo Barčić* (1913.).

Za vrijeme Prvog svjetskog rata sve su velike javne zgrade bile rekvirirane za vojsku pa tako i Dom Hrvatske čitaonice na Trsatu. U njemu je najprije boravila austrougarska vojska; za vrijeme okupacije talijanska je vojska bila smještena u njemu od 1919. do 1923. godine, a potom je do jeseni 1924. tu bila i jugoslavenska vojska. Dom je bio znatno oštećen, stradao je kazališni zastor, odnesen je inventar. Od naknade talijanske vlade i od stanarine koju je za boravak jugoslavenske vojske platilo Gradsko poglavarstvo Sušaka, Dom je potpuno obnovljen i otvoren 26. prosinca 1925. godine.

Za vrijeme Drugog svjetskog rata u Domu su obitavali talijanski vojnici, a od 1943. godine njemački. Pred svoj bijeg Nijemci su postavili eksploziv koji je razorio desnu stranu pročelja zgrade. Odmah nakon oslobođenja Narodnooslobodilački odbor pokrenuo je akciju osposobljavanja Doma te je najprije obnovljena velika dvorana. Zahvaljujući marljivu radu obnova je Doma brzo napredovala i već se početkom 1946. godine mogao u njemu odvijati društveni i umjetnički život. Velika terasa pred Domom proširena je i s nje se još bolje otvorio vidik na Rijeku i more.

Trojica slikara. Uz Dom su vezana imena trojice poznatih slikara, koji su ukrašavali njegov interijer. Prvi je bio Marco Antonini čija su djela, zidne dekoracije i zastor na pozornici u svečanoj dvorani, uništeni za vrijeme boravka okupacijske vojske u Domu od 1919. do 1923. godine. Marco Antonini rođen je u Gemoni u Italiji 7. rujna 1849., a umro u Zagrebu 25. svibnja 1937. godine. S grofom Nugentom se upoznao prigodom njegova boravka u Vatikanu te ga je Nugent kao člana rimske akademije pozvao da dođe u Hrvatsku. Na Trsatu je grofu Nugentu dekorirao rezidenciju i prostorije muzeja u Kaštelu. Radeći za grofa u Kaštelu upoznao se s pokretačima gradnje Doma pa su ga oni angažirali za izradu ukrasa u unutrašnjosti i zastora. Antonini je inače poznat kao slikar zidnih dekoracija u dvorcima i crkvama u Hrvatskoj. Sačuvana su mu djela u Oroslavlju, a radio je i kazališne dekoracije u Zagrebu.³ Velika je šteta da se njegova djela na Trsatu nisu sačuvala.

Drugi umjetnik čije je ime vezano uz zgradu Doma je slikar Josip Moretti-Zajc. Rođen je u Bakru 1882. godine. Nakon završene bakarske nautike studirao je u Veneciji na Akademiji lijepih umjetnosti. Iz Venecije je otišao u Trst, ali se vraća u Rijeku i djeluje na relaciji Bakar, Sušak, Rijeka. Bio je poznat kao umjetnik i likovni pedagog. Umro je u Sušaku 1933. godine. U Domu je 1925. naslikao novi zastor koji i danas postoji. Uz veliki napor Trsaćana i novčana ulaganja ostvareno je djelo značajno u opusu ovog osebujnog umjetnika, koji je stekao iskustvo dekorativnog slikarstva u ateljeu Giovannija Fumija u Rijeci. Bio je suradnik E. Bellosa na ukrašavanju dvorca *Miramare* u Trstu, a sve se to odražava i na zastoru u

čitaonici. Za njega je neosporan bio utjecaj velikog tršćanskog slikara Eugenija Scomparinija, autora zastora i zidnih dekoracija u palači riječke Filodrammatike. Moretti je s njim također surađivao u Trstu. U izvedbi na zastoru pomagao je i Martin Koprivnikar.⁴ Konceptija Morettijeva zastora još je uvijek romantična, tu su obavezni motivi preporoda, narodne vile i vječna vatra, ali su prisutni i motivi iz luke Baroš, *Molo longo*, Učka i Trsatska gradina.⁵ Treći umjetnik čije je djelo prisutno u Domu, ugledni je riječki slikar Vlado Potočnjak. Građevinsko je poduzeće *Adriamont* 1975. godine potpuno obnovilo prostorije restorana u prizemlju čitaonice i otvorilo ugostiteljski objekt pod nazivom *Tersatica*.⁶ U to je vrijeme *Tersatica* bila jedan od najljepše uređenih ugostiteljskih sadržaja u gradu, a tome su neosporno pridonijele izvanredno uspjele zidne dekoracije temeljene na modernoj interpretaciji narativnih likovnih sadržaja, simbola vremena iz kojega izrasta povijesno tkivo vezano oko Kaštela i feudalne obitelji Frankopana. Dekorativni ansambl paljenog i patiniranog drveta s pozlatom oslobodili su prostor izgrađen koncem XIX. stoljeća dojma vremenske konzervativnosti. Prastara priča o nastajanju Trsata i Rijeke oslobođena je knjiške dosade. S tih se murala prosuo sjaj zlata i purpura, s površina drvoreza planula je bajoslovna raskoš, tako da ove dekoracije trajno djeluju kao hijeroglifi koji znače Rijeka, Trsat, Sušak, Hrvatsko primorje. Čitaonica preko glazbene umjetnosti i likovnih umjetničkih djela živi i produžava svoje korijene.

Naša Rijeka, god. X, br. 114, lipanj 1988.

¹ Z. Matrljan, Narodna čitaonica, žarište kulture – čuvar materinje riječi i naše kulturne baštine – svjetionik rodoljublja – matica hrvatskih društava, u: Trsat od davnih do današnjih dana, Rijeka, 1982., 71-119.

² A. Rački, Povijest grada Sušaka, Sušak, 1929., 296, pretisak ICR, Rijeka, 1990.

³ D. Kečkemet, Antonini, I. Marco, ad vocem, Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti, 1, A-Ćus, JLZ, Zagreb, 1959., 113.

⁴ V. Tartaglia-Kelemen, Moretti-Zajc, Josip, ad vocem, Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti, 3, Inj-Portl, JLZ, Zagreb, 1964., 394.

⁵ Lj. Pavešić, Na krilima romantike, u: Trsat od davnih do današnjih dana, Rijeka, 1982., 392.

⁶ R. Matejčić, Rapsodičnost površine, Novi list, Rijeka, 20. i 21. XII. 1975., 9; M. Zinaić, Likovni kritičar Zinaić o unutrašnjem uređenju Tersatice, *Adriamont*, Rijeka, 1975., br. 7, 7; E(lio) F(araguna), Otvoren novi restaurant snack-bar *Tersatica*, *Adriamont*, Rijeka, 1975., br. 7, 7.

Hrvatska čitaonica na Trsatu podignuta je 1897. godine, po projektu Mate Glavana

Sušački arhitekt Mate Glavan, osim Hrvatske čitaonice na Trsatu, projektirao je i Rafineriju nafte na Mlaki, Ljuštionicu Riže, te hotel Kontinental na Sušaku

Hrvatska čitaonica i crkva Gospe Trsatske

Središte Trsata krajem XIX. stoljeća

6 Bibliography

WEBPAGES:

Hrvatski Jezični Portal, hjp.znanje.hr/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

“Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America's Most-Trusted Online Dictionary.” *Merriam-Webster*, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

Flip.hr. “Struna: Hrvatsko STRUKOVNO Nazivlje.” *Struna Tražilica*, struna.ihjj.hr/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

“Royal Institute of British Architects.” *RIBA*, www.architecture.com/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

“Matejčić, Radmila.” *HE*, www.enciklopedija.hr/natuknica.aspx?id=39388. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

“English Dictionary, Translations & THESAURUS.” *Cambridge Dictionary*, dictionary.cambridge.org/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

Narodni.NET, narodni.net/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

“The World Standard in Knowledge since 1768.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., www.britannica.com/. Accessed 9 Sept. 2021.

BOOKS AND PAPERS:

Bujas, Željko. *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*. Globus, 1999.

Strunje, Petar. “Palladio i Dioklecijanova palača”, Zagreb, 2014.