

**DUNJA DOBAJA**

Institute of Contemporary History, Ljubljana  
dunja.dobaja@inz.si

## **SCHOOL GARDENS IN SLOVENIA AS A TEACHING TOOL, WITH AN EMPHASIS ON THE CENTRAL SCHOOL GARDEN IN LJUBLJANA IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD**

---

**Abstract:** This paper focuses on Slovenian territory. It explores the development of the idea of a school garden as a teaching tool and its practical implementation within work school principles and looks at differences between urban and rural areas. The article covers the period from the nineteenth century to the mid-1930s, with a particular focus on the interwar period. The central school garden in Ljubljana is presented as an example of a central city school garden. This particular school garden was abolished in 1934, but school gardens remained a part of the curriculum until 1941. The article draws on information from the literature and archival sources from the Historical Archives Ljubljana.

**Keywords:** school garden, work school, Ljubljana, Drava Banate, agriculture.

---

### 1. Introduction

The concept of a garden includes the aspects of profitability and aesthetics.<sup>1</sup> A school garden, however, is a specific teaching and learning tool with a particular role within children's general compulsory education. Teachers need to possess knowledge of how to maintain the garden.<sup>2</sup> In Europe, the first school gardens were created in Sweden and Belgium.<sup>3</sup> In Sweden, the first school gardens were reported in 1842,<sup>4</sup> and they gradually spread to other parts of Europe as well.

One of the first records of school gardens in Slovenia was written by Anton Martin Slomšek (1800–1862), a Slovenian bishop, writer, and poet, in an 1842 book titled *Blaže in Nežica v nedeljski šoli* (Blaže and Nežica in Sunday School).<sup>5</sup> The Slovenian school system followed the structure of the Austrian model. The first Austrian Primary Education Act of 1774 made school mandatory for all children, regardless of gender, social status, or place of

---

<sup>1</sup> Bavdaž 2015: 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Lopan 1880: 66.

<sup>4</sup> Pogačnik 2013: 7.

<sup>5</sup> Ribarič 2015: 263.

residence (cities or the countryside).<sup>6</sup> Compulsory primary education lasted from the age of six until twelve, when children were expected to have acquired the necessary knowledge for their future role in society, according to their class.<sup>7</sup> The act introduced three types of primary schools and differentiated the contents of instruction according to class: the *trivialke* for peasants, and the main schools and the *normalke* for the bourgeoisie and as preparation for further studies.<sup>8</sup>

In the rural areas, primary-level education was provided by two-year elementary schools called *trivialke*. Their educational objectives focused mainly on literacy and on giving helpful guidance for everyday life. In addition to religion, these schools mainly taught reading, writing, and a bit of arithmetic.<sup>9</sup> To consolidate the acquired knowledge and increase literacy, in 1816, a decree by the Court Committee for Education made Sunday school compulsory for youth between the ages of twelve and fifteen.<sup>10</sup>

Slomšek, the initiator of Sunday schools, also introduced many useful teachings for the common people in *Blaže and Nežica in Sunday School* about fruit growing, which was one of the main branches of agriculture at the time. He encouraged parents and teachers to instill in children a positive attitude towards work by, for example, entrusting them with the care of a fruit tree.<sup>11</sup> Through his teachings, he sought to improve Slovene's financial situation and educational level. His encouragement of Sunday school pupils to take an interest in fruit growing can be interpreted as an attempt at the school garden idea, which was given a legal basis after the adoption of the Primary Education Act of 1869, which established the principles of teaching at primary schools.<sup>12</sup> Among other things, it also laid the foundations for school gardens at teachers' schools at the upper secondary level and in primary schools,<sup>13</sup> introduced general compulsory education, and laid the foundations for the development of secular education.

Primary schools came under provincial autonomy. The Primary Education Act abolished the division of primary education into the three types of schools (the *trivialke*, *normalke*, and main schools). This division reflected class divisions within society and discrimination against pupils from the lower classes by denying them further education and thus the possibility of social advancement.<sup>14</sup> The new act prescribed eight years of compulsory schooling for all children between the ages of six and fourteen but allowed the provinces to reduce this obligation to six years.<sup>15</sup> With expanded curricula and improved teacher training, the quality of instruction improved. This act also introduced four-year teachers' schools for women and men, which provided a higher quality of general and vocational education.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Schmidt 1963: 179.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 180.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 179.

<sup>9</sup> Okoliš 2008: 59.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* 61.

<sup>11</sup> Praprotnik 1883: 5.

<sup>12</sup> Heinz 1895: 13.

<sup>13</sup> Bavdaž 2015: 298.

<sup>14</sup> Protner 2020: 397.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.* 399–400.

The act also included several provisions relevant to school gardens: Article 27 stated that each teachers' school should have a suitable piece of land for practical training in agricultural work.<sup>17</sup> For teachers' schools for men, Article 29 also prescribed, among other subjects, "the study of agriculture with a special focus on the soil conditions in their place of origin."<sup>18</sup> Article 63 provided for the creation of school gardens in rural municipalities to facilitate practical training in farm work.<sup>19</sup> Although the legislation did not provide for agricultural instruction as a separate subject in primary schools, a new subject called *pririodopis* (natural science) appeared in the primary school curricula from 1869 onwards. It was taught in the fifth grade for two hours a day.<sup>20</sup> The goal of teaching natural science was to instill in children a positive attitude towards nature; familiarize them with animals, plants, and rocks; and to put this knowledge into practice. School gardens were an excellent opportunity to do just that.

The school garden was meant to be a model for village gardens, and the teachers were respected figures among the rural population who taught how to cultivate better quality fruit and vegetables.<sup>21</sup> Smart farming was meant to increase the yields of the peasant population and entire village communities.

The Slovenian provinces were agrarian with a predominantly agricultural economy. They were part of the less developed areas of the Austrian half of the monarchy, but were about average in comparison to the entire monarchy.<sup>22</sup> In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Slovenian farmers faced issues of over-indebtedness and economic decline due to the penetration of the market economy into the countryside and the introduction of a money economy.<sup>23</sup>

In the late nineteenth century, when the peasant economy was in decline, school gardens were seen as one way to develop agriculture in the Slovenian provinces. Particular emphasis was placed on fruit growing, which was meant to help the peasant population overcome their economic difficulties. The gardening teachers would show the pupils how to care for fruit trees in practice and distribute tree seedlings to the farmers in the villages where they worked, thus promoting fruit cultivation.<sup>24</sup>

However, this was rarely implemented in practice. In the Slovenian countryside, the condition of school gardens varied. In addition to exemplary school gardens, some were neglected or did not exist at all if the land was unsuitable or if the local school councils were unwilling to purchase adequate land for a garden. The reasons for this were often financial.<sup>25</sup> Additionally teachers did not acquire enough practical knowledge at the teachers' schools, nor were they provided with any teaching aids to introduce them to school gardening. Therefore, the Ministry of Agriculture commissioned Gustav Pirc (1859–1923), the

---

<sup>17</sup> Heinz 1895: 31.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 49.

<sup>20</sup> Ribarič 2015: 264.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 66–67.

<sup>22</sup> Lazarevič 2009: 39.

<sup>23</sup> Lazarevič 1994: 14.

<sup>24</sup> Učiteljski tovariš, 1 May 1885, vol. 25, No. 9, 130, Šolski vrti.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* 131.

secretary of the Carniolan Agricultural Society and a traveling agriculture teacher,<sup>26</sup> to write an professional manual on school gardening titled *Vrtnarstvo s posebnim ozirom na obdelovanje in oskrbovanje šolskih vrtov* (Gardening with a Particular Focus on the Cultivation and Maintenance of School Gardens).<sup>27</sup>

Teachers learned more about agriculture at courses organized in agricultural schools by the Ministry of Education. Courses for teachers from the monarchy's Slovenian provinces were initially held in Vienna and Graz, and they were attended by teachers who worked successfully in agriculture in their home environments and reported on their efforts and experiences in educational and agricultural journals.<sup>28</sup> After the establishment of agricultural schools in the Slovenian provinces in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Slovenian teachers could attend courses in Maribor, Slap (near Vipava), Grm (near Novo mesto), and Šentjur (near Celje).<sup>29</sup>

According to the teachers, some school gardens were neglected not only due to a lack of agriculture knowledge but also because of inadequate financial support, which was insufficient to cover all their related expenses. Sometimes, there was no financial support at all. Consequently, many gardening teachers were forced to earn additional income or use the school gardens for their own needs.<sup>30</sup>

As indicated in an article from 1912 in *Učiteljski tovariš*, a leading educational journal, teachers were also critical of agricultural courses, which often accepted young teachers without any practical experience or even a school garden at all.<sup>31</sup> Although the article does not indicate the rule for selecting the teachers for the training courses, we can assume that the selection criteria varied from one primary school to another.

The Primary Education Act of 1869 focused on rural school gardens rather than urban ones. Erasmus Schwab, the author of the first practical manual about this subject (*Der Volksschulgarten. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Aufgabe unserer Volkserziehung*, 1870), which included guidelines for creating school gardens based on the provisions in the act, also discussed the importance of school gardens in the cities.<sup>32</sup> He particularly emphasized the health, educational, and aesthetic functions of urban school gardens. Max Machanek, a Moravian member of the National Assembly, contributed plans for the "ideal school gardens" contained in the booklet.<sup>33</sup> The authors were aware of beautiful examples of school gardens in some primary schools that predated the 1869 Primary Education Act. What had been missing, though, was a single, systematic, carefully considered, and educationally oriented school garden design. They hoped that their work would be a step in that direction.<sup>34</sup> However,

---

<sup>26</sup> In 1884, Gustav Pirc was appointed as a traveling teacher of agriculture. By appointing and employing itinerant teachers, the provincial government supported the development of agriculture in its territory. Traveling teachers were appointed for a specific area or specific profession (e.g., viticulture, dairy farming, etc.). Their main task was to educate the peasant population. In: Šalehar, Rupnik, Lotrič 2011: 12.

<sup>27</sup> Levec 1888: 444.

<sup>28</sup> Hojan 2015: 347.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Učiteljski tovariš*, 19 April 1912, vol. 52, No. 16, 1, Šolski vrtovi in njih oskrbniki.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Bavdaž 2015: 299, 301. Erasmus Schwab was a teacher and district school inspector. In: *Ibid.* 299.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* 299.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 301.

when putting the ideas of these authors into practice, it was necessary consider that the design of school gardens depended on the location, size, and soil quality of the school garden site.

Gardening teachers from the Slovenian provinces received the booklet with mixed feelings. In particular, they hoped for additional funding that would enable them to put the advice it contained into practice.<sup>35</sup>

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the reform pedagogy<sup>36</sup> movement increasingly gained prominence. It advocated a balance between children's individual characteristics or abilities and their natural need to work and be active. Within reform pedagogy, various didactic approaches were developed that shared common foundations but were based on different ideas and implementation methods, and they did not all emerge simultaneously (e.g., the Maria Montessori method and the Waldorf School). However, as an alternative to the traditional school, they supported efforts for education in nature and for work schools.<sup>37</sup> The idea of work schools is based on the idea that children learn through their own activity rather than through strict frontal instruction. Work schools were therefore based on the consistent application of the principle of the pupil's activity during the learning process.<sup>38</sup> Work schools were not intended to abolish the traditional school as such, but rather only to encourage a different approach to learning. School gardens were one of the elements of work schools.

The idea of school gardens continued into the interwar period. However, in the newly established Yugoslav state, they were only required by law for rural schools, but not for urban schools. The *Zakon o narodnih šolah* (The National Schools Act of 1930) provided for the establishment of school gardens in cities only if conditions allowed for them.<sup>39</sup> In the interwar period, school gardens were also a means of learning about agriculture, fruit growing, vegetable growing, beekeeping, and floriculture. They instilled in pupils an appreciation of nature and enjoyment of and a desire to work.<sup>40</sup> Of course, only a well-kept and carefully tended school garden could serve as a teaching tool.

## 2. School gardens as a teaching tool in the interwar period

In the interwar period, Slovenia was a predominantly agrarian society in which half of the national income came from agriculture and was the primary source of income for around 60 % of the population.<sup>41</sup> As an economic and social group, peasants were crucial for social stability. The agricultural industry faced many difficulties regarding production intensification. The main issues included the fragmentation of agricultural holdings, low productivity and consequently low return on agricultural work, and poor education of the rural population.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Učiteljski tovariš, 1 August 1871, vol. 11, No. 15, 226, Šolski vert.

<sup>36</sup> Protner 2017: 116. In the Anglo-Saxon world the name progressive education came to be used for this pedagogical paradigm (author's note).

<sup>37</sup> Protner 2017: 116.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Official Gazette of the Royal Ban's Administration of the Drava Banate, vol. 1, No. 25, 28 January 1930, 283.

<sup>40</sup> Učiteljski tovariš, 19 August 1926, vol. 66, No. 2, 5, Šolski vrtovi in kmetijski pouk.

<sup>41</sup> Lazarević 2022: 20.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

The guidelines for maintaining school gardens in the Ljubljana Administrative Unit were laid down in the Higher School Council instructions of June 15, 1921.<sup>43</sup> Although there is no explicit indication in these guidelines of whether the instructions were aimed at the rural school gardens exclusively, the specified goals nevertheless suggest that the gardens located in the countryside were the primary focus of the pedagogical profession.

School gardens were the responsibility of local school boards, school administrators, and gardening teachers and had to be at least ten acres large,<sup>44</sup> not including the schoolyard, sports facilities, and the school building. In the autumn, each gardening teacher had to draw up a work plan, which was essentially a sketch of the school garden on a 1:100 scale.<sup>45</sup> The sketch had to include the locations of beds and which crops were planned for the following year. The work plans were kept in the school archives and served as a guide for future gardening teachers. School garden maintenance counted as one of the teachers' qualifications.<sup>46</sup> By the end of June every year, the gardening teachers had to submit a report on the state of the school gardens and land to the Education Inspector of the Ljubljana Administrative Unit.<sup>47</sup>

With the establishment of the Drava Banate, the Ban's Administration re-emphasized the importance of school gardens as a teaching tool for agricultural and natural science education. It urged the local school boards and gardening teachers to follow the instructions for the preparation and maintenance of school gardens issued by the Higher School Board in 1921.<sup>48</sup> These instructions were to be brought to the attention of the members of the local school board once again at their first regular meetings, and all necessary steps were to be taken to improve school gardening. Fruit cultivation was the most important, and the Ban's Administration ordered all districts to draw up a tabular overview of all of their schools by March 1, 1931, that would indicate which schools did not have school gardens and why, which schools did, and which schools did not have a tree nursery and why. The relevant information was provided by the gardening teachers through the school administrations.<sup>49</sup>

The archival materials do not include the results the individual districts communicated to the Ban's Administration, so the information about school gardens in the Drava Banate at the beginning of 1934 found in the February 22 edition of *Učiteljski tovariš* will be used here as an example.<sup>50</sup> Throughout the Banate, 705 schools had their own school gardens; 13 schools used school gardens that were owned by the administrative municipalities; 23 schools rented land for their school gardens; and 90 schools had no school garden. In terms of organization and maintenance, 211 gardens were considered excellent,

---

<sup>43</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo o stanju in oskrbovanju šolskih vrtov, 1 May 1928. The present contribution focuses on the Ljubljana Administrative Unit. I assume that the Maribor authorities implemented similar rules regarding school gardens (author's note).

<sup>44</sup> *Učiteljski tovariš*, 19 August 1926, vol. 66, No. 2, 5, Šolski vrtovi in kmetijski pouk.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo o stanju in oskrbovanju šolskih vrtov, 1 May 1928.

<sup>48</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev šolskih vrtov, 31 January 1931.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Učiteljski tovariš*, 22 February 1934, vol. 74, No. 28, 1, Šolstvo in prosveta v Dravski banovini.

309 were good, and 209 were satisfactory or poor.<sup>51</sup> Local school boards contributed funds to improve school gardens, particularly for garden fences and the purchase of necessary tools. The Banate also contributed funds, especially for prizes for outstanding school gardens and for individual awards given to the most diligent gardening teachers. To ensure further training of teachers, the Ban's Administration organized two-day courses in each district, where gardening teachers familiarized themselves with the school gardening guidelines. At the beginning of 1934, the Ban's Administration, in a report on course attendance, noted that the courses were well attended, although the participants had to cover their own travel and food expenses.<sup>52</sup> Although the number of course participants, which would indicate the level of interest among gardening teachers, is not stated in the journal, it does highlight an increase in initiative among teachers to learn about school gardening. In almost all districts, teachers organized school gardening clubs to share experiences and ensure networking and cooperation.<sup>53</sup>

The National Schools Act did not make urban school gardens compulsory, but it did recommend them if the conditions were right. However, this does not mean that decision-makers in urban areas were not aware of the significance of school gardens as teaching tools.

### 3. The central school garden in Ljubljana

At a teachers' conference in Ljubljana in 1921, Andrej Skulj (1880–1956), a teacher, school garden supervisor, and organizer of the Fruit Growers and Gardeners Association for Slovenia,<sup>54</sup> put forward the idea of establishing central school gardens in Slovenian cities.<sup>55</sup> Many schools in the city did not have a school garden because they lacked the appropriate facilities or their gardens were not fit for the purpose. Skulj stated the educational and pedagogical reasons for creating central school gardens, and drew attention to the destruction of urban plantations and promenades by certain youth groups due to "loitering," by which he meant aimless activities that encouraged idleness, such as "bouncing balls around incessantly."<sup>56</sup> Skulj stressed the importance for children of exercise and play, but he believed too many children were left to the streets. Therefore, he shared the opinion of the part of the teaching profession that advocated for youth education to encourage respect for work and nature. This purpose could be achieved with central school gardens, where, under the guidance of a gardening teacher, the youth would learn about cultivating various crops and would grow them on their own while developing a positive attitude towards work and the environment. The creation of central school gardens in Slovenian towns was also important for education as a tool for teaching natural sciences.<sup>57</sup>

Skulj adopted the idea of central school gardens in Slovenian towns from the German physician and orthopedist Daniel Gottlieb Moritz Schreber (1808–1861), who had argued

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Arko 1972: 5.

<sup>55</sup> Skulj 1922: 2.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

in the nineteenth century for reform in urban children's education.<sup>58</sup> One of Schreber's main ideas was to create gardens as a didactic tool for urban children and where they would take care of the plants themselves. The gardens would contribute to urban children's harmonious and healthy development.<sup>59</sup> At Schreber's initiative, gardens were established in some of the German cities, where they served as educational facilities and as a place for children to play in a natural environment. Gradually, urban school gardens spread to other parts of Europe and to major cities in the United States.

In 1922, "after much consultation," those in the Ljubljana municipality reached a decision to establish a central school garden.<sup>60</sup> Of the seventeen school buildings in Ljubljana, only one, the school in Barje (Ljubljana Marshes), had a suitable school garden, so the representatives of the Ljubljana schools, the urban municipality, and experts in education and construction chose it as the site for a central school garden for all the primary and secondary schools in Ljubljana.<sup>61</sup> The municipality allocated two plots of land for the central school garden: one for the garden and another one for a playground, thereby complying with the stipulations of the Ljubljana Higher School Council Decree of June 15, 1921,<sup>62</sup> the instructions of the Commission for Education and Worship of May 10, 1921, and the Ljubljana Higher School Council Decree of October 18, 1921,<sup>63</sup> which provided for the establishment of school gardens measuring at least ten acres near the school buildings.<sup>64</sup>

It was impossible to set up suitable school gardens next to the existing school buildings, so the central school garden was established in the Ljubljana suburb of Trnovo.<sup>65</sup> It measured 1705 square meters.<sup>66</sup> The founders were guided by the conviction that it would be beneficial to introduce the city's youth to certain branches of agriculture because it would encourage a general appreciation of farm work and labor as well as encourage respect for nature. Furthermore, working in the school garden would discourage bad habits and satisfy the desire to exercise. In addition to the educational benefits, school gardens were also healthy, as they promoted exercising in the fresh air.<sup>67</sup> The health benefits were exceedingly important because of the prevalence of tuberculosis, which was also considered a social disease<sup>68</sup> that spread most rapidly in times of war, deprivation, and poverty. It reached its peak in the Slovenian provinces at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>69</sup> At this time, the fight

---

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moritz\\_Schreber](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moritz_Schreber)

<sup>60</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo o centralnem šolskem vrtu, ki ga je podal upravitelj na anketi dne 10. 1. 1929 v posvetovalnici mestnega magistrata v Ljubljani.

<sup>61</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev šolskih vrtov v Ljubljani, 26 May 1928. The Barje school was located on the edge of the Ljubljana Marshes (author's note).

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> Učiteljski tovariš, 19 August 1926, vol. 66, No. 2, 5, Šolski vrtovi in kmetijski pouk.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev šolskih vrtov v Ljubljani, 26 May 1928.

<sup>66</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 1, item 1, Poročilo o ljubljanskih osnovnih šolah, mestnih otroških vrtcih, zavetiščih in šolskih ustanovah za leto 1929.

<sup>67</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev šolskih vrtov v Ljubljani, 26 May 1928.

<sup>68</sup> Zupanič Slavec 2005: 77.

<sup>69</sup> Jaunig, Zupanič Slavec 2012: 362–385.



against tuberculosis in Slovenia was still in its infancy, but the anti-tuberculosis campaign was relatively well implemented through the use of both preventive and curative measures.<sup>70</sup>

By combining all the components the central school garden would bring to life, the city of Ljubljana envisaged a future urban colony of small apartments with landscaped gardens.<sup>71</sup> The municipality, in cooperation with educational experts, therefore sought to raise awareness among the youth of the importance of cultivating land in an urban environment—not only for the sake of developing a positive attitude towards work, nature, and health but also for purely practical reasons. Children were expected to bring all this awareness into their home environment.

The garden was managed by the teacher Josip Kobal, who served as the main administrator, along with the teachers Alojzij Škrinjar and Zora Rugelj.<sup>72</sup> The administrator's duties were defined in a contract between the local school board in Ljubljana and the manager of the central school garden.<sup>73</sup> Of course, the contract also specified the obligations of the local school board. The latter was obliged to purchase fruit tree seedlings, herbs, and ornamental flowers. The garden was filled with fruit trees, vegetables, and flowers. Part of the vegetables were donated to the city shelter on Japljeva Street in Ljubljana, and the other part was sold at the city market, with the proceeds going to the city coffers.<sup>74</sup> Every year, the manager was obliged to plant, graft, and maintain 1000 trees in the nursery.<sup>75</sup> According to the manager's data for 1927, the tree nursery contained around 3500 grafted trees, and there were 90 apple trees in the orchard.<sup>76</sup> At the end of their schooling, each pupil would receive a small tree as a souvenir if they wished to have one and if their parents had a garden within the Ljubljana municipality.<sup>77</sup>

Manual labor in the central school garden was carried out by municipal workers, and the municipality supplied manure and took care of rubbish collection. The local school board was obliged to provide the administrator with a pair of horses for plowing and transporting various supplies. At the end of each fiscal year, the administrator and the two teachers were entitled to a cash allowance of 1,500 dinars for clothing and footwear expenses.<sup>78</sup>

Kobal's goal was to ensure that the central school garden served as a model garden for the youth and citizens in general, as well as an ornament for the municipality. This was also the expectation of the Ljubljana municipality. Archival records indicate, however, that

---

<sup>70</sup> Zupanič Slavec 2005: 77.

<sup>71</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev šolskih vrtov v Ljubljani, 26 May 1928.

<sup>72</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 1, item 1, Šolstvo v Ljubljani, 1928 and SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Uprava centralnega šolskega vrta, 2 June 1926.

<sup>73</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Pogodba, 31 August 1928. In the archives, I only found a contract dated 31 August 1928. As the central school garden was established in 1922, I assume that this is a renewal of the contract (author's note).

<sup>74</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 1, item 1, Šolstvo v Ljubljani, 1928.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Uprava centralnega šolskega vrta. Proračun za leto 1928, 4 October 1927.

<sup>77</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Pogodba, 31 August 1928.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*

the garden did not completely fulfill its purpose because the city and the administrator disagreed about the financing required for its infrastructure. Kobal had warned the city's school board, government, and the finance office that a fence needed to be built around the garden to protect it from theft and damage, primarily from rabbits. For example, during the winter of 1925/26, rabbits gnawed on over 1,000 trees in the nursery, causing over 10,000 dinars in damage.<sup>79</sup> Thefts of vegetables and flowers were also common,<sup>80</sup> which most likely had been the result of vandalism and social hardship. Kobal also claimed the fence was necessary due to the nearby inhabitants who had started using the path through the central school garden to cut through to the other side. Whenever the administrator, garden workers, or teachers pointed out that the path was not public, they were shouted at.<sup>81</sup>

The fence was not the only problem. The garden lacked other necessities for proper maintenance. For example, it had no water supply,<sup>82</sup> which affected the yield, especially during droughts such as the one in the summer of 1928.<sup>83</sup> At first, garden workers, teachers, and children would get water from neighbors or the nearby town knacker. However, the city health office forbade the use of water from the town knacker, probably for hygienic reasons. Meanwhile, the people in the immediate area were unwilling to provide water on the pretext that the municipality should ensure a water supply. Kobal warned the city authorities that children were unable to wash their hands or quench their thirst when visiting the garden and the playground, and that they often asked for water at the surrounding houses, which resulted in complaints from the neighbors.<sup>84</sup> Due to the lack of access to running water,<sup>85</sup> restrooms were not provided either, which only worsened the hygiene issue. Kobal proposed to the local school board in Ljubljana that it finance the construction of a plumbing system with the profits from the produce sales.<sup>86</sup>

Another shortcoming of the central school garden was the lack of suitable storage space for seeds, tubers, and bulbs. There was also no shelter for teachers and pupils during inclement weather.<sup>87</sup> Kobal also proposed installing an apiary to provide the Ljubljana primary and secondary school youth with a practical introduction to economical and advanced beekeeping. Kobal had also been a beekeeper since 1911 and owned twenty hives, and he expressed his willingness to move these to the central school garden.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Naprava ograje, 11 February 1928.

<sup>80</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Proračun za leto 1928, 4 October 1927.

<sup>81</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Naprava ograje, 11 February 1928.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Prošnja za dovolitev naprave gnojaka in vodovoda, 5 September 1928.

<sup>84</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Proračun za leto 1928, 4 October 1927.

<sup>85</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo o centralnem šolskem vrtu, ki ga je podal upravitelj na anketi dne 10. 1. 1929 v posvetovalnici mestnega magistrata v Ljubljani.

<sup>86</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Prošnja za dovolitev naprave gnojaka in vodovoda, 5 September 1928.

<sup>87</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Uprava centralnega šolskega vrta, 2 July 1928.

<sup>88</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Naprava čebelnjaka, 14 August 1929.

Protecting the central school garden with a fence and setting up all the necessary infrastructure would allow Kobal to fulfill his contractual obligations to improve the garden and increase its yield to cover the municipality's related financial expenditures.<sup>89</sup> He had ambitious ideas regarding the garden's improvement. However, over the years, he became less willing to keep pointing out shortcomings and abandoned some of his plans. For example, he had initially planned to intensively cultivate dwarf fruit trees, ornamental shrubs, roses, and perennials, but abandoned these plans due to constant theft.<sup>90</sup> He acknowledged the municipality's financial contribution to the garden's maintenance but also complained about the still insufficient investments, which had forced him to "focus on primitive gardening and the simplest crops while abandoning the cultivation of all high-quality produce that would nevertheless be stolen."<sup>91</sup>

With such management, the central school garden in fact lost its essence. The city authorities insisted that its financial contribution was sufficient and expected the land allocated for the garden to be cultivated more intensively and to produce quality crops. They accused Kobal of devaluing the purpose of the school garden with his "primitive commercial methods" of growing lots of fruit trees, cucumbers, cabbage, kale, etc. He sold the produce, which was not in accordance with the mission of the teaching profession.<sup>92</sup> Due to the conflict of interest between the municipality and the central school garden management, the city authorities proposed redeveloping the garden, reducing its size, and transforming the remainder of the land into a "promotional urban garden."<sup>93</sup> The latter could serve as a model for garden owners and other horticulture enthusiasts in Ljubljana. Reducing the size of the central school garden would make it easier to maintain and allow it to fulfill its actual purpose. To implement the proposal, the municipality organized a meeting at the beginning of January 1929 to discuss the issue. It was attended by the representatives of the Ljubljana Local School Board; experts in the field of agronomy; the administrator of the central school garden; Andrej Skulj, the government supervisor in charge of school gardens; the manager of the Barje primary school, which had a well-maintained school garden; and Anton Likozar, who represented the mayor, Dinko Puc.<sup>94</sup> During the meeting, a decision was made to divide the central school garden into two sections. One section, which was connected to the school, would be managed by Josip Kobal, while the rest of the land would be converted into a municipal garden center overseen by an expert who answered to the city authorities.<sup>95</sup> Both sections would be financed from the municipal budget.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Naprava ograje, 11 February 1928.

<sup>90</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo o centralnem šolskem vrtu, ki ga je podal upravitelj na anketi dne 10. 1. 1929 v posvetovalnici mestnega magistrata v Ljubljani

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>92</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Mestni gradbeni urad Ljubljana, uradno poročilo, 8 November 1928.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>94</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Zapisnik sestavljen povodom sestanka strokovnjakov, sklicanih od Krajevnega šolskega odbora ljubljanskega, v svrhu delitve in ureditve Centralnega šolskega vrta v Ljubljani, dne 10. 1. 1929 v mestni posvetovalnici.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>96</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Naprava ograje,

The shortcomings resulting from a lack of suitable infrastructure, which Kobal had been pointing out all along, soon became apparent when the city garden center decided not to plant better high-quality ornamental plants on the unfenced plot due to theft.<sup>97</sup> Kobal's efforts to get a fence built stretched into the 1930s without any success. Moreover, in a letter to the Ban's Administration dated March 7, 1932, the municipality made it clear that the central school garden had always been a financial burden for the city.<sup>98</sup> In the fiscal year of 1931/32, it was no longer able to include it in the annual budget. It justified this decision by referring to the National Schools Act provision that did not categorically require municipalities to financially maintain school gardens if it was not possible for them to do so. However, the city authorities claimed they were unable to finance the garden due to extreme restrictions imposed on the municipal budget by the Ministry of Finance in response to the Great Depression.<sup>99</sup> Article 22 of the National Schools Act stipulated that municipalities had to allocate land for school gardens "according to their capabilities."<sup>100</sup> The legislation therefore provided for the possibility of allocating land rather than options for supporting the land financially. This called their argument and the different interpretations of the provision into question.

Nevertheless, the municipality's second argument was well-founded, which was also reflected in the drafting of the 1931/32 budget. During its preparation, the Ban's Administration took into account the initial consequences of the economic crisis. At the first meeting of the Ban's Council on January 20, 1931, Ban Drago Marušič presented the basic premises on which the budget for 1931/32 had been drawn up: work, austerity, and economy.<sup>101</sup> Interestingly, Ban Marušič denied the city's claim that it was unable to finance the central school garden and the attached playground.<sup>102</sup> Both facilities were of significant educational, training, and health importance, and following a decree from the Ministry of Education on February 8, 1931 and a decision proposed at the Banate School Committee session of March 6, 1931, Ban Marušič decided to maintain and improve this institution with the necessary infrastructure—first and foremost a fence. To relieve the municipality of its financial burden, he proposed that the garden be operated commercially, though not to the detriment of its fundamental educational purpose.<sup>103</sup>

The city authorities disagreed with the decision of the Ban's Administration and the Ministry of Education, and appealed to the State Council of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, which was the highest administrative court in the country.<sup>104</sup> The State Council found that

---

10 September 1930.

<sup>97</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Poročilo in predlogi glede preureditve Centralnega šolskega vrta, 19 April 1929.

<sup>98</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Ureditev centralnega šolskega vrta, 21 March 1932.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> Official Gazette of the Royal Ban's Administration of the Drava Banate, 28 January 1930, vol. 1, No. 25, 283.

<sup>101</sup> Dobaja 2018: 51.

<sup>102</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Kraljevska banska uprava dravske banovine v Ljubljani, 14 March 1931.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Državni svet kraljevine Jugoslavije, 9 December 1933.

the municipality was not obliged to maintain the central school garden and playground according to the National Schools Act and ruled in favor of the City of Ljubljana. The Ljubljana municipality had voluntarily contributed land for the garden and playground in 1921. It was not obligated to do so under the National Schools Act, so its contribution and the maintenance of the garden and playground was a voluntary act that it could withdraw from at any time.<sup>105</sup> The Supreme Administrative Court's decision marked the end of the central school garden and the playground. At the beginning of 1934, the city's school supervisor informed the local school board that the central school garden and playground had been abolished.

The city authorities and all other interested parties that had contributed to the creation of the central school garden and playground in Ljubljana were aware of these facilities' general importance for the city's youth. However, their practical implementation had been accompanied by conflicts of interest and Kobal's constant pleas and efforts to ensure the required infrastructure. During this constant struggle for the garden and the playground, the educational process nevertheless proceeded. The pupils and teachers from Ljubljana's primary and secondary schools visited the garden and enjoyed the playground. The teachers Škrinjar and Rugelj, who were in charge of the playground and supported Kobal, kept warning the school board that the playground was untidy and unattractive for children.<sup>106</sup> They requested that it intervene with the city government to obtain financial resources for the playground, which was located in a meadow that flooded and became inaccessible during heavy rains. The two teachers suggested that the drains should be cleaned and the playground be covered with sand and equipped with a fence. There needed to be fruit trees planted and benches placed under the trees to provide shelter during the warmer months, and there was a plan to build a running track around the playground. City workers started building it, but it was never completed. There also needed to be gymnastic equipment in the center. Like Kobal, the two teachers pointed out the need for plumbing, sanitary facilities, a shelter in case of bad weather, and a storage room for the tools for the central school garden.<sup>107</sup> Their pleas fell on deaf ears.

### 3.1. The central school garden and playground attendance

These issues were also reflected in attendance. The central school garden was meant to be visited by primary and secondary school pupils starting from the fifth grade. Attendance was generally poor, erratic, and the children were unsupervised. Some of the classes did not visit the garden or would only drop by briefly, and the children were not actively involved. They would listen to the teachers' explanations and observe.<sup>108</sup> In his 1928 report, the government school garden supervisor Andrej Skulj pointed this out and suggested that pupils should be given special beds to tend to on their own, from sowing to

---

<sup>105</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, centralni šolski vrt – ukinitev, 21 February 1934.

<sup>106</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Uredba igrišča, 2 June 1926.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>108</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Uradno poročilo o stanju in preureditvi Centralnega šolskega vrta, 8 November 1928.

harvest. This would bring out their creativity,<sup>109</sup> which was also one of the primary purposes of school gardens as a teaching tool that would put the work school principles into practice.

To ensure that the central school garden actually fulfilled its purpose, in an official report on the state and redevelopment of the garden dated November 8, 1928, the municipal building office asked the local school board to ensure day-long visits by all classes at least every two weeks, weather permitting.<sup>110</sup> Poor attendance was not only the result of the municipality's meager contributions but also of the schools themselves failing to properly organize visits. The local school board need to be more vigorous in organizing visits and ensuring the children participated more actively in the central school garden. The city construction office also praised the work of the garden administrator and the two teachers who were mainly in charge of the playground and rejected accusations that they were to blame for poor attendance.<sup>111</sup>

The education department kept records of visits for each school year. The following are the figures for the years available in the archives:

In the school year 1927/28, 58 classes visited the central school garden and playground 137 times. The total number of visitors was 3,028.<sup>112</sup> The education department was pleased with the attendance and confident it would improve further once the garden and the playground were finally completed. Dr. Karel Capuder, the acting education inspector who reviewed the attendance data, pointed out lower attendance during the holidays, when mostly only those children who lived nearby visited the facilities.<sup>113</sup> He believed that parents were mostly responsible for the poor attendance because they were not aware of the importance of the garden and the playground for education, training, and well-being. This was particularly true for those children who stayed in the city during the holidays. He hoped that after the garden and the playground were completed, the number of visitors would also increase during the holidays. He asked the education department to make the teachers aware of the importance of the school garden and to encourage youth to visit during their free time and holidays.<sup>114</sup>

In the school year 1928/29, 40 classes visited the central school garden and playground 174 times. The total number of visitors was 3,870.<sup>115</sup> A comparison with the previous school year shows that, although fewer classes visited the garden, they did so more often. The number of visitors increased as well. This school year was more successful because of opportunities for the pupils to actively participate. The garden administrator implemented the recommendations from experts: in the spring, he allocated a twelve-acre plot of land to individual schools. The pupils independently cultivated the plot, and they actively participated in the garden activities under the supervision of their class teachers. The administrator provided the required seeds, seedlings, and tools. All the crops were their property.<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>112</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Obisk centralnega šolskega vrta in igrišča, 26 October 1928.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>115</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Obisk vrta, 20 November 1929.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*

Sources in the archives testify to Kobal's efforts to improve the quality of the garden and contribute to the visitors' well-beings. In the 1928/29 school year, he also created a small botanical garden that included interesting plants, including poisonous ones.<sup>117</sup>

In the school year 1929/30, attendance was the least satisfactory compared to the other two years, with a total of only 1,638 visitors,<sup>118</sup> and 55 classes visited the central school garden and playground 120 times. In his report to the education department, the administrator especially praised the teachers at the special needs school, who had taken over 1.5 acres of the garden and cultivated it together with the children.<sup>119</sup> They had also visited the garden most often. Their gardening efforts were probably also a part of the educational work with children with special needs.

The administrator blamed the lack of appropriate infrastructure in the garden and playground for such poor attendance, which he pointed out every year. During this school year, he also took an innovative approach to improving the number of visits, which was comparable to modern holiday childcare. He sent a request to primary school headmasters for lists of children who would like to come to the garden and the playground during the holidays. Only the first primary school for girls responded and sent a list of 26 names with the comment that the playground was not usable due to inadequate facilities, including the lack of drinking water, toilets, and shelter in case of bad weather.<sup>120</sup> The special needs school saw the administrator's proposal as a replacement for holiday colonies and pointed out the social and health aspects. During the summer holidays, it was mainly the poorer children who stayed in the city, and they were malnourished and exposed to an unhealthy environment at home. Thus, the special needs school management pointed out that spending holidays in the garden and playground would be feasible if there was the necessary infrastructure and a possibility for hot meals to be served.<sup>121</sup>

According to school board records, in the school year 1930/31, 60 classes visited the central school garden and playground 174 times.<sup>122</sup> The record states that 4,301 children visited the garden and the playground, with the caveat that a single class had been taken into account more than once,<sup>123</sup> meaning the garden and the playground were not always visited by the same number of children from the same class, perhaps due to their absence from school. In this school year, the administrator's report to the education department was somewhat more optimistic about the involvement of pupils and teachers. Under the guidance of their class teachers, the pupils carried out easier gardening tasks, learned about garden tools, and observed the changes in the garden during the different seasons. He especially praised the efforts of the pupils from the special needs school and the first primary school for girls, who cared for their flowerbeds even during the holidays. All the produce

---

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Izkaz o obisku centralnega šolskega vrta in igrišča v Ljubljani v šolskem letu 1929/30.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>120</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Centralni šolski vrt, uporaba, 7 July 1930.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>122</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Obisk vrta, 29 July 1931.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*

was the property of the children.<sup>124</sup>

The administrator's arguments that the garden and playground infrastructure needed to be completed became increasingly scarce, probably because he was aware that his requests would not be heard. During the Great Depression, which was increasingly felt in the Drava Banate as well, the prospects became even bleaker. The city's budget for 1932 reveals that the local school board was no longer including maintenance costs for the central school garden and the playground in the school budget.<sup>125</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

The concept of a school garden as a teaching tool started developing in the Slovenian region during the nineteenth century and continued to develop in accordance with European trends. As a predominantly agrarian area, this region did not lag behind the more developed countries as far as putting school gardens into practice was concerned. Rural school gardens were at the forefront. By employing work school principles, they educated future farmers and homemakers, and instilled in young people a positive attitude towards nature and work, which were seen as two of the nation's fundamental values during this period.

The urban school gardens also had an important health component: They allowed youth to exercise in the fresh air, which strengthened them against social diseases, and tuberculosis in particular. In Ljubljana, the central school garden and its accompanying playground represented an attempt to also implement this aspect. However, they failed to fulfill their purpose due to infrastructural shortcomings, which the garden administrator often brought to the attention of the municipal authorities.

#### REFERENCES:

##### Archive sources:

Historical Archive Ljubljana, Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana (SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397).

##### Periodicals:

*Dolenjski list*, Novo mesto, 1972.

*Ljubljanski Zvon*, Ljubljana, 1888

*Popotnik. List za šolo in dom*, Celje, 1880.

*Popotnik. List za šolo in dom*, Maribor, 1883.

*Učiteljski tovariš. List za šolo in dom*, Ljubljana, 1871, 1885.

*Učiteljski tovariš. Glasilo avstrijskega jugoslovanskega učiteljstva*, Ljubljana, 1912.

*Učiteljski tovariš. Glasilo Udruženja Jugoslovanskega učiteljstva*, Ljubljana, 1922, 1926.

*Učiteljski tovariš. Stanovsko politiško glasilo J. U. U. – sekcije za Dravsko banovino v Ljubljani*, 1934.

---

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>125</sup> SI\_ZAL\_LJU/0397 Krajevni šolski odbor Ljubljana, container 3, item 36, Proračun centralnega šolskega vrta za leto 1932, 7 December 1931.



Official paper:

Uradni list kraljevske banske uprave Dravske banovine, 1, 25, 28. 1. 1930.

References:

- Bavdaž, M. 'Šolski vrt – vznik in izoblikovanje mnogostranskega učno-vzgojnega sredstva po sprejemu avstrijskega državnega ljudsko-šolskega zakona v letu 1869', *Šolska kronika*, 24, 3, 2015, 297–309.
- Dobaja, D. *Za blagor mater in otrok. Zaščita mater in otrok 1919–1941*, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2018.
- Heinz, F. *Handbuch der Gesetze und Verordnungen über das Volksschul-Wesen für Krain*, Laibach: Kleinmayr & Fed. Bamberg, 1895.
- Hojan, T. 'Prvi kmetijski tečaji za učitelje po sprejetju osnovnošolskega zakona leta 1869', *Šolska kronika*, 24, 3, 2015, 338–348.
- Jaunig, S., Zupanič Slavec, Z. 'Tuberkuloza, naša ljudska, delavska in kmetijska bolezen', *Zgodovinski časopis*, 66, 3–4, 2012, 362–385.
- Lazarevič, Z. *Kmečki dolgovi na Slovenskem*, Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče Ljubljana, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Plasti prostora in časa. Iz gospodarske zgodovine Slovenije prve polovice 20. stoletja*, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Delo in zemlja. Male študije kmečkega sveta*, Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2022.
- Okoliš, S. *Zgodovina šolstva na Slovenskem*, Ljubljana: Slovenski šolski muzej, 2008.
- Protner, E. 'Razvoj i aktualno stanje alternativnih pedagoških koncepatov u Sloveniji', *Acta Iadertina*, 14, 1, 2017, 115–130.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Vzpostavitev slovenskega šolskega sistema leta 1919', *Studia Historica Slovenica*, 20, 2, 2020, 395–450.
- Ribarič, M. 'Razstava "Učilnica v naravi: šolski vrt včeraj, danes, jutri" Slovenski šolski muzej, november 2014–september 2016', *Šolska kronika*, 24, 3, 2015, 261–271.
- Šalehar, A. Rupnik, S. Lotrič, M. Ž. *Gustav Pirc (1859–1923)*, Slovenj Gradec: Kmetijska založba, 2011.
- Schmidt, V. *Zgodovina šolstva in pedagogike na Slovenskem III. (1848–1870)*, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1966.
- Zupanič Slavec, Z. *Razvoj javnega zdravstva na Slovenskem med prvo in drugo svetovno vojno in njegov utemeljitelj dr. Ivo Pirc*, Ljubljana: Inštitut za varovanje zdravja RS, 2005.

Internet sources:

- Pogačnik, M. *Osrednja vloga šolskega vrta v kmetijskem izobraževanju*, Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Biotehniška fakulteta, Doktorska disertacija, 2013 in: [http://www.digitalna-knjiznica.bf.uni-lj.si/agronomija/dd\\_pogacnik\\_marijan.pdf](http://www.digitalna-knjiznica.bf.uni-lj.si/agronomija/dd_pogacnik_marijan.pdf)
- Wikipedia, »Moritz Schreber« in: [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moritz\\_Schreber](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moritz_Schreber)

ДУЊА ДОБАЈА

Институт за савремену историју, Љубљана

**ШКОЛСКИ ВРТОВИ У СЛОВЕНИЈИ КАО ОБРАЗОВНО СРЕДСТВО,  
СА НАГЛАСКОМ НА ЦЕНТРАЛНИ ШКОЛСКИ ВРТ У ЉУБЉАНИ  
У МЕЂУРАТНОМ ПЕРИОДУ**

**Резиме**

Овај прилог се фокусира на идеју о школским баштама као предавачком средству у области данашње Словеније од 19. века до средине тридесетих година 20. века, као и на њихову практичну примену. Рад указује да су словеначке покрајине пратиле европске трендове у погледу школских вртова у градским и сеоским срединама. Њихова сврха није била само да пружи практична упутства за природне науке, већ да у деци усаде позитивни однос према природи, послу и здрављу. У сеоским срединама, првенствени циљ био је да се едукују будући ратари и домаћице. Школски врт био је један од чинилаца у спровођењу принципа радне школе, чему су и едукатори у Словенији такође тежили. У Аустроугарској Државни закон о основним школама донет је 1869. године, а између осталих ствари је поставио темељ за школске вртове у учитељским и основним школама. На тај начин су школске баште постале део курикулума све до 1941. Државни закон о основним школама из 1869. фокусирао се на сеоске, пре него на градске школске вртове. Еразмус Шваб, аутор првог практичног приручника на ову тему, који је укључивао смернице за успостављање школских вртова, такође је разматрао важност школских вртова у градовима.

Идеја о школским баштама као наставног алата наставила је да постоји и у међуратном периоду, у оквиру нове југословенске државе. У ово доба Словенија је претежно била аграрно друштво и било је потешкоћа везаних за интензификацију производње. Једно од решења било је увођење школских вртова којима је међу младима требало усадити љубав према пољопривреди, нарочито воћарству и баштованству, знању земљорадничких задатака и позитиван однос према природи и раду. Када је основана Дравска бановина школски вртови у селима били су укључени у легислативу посредством националног Закона о школству, док су онима у градовима биле дате законске потврде једино ако је за то постојала могућност. У Љубљани већина школа није имала баште, због чега је основан централни школски врт, а потешкоће везане за њега су размотрене у раду.

**Кључне школски вртови, радне школе, Љубљана, Дравска бановина, пољопривреда.**

© Faculty of Philosophy, Novi Sad, 2023

ISTRAŽIVANJA – JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL RESEARCHES 34, 142-159