

Croatian Philosophers III: Pavao Vuk-Pavlović (1894–1976)

LOVORKA MAĐAREVIĆ

University of Zagreb – Croatian Studies, Ulica grada Vukovara 68, HR-10000 Zagreb
lmađarevic@net.hr

PROFESSIONAL ARTICLE / RECEIVED: 12-03-05 ACCEPTED: 25-05-05

ABSTRACT: The paper is a brief outline of Vuk-Pavlović's life, his scholarly career and his philosophy. A short account of Vuk-Pavlović's critique of the theory of knowledge and its interpretation as a meta-empirical issue is given, as well as some aspects of his philosophy of values, providing a framework for his entire philosophical system. Since he has remained one of the most influential Croatian authors when it comes to philosophical considerations of pedagogical problems, the main focus is on his philosophy of education.

KEY WORDS: Pavao Vuk-Pavlović, cognition, theory of knowledge, metaempiricism, values, philosophy of values, human being, philosophy of education, education, future, creativity, experience, individuality, collectivity, social community, politics, personality.

1. Biography

Pavao Vuk-Pavlović was born on February 9th, 1894, in Koprivnica.¹ After finishing elementary school, he went to Zagreb, where he finished high school. As a high school student he showed great interest in languages and literature. After finishing high school in 1912, he enrolled in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig, where he attended classes by Wilhelm Wundt, Johannes Volkelt and Eduard Spranger, among others. During the four semesters there, he mostly studied aesthetic, epistemological and metaphysical problems. Due to the First World War he abandoned his studies and being drafted in 1914, he spent four years in the army service. During that time, he did not give up literary interests. Thus, he translated Boccaccio, Tagore and Strindberg's works and published some of his own. In one of his well-known articles "Aristofan i rat" ["Aristophanes and the War"], published in *Jutarnji List* in 1915, he presented his pacifistic beliefs through the discussion of Aristophanes's pacifism.

After the war, Vuk-Pavlović continued philosophical studies at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb. Apart from philosophical courses,

¹ Biographical and bibliographical information on Vuk-Pavlović is mostly taken over from Polić (2002) and Zenko (1995).

he studied German language and literature, as well as Croatian language. He earned his PhD in philosophy on January 31st, 1921, with the thesis *Spoznaja i spoznajna teorija. Metodički pokušaj s osobitim obzirom na problem očitosti* [Cognition and Theory of Knowledge. Methodological Attempt in Special Regard to the Problem of Evidentness]. In the same year, he left for Berlin, where he studied aesthetics, ethics, pedagogy, sociology and applied psychology for two semesters. To experience the practical side of pedagogical problems, he visited Berlin high schools, boarding schools and educational institutions. Based on this experience he wrote *Mogućnost i granice estetskog uzgoja u vidu individualne i socijalne pedagogike* [Possibilities and Limitations of Aesthetical Education in Regard to Individual and Social Pedagogy]. After return to Zagreb, he passed his state exam in teaching.

In September 1922, Vuk-Pavlović started to work as a high school teacher of philosophical propaedeutics and German language. In one of his high school classes, following the pedagogical attempts of his German colleagues, he introduced the principle of the “working school”. His methods were proven highly successful, but soon he was transferred to a new position at the school of pedagogy. There he taught theoretical and practical philosophy, theoretical pedagogy, and history of philosophy and pedagogy. During this period he published two books: *Spoznaja i spoznajna teorija* [Cognition and the Theory of Knowledge] and *Spoznajna teorija i metafizika* [The Theory of Knowledge and Metaphysics].

He left this position rather swiftly and, in 1929, became an assistant professor of philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb. During the next couple of years, he taught numerous courses, some of which include: *Main Ethical Positions and Problems, Philosophy of History, Doctrine of the Highest Good and Problems of Free Will, The Basics of Aesthetics and Aesthetical Education, History of Education and Educational Theories*. With Antun Bazala he held seminars such as *English Empiricism and Kant’s Criticism, Reading and Interpretation of Selected Philosophical Works, Logical Problems*, etc. Even though he was interested in many philosophical problems, his main interest was in the philosophy of education. Thus in 1932, he published his best-known work *Ličnost i odgoj* [Personality and Education]. He published many articles on education as well as two more books: *Stvaralački lik Đure Arnolda* [Creative Character of Đuro Arnold] and *Spinozina nauka* [Spinoza’s Doctrine].

Vuk-Pavlović went through many difficulties and conflicts in his career. Ever since 1930s, the situation at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Zagreb was not favorable for young, non-conformist professors and hindered their promotion. This situation, partly fostered by the growing antisemitic feelings,² resulted in his suspension and retirement. After the Second

² Vuk-Pavlović, who decided to change his last name as a young man, was born as Pavao Wolf into a Jewish family that converted to Catholicism when he was a child.

World War, he returned to his position, but he was soon opposed by a group of his students, the members of the Communist Party of Croatia. These students opposed his lectures on Plotinus, and demanded that he taught on Marx. Due to this “incident”, Vuk-Pavlović was never to return back to the Faculty of Philosophy. After this, he worked in the National Library in Zagreb for some time, but was once again forced to retire.

In the following few years he did not publish any kind of philosophical work, but he wrote poetry that was published in the collections of sonnets *Zov [The Call]* and *Razvaline [The Ruins]*. However, having been an outcast in Croatia for 10 years, in 1958 he was offered a position at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Skopje, where he became a professor of Ethics and Aesthetics. There he was greatly admired and respected by his colleagues and students. The favorable conditions provided for the development of his teaching, pedagogical and organizational skills. Along with teaching, he encouraged students to conduct experiments and established a laboratory for aesthetics so that the students acquire a better understanding of arts. After his final retirement in 1971, he returned to Zagreb where, several years later, he published a book called *Duševnost i umjetnost [Spirituality and Art]*, based on his research of aesthetical and educational problems.

During his philosophical and scholarly career, Vuk-Pavlović held many public lectures at home and participated in many international philosophical conferences. His papers included: “Politik, Erziehung, Religion” [“Politics, Education, Religion”] (Prague, 1934), “Wert und Schöpfertum” [“Value and Creativity”] (Paris, 1937), “Philosophie und Herrschaft” [“Philosophy and Authority”] (Brussels, 1953), “Gemeinschaft und Scheingemeinschaft” [“Community and the So-called Community”] (Zurich, 1954), “Penseurs présocratiques de la Grande Grèce comme médiateurs des fondements spirituels de la civilisation méditerranéenne” [“Presocratic Thinkers of Great Greece as Intermediaries of Spiritual Foundation of Mediterranean Civilizations”] (Erice, 1957), “Zur Gegenwartslage der europäischen Kultur” [“On the Current Situation of European Culture”] (Bolzano, 1958), “Wertverwirklichung” [“Realization of Values”] (Venice-Bologna, 1958), “Značenje povijesne predaje” [“Importance of Historical Tradition”] (Ohrid, 1971). He was also a corresponding member of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, a member of Croatian Pedagogy-Literary Association, Institut International d’Études Européennes “A. Rosmini”, Société Européenne de Culture, Accademia del Mediterraneo and others.

Pavao Vuk-Pavlović died in Zagreb, on November 13th, 1976. As a theoretician, he left some valuable philosophical works, through which he made a considerable contribution to Croatian philosophy. As a teacher, he was known as an excellent and unconventional lecturer, who followed closely his progressive and noble pedagogical ideas in the work with students.³

³ On Vuk-Pavlović as a teacher see in Brida (1974) and Temkov (1987).

2. Vuk-Pavlović's Philosophy

The diversity of Vuk-Pavlović's interests is evident throughout his entire career. According to Franjo Zenko, Vuk-Pavlović is "one of the few Croatian philosophers whose philosophical thought cannot be reduced to some specific philosophical problem, in the sense that it could be considered 'pivotal' for his entire work."⁴ This becomes evident from the very titles of his books and papers delivered at conferences and numerous university courses. Even though he was working in many philosophical fields, I will try to present the main aspects of his theory of knowledge, philosophy of values and philosophy of education.

2.1. Theory of Knowledge

Vuk-Pavlović was concerned with the issue of cognition in the 1920's, during the strong influence of neo-Kantian philosophy. However, he rejects this position, which claims that *cognition* has the absolute importance for the explanation of the world, while *the theory of knowledge* has a decisive role in the formation of an entire philosophical system.⁵ Thus, in his works *Spoznajna i spoznajna teorija* [*Cognition and the Theory of Knowledge*] and *Spoznajna teorija i metafizika* [*The Theory of Knowledge and Metaphysics*], he is primarily interested in the status and the possibility of the theory of knowledge. In other words, the major question he is concerned with can be formulated in the following way: is the theory of knowledge possible at all, even under the assumption of rejecting a skeptical objection that cognition as such is impossible? If we allow that some form of cognition is possible, it still remains questionable whether there is such a thing as a theory of knowledge, and even if there is, "in what sense, under what conditions and within which boundaries."⁶

A theory of knowledge is faced with the same demand as any other doctrine that aspires to have a scientific status. It has to show that it has a *homogenous* subject-matter, and a method by which it will logically and systematically prove itself to be an autonomous and a complete scientific system. However, on the one hand, the theory of knowledge, by insisting on cognition as its area of interest, encroaches upon the field of *psychology* that studies cognition with respect to the function of consciousness. On the other hand, by studying the object of cognition, the theory of knowledge also encroaches upon the field of *the theory of objects*. Thus, the examination of the subject-matter of the theory of knowledge is based on the relation between

⁴ Zenko (1995), p. 393.

⁵ Vuk-Pavlović dissents from his neo-Kantian professors in Berlin, and this makes him closer to Heidegger and Hartmann's thought. Furthermore, in confronting the anti-realistic tradition, the influence of Meinong's theory of objects can clearly be discerned.

⁶ Vuk-Pavlović (1926), p. 13.

these two *heterogeneous* fields. As such, it does not fulfill a necessary prerequisite for achieving the scientific status, that is, it does not manage to present itself as a unique and an autonomous science. This is why Vuk-Pavlović methodologically questions the possibility of the theory of knowledge, claiming that “there are no reasonable issues that lead to some solution, issues that are *truly specific for the ‘theory of knowledge’*, in the sense of an autonomous science.”⁷ There are no such issues precisely because the theory of knowledge deals with the *relation* of cognition and the object of cognition that already make up the separate fields of other sciences.

In this context, it should be noted that Vuk-Pavlović calls these separate fields the “categorical fields”, which are in turn different from what he labels the “categorical layers”. This distinction is clearly exemplified in the relation that various sciences have toward *gold*.⁸ He describes how a chemist studies gold from the perspective of a chemical element, a psychologist from the perspective of a color, a coin collector from the one of coined money etc. Gold, then, together with silver and other chemical elements constitutes the categorical field of chemistry, while, together with other coined money, it constitutes the categorical field of coin collecting etc. These categorical fields are homogenous since they contain the objects of the same kind (chemical elements, colors, coined money etc.). However, if gold is common-sensically understood as a “thing” that possesses certain aspects such as yellow color, chemical element, or value, then we have a case of a categorical layer that is heterogeneous as such.⁹

As we have already seen, the theory of knowledge does not have its own categorical field and, accordingly, it is not a unique science. Since there are several *subject-matters* of different sciences within the framework of the problem of cognition, it becomes clear that there is also no method that would be specific for the theory of knowledge. The method of the theory of knowledge can be discussed only within the framework of the already existing methods of psychology and the theory of objects. Even in this regard, the theory of knowledge cannot be considered as a unique science and, as such, it cannot have the last say when it comes to the problem of cognition. Consequently, it cannot aspire to become a fundamental science that would be responsible for explaining other philosophical disciplines or creating an all-encompassing philosophical system. This role, according to Vuk-Pavlović, belongs to metaphysics or, more specifically, to “metaempiricism”.¹⁰ Meta-

⁷ Ibid, p. 241.

⁸ See more in Mišćević (1999), p. 449.

⁹ Here it is worth noticing that it is impossible to grasp *all* aspects of a certain thing that make up its categorical layer, and, in this sense, it is possible to understand Vuk-Pavlović’s claim that a thing by itself remains uncognizable.

¹⁰ Even though metaphysics does not belong to what could be called the “exact scientific system”, Vuk-Pavlović nevertheless claims that its subject-matter as well as its own method make it an autonomous science. For Vuk-Pavlović metaphysics is a science which for its subject-matter has certain metaempirical positions. See Vuk-Pavlović (1926), p. 179.

empiricism in this matter represents a theoretical explanation of the world that is “behind” the empirical.¹¹ The subject-matter of metaempiricism is a part of the, so-called, *cognitional experience*, which is, furthermore, constituted by the interrelated elements of cognition and the object of cognition. To clarify this point, one might say that there are simply no questions which belong *particularly* to the field of the theory of knowledge. On the contrary, if we are interested in the problem that is in any way connected to the problem of cognition, it is of crucial importance to understand whether we are perhaps dealing with the problem of psychology, the theory of objects, or metaphysics. It has already been said that the theory of knowledge is left to deal with the relation of the two sciences, yielding the process of cognition to psychology, and the object of cognition to the theory of objects. This is also why the theory of knowledge can be considered as a part of metaempiricism. The relation between psychology and the theory of objects itself is of a metaempirical nature.

2.2. *Philosophy of Values*

Vuk-Pavlović perceives *values* as a bridge between the natural and the spiritual sphere of life. By their realization, the human being transcends his natural existence, and in his distancing from the level of mere animal survival, he is recognized as a creative and spiritual being. In this sense, the human being is not simply a passive observer of the natural flow of events, but one that meaningfully shapes the present through creation. There are indications of a future dimension in the present, in which the meaning of human existence is yet to be confirmed. In this tendency toward something that is to be, a human being relies on some *value criteria*, even though there is no guarantee that would ensure in advance the validity of those criteria. In this context Vuk-Pavlović claims:

Since the meaning and value of this criterion can be seen only through the development of life that is individually shaped and lived, its validity cannot be proven in advance by theoretical inference: it should be consistently *believed* in, so that a human being would dare to live a life that will accept this criterion as its decisive direction.¹²

Vuk-Pavlović points to the consistency of human beings and their faith in the appropriateness of their own lives. Even though he does not deny the existence of values and morality, a theoretical proof of *right* values is, according to him, impossible since they can only be confirmed in the future. The value criterion needs to be individually tested, while the human being never knows whether it will lead him to the ultimate meaning of life. The creative realization of values is, in its essence, always directed toward some-

¹¹ Cf. Josifovski (1987), p. 200.

¹² Vuk-Pavlović (1937), p. 8.

thing new and different, and thus cannot be the subject of scientific knowledge. Therefore, the human being on her way toward the future cannot rely on certain knowledge or some kind of a theory that would in advance point to the values she should be led by.

From this point of view it is also possible to understand why Vuk-Pavlović did not write any works on ethics. His conviction was that it is impossible to provide the *valid* ethics due to the very nature of life that changes so quickly that it simply cannot be grasped scientifically.¹³ Despite all this, it would be wrong to conclude that he never considered ethical issues. He himself believed that “there are enough elements in his works to consequently construct an ethical position...”¹⁴ This ethical position is evident in his understanding of values and the role of the human being as a creative being. As already mentioned, Vuk-Pavlović argues that all human tendencies are directed toward discovering the meaning of life, which can be achieved only through *creativity* as a typical human activity. The human, by creating, always finds a way to live according to the values. However, the choice of those values can only be made through the human freedom. Thus he claims:

If the acceptance of the domain of essential values and participation in its realization are to be truthful and genuine, and real, it can only be so out of freedom [...]. And in the same manner, the mutual coordination and adjustment of personal inclination can be understood only from the domain of freedom [...].¹⁵

Ethical experience is based on human tendency toward freedom of the will that is confirmed as autonomous in its relation to the spiritual values. In this regard, the human being can create his place in the world only as a free being. However, this freedom does not exclude his connection with other people. It is exactly in the interaction with other human beings that the human being achieves its human quality. “The human being is not”, in Vuk-Pavlović’s words, “even in the ultimate loneliness, an isolated individual, and is tied with a natural bond that makes it a member of the human community.”¹⁶

Human community would not be possible if it were not based on mutual respect, love, and goodness as a moral value. In this context, it is possible to characterize Vuk-Pavlović’s considerations of ethics as moral anthropology. Following this moral anthropology, the human being is recognized as a human being through the relation to the values, that is, through the morality that is realized only in mutual relation with others. The community must be based on partnership, in regard to any human activity, but especially in regard to moral practice. The community which would discard goodness

¹³ See more in Temkov (1987), p. 121–123.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 121–122.

¹⁵ Vuk-Pavlović (1974), p. 71–72.

¹⁶ Vuk-Pavlović in Temkov (1987), p. 122.

and other moral values would at the same time discard the meaning of its own existence, and would be a “so-called community”.

Since the human activity, as the *active relation* toward the values, can be found in the very foundations both of a personal and a communal life, ethics, for Vuk-Pavlović, is a science which arises from this human activity. Since every activity is subject to evaluation, philosophy acquires an axiological function in the field of ethics, as well as in the fields of aesthetics and pedagogy. These fields are always about subject-object relation, which is characterized by an axiological position. In this regard, the *philosophy of values* becomes the main framework of his views. It is certain that this value-based philosophy was partly influenced by Franz Brentano’s ethics and his theory of sensation of worth as well as Hermann Lotze’s examination of ontological status of values.¹⁷ Based on Lotze’s distinction between the level of causally structured reality and the level of permanent values, it is possible to grasp Vuk-Pavlović’s understanding of values through which the human existence is permanently and meaningfully confirmed by denying the natural flow of time.

2.3. *Philosophy of Education*

Vuk-Pavlović’s philosophical views on education are presented in his book *Ličnost i odgoj* [*Personality and Education*], in which he tried to show that the world can exist only if it is founded on human activity. This activity is characterized by *education*, which is, in turn, seen in its relation to the *future*. Accordingly, the concept of future is one of the central notions of his philosophy of education.¹⁸ However, the future is not perceived as time in its physical sense. By contrast, the future is seen as a qualitative category: it is not just one of the moments of temporal sequence that are to happen unquestionably. Put differently, the future is not something that has to come while the human has no influence on its realization. In author’s words:

[...] the ‘future’ should not be thought of as being like some blind and soulless destiny that is constantly ‘approaching’ with the transitoriness of time and the necessity of the natural laws. The human soul, as the empty time passes and goes by, does not move toward it, but it depends on the man himself as a spiritual being and his experience, whether he will participate in it or not. [...] The future, as considered here, does not come by itself tomorrow, the day after tomorrow or any other following day; it is being ‘born’.¹⁹

To interpret the mutual relation between the education and the future, thus understood, Vuk-Pavlović introduces the notion of *value* that connects them in a specific way. Values and their sustainability are that which defines

¹⁷ Vuk-Pavlović most probably got acquainted with Lotze’s philosophy through his professor Đuro Arnold, who was Lotze’s student.

¹⁸ See more in Polić (2001), p. 101–111.

¹⁹ Vuk-Pavlović (1996), p. 47.

the human being and separates him from the unthinking nature. As spiritual beings, people transcend the “natural” side of their existence by inheriting and achieving the “good” which is passed on to the future generations. In this manner, in spite of the fact that they cannot, as natural beings, escape mortality, they always remain present through the permanent existence of values. Distancing themselves from the biological-physiological mechanisms, and the mere temporal sequence of events, the human race consciously and freely participates in the creation of the future, thus confirming its own existence. Therefore, the future is not merely a segment of time, but its sense lies in the continuity of human *experience* of values. In this regard, Vuk-Pavlović argues that education is the basis upon which the future should be creatively realized.

Education is not simply a means for achieving some external goal. Its purpose should be sought after in itself since education is a prime human activity through which the human being is constantly being confirmed. This activity is necessarily creative, free and liberating, and is mediated through love because “all education is born out of the spirit of love and can only be born from that spirit”.²⁰ Thus, the very educational function is guided by *pedagogical eros* through which the relation between the educator and those being educated (the “educatees”) is being established. Next to love, which is presupposed as a key aspect of the pedagogical activity, the vital importance of *pedagogical altruism* is also emphasized. If transmitting the “good” is the essence of the pedagogical function, then it is obvious that the educator should unselfishly share it with the educatees. If education were aimed at a mere self-preservation or the preservation of species, and not at the preservation of values and life according to those values, then we would be dealing with the educator’s selfishness. However, pedagogical function, if considered like this, would go against the very sense of education.

When and in what way is the relation between the educator and the educatees possible at all? According to Vuk-Pavlović, it is possible only when this relation is not externally conditioned, and when it rests upon *freedom* and mutual respect. It is the appreciation of creative possibilities of the educatees that is a prerequisite for, and a basic characteristic of, an educational attempt. As opposed to this, the attempt at an aggressive formation of a person according to given patterns, by which the autonomy and individuality of the educatees is undermined, is tantamount to denying the sense and purpose of education.²¹ In this context, the educator himself has to denounce his *power*. His authority can be based exclusively on love and understanding. In this way, even the authority becomes a sort of value experience that encourages the educatees to develop their own *personalities*, which will eventually become the educational role model.

²⁰ Ibid, p. 77.

²¹ See more in Polić (2003), p. 182.

Vuk-Pavlović further emphasizes the distinction between the categories of love and power through the relation between *politics* and *education*. He claims that the political and the pedagogical tendencies are always developed in their mutual divergence: the development of power as a politician's principle is in discord with love as an educator's principle. Furthermore, the roles of the politician and the educator differ from each other with respect to their tendency toward *the past* or *the future*. Even though every creative act relies on something past and known, it nevertheless strives toward the future through its realization and the transmission of values.²² In accordance with this, the pedagogical function is necessarily directed toward the future. The function of politics, on the other hand, is realized, as Vuk-Pavlović claims, in its relation to the past. The mutual divergence of pedagogical and political functions, resulting from their orientation toward different aims, can be clearly seen in the following paragraph:

This is a crossroad where the man of power and the man of love finally depart. The power holder and the politician in the end yearn to be heroes of some historical past, or at least wish to appear like one according to their innermost ingrained tendency; a guarantee of their strength out of which the monument of their glory rises is stored in the past. The educator, on the contrary, would like humanity to have a hero of the future that is yet to come out in every single individual.²³

If the diversity of these two human activities is seen in this way, it is clear that their relation toward the *present* will also be considerably different. On the one hand, the present conceived through the eyes of the politician will be realized in the adequate and transient forms of power, that is, in the government and the regime which will attempt at preserving the past. The present conceived from the pedagogical point of view, on the other hand, will manifest itself in the personal experience and its embodiment of values, which is by its very nature eternal and which already achieves the future. With regard to the diverse political and pedagogical formation of the present, any interference on the side of politics in the process of education will eventually lead to the denial of the very essence of education. Thus, the education as a creative activity, in Vuk-Pavlović's view, can and must be carried out freely and without any governmental or state limitations.

However, the truth is that education in non-democratic societies has been controlled by the political establishment. The cause of the supremacy of power over free education can be partly found in the human being's natural side. In order to survive in the society, it forces him to try to accomplish his own interests by fighting against other people's interests. But he is not able to do this unless he possesses a certain amount of power that allows

²² Vuk-Pavlović *does not* consider the past to be irrelevant since it helps in understanding the present. However, he refutes the past if it is manifested through its strict and traditional preservation of the bygone and if it is closed to progress. See in Polić (2003), p. 183.

²³ Vuk-Pavlović (1996), p. 132–133.

him to direct the situation to his own advantage. In order to increase and spread the power, he joins forces with other individuals whose interests to some extent coincide with his own. The consequence of this is the development of the collectivity, and the human being, as a natural individual, necessarily becomes its member.²⁴ Yet, the integration of an individual in collectivity violates human freedom and differences between human beings as well as any educational aspiration. In this sense, Vuk-Pavlović claims that

[...] the integration of an individual into collectivity is in fact achieved by the equating of conditions and relative homogeneity of an individual's position in non-freedom. At this level, freedom and equality are mutually exclusive. In this perspective, equality exists only in non-freedom, and he who wants to build the world in freedom has to put up with versatility, the differences, and allow inequality.²⁵

The situation seems to be paradoxical since the human being, on the one hand, depends on the collectivity which violates freedom and negates human differences, while, on the other, he needs to be raised as a free and a unique human being. However, Vuk-Pavlović believes that the solution to this problem lies in the fact that education should not be focused on the individuality or on the collectivity. Any kind of education that would be one-sidedly directed toward an individual or a social aspect would miss its purpose, which is raising an autonomous *person* responsible both to herself and to others. This can be achieved by distancing from a mere collectivity, and by moving toward social community which is not, in contrast to the collectivity, based on the principles of power and supremacy. Quite the opposite, the social community is based on human love for spiritual values, and their creative realization through the arts, sciences and morality. In this regard, Vuk-Pavlović sees the role of education as consisting in the liberation and the development of human creative potentials upon which every culture is realized and transmitted.

3. Conclusion

As has already been mentioned at the beginning of this paper, Vuk-Pavlović's scholarly work is characteristic for his discussion of numerous and versatile philosophical problems. However, his work shows remarkable consistency and coherence in philosophical, as well as personal views and ideas. Due to this fact, he became prominent on the Croatian philosophical and cultural scene. In the times characterized by political and social turbulences that greatly affected his life and work, he also stood for the depolitization of schools. Never accepting the opposing social and scientific climate of his

²⁴ About Vuk-Pavlović's views on the relation between the individuality and the collectivity, see more in Brida (1974), p. 107–113.

²⁵ Vuk-Pavlović (1996), p. 114.

time, he bravely and progressively defended philosophy and education against the interference of politics and authorities.

Theory of knowledge occupies a particularly interesting position in his work since, in the consideration of the problem of cognition, he departs from dominant neo-Kantian philosophy. In this context, I tried to give a brief outline of why he denies the possibility of the theory of knowledge as an autonomous science.

The value consideration of the meaning of the human life is a recognizable framework of Vuk-Pavlović's philosophical system, which can be clearly seen in his work on the philosophy of education. Thus, I tried to present the way in which love, creativity, individuality, future, and freedom are, as fundamental categories of his philosophy of values, addressed through the relation between the educator and educatee, individuality and collectivity, as well as education and politics.

Bibliography

Brida, M. (1974) *Pavao Vuk-Pavlović, čovjek i djelo* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju Sveučilišta u Zagrebu).

Josifovski, J. (1987) "Spoznajna teorija Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 1–2 [25–26] (Zagreb: Institut za povijesne znanosti, Odjel za povijest filozofije).

Miščević, N. (1999) "Ontologija Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića", *Filozofska istraživanja*, 74 / Vol. 3 (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo).

Polić, M. (2001) *Život i djelo Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića* (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo).

— (2003) "Vuk-Pavlovićeva filozofija odgoja" in P. Barišić (ed.): *Pavao Vuk-Pavlović – život i djelo* (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Institut za filozofiju).

Temkov, K. (1987) "Etički pogledi Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića", *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine*, 1–2 [25–26] (Zagreb: Institut za povijesne znanosti, Odjel za povijest filozofije).

Vuk-Pavlović, P. (1926): *Spoznaja i spoznajna teorija* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti).

— (1937): "Vrednota i stvaralaštvo", *Napredak* 7–8 (Zagreb: Hrvatski pedagoško-književni zbor).

— (1974): "Pogled na kulturnopovijesna smjerenja" in: *O značenju povijesnih smjerenja* (Zagreb: Institut za filozofiju Sveučilišta u Zagrebu)

— (1996) *Ličnost i odgoj* in M. Polić (ed.): *Filozofija odgoja* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada).

Zenko, F. (1995) "Pavao Vuk-Pavlović" in: *Novija hrvatska filozofija* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga).

**Hrvatski filozofi III:
Pavao Vuk-Pavlović (1894–1976)**

LOVORKA MAĐAREVIĆ

SAŽETAK: U radu se donosi kratki prikaz života, znanstvene karijere i filozofije Pavla Vuk-Pavlovića. Ukratko se izlaže Vuk-Pavlovićeva kritika spoznajne teorije i njegovo tumačenje spoznaje kao metaempiričkog pitanja kao i neki aspekti filozofije vrijednosti koja predstavlja glavnu okosnicu njegova filozofskog sustava. Budući da je do danas ostao jedan od najutjecajnijih hrvatskih autora na području filozofskog razmatranja pedagoških problema, glavni je naglasak stavljen na njegovu filozofiju odgoja.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: Pavao Vuk-Pavlović, spoznaja, spoznajna teorija, metaempirika, vrijednosti, filozofija vrijednosti, čovjek, filozofija odgoja, odgoj, budućnost, stvaralaštvo, doživljaj, individualitet, kolektivitet, zajednica, politika, ličnost.
