

PHILOSOPHY OF ANTUN BAUER IN ITS TIME

Ivan Macan S. J.

UDK 1 (091) Bauer, A.

Antun Bauer, a philosopher and a theologian, a regular member of the Yugoslav Academy of Science and Art, archbishop of Zagreb and people's representative in Croatian Parliament, whom after his death Dr. Albert Bazala described in his "commemorative word" as a "splendid source of brilliant thought, noble feeling, devoted will, philanthropic fondness, patriotic aspiration and religious fervour", is almost forgotten, completely unjustly, even amongst the ecclesiastics. Therefore now, more than 60 years after his death and more than 140 years after his birth, it is more than necessary to look back at personality and achievement of a man who deserves it. The mere fact that his philosophic work could be subject to a whole array of themes implies that Bauer was in many ways a pioneer in recent Croatian philosophy, and especially in philosophy relying on Christianity (it is therefore called "Christian philosophy" or "neo-scholasticism").

1. Life and work of Antun Bauer

But let us first take a look at the course of his life. Bauer descends from a German-Austrian family that came to Croatia from Burgenland (Gradišće) in Austria. His father, also Antun, was born in Siegendorf (Cindrovo) in the county of Soprov*, but his family moved to the estate of count Erdödy in Jastrebarsko. He married Barbara Rubinić, a Croatian girl from Jastrebarsko area, with whom he had fifteen children. Not until the third child did he have a boy whom he gave the name of his patron St. Anthony of Padua. He was born on 11. February 1856, in the village of Breznica not far from Bisag, where his father had moved after he got married. When little Antun was at the age of two, his father rented a dairy plant on another Erdödy estate in Zamlaka near Varaždin, in the parish of Vidovec.¹

¹ [Parish priest Ivan Zrinščak liked little dark Tonček very much so when he once in jest asked the only four year old boy: "So, what will you be, Tonček?", the boy replied to him: "I will

He went to the elementary school in Jastrebarsko, where his father had sent him to his parents, but after the second grade and after his parents moved to Varaždin, where his father bought a house in Long street (Duga ulica) and became a citizen of Varaždin, and even a councillor in city's assembly, he continues his education in Varaždin to first finish the elementary school, and then to join the grammar school of Varaždin. Though not born in Varaždin, it was Varaždin where he spent the most beautiful years of his schooltime, writes Barl. The last two grammar school grades he finishes in "black school" seminary in Zagreb, where he also continues studying theology. In the same grade there were a couple of boys with him who became famous later on; among them were future university professors Tomo Maretić and Bauer's opponent Franjo Spevec. His theology professor was Josip Stadler, who wanted Bauer to continue his studies in Rome or at least in Louvain after he finishes grammar school, but archiepiscopal chancellor Nikola Horvat objected to it. In the end, in his third year of studies, Bauer was sent to Budapest in 1877, and after having been ordained (1879), he went to the Fritaneum in Vienna as a young priest. In Budapest he associated with Romanian Uniates who experienced similar destiny in the Hungarian capital like Croats. He was ordained on 27th July 1879, and he held his virgin mass on August 10th in the Ursuline church in Varaždin. In June 1880 he comes to Vienna where he stays until the end of 1882. He studies theology and wins his doctoral degree. After having returned to Zagreb, he becomes a catechist, first in Samobor, then in a male normal school and finally, throughout three years until October 1887 at upper-town grammar school in Zagreb. Namely, at the beginning of October of that year he becomes a tutor on the Theologic College, and associate professor of basic theology the following year. He remained associate professor for the entire 22 years, until December 31st 1904, and the reason for that was that the Croatian civil governor, civil governer Khuen-Hédervary opposed to Bauer's becomming a regular professor because he was "a good Croat and oppositionalist" (according to Ante Radić, comp. Stj. Srkulj, Zbornik, p. 14)².

be mister parish priest" and his father added: "Not a parish priest, but a bishop". (Comp. Barlè, *Dječje i đачke godine /Childhood and schoolday years, tr.*, in Zbornik, 1929, p. 9)]

- 2 [Professor Petar Grgec writes about this in biography of Dr. Rudolf Eckert: "Kuhén as Croatian ban had persecuted him once. On the January 20th 1898 Dr. Šandor Bresztyenszky gave a speech in the Parliament defending the Theological Department. On this occasion he said to Dr. Ante Bauer the following: Regarding associate professors please allow me to point out one specialty on our University in Croatia, one specialty of classes in Croatia. One professorship of the Theological Department holds a man, perfect regarding his private life as well as his scientific education, a man who gained a reputation in Croatian literary world and who until recently has not been in politics. With his remarkable pen he defends the Church, regardless who he had to fight against. And unless the circumstances change, I think in three or four semesters this man shall celebrate his twentyfifth semester as associate professor. Even today this man has a *malheur* to belong to a coalition opposition.' After these words

Even before he became college professor, i. e. in 1886, Bauer becomes editor of the weekly *Katolički list* (Catholic weekly), in which he particularly developed his polemic activity in defending the Church. This activity of his describes Dr. Stjepan Bakšić: “In the manner of a routined sub–editor he watched vigilantly all the occurrences of the Catholic life here and in the world. Neither philosophic–theologic nor social movements cannot escape him, either here or in the world. And he registers and evaluates all these occurrences in the *Katolički list*, always bearing in mind the one practical principle of his work: consolidation of Catholicism in all areas of Croatian public life” (*Zbornik*, p. 16). He leaves his editorial service in 1890 and then completely devotes himself to school and science. He continues his cooperation with *Katolički list* as well. But his literary work begins now, especially in the field of philosophy. At that time, on proposal of Franjo Marković PhD, because of his studies of Wundt’s metaphysics, Bauer also becomes a member of the Yugoslav Academy. In 1896 he first becomes a correspondent, and in 1898 full member of the Academy. In 1915, now the archbishop of Zagreb, he was chosen by the same Academy for its first patrony after its founder bishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer.

But Bauer becomes very important for us because in 1892 he wrote and published his piece of work “Naravno bogoslovlje” (Natural Theology) as “the first such a book in Croatian language”, as he claims in his foreword. Zlatko Posavac writes about this work of Bauer in the philosophical review *Praxis* in 1967, in times when almost nothing positive was written on clergy: “Since Kržan’s article (on genesis of man) was of a polemic nature, and since Stadler’s books were published later on, it was Bauer who deserved credit as a writer, even in the theological–textbook form, of the first, most abstract philosophic discipline entirely described in Croatian language”.³ Two years later, in 1894, “Opća metafizika” (General Metaphysics) was published. In these two works Bauer expounds scholastic philosophy in Croatian language and thus making, as one of the first, Croatian philosophic terminology.

In 1906 Bauer becomes a chancellor of the Croatian university in Zagreb. On this occasion he held, and later published, his outstanding inaugural speech *Religion and science* in which he pointed out the true freedom of university teaching as well as impossibility of a conflict between the true science and the true religion. On this occasion he experienced inconveniences again, when a couple of youngsters tried to discredit him because of his catholic and theologic points of views. They were children of those people who imported and spread thoughts of theology from Prague as of an out–of date science, in

one could hear “Long live Bauer!” within the left wing.” (Petar, Grgec, *Dr. Rudolf Eckert*, p. 112–113).

3 *Praxis*, No. 3, 1967, p. 401.

fact as a non-science which did not belong to the university and therefore neither a theologian nor a priest could be a university chancellor.

When Josip Posilović (1834–1914), the archbishop of Zagreb, had already weakened, his successor was sought. P. Grgec writes about it in the above mentioned text as follows: “Croatian–Hungarian Unionists, coalitionists and members of the Croatian Party of Right fought on Kaptol.... Croatian–Hungarian Unionists, canons Švinderman, Ivančan and Radičević would have been eager to see their like-minded friend Dr. Ivan Krapac as the archbishop of Zagreb, who on April 7th 1910 became bishop of the diocese of Đakovo. Followers of ‘Croatianness’ were fond of the canon Dr. Gustav Baron, and the coalitionists, canons Iveković, Suk and Pliverić, stuck to the university professor Dr. Ante Bauer and said: he has to be Posilović’s successor!” Grgec adds to it: “Not one other candidate could compare with him regarding education.”

And really, Dr. Antun Bauer was consecrated for bishop on January 29th 1911 in Rome, and in 1914, in the eve of the World War I. he became the 71st bishop and the 4th archbishop of Zagreb. In 1929 that event and the situation of that time Dr. Svetozar Rittig described like this: “Never has the bishopric of Zagreb gone through tougher times. Not even in the time of the Turkish invasion. The Earth poles shook in terrifying war and the face of the world changed. The Croatian people enters a new era of its life and history, and with it the metropolis and archdiocese of Zagreb” (*Zbornik*, p. 89–90).

When Bauer becomes (arch)bishop, his scientific activity mainly ceases, so that he can devote himself to other, pastoral activities. Many institutions in Zagreb and Croatia have to write the name of Antun Bauer in their history.

He is the protector of the *Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Science*, a great benefactor of the *Croatian university* in Zagreb. It is to his credit that medical Faculty and Faculty of agriculture and forestry were founded. Bauer donates or sells them land for fair prices to build clinics and institutes on. He takes care for the academic canteen, for students’ homes, for poor students and pupils.

Croatian theologic academy thanks to Bauer for its existence because he initiated founding of that scientific theologic society for systematic organizing of the theologic work.

He is particularly interested in public education of the “grass-roots”. He was the protector of the “St. Jeronimus’ Society”. On September 16th 1922 he opens “archbishopric great grammar school with the right of publicity* in Zagreb”, and he later on built imposing buildings of boys boarding school in Šalata.

He supported sound press and stimulated clergy and laymen to write. With his own money he founded the “Archbishopric printing-works” and decided to give it to the “Boys seminary”.

Bauer is also a promoter of the idea of co-operative, he collects shares and founds Agricultural bank which would give credits to the Croatian peasant. Its first premisses were in his private apartment.

Archbishop Bauer was very active even in the political area; first as a follower of Starčević's teaching, and after the split of the Starčević-movement, he joins the coalition, which was why the Croatian-Hungarian Unionists labeled him as a serbofil. His speeches in the Parliament in Budapest were well-known (Bauer knew the Hungarian language, which was also mentioned in the protocol of the Viennese collegium).

Bauer withstands lack of clergy in his archdiocese and realizes his old wish: building of a boys' seminary with its own grammar school. He invested massive church capital in order to make as good a use of it as possible and save it from disappearing in bank vaults.

He renewed the archdiocese and invites to Zagreb many orders: Conventualists, Tertiaries, Salesians, Dominicans and Franciscans, as well as many female monastic communities.

As president of the Bishop's conference he spreads his influence even beyond the borders of his archbishopric. He protects just causes of the Church, its agrarian goods, religious teaching in schools, freedom of Marian congregations.

He takes care of renewal the spiritual life, especially among priests. He introduces eucharistic congresses at deaneries, and he held the Croatian national eucharistic congress in Zagreb twice. He opens the first diocesan synod (1925) for implementation of the new ecclesiastical code.

Archbishop Bauer is also a great benefactor of Zagreb. For only a slight compensation he assigned to the municipality whole complexes of the prebendal land in the city's area at sizes of dozens of acres so that new building sites could emerge. And within two years he himself builds the largest residential building on the grounds of the former archbishopric garden in Vlaška street (the building is later on called "Vatican" and was expropriated during the communist regime) "whose Eastern front street will carry Bauer's name forever", wrote Ivan Peršić in 1929 (*Zbornik*, str. 72).

His associate Fran Barac (canon of Zagreb and the first chancellor of the Boys' seminary on the hill of Šalata in Zagreb) writes about Bauer's character: "He jokes, laughs, sings, but always 'in Domino'. He is patient to the extreme. [...] When necessary, he faces the risk and fights. He is tactful, because he is a realistic man, aware of responsibility of his status, but he is also resolute. On top of that he was an authority even to those who did not respect authority of the Catholic Church" (Dr. Antun Bauer, in *Bogoslovna smotra*, (Theological review) 1938, p. 14). Antun Bauer died on December 7th 1937 at the age of 82.

2. *State of science and philosophy in Antun Bauer's time*

But let us examine philosophy of Antun Bauer and the time it developed in. In order to make the most fair judgement of Bauer's contribution to Croatian philosophy, one should take a brief look at the general state of Croatian philosophy in the time when he emerged on the scene.

If the philosophic life of a country is mainly tied to university, we have to remind that the new university in Zagreb was not founded until 1874. As is known, Jesuits were the first ones in Zagreb to open public philosophy studies in 1662 and seven years later procured university rights from the emperor that were, unfortunately, soon suspended by Vienna and Rome in large part. After in 1773 Jesuit order was dissolved, in 1776 empress and queen Maria Theresa issued a decree on new temporary school system in Croatia and founded *Royal Science Academy* (*Regia scientiarum academia*) with three university studios: philosophical, theologic and law school. Bishop Josip Galjuf requires that a complete university be found in Zagreb, but the resistance from Budapest caused this request to remain unfulfilled for one university in Budim was considered enough for the whole Hungarian Kingdom. In 1777 Maria Theresa introduces new and definite school system rules, so called *Ratio educationis*, for Croatia and Hungary. Ever since 1784, when Josef II. separated the theologic college from the Academy which was then transferred to the Central seminary on Kaptol, until 1850, the Academy consists of only two faculties: philosophic and law school. The philosophic college consisted of Departments for philosophy, mathematics, physics and history. Following the instructions of the government in Vienna (in the era of Absolutism), in 1850 the whole school system in the Habsburg Monarchy was reformed and by the decree of the 3rd October 1850, six years before Bauer was born, Royal Academy in Zagreb was dissolved. The philosophic study (or college) joined with the classical grammar school, as well as the 7th and 8th grade, and the law school was turned into *Imperial-Royal Law Academy* (*Regia academia iuris*) which until 1874 remained the only degree-granting educational institution in the Banska Hrvatska* and the only true successor of the old Academy. Law students could not get doctor degree on this Academy; instead they had to get it on other universities in the Monarchy.

After the collapse of the Habsburg's absolutism the Croatian Parliament decides to establish a university. During emperor Franz Joseph I.'s visit to Zagreb in 1869 the *ban* (governor) submits him for approval an Article on the University in Zagreb which the emperor indeed confirmed on the April 8th 1869, but the realization of this Article had to wait another five and a half years because of the internal tensions between the National and the Unionist parties so that the university was opened on the October 19th 1874 with the

speech of the *ban* Ivan Mažuranić as king's envoy 205 years after the Leopold's privilege.

The new university consists of four colleges: law school, theologic college, philosophic college and medical school which remain on paper up to 1917/18. During the rule of the *ban* Kuhen Hédérvary in 1894 a new piece of University act was passed which authorized the government to propose candidates for professor positions to the king without the suggestion of professorate. The law school and the theologic college moved in 1882 from already too small upper-town building of the old Academy into today's building of the vice-chancellor. The theologic college still remains in the Seminary on Kaptol. The first professors on the theologic college were Josip Pliverić, Feliks Suk, Josip Stadler, Antun Kržan, and on the philosophic college Franjo Marković and later Đuro Arnold.

Bauer starts studying theology in 1875 in Zagreb. His professors were Anton Kržan and Josip Stadler, who distinguished themselves as philosophers as well. In 1874 Kržan already publishes a comprehensive and complete work "Genesis of Man According to the Latest Prudent and Natural Sciences" (Volume 1, and in 1877 Volume 2), in which he confronts the theory of evolution and those in general who thought that science was against religion and theology. I suppose that those two were the ones who directed young Bauer towards philosophy, because in Budapest and Vienna he studied only theology.

In order to achieve a better understanding for the philosophic direction in which Bauer's mind developed, one should consider reflective movements within the philosophy on Catholic theologic colleges, especially in Europe. At the beginning of the studies each student of theology has to spend some time studying philosophy. As is known, this philosophy is normally called *neoscholasticism* or to get more to the core *neothomism*. This movement develops in the middle of the 19th century, and with the encyclical letter of the Pope Leon XIII. *Aeterni Patris* it gets a strong momentum. Neoscholasticism and neothomism had a stronghold in Italy, in the reformed Gregorian University and in the magazine *Civiltà cattolica*. This magazine deserves the most credit for spreading the neoscholastic idea. The professors of Gregorian University first resisted the integrist course represented by the *Civiltà cattolica*. The most famous names among them are Salvatore Tongiorgi and Domenico Palmieri, so that the polemics among the Jesuits had to be calmed down by the Jesuitic general Pierre-Jean Beckx himself (1795–1887). The Neothomists took the victory. They were at their highest with the proclamation of the famous 24 Thomistic theses (1914), that were prescribed as "the real science" and were to be accepted with obedience. Orthodoxy was always measured by accepting and overlapping with such a Thomism. Among the champions of the neoscholasticism is German Jesuit Josef Kleutgen (1811–1883) who was the teacher to our Kržan and Stadler, and they to Bauer. Neoscholastics did

not have a positive relation towards modern philosophy nor towards sciences. Modern was always identified with rebellion against the Church authority, with subjective unyielding pride, with hidden or obvious inclination towards protestantism by accepting the political revolution and social changes. Neo-scholasticism saw its task in defending the Church idea, i. e. in apologetic point of view.

Since Bauers teachers Stadler and Kržan were Roman students, he, too, inherited the apologetic point of view from them. This can be best seen in his polemics against then “modern” ideas of liberalism, evolutionism and materialism (Bauer opposes them under the term of “realism”) which was spread in Croatia mainly by those who were not philosophers, like for instance Bogoslav Šulek — linguist, Špiro Brusina — biologist and Franjo Spevec — jurist. In Bauer’s polemics with Anton Mahnič, the bishop of Krk, and the magazine “Hrvatska straža” on Fran Barac’s book *O modernoj katoličkoj apologetici* that presented that apologetics rather critically and Bauer took Barac’s side, we can see his more elastic point of view within the very Catholic philosophic idea. In his *Naravno bogoslovlje* (Natural Theology) he also judges Kleutgen when he writes about him that we are dealing here with “maybe the greatest theologian and philosopher of this century” (p. 110). If we know that Kleutgen’s *Philosophie der Vorzeit* represents a strong defence of scholasticism and a strong confrontation with Georg Hermes and Anton Günther especially, then we can conclude that Bauer, who besides Latin read mostly German authors, fed on those ideas, too. But Bauer often quotes German apologist Constantin Gutberlet (1837–1928) as well, who though studying in Rome as a Germanist, in his works is not a Thomist at any price. While dealing mostly with marginal questions in the area of natural sciences, Gutberlet wrote a series of apologetic essays on then current questions, for instance on Darwinism, Determinism, Wundt and Fechner, but as a philosopher he tried to enrich the Christian philosophy with means of modern science. Therefore we can assume that neither Bauer was so intransigent, especially when it was not a question of a direct attack on religion and theology, which was exactly what those three already mentioned university professors did. Bauer’s elasticity can be seen in the fact that he considers Günther, Hermes and Rosmini, as “great minds”, people who were denounced in the 19th century and regarded as “adversaries”. But he still says for them that they “stumbled” while dealing with some difficult problems (op. cit. p. 118).

Both Bauer’s books with which, in his own words, he “tried in the first place to satisfy the needs of listeners of mine to whom I owe to interpret this teaching in the Croatian language” (*Nar. bog.* Preface) or to comply with “the wish of Holy Father Lenon XIII. to spread the teaching of St. Thomas” which fills him with joy “as well as a Catholic or as a Croat” (*Opća metafizika*, Pref-

ace), were textbooks. Still, they were written in a clear style, not in usual theses. Even a quick look in these books makes an impression that Bauer was very well acquainted with scholastic teaching, especially with the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas, whom he extensively quotes. Unfortunately, he only quotes him in Latin, without translation, apparently thinking that his readers understand Latin. Though Bauer is a faithful follower of St. Thomas' teaching, he is not a strict Thomist. When outlining the famous question on difference between "existence and essence", he still inclines towards Suarez when he writes: "Although it seems that those who claim that essence really differs from existence have more right to refer to St. Thomas, we still think that stronger reasons campaign for opposite opinion that allows only virtual difference" (Opć. met. p. 57). He tries to justify his point of view with reasons by firstly outlining standpoints of his opponents and by responding to them, and concludes this discussion with: "Therefore we think that essence and existence in created beings differ only virtually, only *ratione cum fundamento in re*", thus citing Suarez (nav. dj. p. 58). While outlining his doctrine Bauer quotes famous (neo)scholastics of the 19th ct. like J. Kleutgen, Till. Pesch, S. Schiffini, A. Stöckl, C. Gutberlet, but also those who, on grounds of their refusal of strict Thomism, were denounced like Palmieri and Tongiorgi (compare op. cit. p. 104). But Bauer wrote his books some twenty years before the famous 24 Thomistic theses were published.

Bauer publishes the most important Aristoteles' texts in the original Greek language, and thus introduces the Greek text to the Croatian readers, which was critically published in 1831. Bauer also quotes other philosophers quite extensively, even those who, in terms of time, are very close to him, especially from the German language. This shows that he eagerly followed philosophic events of the 19th ct., starting from Kant, over German Idealism to post-Kantists. Even while confronting with those heterodox philosophers, Bauer, whom we know because of his sharp polemics where now and then words unusual for the scientific language were written, remains restrained, though determined in his point of view.

4. *Bauer's struggle against liberalism and materialism*

But first we have to point out that Bauer was a Christian philosopher and apologist who opposed the intrusion of materialistic and liberal spirit into Croatian regions, which was spread mostly by non-philosophers. It was something Bauer was unmercifully critical about.

As we have already mentioned, the polemic that had lasted for the whole two decades, especially through public lectures, articles, brochures and books, was mostly directed against three Zagreb university professors, all of

whom were not professional philosophers. It was, in the first place, the linguist Bogoslav Šulek (1816–1895), who spread materialistic ideas with extraordinary sharpness. On the April 14th 1888, as a regular member of the Yugoslav Academy, Šulek read his work on a session of the mathematical and natural history section, and he later on published it in the *Rad JAZU* with the title *Područje materijalizma* (The Area of Materialism). Bauer was provoked to respond, so he as well published his work under the same title as a response to Šulek. A today's reader may be really astonished by the sharpness of this polemic. Bauer is 40 years younger than Šulek, but that does not prevent him from attacking him very sharply. At the age of only thirty Bauer writes: "So Croatian people would be much better off, had Dr. B. Šulek never enjoyed its hospitality; and Croatian people would really not mind, if neither S. Brusina ever celebrated even a little bit of his common sense" (Kat. l., 1886, No. 44, p. 348). Professor Špiro Brusina (1845–1908) (Italian by origin) was a biologist and quite important for the Croatian science in this branch, but he spread with great zeal darwinistic evolutionist ideas that were against the immortality of the human soul. Of course, Bauer opposed to that by criticising "realism, empirism and raising the intellect over religion". He calls to Šulek and Brusina: "Gentlemen of experiments and sharp critic based on the scientific grounds, admit that we, too, have common sense! But our common sense is not lonely, it is not narrow and sceptic, it does not strive after demolishing everything; it exists in harmony with all our spiritual powers, in harmony with indisputable metaphysical truths. [...] We resist to the fact that human intellect is a sovereign principle of the knowledge and life as well; we resist to calls for raising the human intellect on the throne of the God" (Kat. l. *, 1886, p. 331). Maybe it would be interesting to cite here Bauer's words he wrote in the same volume, warning against dangers that come from chemistry, that are very current for us today. He writes: "Perhaps a hero shall be born who will invent a masterpiece of mechanical skill, that shall turn the whole world into nothing with a single bang" (op. cit. p. 337).

But still maybe the sharpest critics Bauer excersized against his former fellow student, now a colleague at the univeristy, "just chaired" law professor Franjo Josip Spevec (1855–1918). In his lectures and essays as well as his speeches in the Parliament Spevec spoke from a liberal point of view and denounced Christianity, especially theology to which he denied a scientific feature. He used to lecture "in an antichristian and atheistic spirit".

Here are some of Spevec's statements:

- The Church threatened with destruction of culture.
- The mediaeval Christianity committed a big sin because it kept the spirit in chains for a thousand years.
- The most beautiful places in the Bible were taken from pagan works, especially from Seneca.

- Theology did not consider methods and backgrounds of other sciences, so that the things that happen are nothing in essence but a seeming science of the mediaeval scholasticism.
- It is ironic when catholic priests call themselves benefactors and friends of the people. They plead for the people when their own good is at stake, but otherwise they fleece the people on every occasion they have.

It is clear that such and similar expressions are very irritating. Yet, Spevec referred to the ideas of the Catholic theologic school from Tübingen. Clearly, Bauer firmly rejected such ideas, and he criticized even this school of Tübingen: “This school is a disgrace to him! Now we understand which inelligent theologians are the ones who regret the fact that for such an important phenomenon as Christianity there are no historically credible data as of the way of its factual origin and its first development” (Kat. l. 1886, No. 30, p. 233). When in addition to that prof. Spevec, first in the brochure *The Meriage and the State* accused bishops Posilović and Strossmayer for ultramonatism, and later on in a series of articles and anonymously under the title *Pismo Luke prijatelju Marku* pledged for an obligate and dissoluble civil marriage as well as for the absolute power of the state over the Church and religion according to Hegel’s principle, Bauer, having of course recognized the author, responds to him by a series of articles in the *Katolički list* titled *Pismo Luki o njegovom pismu Marku* in which he again strongly opposes to Spevec’s ideas. In the end Bauer calls on his former fellow student to convert to God on time: “Luka, you are still too young to be obsessed by such thoughts. Mine might still come too late for ‘God does not permit to be mocked’ (Gal. 6, 7). Therefore I beseech you with the memory on those days we spent together under one roof — the seminary — and repeat to you: ‘Do not hesitate to convert to the Lord and do not postpone it from day to day, for His anger will come suddenly and the time of revenge will destroy You (Eccl. 5, 8. 9), Yours sincerely Ante” (Kat. l. 1887).

It would be wrong to conclude, based on Bauer’s polemics with then famous Croatian scientists, that he was against modern sciences. On the contrary, under the influence of Gutberlet, who distinguished himself exactly through his attempts to relate philosophic problems with natural sciences, he was, too, open for scientific achievements, of course, when those sciences did not oppose, often to quickly and to hastily, to metaphysical principles and religious truths. He represents the idea that there can be no confrontation between the revelation in the Bible and nature. If not so, than the interpretation is to be blamed: “contradiction lies in the exegesis of both books” (Kat. l. 1886, p. 97). The same thought will be elaborated in his inaugural speech *Vjera i znanost*. Science has “an indefinite open field of researches” in front of itself,

and revelation does not say anything about them. Namely, there is nothing on physics, chemistry, philosophy nor astronomy etc., says Bauer to those who denied him, as a priest, his belonging to science and to the university.

5. *The meaning of Bauer's work in Croatian philosophy*

We can conclude that Bauer belonged to the stream of the European philosophical movement by the fact that for an object of his mature discussion he chose the system of his contemporary German philosopher and positivist Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920). Stjepan Zimmermann says that Bauer's work (Wundt's metaphysical system) Wundtovo metafizički sustav, "affirms not only the precise Bauer's being well-informed on modern philosophy, but also his critical view on its basic problems". Zimmermann concludes: "In our Croatian philosophical literature Bauer was the first one to document **critical understanding of the modern philosophy**" with this discussion (Bauer kao filozofski pisac, Zbornik, p. 27).

It is interesting to observe that Bauer did not have any significant confrontations with his colleagues philosophers on the Philosophic college, "the most eminent names of secular philosophy in the 19th century Croatia" (Posavac), which are Franjo Marković and Đuro Arnold. Indeed, Bauer is often attributed with the fact that in his later points of view Đuro Arnold left his spiritualistic monism, panpsychic evolutionism and agnosticism and started to incline to neoscholastic way of thinking, especially in his text *Monizam i kršćanstvo* (Rad, 178 1909). And Franjo Marković proposed Bauer to be a member of the Yugoslav Academy. Perhaps the reason for this is what Albert Bazala, also a philosopher and academician, said about Bauer in his funeral speech:

He Bauer judged the scientific mind and philosophic thought within a specific frame of religious view, convinced that it was the ultima ratio of the human option. But beside the understanding that human nature is not only exposed to mistake ("man makes mistakes all his life") but it is often induced to wander and try until it reaches the right way, he has always been ready to engage in a sober and calm discussion where he saw a good will for truth. This kind feature repaid to him, if he ever made a mistake in judging the scientific and philosophic endeavours and overlooked possibilities for their reconciliation with Christian understanding, that emerged later on; it repaid to him justly, for he has never sought a personal gain, perhaps a personal victory, but rather the victory of a better idea. Everyone, who came in contact with him, had an opportunity to feel this kind, open and benevolent definition of his principally and significantly matured personality" (Annual JAZU, vol. 50, 1938, p. VI).

Although these words were said on the occasion of Bauer's death, when usually negative things are not mentioned, — since they were said by a serious man, a philosopher himself, who did not curry favour with the clergy, such as Bazala — they represent a fine testimony on Bauer's efforts to enable "the victory of a better idea".

Even in clerical area Bauer confronted another equally strong personality and champion of truth such as Anton Mahnič, the bishop of Krk. Although both had in common an intention and struggle against invasive liberalism, Mahnič's religious and political integralism and conservatism were still too rigid for Bauer's standpoints. This was especially obvious in the already mentioned quarrel on Barac's book, but also on Catholic organisation such as "followers of Domagoj". Though a Slovenian by origin, Mahnič was a determined fighter for the development of Croatian Catholicism and Catholic Croatian-ship, and his Hrvatska straža, whose programme was to confess and defend "principles of Christianity and sound philosophy" (No. 1, p. 1), was able to realize this task. He himself stated: "I was born as a Slovenian, but I will die as a Croatian" (quot. ref. to Grgec, nav. dj. p. 148). Hrvatska straža published also number of philosophic texts that covered modern questions of liberalism, Darwinism, Spinozism, Christian philosophy, scholasticism etc. Grgec writes about that: "With his 'Hrvatska straža' Mahnič gave a beautiful example to the Croatian literature and journalism. With its strength his style reached the style of Ante Starčević. Unlike Ante Bauer, he did not restrict himself to individual persons and systems and theologic textbooks, but rather he syntetically elaborated all the events in Croatian public life for scholars as well as for the clergy" (op. cit. p. 147). Grgec was not a philosopher but rather a literary man, so he certainly was not able to completely weigh out the meaning of Bauer's "theologic textbooks".

At the end we can say that Bauer's philosophy was indeed completely in harmony with its time; that it satisfied the needs that imposed on the Croatian intellectuals at the turn of the century. We think that we should regret the fact that Bauer's contribution to the Croatian philosophy remained forgotten and neglected. I would like to conclude with the words of Stjepan Zimmermann that he wrote in 1929: "Bauer belongs to the creators of the most recent philosophical period in Croatia. [...] He belongs to the "first and strongest" philosophic workers. His colleagues on the Philosophic college were Marković and Arnold, and on the Theologic college (before Bauer) Kržan and Stadler were the ones who distinguished themselves. Science was being created for the university of Zagreb had just been founded. One should point out that with his education as a teacher on the Theologic college Bauer undoubtedly belonged among those bright minds that are pride of the annals of our Alma Mater" (Zbornik, p. 29).