

ACTA  
ECCLESIASTICA  
SLOVENIAE  
28

---

**Metod Benedik  
JANEZ EVANGELIST KREK  
V SPISIH SODOBNIKOV**

---

**Bogdan Kolar  
IZ KRONIKE ŽUPNIJE  
GRAHOVO PRI CERKNICI  
V ČASU ŽUPNIKA ALOJZIJA WESTRA  
(1910-1928)**

---

**Edo Škulj  
KRONIKA ŽUPNIJE TURJAK**

---

LJUBLJANA 2006



# KAZALO

## Metod Benedik

<b>Janez Evangelist Krek v spisih sodobnikov</b>	7
Uvod	9
1. Anton Mrkun	10
2. Janez Hladnik	19
3. Peter Rogulja in Vinko Brajević	24
4. Miha Moškerc	31
5. Poslanec Störch	41
6. Krek in ljudska igra <i>Sveta Lucija</i>	42
7. Ivan Dolenc: <i>Predavanje o Kreku 1940</i>	44
8. Dolenčeve pripombe h knjigi Matija Škerbca <i>Pregled novodobnega slovenskega katoliškega gibanja</i> , Cleveland 1956, 1957	50
9. Ivan Podlesnik	89
10. Fran Šuklje	91
11. Franc Oswald	99
12. Mihael Arko	107
13. Ivan Dolenc Hermannu Wendlu za pripravo knjige <i>Aus dem südslaawischen Risorgimento</i>	110
14. Terezija Bučar	137
15. Anton Mahnič	139
16. Petar Grgec	140
Povzetek	143
Summary	149

## Bogdan Kolar

### *Iz kronike župnije Grahovo pri Cerknici v času župnika*

<i>Alojzija Westra (1910-1928)</i>	157
Uvod	159
Duhovniki v Grahovem	160
Župnik Alojzij Wester	162
Liber memorabilium	165
Iz kronike župnije Grahovo	169
Povzetek	214
Summary	216

**Edo Škulj**

<b>Kronika župnije Turjak</b> . . . . .	219
Uvod . . . . .	221
Kratka zgodovina turjaške župnije . . . . .	222
Historia brevis paroeciae auerspergicae . . . . .	223
Svetiče B.M.D. danes župnijska cerkev . . . . .	256
Sacellum B.M.V. hodie ecclesia parochialis . . . . .	257
Kronika župnije . . . . .	263
Turjaški župniki . . . . .	263
Dodatek – župnijski soupravitelji po drugi svetovni vojni . . . . .	293
Povzetek . . . . .	295
Summary . . . . .	299
<b>Navodila sodelavcem</b> . . . . .	305
<b>Publikacije Inštituta za zgodovino Cerkve</b> . . . . .	307
<b>Sinopse z naslovi avtorjev</b> . . . . .	311

## POVZETEK

Znani krekolog Ivan Dolenc je veliko časa in truda posvetil zbiranju najrazličnejšega gradiva o Janezu Ev. Kreku, ki je bil konec 19. in do smrti 1917 s svojim delovanjem zelo vpliven in odmeven v političnem, gospodarskem, socialnem in kulturnem življenju slovenskega naroda. Med tem gradivom je večje število Krekovih pisem raznim osebam; ta pisma so bila objavljena v AES št. 26 (2004). Nadaljujemo z objavo nekaterih krajših ali daljših spisov Krekovih sodobnikov, ki v različnih okoliščinah in pod različnimi vidiki pišejo o Kreku. Objava teh spisov, opremljena s potrebnimi pojasnili, še dodatno osvetluje lik te pomembne osebnosti, posebej pa je ta objava koristna za osvetljevanje manj znanih ali čisto neznanih ozadjih, v katerih so se rojevale posamezne poteze predvsem političnih, socialnih in kulturnih dogajanj na Slovenskem. Če upoštevamo širši okvir tedanjega časa, namreč razpad avstroogrsko-monarhične monarhije in iskanja novih poti slovenskega naroda, so ugotovitve, ki izhajajo iz tokrat objavljenih zapisov, še dragocenije. Med avtorji teh zapisov so najrazličnejši ljudje, od znanih političnih in kulturnih delavcev tedanjega časa, do Krekovih sodelavcev in priateljev ali tudi ljudi, ki so Kreka srečali zgolj ob posebnih priložnostih.

**Anton Mrkun (1876–1961)** je dolga leta tesno sodeloval z Janezom E. Krekom. Poleg nekaj pisem je posebej zanimiv Mrkunov spis o Kreku. Dobrih dvanajst strani dolg rokopis strnjeno predstavlja celo vrsto področij Krekove dejavnosti, vmes pa avtor naniza celo vrsto krajših pripomb, ki dobro osvetljujejo Krekov značaj, njegov odnos do ljudi in do stvari. Kot dolgoleten sodelavec in priatelj je Kreka dobro poznal in zato je ta zapis nedvomno prisnna osvetlitev Krekove osebnosti.

**Janez Hladnik (1863–1949)**, prav tako dolga leta Krekov priatelj in sodelavec napiše nekaj drobnih zanimivosti o Kreku: kot stolniški kaplan je zbiral dijake in jih učil slovanske jezike; ko je postal profesor, »je njegovo stanovanje bilo vedno polno obiskovalcev«, zlasti so k njemu prihajali delavci in se z njim pogovarjali o raznih delavskih in socialnih vprašanjih; »v njegovem stanovanju se je urejal delavski Glasnik, pri njem je bila tudi administracija liste«; bogoslovce je spodbujal k študiju socialnih vprašanj in delu na tem področju. Poudarja Krekovo osebno uboštvo: »gmotno je slabo stal«, ker je skoraj vse kar sproti razdal; tudi za svojo obleko ni kaj prida skrbel.

**Peter Pero Rogulja**, eden najbolj navdušenih Krekovih učencev na Hrvaskem in kasneje njegov zelo dejaven sodelavec za hrvaško področje, je s Krekom pogosto razpravljal o socialnih, gospodarskih in političnih vprašanjih na Hrvaskem. O Kreku in njegovem delu je pisal v dijaškem mesečniku Luč (Krk 1905). V Dolenčevi zbirki spisov o Kreku je rokopis njegovih misli o Kreku, kakor jih je podal v knjižici o Kreku leta 1916.

**Vinko Brajević (1888–1967)**, splitski duhovnik, je kot dober poznavalec Kreka in njegovega socialnega dela leta 1919 v Splitu objavil knjižico o Kreku.

**Miha Moškerc (1872–1924)**, časnikar in organizator, je po Krekovi smrti napisal tudi več člankov o Kreku in njegovem delu. Pri organiziraju krščansko socialnega delavstva je bil Krekova desna roka; sodeloval je pri organizaciji Vzajemnega podpornega društva (1892), Slovenskega katoliškega delavskega društva (1894), ljubljanskega delavskega konsumnega društva (1895) in še drugih. Kot eden tesnih Krekovih sodelavcev in soorganizator je leta 1920 pripravil strnjeno predstavitev SKSZ in Krekove vloge pri njej. V tem spisu poudarja, kako je Krek deloval v smeri, da bi se ob pobudah in pomoči SKSZ osnovala čim številčnejša izobraževalna društva na podeželju, v posameznih župnijah, ki naj bi jih usklajevali dekanjski odbori. Na poseben način so ta društva delovala po organiziranju številnih tečajev. Tako so se vrstili socialni tečaji, tečaji za ljudsko higieno, za knjigovodstvo, za strojepisanje, za stenografijo, za študij novejšega slovenskega slovstva ter jezikovni tečaji za nemški, italijanski, bolgarski in francoski jezik.

**Ivan Dolenc, Predavanje o Kreku 1940.** V predavanju so opazne nekatere podrobnosti, ki jih je lahko poznal le človek, ki je Kreku bil blizu tudi v njegovih domačih krajih, v Selcih, na Prtovču in v Dražgošah. Dolenc ga je pripravil za Slovensko stražo, ki je ob 75-letnici Krekovega rojstva v Ljubljani priredila spominsko slovesnost. Glavni poudarki: za potrebe kmečkega stanu je Krek po vsej domovini ustanavljal hranilnice in posojilnice, nabavne in prodajne zadruge, električne in strojne zadruge; delal je za kmečki in delavski stan. Po ocenah poznavalcev je ob različnih priložnostih imel nad 3.000 govorov in po različnih publikacijah dvakrat toliko člankov. Ena značilnih in stalno prisotnih Krekovih načel se je glasilo: »Dajmo ljudstvu idej, učimo ga misliti ... Samostojnih mislecev hočemo v narodu ... Misleč narod hočemo imeti. Vzgoje je treba in ne dresure, moške, značajne katoliške zavesti in ne slepe pokorščine!«

**Ivan Dolenec, Nekaj pripomb k Škerbčevem Pregledu.** Matija Škerbec je 1956/57 v Clevelandu USA v dveh delih objavil *Pregled novodobnega slovenskega katoliškega gibanja*. Precej enostranske ocene nekaterih ključnih dogajanj in oseb so spodbudile Dolenca, da je k temu napisal svoje pripombe (rokopis 44 strani). Posebej so ga zmotile Škerbčeve ocene Kreka in Šuštersiča oziroma odnosa med tema vodilnima možema na Slovenskem ob prelому stoletij. Da bi sam prišel do čim stvarnejše slike, se je ob intenzivnem osebnem študiju predvsem naslonil na mnenja in zapise nekaterih sodobnikov, ki so izhajali iz različnih idejnih in političnih smeri ter imeli dosti vpogleda v dogajanja posebej na političnem in socialnem področju. Tako v tem Dolenčevem spisu srečamo celo vrsto ljudi, od zelo znanih ljudi javnega življenja do tistih, ki so delovali bolj v ozadju, ob tem pa imeli dosti uvida tudi v ozadja posameznih dogajanj. Prav glede na zelo široko paleto Dolenčevih »sogovernikov« ima ta njegov spis občutno težo, ki je brez njih ne bi imel: hitro bi se lahko sklicevali na dejstvo, da je bil Dolenec Krekov prijatelj in je zato pri opisu preveč enostranski.

Najprej obravnava spor med Krekom in Šuštersičem, ki ni le trenutna in seveda tudi ne zgolj njuna osebna zadeva, ampak gre za trajnejše razhajanje, ki je glede na vplivnost obeh mož ustvarilo različne poglede na nekatera temeljna politična in socialna vprašanja tedanjega časa v slovenskem narodu, s tem pa tudi oblikovalo idejno različno usmerjene skupnosti, ki so si med seboj v določenih primerih precej nasprotovale, kar je seveda v končnih posledicah za slovenski narod bilo zelo slabo. Potem spregovori o Krekovih prizadevanjih in zaslugah za razvoj zadružništva na Slovenskem, pri čemer poudarja še eno značilno Krekovo potezo, ki je bila za tiste okoliščine še kako pomembna. Veliko si je namreč prizadeval, da bi se po posameznih krajih izšolali ljudje, ki bi sami bili sposobni voditi zadruge in druge gospodarske, socialne in tudi kulturne ustanove; duhovščina naj bi se umikala z vodilnih mest, ta naj bi postopoma prevzemali dobro usposobljeni laiki. Dotakne se nekaterih potez Krekovega zasebnega življenja. Najprej spregovori o Krekovi zvezi z Josipino Eržen, s katero je imel sina. Piše o raznih govoricah, ki so se glede tega širile v krogih Krekovih znancev. Dolenec poudarja, da tudi v takem primeru ne gre prikrivati resnice. Navaja besede uglednega prošta Andreja Kalana, ki je menil, da »Krek zaradi tega ni nič manjši«. Seveda se ne more izogniti tako imenovane Theimeričine afere. Tokrat se Dolencu ob množici različnih presoj zdi umestno posebej upoštevati misli župnika Josipa Abrama, ki je bil dolga leta Krekov prijatelj; dostikrat sta se srečala in se veliko pogovarjala in se

lahko trdi, da je Abram Kreka poznal tako dobro kot le redko kdo drug. O Kreku je zapisal: »Jaz ga imam za svetnika, čeprav bi bilo vse res, kar se mu je podtikal«.

**Ivan Podlesnik (1881–1936)**, gospodarski organizator, je 1900 stopil v službo pri Ljudski posojilnici ter postal zelo zavzet Krekov sodelavec pri snavanju izobraževalnih društev in gospodarskih zadrug. Piše v zvezi s Theimeričino afero in je prepričan, da so v ozadju razne politične spletke; boli ga, da so spletkam nasedli mnogi nekdanji Krekovi sodelavci in prijatelji, še posebej pa, da se je tudi pri številnih duhovnikih ustalilo »prepričanje, da je res, kar se je Kreku očitalo«. Nekateri posamezniki iz vrst duhovštine so Kreka zelo grdo obsojali.

**Fran Šuklje (1849–1935)**. Konec leta 1911 je Šuklje odstopil s položaja kranjskega deželnega glavarja. O vzrokih, zakaj se je odločil za ta korak, kdo so bili kandidati za njegovega naslednika in kako je Šušteršič postal njegov naslednik, se je takrat veliko pisalo. Kako je na to zadevo gledal Krek, je Dolenc dokaj obširno pisal v zgoraj navedenem spisu *Nekaj pripomb k Škerbčevemu Pregledu*. Šukljeta je, razumljivo, zanimalo, kakšna je bila resnična vloga Kreka pri tem in se je o zadevi pozanimal pri najbolj uveljavljenemu krekoščigovi. Dolenčevega odgovora Šukljetu žal ne poznamo, gotovo pa njegove misli povzema stenografirani osnutek odgovora. Več kot dve desetletiji kasneje, ko je zadevo že bilo možno presojati z mirne oddaljenosti, je Šuklje glede tega zapisal jasno besedo v svoji knjigi *Sodobniki*.

**Franc Oswald (1871–1932)**, doma iz Idrije, se je s Krekom ne le seznanil ampak začel tudi tvorno sodelovati še kot bogoslovec leta 1893. Od študentskih let naprej se je zelo zanimal za socialna vprašanja in pri tem bil močno povezan s Krekom. Z njim si je dopisoval in ga ob nekaterih priložnostih tudi povabil v Idrijo. Oswald piše, kako je leta 1893 prišlo do ustanovitve »Katoliške delavske družbe« v Idriji, kakšno vlogo je pri tem imel Krek in kako je potem »hodil redno dolgo dobo leta za letom v Idrijo« ter »stopil v najtesnejši stik z rudarji in gozdnimi delavci«, jih poučeval in jim svetoval. Poudarja Krekove misli: *Ni nam na tem, da premrežimo zemljo slovensko samo s tovarniškimi dimniki, ampak tudi na tem, da napravimo slovenskemu delavstvu dom, dom sreče in zadovoljnosti. Človek je več kot samo telo. Zato v boj za čast in dostojnost dela, proseč blagoslova iz nebes, ki nam daje samozavest, da smo več kot stroj. V tem smislu vihraj, zastava, pred delavskimi četami!* Krekova dejavnost na Idrijskem je eden številnih primerov, ki kažejo, da

se je nenehno zavzemal tako za kmečko kot za delavsko prebivalstvo. Ta - njegova široko razvejana socialna usmerjenost je nedvomno ena osnovnih značilnosti, ki so ga razlikovale od Šušteršiča; slednji je namreč gradil predvsem na kmečkem prebivalstvu. Krekovo videnje trenutnih razmer in prihodnosti slovenskega naroda po tem, ko je v vojno stopila Italija, zelo nazorno kažejo njegove besede v zadnjem odstavku Oswaldovega pisma. Medtem ko je Šušteršič pozival Slovence k organiziranju prostovoljnih strelcev v obrambo zahodne meje in k vplačevanju vojnega posojila, je Krek in njegova skupina v SLS je temu odločno nasprotovala. Tako so se znotraj SLS oblikovala vse večja razhajanja tako glede strategije kot glede ciljev v narodni politiki. Spor se ni več zgladil, temveč se je le še poglabljal do končnega razcepa jeseni 1917.

**Arko Mihael (1857–1938)**, od 1897 do smrti župnik in dekan v Idriji, kot bližnji in dolgoletni Šušteršičev sodelavec Dolencu pojasnuje, kako se sam spominja okoliščin, v katerih je Šušteršič za Šukljetom postal deželni glavar. Kot je videti, pa Arku ni bilo natančneje znano, kdaj in čemu so se začela nasprotstva med Šušteršičem in Krekom.

**Ivan Dolenec Hermannu Wendlu.** Nemški zgodovinar Wendel je pripravljal knjigo *Aus dem südslawischen Risorgimento*. Prosil je Dolenca, naj mu pripravi obširnejšo predstavitev Kreka, da bi ga lahko primerno umestil v to knjigo. Dolenec je pripravil tipkopis na 29 straneh, k temu pa je več pripomb pripisal tudi Anton Mrkun. Knjiga je izšla leta 1921. Politične in kulturne razmere, kakršne so se postopno oblikovale od začetka 20. stoletja in konec drugega desetletja privedle do velikih sprememb na tem območju, avtor obravnava ob predstavitvah posameznih velikih osebnosti. Poglavlja se vrste takole: Dositej Obradović, Ljudevit Gaj, Die Omladina, Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Svetozar Marković in Janez Krek (na straneh 167–193). V prvem delu poglavja z naslovom Janez Krek Wendel sicer kratko predstavi Kreka, dejansko pa opisuje razmere na Slovenskem, kakršne so se vzpostavile v revolucionarnem letu 1848, pri čemer posebej poudarja živahno kulturno življenje. Potem se spet vrne h Kreku in zapiše značilne besede: *Kar je Krek na Dunaju (ko je prišel tja na študij) zelo jasno spoznal, ni bilo cesarsko mesto in glasba in Prater in zabavišča, ampak delavska naselja, v katerih socialne potrebe na tisoč načinov kriče po rešitvi. Napeto je spremljal začetke krščanskosocialnega gibanja, prve korake k uresničevanju nauka barona Vogelsanga, ki je kapitalistično imetje opredelil kot 'krajo Bogu, družbi in državi'. Debela knjiga človeškega trpljenja, ki jo je listal ne le s čustvi ampak tudi z jasnim razumom,*

je na mladega duhovnika naredila neprimerno globlji vtis, kot bi ga moglo pustiti bivanje doma med štirimi stenami. Srce mu je burno utripalo, ko je doživeljal svojo notranjo preobrazbo in ko se je 1892 po študiju vračal domov, je iz njegovih oči sijala gotovost razgibane prihodnosti, kot mu je preprosto bivanje v neki podeželski kranjski župniji ne bi moglo ponuditi. Wendel zatem pripoveduje o začetkih Krekovega socialnega dela, pri čemer posebej poudarja pomen Slovenske krščanske socialne zveze, ki je slednjič zajemala 476 raznih združenj ter imela okoli 42.000 članov. Govori o številnih gospodarskih združenjih, ki so nastala na Krekovo pobudo in bila povezana v Gospodarsko zvezo oziroma Zadružno zvezo. Ko piše o Krekovi mnogovrstni izobraženosti, znanju številnih jezikov, posebej slovanskih, o njegovi široki razgledanosti, poudarja, kako se je Krek bolj kot kdorkoli zavzemal za šolanje in izobraževanje mladih ljudi: Njegova Slovenska katoliška delavska družba je bila osnovna celica, iz katere so vzklile številne vzgojne in izobraževalne ustanove; njegovi tečaji krščanskosocialne zveze, s katerimi je začel v Ljubljani, so se razraščali v pravo ljudsko visoko šolo za politične vede, za govorništvo in za trgovstvo. Tudi v najbolj odročni vasici je želel dopovedati, da poleg hoje za plugom in gojenja govedi obstajajo duhovne vrednote, za katere se je treba potruditi, da bi življenje postavili na višjo raven. Zato mu je posebej draga bila mladina, ki se je pri Sv. Joštu in drugod zbirala okoli njega. Wendel v svoji knjigi ne more obiti Krekove politične dejavnosti ne doma, na Kranjskem, ne v dunajskem parlamentu. Poudarja njegovo zavzetost tako za kmečko prebivalstvo kot za delavstvo, njegovo jasno besedo, njegovo odločnost in pokončnost: Zaradi spoštovanja do resnice se ni obotavljal izreči razločne besede, četudi so se zaradi tega obenj spotikali njegovi strankarski tovariši ali ozke duhovniške duše. Če je v dunajskem parlamentu bilo najavljeno, da bo govoril Krek, so se poslanci, ki so se bili razpršili, nemudoma spet zbrali v dvorani. Ta neznaten, srednje velik mož širokih ramen v skromnem duhovniškem talarju z izrazitimi, pa ne strogimi potezami, s čelom intelektualca, z odločnim pogledom izza okroglih očal, je imel v sebi moč besede, ki je osvajala. Jasno in stvarno mu je tekla beseda, znal se je držati bistva zadeve. Mogel je zatrdiriti, da sovraži nepoštenost, hinavščino in politično dvoličnost, pri čemer pa ne pozna sovrašta do človeka, do politične stranke, do nekega naroda. Poglavlje o Kreku Wendel sklepa s pregledom dogajanj med svetovno vojno in Krekove vizije prihodnosti slovenskega naroda v povezavi z južnoslovanskimi narodi zahajajoče habsburške monarhije.

**Terezija Bučar**, preprosta delavka iz Ljubljane, je Dolencu napisala nekaj osebnih spominov na Kreka. Izstopa misel, kako ja bil Krek iskreno in pristno povezan z delavci, jim znal prisluhniti, bil domač in preprost s preprostimi ljudmi. Na neposreden in razumljiv način je znal ljudem spregovoriti in jih poučevati ter spodbujati.

**Anton Mahnič (1850–1920)**, 1881 profesor bibličnih ved v goriškem bogoslovnem učilišču, od 1896 škof na Krku. Tudi kot krški škof se je živo zanimal za razmere na Slovenskem in ves čas ostajal močno povezan z vodilnimi slovenskimi osebnostmi. Ob koncu leta 1915, ko sta se slovenski in hrvaški narod znašla v skrajno ogroženem položaju, je bil iniciator narodno-politične akcije škofov goriške metropolije, katere rezultat je bila spomenica dunajski vladi 5. januarja 1916. Ko se je začelo gibanje za majniško deklaracijo, ga je Mahnič navdušeno pozdravil. Aktivno je podpiral gibanje za državno-pravno združitev južnoslovanskih narodov, ki so dotelež živeli v okvirih habsburške monarhije. Močno ga je prizadelo, da na Slovenskem prihaja do vse bolj vidnih sporov znotraj stranke, ki naj bi močna in enotna vodila narod v teh usodnih trenutkih. V pismu Kreka roti, naj naredi vse, da bi prenehali prepiri in se vzpostavila nujno potrebna edinost.

**Petar Grgec (1890–1962)**, pred prvo svetovno vojno urednik več listov, po letu 1919 profesor na škofijski gimnaziji v Zagrebu. Večkrat se je udeležil Krekovih tečajev o socialnih vprašanjih pri Sv. Joštu. Predvsem v listih Luč in Hrvatska prosvjeta je marsikatero Krekovo misel posredoval hrvaškemu okolju. V pismu Dolencu piše, kako on in njegovi sodelavci zbirajo gradivo o Kreku. Predvsem pa je iz pisma jasno vidno, kako je bil Krek na Hrvaškem dobro znan in cenjen.

## SUMMARY

### Metod Benedik,

### *Janez Evangelist Krek in the records of his contemporaries*

An authority on Krek, Ivan Dolenc spent much time and effort in collecting different material on Janez Evangelist Krek. J.E.Krek was a very influential and notable figure in political, economic, social and cultural life of the Slovene nation at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until his death in 1917. The material includes a large number of Krek's letters to different people. The letters were published in AES Vol.26 (2004). We continue with the publication of

some shorter or longer treatises of Krek's contemporaries who wrote about him under different circumstances and from different viewpoints. The publication of the treatises with the necessary explanations sheds even a clearer light on this important figure. The importance of the publications lies in particular in illuminating less or even completely unknown backgrounds of the political, social and cultural events in Slovenia. Taking into account a wider frame of the time, namely the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the search for new ways for the Slovene nation, the value of the publications is even greater. The authors of the treaties range from famous political and cultural figures of the time to Krek's collaborators and friends and also people who met Krek on special occasions.

**Anton Mrkun (1876–1961)** cooperated with J.E.Krek closely for a number of years. Alongside a few letters, Mrkun's essay on Krek is of particular interest. A good twelve pages long manuscript brings a condensed presentation of a whole range of Krek's activities. Included are numerous observations on Krek's character, his relationship to people and things. Being Krek's collaborator and friend for many years, Mrkun knew him very well and therefore the essay is doubtlessly a genuine portrait of Krek's personality.

**Janez Hladnik (1863–1949)**, also Krek's collaborator and friend for many years, notes down a few interesting details about Krek: as the cathedral's vicar he gathered students and taught them the Slavic languages; when he became Professor, "his apartment was always full of visitors", especially workers who came to discuss different workers' and social questions; "in his apartment the workers' newspaper *Glasnik* was edited and managed"; he encouraged semi-narians to study and engage in social questions. Hladnik stresses Krek's personal poverty: "financially he was badly off" because he gave away almost everything he had every day; he also took little care about his clothing.

**Peter Pero Rogulja**, one of the most enthusiastic of Krek's students in Croatia and later his very active collaborator for Croatia, often discussed with Krek social, economic and political questions in Croatia. He wrote about Krek and his work in the students' monthly magazine *Luč* (Krk, 1905). Ivan Dole-nec' collection of essays on Krek includes a manuscript of Rogulja's reflections on Krek as published in a booklet about Krek in 1916.

**Vinko Brajević (1888–1967)**, a priest from Split (Croatia) was an expert on Krek and his social work. In 1919 he published a booklet on Krek in Split.

**Miha Moškerc (1872–1924)**, a journalist and organizer, wrote a number of articles about Krek and his work after Krek's death. He was Krek's right-hand man at organizing the Christian Social Workers; he took an active part in organizing the Mutual Aid Association (1892), the Slovene Catholic Working Men's Association (1894), Ljubljana Working men's Cooperative Society (1895) and others. As one of Krek's close co-operators and co-organizers he prepared a condensed presentation of the Slovenian Christian Social Union (SCSU) and Krek's role therein. He stresses Krek's endeavour to establish with the initiative and help of SCSU diverse educational societies in the countryside and in the parishes under the direction of deanery committees. The societies organized numerous courses such as social courses, hygiene promotion courses, courses on bookkeeping, shorthand and typing, contemporary Slovene literature studies, as well as language courses for German, Italian, Bulgarian and French.

**Ivan Dolenc, A lecture on Krek 1940.** The lecture includes some interesting details known only to a person close to Krek also in his native places of Selce, Prtovč and Dražgoše. The lecture was prepared for the Catholic national defence society Slovenska straža on the occasion of 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Krek's death in Ljubljana. The main points: Krek founded saving banks and loan societies, marketing cooperatives, electric and machinery cooperatives; he worked for the benefit of the agricultural labourers and working class. He delivered over 3000 speeches on different occasions and published twice as many articles. One of his typical and constant principles was: "Give the people ideas, teach them to think...we want independent thinkers in our nation...we want to have a thinking nation. We need education, not training, firm Catholic consciousness and not blind obedience!"

**Ivan Dolenc, Some notes on Matija Škerbec' Review.** Matija Škerbec published in two parts the *Review of contemporary Slovene Catholic movement* in Cleveland, USA in 1956–57. A rather one-sided evaluation of some of the key events and personalities urged Ivan Dolenc to write his comments (a 44 page manuscript). He was greatly disturbed by Škerbec's judgement of the relationship between Krek and Šušteršič, the two leading men at the turn of the century in Slovenia. To get an objective picture, he studied the notes of ideologically and politically different contemporaries and thus got much insight into what was happening in the political and social spheres. We can find famous public figures in his essay as well as people who worked in the background but who had much insight into the background of the events. The wide spectrum of the people referred to gives weight to Dolenc's essay. Without

this, critics would appeal to the fact that Dolenc was a friend of Krek and therefore too one-sided.

First Dolenc considers the conflict between Krek and Šušteršič, which was not a fleeting or personal matter, because the views of these two influential men affected the views on some fundamental political and social questions of the time in the Slovene nation. This, in turn, resulted in the formation of ideologically opposed communities. Further he talks about Krek's efforts and the advantages of developing cooperatives in Slovenia and stresses another Krek's feature of great importance for the time. He strove hard to provide education for people who would be able to lead the cooperatives and other businesses, social and cultural institutions. The clergy should withdraw from the leading posts, these should be eventually taken over by the well qualified laity. Then he looks at some personal details from Krek's life. He mentions Krek's relationship with Josipina Eržen by whom he had a son. He writes about rumours regarding this in the circles around Krek. Dolenc stresses the truth should not be disguised. He quotes the reputable provost Andrej Kalan who said that "Krek has no less value because of this". We can not avoid the so called Thaimer scandal. Dolenc sees it appropriate to consider the opinion of Rev. Josip Abram who was a good friend of Krek; they often met and talked a lot and it can be said that Abram knew Krek better than anyone else. He wrote about Krek: "I consider him a saint even though everything that was foisted on him was true."

**Ivan Podlesnik (1881–1936)**, a business organizer, started his work at the People's Loan Society in 1900. He helped Krek in founding educational courses and business cooperatives. He writes about the Thaimer scandal and is convinced of different political intrigues behind it. It hurts him that many of Krek's former collaborators and friends were trapped in a web of intrigue and particularly because many priest were "convinced that the reproaches were true". Some priests condemned Krek very severely.

**Fran Šuklje (1849–1935)**. At the end of 1911 Šuklje resigned as governor general of Carniolan province. A lot was written at the time about the reasons for his resignation, about the candidates to succeed him and how Šušteršič became his successor. Dolenc wrote extensively about Krek's opinion of the matter in the Review '*Some comments on Škerbec*'. It is understandable, that Šuklje was interested in Krek's role in the matter so he asked Dolenc about it. Unfortunately we do not know the answer he received from Dolenc but it is summarized in the short hand written abstract of the answer. More than two

decades later when it was possible to look at the matter more peacefully Šuklje wrote clearly about it in his book *Contemporaries*.

**Franc Oswald (1871–1932)**, was a native of Idrija, who started to work with Krek already as a seminarian in 1893. From his student years he was interested in social questions and was closely linked to Krek. He corresponded with him and invited Krek to Idrija. Oswald writes about the circumstances of the foundation of the ‘Catholic Working Men’s Association’ in Idrija in 1893, about Krek’s role and how ‘for a long time he came to Idrija year by year’ and ‘entered into strong connection with coal miners and foresters’ how he taught them and gave advice. He stresses Krek’s ideas: *‘It is not only necessary to cover the Slovene land with factory chimneys but also to provide the Slovene workers with home, a happy and content home. A human is more than just a body. Therefore – fight for honour and dignity of work asking for the blessing from heaven which assures us that we are more than a machine. In this sense, flutter the flag before the working forces!’* Krek’s activity in the Idrija region is one of many examples which show that he continuously strove for the well being of the peasants and workers. His wide social engagement was doubtlessly one of the basic characteristics which distinguished him from Šušteršič; the latter was more engaged with the peasants. Krek’s understanding of the circumstances and the future of the Slovene nation when Italy entered the war can be clearly gathered from his words in the last paragraph in Oswald’s letter. While Šušteršič called the Slovenes to organize volunteer riflemen in defence of the western frontier and to pay war loan, Krek and his group Slovene People’s Party most strongly opposed the idea. In the Slovene People’s Party the difference in opinion about the national strategy and political goals grew stronger. It was not possible to resolve the disagreement; it only grew deeper until the final split in 1917.

**Arko Mihael (1857–1938)**, from 1897 until his death, was a priest and dean in the town of Idrija, and for many years a collaborator of Šušteršič. He explained to Dolenc his view of the circumstances in which Šušteršič became governor general of the Carniolan province following Fran Šuklje. It appears, however, that he did not know the details of when and why the conflicts between Šušteršič and Krek started.

**Ivan Dolenc Hermannu Wendlu.** The German historian Wendel was preparing the book *Aus dem südslaawischen Risorgimento*. He asked Dolenc to prepare an extensive presentation of Krek to include in the book. Dolenc prepared a 29 page typescript. Anton Mrkun added several notes. The book

was published in 1921. Alongside the presentation of individual important figures, the author deals with the political and cultural circumstances from the beginning to the second decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The chapters run as follows: Dositej Obradović, Ljudevit Gaj, Die Omladina, Josip Juraj Strossmayer, Svetozar Marković and Janez Krek (on pages 167–193). The first part of the chapter entitled Janez Krek presents a short presentation of Krek, although it concentrates more on the conditions in Slovenia after the revolutionary year, 1848, with the emphasis on the lively cultural life. When he returns to Krek, he notes down: "*What Krek came to know very clearly in Vienna (when he studied there) was not the imperial city, music, Prater and the recreation grounds, but working class districts where social conditions cried out for solutions. With rapt attention he followed the beginnings of the Christian Socialist movement, particularly the first steps taken to make the precept of Count Vogelsang, who defined capitalist property as 'stealing from God, society and the state', a reality. As he leafed through a thick book of human suffering, not only with emotion, but with a clear mind, a far deeper impression was left on the young priest, than any rumination within four walls at home. His heart was throbbing when he experienced inner transformation. On his way back home, after his studies in 1892, his eyes were glowing with the certainty of an active future which a simple residence in a Carniolan parish could not have offered.*" Wendel continues to describe the beginnings of Krek's social work, stressing the importance of the Slovenian Christian Social Union, which in the end comprised 476 different associations and had around 42,000 members. He talks about numerous business associations established on Krek's initiative which joined the Business Union or the Co-operative Union. When he writes about Krek's wide education, his knowledge of several languages, especially the Slavic languages, he emphasizes how Krek encouraged, more than anyone else, the education of the young. His Slovene Catholic Working Men's Association was the foundation for many educational institutions; the courses of Christian Social Union, which he started in Ljubljana, grew into a college for political science, rhetoric and trade. Even in the remotest villages, he tried to teach people that besides ploughing and cattle breeding there exists spiritual values, to which one should aspire, in order to bring more quality to life. For this reason he had a special affection for the young, who gathered around him at St Jošt and elsewhere. In his book, Wendel also writes about Krek's political activity at home, in Carniola and in the parliament in Vienna. He stresses his concern both for the peasants and workers, his lucidity, resoluteness and uprightness. For the sake of truth he did not hesitate to voice a clear opinion, despite the opposition from his col-

leagues or some clergymen. If it was announced in the parliament in Vienna that Krek was about to speak, the scattered M.P.s immediately gathered in the hall. This unimposing man of medium height and broad back, dressed in a modest cassock, with expressive but not stern facial features, an intellectual with a resolute gaze from behind his round glasses, possessed in him a persuasive power with words. He spoke clearly and objectively and kept to the point. He maintained that he hated dishonesty, hypocrisy and political falsehood, but he did not know any hatred towards a person, political party or a nation. Wendel concludes the chapter on Krek with a review of the events during the World War I and Krek's vision for the future of the Slovene nation in connection with the South Slavic nations of the sitting Habsburg Monarchy.

**Terezija Bučar**, a simple worker from Ljubljana, wrote some personal memories of Krek. She stressed the fact that Krek sincerely and genuinely befriended the workers, listened to them and was simple with the simple people. He could speak to the people in a direct and comprehensible manner, he taught and encouraged them.

**Anton Mahnič (1850–1920)**, was in 1881, Professor of Biblical Studies at the Gorizia Theological Faculty and from 1896 bishop of Krk in Croatia. He took a keen interest in the circumstances in Slovenia and was closely linked to leading Slovene figures. At the end of 1915, when the threat to the Slovene and Croatian nation was very severe, he initiated a national and political action of the Gorizia Metropolitan, which resulted in a memorandum to the Vienna Government in January, 5<sup>th</sup> 1916. When the movement for the "May Declaration" started, Mahnič was very enthusiastic about it. He actively supported the movement for the legal union of the South Slavic nations, who were until then, part of the Habsburg Monarchy. He was deeply distressed about the visible conflicts among members within the party, who he felt should be strong and united in the fatal moments for Slovenia. In a letter he implores Krek to do everything he can to stop the conflicts and to re-establish the concord so urgently needed.

**Petar Grgec (1890–1962)**, was an editor of many newspapers before World War I, and a teacher at the *Diocesan Grammar School in Zagreb, Croatia*. He frequently attended Krek's courses on social issues at St Jošt. In the newspapers *Luč* and *Hrvatska prosvjeta* he presented many of Krek's ideas to the Croatian public. In a letter to Dolenec he writes about how he and his colleagues collect material about Krek. Above all, the letters make it clear that Krek was well known and esteemed in Croatia.

## POVZETEK

### Iz kronike župnije Grahovo pri Cerknici v času župnika Alojzija Westra (1910-1928)

Župnija Grahovo na Notranjskem, ustanovljena leta 1871, je kot cerkveno občestvo imela veliko samostojnost že stoletje pred tem. Njena zgodovina nam je bolje poznana, ker je župnik Alojzij Wester (rojen 6. maja 1873 na Bledu, umrl 27. februarja 1948 v Grahovem) v dolgoletnem vodenju župnije načrtno zbiral gradivo za zgodovino in dosledno pisal župnijsko kroniko. Tako je kronika danes bogat vir za zgodovino kraja, župnije in tudi širšega okolja. Objavljeni so zapisi za leta med 1910 in 1928, to je od časa, ko je vodstvo župnije nastopil župnik A. Wester, in do uvedbe kraljeve diktature januarja 1929, ko je prenehalo običajno politično in družabno življenje. Kralj Aleksander je namreč ukinil ustavo, politične stranke in razne vrste organizacij, tudi cerkvene. Tako politično kot cerkveno življenje je bilo s tem močno prizadeto; težko govorimo o normalnih družbenih razmerah. Pri pripravi kronike je župnik A. Wester dajal veliko pozornosti zapisom o cerkvenem življenju, o mestu šole v kraju in o gospodarskih razmerah (suši, stanju trgovine, zadolževanju, zgrešenih investicijah, tihotapljenju prek italijanske meje), občasno je pripisal statistične podatke. Krajevno dogajanje je povezoval z dogodki na svetovni ravni. Kronika vsebuje poročila o delu cerkvenih bratovščin in različnih družb, posebej še o karitativnem delu v času vojne in med gospodarsko krizo, ki je sledila vojni. Spremljal je delovanje političnih strank, pri čemer je očitno pokazal svojo naklonjenost do delovanja Ljudske stranke in nastopov njenih kandidatov. Predvsem pa ima pričevalno vrednost njegova kronika iz časa prve svetovne vojne. Župnija Grahovo se je nahajala blizu osrednjih bojišč predvsem po letu 1915, ko je bila odprta fronta med Avstrijo in Italijo na Soči. Dogodki na bojišču so neposredno posegali v življenje kraja in ljudi. Ne le, da so bili mnogi moški poklicani pod orožje, v kraju se je nahajala bolnišnica z oddelkom za preskrbo ranjenih konj. Krajši čas je v kraju delovala vojaška pekarna in tu so se zbirali vojaki, preden so odšli na italijansko fronto. Občasno so bili v kraj poslani kot fizični delavci vojni ujetniki, predvsem Rusi (med temi tudi judovske vere). Cerkvena skupnost je morala oddati zvono, dele orgel in sprejeti obveznosti za pet vojnih posojil, ki jih je razpisala avstrijska vlada za oboroževanje vojaških enot. Pod orožje bilo vpoklicanih

150 domačinov; 45 jih je bilo ubitih. Ko je po koncu vojne župnik A. Wester povzemal posledice vojnih dogodkov za življenje župnije, je ugotavljal, da župnija v cerkvenem pogledu ni pretrpela večjega negativnega vpliva, čeprav so nekateri bivši vojaki kazali nezavzetost za verske stvari. Negativne posledice na verskem in moralnem področju so nameravali popravljati s pomočjo priprave ljudskega misijona; misijoni so bili po mnenju škofa A. B. Jegliča najboljše prenovitveno sredstvo.

## SUMMARY

### From the Chronicle of the Parish of Grahovo at Cerknica during the ministry of Rev. Alojzij Wester (1910–1928)

The Parish of Grahovo in Notranjska (Inner Carniola), which was established in 1871, already enjoyed independence as a church community a century ago. The history of the parish is fairly well known due to the systematic collection of historical material and the consistent recording of the parish chronicle by the parish priest Alojzij Wester, who led the parish for many years. He was born on May 6, 1873, in Bled and died on February, 1948, in Grahovo. The chronicle is therefore a rich source of material documenting the history of the village, the parish and the wider surroundings. The published records cover the years between 1910 and 1928. This is the period when the parish was run by the parish priest Alojzij Wester up until the time when a royal dictatorship was established in January 1929, which put a stop to the regular political and social life. King Alexander I of Yugoslavia abolished the Constitution, the political parties and different organisations, including those of the church. Political life, as well as church life, was deeply affected; it is hard to talk about normal political circumstances. In the preparation of the chronicle, the priest Alojzij Wester laid great stress on the records of church life, the place of school in the village and the economic situation (drought, the state of trade, indebtedness, bad investments and smuggling across the Italian frontier). Sometimes he noted down statistical data. He linked the local situation with international events. The chronicle contains reports on church fraternities and different associations, in particular reports on the charity work during the war and during the economic crisis which followed the war. He was interested in the activities of the political parties and took a markedly keen interest in the work of The People's Party and the public appearances of its candidates. Of special value, however, is his chronicle from the time of the First World War, particularly after 1915, when the Isonzo (Soča) front between Austria and Italy was opened, as the parish of Grahovo stood in the vicinity of the central battlefields. The events on the battleground had a direct influence on the life of the village and its inhabitants. Many men were conscripted. A hospital, with a ward for wounded horses, was situated in the village. For a short time there was also a military bakery. The place was a rally-

ing point for the soldiers before leaving for the Italian front. Occasionally, prisoners of war were sent there as manual workers. They were mostly Russians, some of them were Jews. The church community had to surrender the church bells, parts of the organ and take on the liabilities for five war loans floated by the Austrian government to arm the military units. 150 local men were conscripted, 45 of whom were killed. After the end of the war, when summarizing the results of the war and the effect on the life of the parish, the priest Alojzij Wester concluded that church life in the parish endured no grave negative effect, although some former soldiers showed disregard for religious matters. Bishop A.B. Jeglič planned to correct the negative effects on religious and moral life by parish missions as he considered these to be the best means of parish renewal.

## POVZETEK

Ko sem 1. avgusta 2005 prevzel župnijo Škocjan in soupravo župnije Turjak, sem začel pregledovati arhiv. Kmalu sem naletel na latinski spis *Historia brevis paroeciae auerspergicae*, ki ga je napisal župnik Mihael Horvat na začetku 20. stoletja, ko je ljubljanski škof dr. Anton B. Jeglič ukazal, da morajo vsi župniki pisati župnijsko kroniko. Mihael Horvat je svojo kroniko napisal v klasični latinščini, kot jo je označil naslednik v pisanju kronike. Drugi del župnijske kronike, ki jo je začel pisati Franc Pavšič v slovenščini, najprej našteje vse župnike in župnijske upravitelje od ustanovitve župnije leta 1789 do svojega predhodnika Antona Medveda. Nato je napisana kronika po letih z nekaterimi prazninami do druge svetovne vojne oziroma do uničenja gradu 19. septembra 1943.

I. Mihael Horvat je začel pri zgodovini Turjačanov, ker je župnijska cerkev del turjaškega gradu. Pri tem delu se je v glavnem poslužil dveh virov, in sicer Valvasorjeve *Slave vojvodine Kranjske* (1689), ki je povsem odvisen od Schönlebove *Genealogie auerspergice*, in napisov na družinskih portretih, ki so krasili grajske dvorane. Od prvega vira je v taki meri odvisen, da ima v kroniki samo tiste latinske navedke, ki jih ima tudi Valvasor, od drugega vira pa v tolikšni meri, da konča s življenjepisi tam, kjer se končajo portreti. Zadnji, ki je pinakoteko izpopolnil, je bil grof Marija Jožef, ki je tudi ustanovil turjaško župnijo v letu francoske revolucije 1789. Prepisi teh napisov na družinskih portretih, ki so sicer od 12. do 14. stoletja nekoliko manj zanesljivi oziroma nedokumentirani, so zaradi tega zanimivi, ker so z uničenjem gradu izginili tudi portreti z napisimi vred.

Avtor se najprej ustavi pri nazivu Turjak, ki ga izpeljuje iz besede tur, kar bi bil prevod nemškega auer, in ne iz oblike gradu v trikotniku (Dreieck), kakor razлага omenjeni Schönleben. Kar zadeva začetke gradu, pa zelo zadeto opozori: »V katerem času je bil prvi grad zgrajen, o katerem se govori, da je bil že od najstarejših časov v posesti Turjaških, nimamo nobenih zanesljivih listin, kajti izročilo, ki ga hrani družina, je bližje povedi kot zgodovini.«

Turjaški grad je bil v zgodovini večkrat porušen in nanovo zgrajen. O sedanjem gradu in njegovi obliki pravi: »Grad, ki danes stoji, je bilo zgrajen leta 1067. Na prednjem okroglem stolpu je pritrjen velik in zelo star kamnit

---

glasbe, o čemer je referiral na več kot 50 simpozijih z mednarodno udeležbo. Leta 2005 se je vsem službam odpovedal in bil imenovan za župnika v Škocjanu pri Turjaku.

grb, na katerem je vklesan nemški napis z rimskimi velikimi črkami: 'Leta Gospodovega 1067 ga je začel graditi gospod Konrad s Turjaka, nato ga je leta 1511 potres razrušil, vendar sem ga jaz Trojan s Turjaka, najvišji komtur na Kranjskem in v Slovenski marki, do temeljev porušil in začel na novo graditi leta 1570.' Vendar, kar zadeva napis, vklesan na starem kamnitem grbu, nimam vse za gotovo. Kajti štirioglati stolp, v čigar podnožju je bilo nekdaj 'evangeličansko' svetišče, zdaj pa je klet za shranjevanje mošta, je brez vsakega dvoma obstajal že dolgo pred letom 1570, kar izdaja že način gradnje in hkrati uči, da v tistem času ni bil razdejan. Odtod sledi, da grad, ki danes stoji, ne kaže enotne gradnje. Prav tako letnica 1570, vklesana na grbu, če se stvar dodata premisli, se mi zdi dvomljiva. Napisi upodobitev povedo, da je Trojan, graditelj nove trdnjave, leta 1554 'skoraj osemdesetleten' umrl. Poleg tega, če upoštevamo dejstvo, da je potres že leta 1511, po mnenju drugih že leta 1509, grad podrl v razvaline, je komaj sprejemljivo, da so gospodje s Turjaka porabili toliko let, da so obnovili podrto trdnjavco. Menim, da je kipar namesto številke 20 napisal 70, in menim, da je utrdba, ki še danes stoji, bila zgrajena okoli leta 1520.«

Pri vprašanju, kdaj je bil zgrajena sedanja župnijska cerkev, pa avtor misli, »da je bilo narejeno po reformaciji, kot se reče. V tistih časih je bilo prvo svetišče razposvečeno, zaradi česar so zgradili novo. Nova cerkev je posvečena B. M. D. Brezmadežno Spočeti, vendar ne od vsega početka, kot menim, ampak od časov cesarja Ferdinanda II., ki je leta 1626 vsem škofom svojih dežel, ki se imenujejo dedne, poslal pisma, v katerih je zaprosil, da bi bilo vpeljano vsakoletno praznovanje v čast B. M. D. Brezmadežno Spočeti.«

Znano je, da so bili nekateri iz družine s Turjaka privrženci zmot 16. stoletja, od katerih so številni pokopani v »evangeličanskem« svetišču, najpri-zadevnejše pa je Lutrovemu nauku služil Herbad VIII., ki je padel leta 1575 v bitki proti Turkom pri Budačkem. Vendar so Turjaški ta krivoverski nauk že ok. leta 1600 opustili, namreč o Herbadu IX., ki je umrl leta 1618, beremo, da je bil učen mož in da je »zelo ljubil katoliško vero«.

Turjaški so nedvomno že od najstarejših časov, kot je bila navada, v svoji trdnjavi imeli domačega duhovnika, da bi brez težav mogli biti pri maši in prejemati zakramente, kajti cerkev v trdnjavi so že pred ustanovitvijo župnije papeži obdarili z različnimi privilegiji; tudi Valvasor pripoveduje (1686), da je v tem svetišču oltar posvečen B. M. D. in da se tam vsak dan daruje sv. daritev, in da se da iz različnih dejstev sklepati, da je bilo svetišče javno.

Apostolska pisma, s katerimi je turjaška kapela z raznimi privilegiji obdarjena in s katerimi ob upoštevanju, kar je treba upoštevati, se podeljujejo odpustki, so bila rokopisno shranjena v grajskem arhivu, poleg tega jih lahko

najdemo napisane na štirioglatih marmornatih ploščah, vzidanih na steni v samem svetišču B. M. D., in sicer prvi in drugi na evangeljski, zadnji pa na listni strani.

II. Drugi del kronike turjaške župnije je sicer na začetku nekoliko zgodovinsko obarvana, saj našteje vse župnike, od leta 1910 pa je prava kronika, saj zabeleži vse najpomembnejše dogodke v vsakem letu.

Turjaški grofje so imeli svoje domače grajske duhovnike že v najstarejših časih, leta 1789 pa je bila na Turjaku ustanovljena župnija z dovoljenjem ljubljanskega škofa Mihaela Brigida in s tem je postala grajska kapela hkrati župna cerkev. O življenju in delovanju posameznih župnikov zgodovina ne ve mnogo povedati.

Po tem kratkem uvodu naj sledijo imena turjaških župnikov in doba njihovega pastirovanja: 1. Andrej Nučič (1790–1811); 2. Marko Stare (1811–1826); 3. Jakob Karpe (1826–1834); 4. Janez Krstnik Kapel (1834–1843); 5. Jožef Suhadolnik (1844–1849); 6. Anton Lubič (1849–1854); 7. Anton Pintar (1855–1861); 8. Jakob Marolt (1863–1867); 9. Ivan Zorec (1867–1870); 10. Ivan Čebašek (1871–1878). Med odhodom in prihodom posameznih župnikov je opravljala župnijo sosednja duhovščina, trajno pa je bila župnija brez lastnega župnika od leta 1878 do 1902. Med tem časom so opravljali v gradu službo božjo kot domači duhovniki naslednji: škocjanski župnik Bartel Kosec (1878–1880); upokojeni župnik Jakob Gruden (1880–1896); upokojeni kaplan Ivan Bevc (1897–1902).

Po letu 1902 se nadaljuje vrsta pravih župnikov: 11. Mihael Horvat (1902–1908), ki je napisal *Historia brevis paroeciae auerspergicae*; 12. Anton Medved (1908–1910), slavni pesnik, ki je na Turjaku umrl; 13. Franc Pavšič (1910–1921), ki je začel pisati slovensko kroniko. Nekdanji kaplan v Sodražici je bil inštaliran 1. avgusta 1910 in je prišel 2. avgusta proti večeru *incognito* na Turjak. Njegov ideal je bil preroditi župnijo v cerkvenem duhu, toda spoznal je kmalu, da vlada v gradu in krog grada precej svobodomiseln duh. 18. decembra je 1915 umrl patron turjaške graščine Leo grof Auersperg. Njegovega pogreba se je udeležila bližnja duhovščina iz patronata, mnogo plemstva, domači župljani in grajski lovci. Na grobu je govoril v nemškem in slovenskem jeziku domači župnik. Pokojnik je bil blaga duša, prijatelj duhovščine in revežev. Po smrti grofa Leona se je preselil v grad njegov sin Herward grof Auersperg s svojo družino. On in njegova soproga dajeta lep vzugled celi župniji.

Prišla je svetovna vojna in po njej je bila ustanovljena Jugoslavija. Začetnemu navdušenju je kmalu sledilo razočaranje. Ob drugi obletnici

župnik razmišlja: »Poudarjalo se je, da bo vladala v Jugoslaviji enakopravnost vseh treh plemen, dejansko pa vidimo, da ni tako. Vzemimo tri brate, ki bivajo pod isto streho. Lepo je, ako vlada med njimi prava bratska ljubezen, ako pa vlada med njimi nevoščljivost in ako le gledajo, kako bi močnejši slabješega prevaril, tedaj ni zdravega razmerja med njimi, a bratje po krvi si ostanejo za vedno. Vsem trem narodom v Jugoslaviji enake pravice in dolžnosti! Poudarjalo se je, da bo vladala enakopravnost vseh treh ver, hkrati pa zatrjuje šef demokratske stranke, da bo preganjal klerikalizem v interesu države, dokler ga ne prezene iz Jugoslavije, zato ker ima le-ta svojega poglavarja v italijanskem Rimu. Upamo, da ne bo tako hudo, ako se bomo katoličani vselej zavedali, kaj da nameravajo nasprotniki, in če bomo storili v polni meri svojo dolžnost, zlasti sedaj ob volitvah.« Po odhodu župnika Pavšiča do 1. junija 1922 je bila župnija vakantna; oskrboval jo je župnik škocjanski Janez Jereb. Dne 1. junija 1922 je prišel za župnika

14. France Hiti (1922–1930). Oktobra 1930 je zapustil turjaško župnijo in odšel na novo župnijo v Dražgoše na Gorenjsko. Za Hitijem je prišel na Turjak

15. France Ambrožič (1930–1940), kaplan v Cerkljah na Gorenjskem, ki je služboval na Turjaku od avgusta 1931 do 12. septembra 1940. Med župnikovanjem na Turjaku je promoviral in postal doktor bogoslovja. Z doktoratom je šel v Ljubljano 12. septembra 1940 in prevzel profesuro verouka na državni gimnaziji. Za Ambrožičem je prišel na Turjak za župnega upravitelja

16. Franc Sartori (1940–1942), ki je kot kapucin (p. Valerijan) dolgo let deloval v kapucinskem samostanu v Celovcu. Kot vojaški duhovnik se je udeležil svetovne vojne od 1914–1918. Ob priklopitvi Koroške k Nemčiji je kot Jugoslovan prišel v Ljubljano in bil sprejet v kler Ljubljanske škofije. Bil je nekaj časa nastavljen kot kaplan pri Sv. Jakobu v Ljubljani, od tam je prišel na Turjak in 1. decembra 1940 prevzel župnijo. Za njim je leta 1942 prišel

17. Anton Stanonik (1942–1943) je bil nekaj let župnik v Zgornjem Tuhinju, odkoder so ga Nemci preselili na Hrvaško. Potem ko se je vrnil v Ljubljano, je bil leta 1942 imenovan za župnijskega upravitelja na Turjaku, kjer je službo opravljal do 19. septembra 1943, ko je bil grad in z njim župnijska cerkev popolnoma razrušen. To je bil zadnji župnik oziroma župnijski upravitelj na Turjaku.

Po drugi svetovno vojni sta župnijo Turjak najprej upravljala velikolaška župnika 1. Jakob Ramovš (1945–1953) in 2. Franc Mate (1953–1964), nato pa škocjanski župniki: 3. Ivan Mramor (1964–1981); 4. Anton Potokar (1981–1996); 5. Jože Razinger (1996–2002); 6. Anton Prijatelj (2002–2005) in 7. Edo Škulj (2005).

## SUMMARY

On August 1<sup>st</sup> 2005 when I took over the parish of Škocjan and the management of the parish of Turjak I started to check the archives. Soon I came across the Latin record *Historia brevis paroeciae auerspergicae* written by the parish priest Mihael Horvat at the beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> century when the bishop of Ljubljana, Dr Anton B. Jeglič gave the order that all parish priests should write parish chronicles. Rev. Mihael Horvat wrote his chronicle in classical Latin as his successor remarked in writing. The second part of the chronicle, written by Rev. Franc Pavšič in Slovenian initially lists all the parish priests and parish administrators from the foundation of the parish in 1789 up to his predecessor Rev. Anton Medved. After that the Chronicles were written year by year with some gaps up to Word War II, or to the destruction of Turjak castle in September 19<sup>th</sup> 1943.

I. Rev. Mihael Horvat began with the history of the Counts of Turjak because the parish formed part of Turjak castle. He used two sources mainly: namely, one by historian Janez Vajkard Valvasor, *Die Ehre des Herzogthums Crain*, written in 1689, which fully depends on Schönleben's *Genealogia auerspergica*, and secondly he used the inscriptions on family portraits that were decorating the castle halls. He depends on the first source, only insofar as he uses those Latin quotations in his chronicle which are also used by Valvasor and on the second source, to the extent that he finishes his biographies where the portraits end. The last portrait to complete the picture gallery was of Count Maria Joseph, who founded the Turjak parish, in the year of the French Revolution in 1789. The copies of the inscriptions on the family portraits, which are less reliable or undocumented from the 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, capture our interest because with the destruction of the castle, the portraits with the inscriptions disappeared.

First of all, the author stops at the name Turjak, which he derives from the word 'tur', a translation from the German *auer* and not from the triangular shape of the castle (Dreieck) as explained by Schönleben. With regard to the beginnings of the castle, he prudently points out that no reliable charters exist stating when exactly the castle was built, which is said to have belonged to the

Nobles of Turjak from oldest times. The tradition nurtured by the family is closer to a legend than history.

In its history, Turjak castle was often demolished and rebuilt. Regarding the current castle and its shape Horvat says: "The present castle was built in 1067. A large and very old stone coat of arms is attached to the front round tower on which a German inscription with Roman capital letters is carved: 'In the year of our Lord 1067 the noble Konrad of Turjak began the building work but it was destroyed in the earthquake in 1511, so I, Trojan from Turjak, the highest komtur in Krain and in Slovenian mark, knocked it down to its foundations and started to build it anew in 1570.' However, I am not completely certain about the inscription carved on the old coat of arms. The square tower, in the basement of which there was once an 'evangelical' sanctuary (a place of refuge for Protestants) and is now used as a cellar for storing cedaer, undoubtedly existed long before 1570, which is evident from the manner of its construction, also tells us it was not destroyed at that time. We can therefore make out that the present castle is not a unified construction. All things considered I am in doubt also about the year 1570 engraved on the coat of arms. The inscriptions on the portraits give away that Trojan, the builder of the new fortress, died in 1554, 'almost eighty years old'. Moreover, if we bear in mind that the castle was completely ruined by 1511, some think probably by 1509, it is hard to understand why it took the nobles of Turjak so many years to repair the ruined fortress. In my opinion the sculptor instead of 20 wrote the number 70. I also think that the fortification which still stands today was built around 1520."

As to the question when the current parish church was built the author believes "that it was constructed after the Reformation, as we say. In those times the first shrine had been deconsecrated so they built a new one. The new church was dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but in my opinion it was not so from the very beginning, but from the time of the emperor Ferdinand II, who sent letters in 1626 to all the bishops of his hereditary provinces asking them to introduce the annual celebration of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

It is known that some of the Turjak family were supporters of the 16<sup>th</sup> century heresy and a number of them are buried in the "evangelical"

sanctuary. The most zealous supporter of Luther's doctrine was Herbard VIII, who was killed in the battle against the Turks at Budačko. However, the Turjak nobles had given up the heretical doctrine already by around 1600. Herbard IX who died in 1618 is acclaimed to have been a well-read man who 'loved the Catholic faith very much'.

As it was the custom, the Turjak nobles had doubtlessly, from the earliest times, a domestic priest in their fortress, so that they could attend Mass without any difficulty and receive the sacraments. The church in the fortress had been granted different privileges by the popes even before its foundation; as Valvasor notes (1686) the church has an altar dedicated to the Immaculate Virgin Mary; Mass is offered every day and different facts show that the church was public.

Apostolic letters, which endowed the Turjak chapel with different privileges and granted the indulgences under set conditions, are deposited in the castle archives. They are also written on the square marble slab built into the wall of the Church of Virgin Mary's Immaculate Conception, the first and the second on the Gospel side, the last on the epistel side.

II. The second part of the chronicle of the Turjak parish gives some historical details in the beginning, by listing all the parish priests, but from 1910 it is a real chronicle because it records all the most important events during the year.

The Counts of Turjak had their own domestic priests from the earliest times: In 1789 the parish was established in Turjak by the Ljubljana bishop Mihael Brigido and thus the Castle Chapel also became the parish church. There is not much evidence recorded about the life and work of the parish priests.

Following this short introduction are the names of the parish priests in Turjak and the length of their ministry: 1. Andrej Nučič (1790–1811); 2. Marko Stare (1811–1826); 3. Jakob Karpe (1826–1834); 4. Janez Krstnik Kapel (1834–1843); 5. Jožef Suhadolnik (1844–1849); 6. Anton Lubič (1849–1854); 7. Anton Pintar (1855–1861); 8. Jakob Marolt (1863–1867); 9. Ivan Zorec (1867–1870); 10. Ivan Čebašek (1871–1878). During the time between the departure and arrival of individual priests, the parish was administered by

the neighbouring clergy, but there was no resident priest from 1878 to 1902. Meanwhile the services in the castle were held by the following domestic priests: Bartel Kosec, was the parish priest of Škocjan (1878–1880); the retired priest Jakob Gruden (1880–1896); the retired curate Ivan Bevc (1897–1902).

After 1902 the parish has its permanent priests: 11. Mihael Horvat (1902–1908), author of *Historia brevis paroeciae auerspergicae*; 12. Anton Medved (1908–1910), a famous poet, died in Turjak; 13. Franc Pavšič (1910–1921), who started to write the Slovene chronicles. The former curate of Sodražica was installed on August 1<sup>st</sup> 1910 and he arrived, incognito, at Turjak on August 2<sup>nd</sup> in the evening. His ideal was to regenerate the parish spiritually but he soon realized that in and around the castle a rather free-thinking spirit reigned. On December 18<sup>th</sup> 1915, Count Leo von Auersperg, the patron of Turjak castle, died. His funeral was attended by the neighbouring clergy who were in his patronage, many of the nobility, the local parishioners and the castle huntsmen. The local priest delivered a speech in honour of the deceased in the Slovene and German languages. The deceased was a person of gentle temper, a friend of the clergy and the poor. After the death of Count Leo his son, Herward Count von Auersperg, with his family, moved into the castle. He and his wife set a good example for the entire parish.

Yugoslavia came into existence as a result of World War I. The initial enthusiasm was soon followed by disappointment. On the second anniversary the parish priest remarked: "It was stressed that the principle of equality of all three nations will be observed in Yugoslavia but in reality we see this is not true. Let us exemplify this with three brothers living under the same roof. It is nice if fraternal love exists among them but if jealousy reigns among them and when they are only mindful how the stronger would deceive the weaker then there is no healthy relationship among them albeit they remain blood brothers for ever. Grant equal rights and duties to all the three nations in Yugoslavia! The equality of all three religions was stressed but at the same time the head of the Democratic Party maintained he would persecute clericalism in the interest of the state as long as it is not banished from Yugoslavia because its head lives in the Italian Rome. We hope it will not get

so bad if only the Catholics are always aware of the intentions of the opponents and if we fully perform our duty especially now at election time.” After the departure of the parish priest Franc Pavšič, on June 1<sup>st</sup> 1922, the parish remained vacant and was cared for by the Škocjan parish priest Janez Jereb. On June 1<sup>st</sup> 1922 he was appointed parish priest

14. France Hiti (1922–1930). In October 1930 he left the parish for the new parish in Dražgoše in the Gorenjsko region. Rev. Hiti was succeeded by

15. France Ambrožič (1930–1940), a curate in Cerkle in Gorenjsko who served the Turjak parish from August 1931 to September 12<sup>th</sup> 1940. While at Turjak he earned a Doctor of Theology degree. He moved to Ljubljana on September 12<sup>th</sup> 1940 and became a secondary school teacher of religion at a state gymnasium. Rev. Ambrožič was succeeded by the parish administrator

16. Franc Sartori (1940–1942), (Fr. Valerijan), a Cappuchin who for many years served at the Cappuchin Monastery in Klagenfurt, Austria. As army chaplain he took part in the World War I from 1914 to 1918. When Carinthia was annexed to Germany being a Yugoslav citizen he came to Ljubljana and was accepted among the Ljubljana diocese clergymen. He served as curate in St James parish in Ljubljana for a while then he came to Turjak and took over the parish on December 1<sup>st</sup> 1940. In 1942 he was succeeded by

17. Anton Stanonik (1942–1943), who served as parish priest in Zgornji Tuhinj for a few years until he was moved by the Germans to Croatia. After he had returned to Ljubljana, he was appointed parish administrator in Turjak in 1942. He served the congregation until September 19<sup>th</sup> 1943 when the castle and the parish church were completely demolished. He was the last parish priest or parish administrator.

After World War II the Turjak parish was managed by the priests from Velike Lašče: 1. Jakob Ramovš (1945–1953), 2. Franc Mate (1953–1964), and then by the parish priests from Škocjan: 3. Ivan Mramor (1964–1981); 4. Anton Potokar (1981–1996); 5. Jože Razinger (1996–2002); 6. Anton Prijatelj (2002–2005) and 7. Edo Škulj (2005).