

A n a l e l e

Universității din Craiova

Seria:

F i l o s o f i e

Nr. 43 (1/2019)

ANNALES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE CRAIOVA – SERIE DE PHILOSOPHIE, nr. 43 (1/2019)
13 rue Al. I. Cuza, Craiova, ROUMANIE

On fait des échanges des publications avec des institutions similaires du pays et de l'étranger

ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA – PHILOSOPHY SERIES, nr. 43 (1/2019)
Al. I. Cuza Street, no. 13, Craiova, ROMANIA

We exchange publications with similar institutions of our country and abroad

Annals of The University of Craiova. Philosophy Series publishes two issues per year, in June and December. The journal is available in print, but it is also available for download as PDF document at http://cis01.central.ucv.ro/analele_universitatii/filosofie/

Editor-in-Chief:

Adriana Neacșu, University of Craiova

Editorial Board:

Anton Adămuț, Alexandru Ioan Cuza
University of Iași

Alexandru Boboc, Romanian Academy

Giuseppe Cacciatore, University of Naples
Federico II

Giuseppe Cascione, University of Bari

Teodor Dima, Romanian Academy

Gabriella Farina, Roma Tre University

Ștefan Viorel Ghenea, University of Craiova

Vasile Muscă, Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-
Napoca

Niculae Mătășaru, University of Craiova

Alessandro Attilio Negroni, Università di Genova

Ionuț Răduică, University of Craiova

Vasile Sălan, University of Craiova

Giovanni Semeraro, Federal University
of Rio de Janeiro

Alexandru Surdu, Romanian Academy

Tibor Szabó, University of Szeged

Cristinel Nicu Trandafir, University
of Craiova

Gheorghe Vlăduțescu, Romanian Academy

Secretary: Cătălin Stănciulescu

Responsible for this number: Adriana Neacșu

ISSN 1841-8325

e-mails: filosofie_craiova@yahoo.com; neacsuelvira2@gmail.com

webpage: http://cis01.central.ucv.ro/analele_universitatii/filosofie/

Tel./Fax: +40-(0)-251-418515

This publication is present in following **scientific databases:**

SCOPUS, Philosopher's Index (USA), European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH, Philosophy), Regesta Imperii - Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA), COLCIENCIAS - Instituto Colombiano para el Desarrollo de la Ciencia y la Tecnología Francisco José de Caldas, Columbia, and meets on the list of scientific magazines established by l'Agence d'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur (AERES).

PLATO'S TRADITIONS IN MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

Oleg BAZALUK¹

Abstract: *The paper is an extension of previous works on the effect Plato's traditions in the development of educational theories in the history of culture. The author distinguished two key stages in the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line. In the paper, the author considers the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line in the Modern Age.*

Keywords: *Plato's line, Greek culture, Modern Age, Heidegger's philosophy, theories of education, humanism, human life*

§ 1. The paper is an extension of previous works on the effect Plato's traditions in the development of educational theories in the history of culture.² We have established that the main features of the theories of education according to Plato's line are:³

1. The relationship between the theories of education and the theories (concepts) of the Universe. In the theories of education according to Plato's line, the basis of the philosophy of knowledge determine the features that form new generations.⁴

2. The theories of education according to Plato's line are based on genuine, scientific and philosophical knowledge of man's place at the scales of the Earth and the Universe. They are in a constant search of the answer to the question: "What is man and what is the meaning of his being at the scale of the Universe?"⁵

3. The theories of education according to Plato's line formulate an understanding of man's image; what kind of man he should be in the meaning of *καλόν*, that is, a desired (or ideal) image. They generate a

¹ Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi Hryhorii Skovoroda State Pedagogical University, Ukraine

² See (Bazaluk, 2017; Bazaluk, 2018).

³ See (Bazaluk, 2017).

⁴ From the written sources that have survived to our generations, that was in Plato's works, for the first time the connection between the peculiarity of the world knowledge and the understanding of education was traced. Plato's pedagogical views cannot be understood beyond his epistemology.

⁵ The dominance of Aristotle's scientific image of philosophy that provides a disinterested pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, John Sellars described in his work (Sellars, 2017).

cultural ideal as a formative principle and the highest principle of morality (the categorical imperative in the terminology of Immanuel Kant), for the achievement of which man and society are directed.¹

We distinguished two key stages in the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line. Consider the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line in the Modern Age.

§ 2. The second stage in the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line is due to the replacement of the geocentric world system by the heliocentric system. The notion that the Earth occupies a central and stationary position in the Universe was replaced with a completely different vision of the structure of the Universe. Initially, Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Johannes Kepler, and others proved that the Sun was the central celestial body around which the Earth and other planets were orbited. In the 20th century, through the efforts of several generations of scholars, the cosmos opened up to us as a large-scale structure of the Universe, in which the existence of numerous planets with biological life and extraterrestrial intelligence is possible.² The basis of the modern understanding of the Universe is formed by the Big Bang theory, which explains the two most significant facts of cosmology: the expansion of the Universe and the existence of cosmic background radiation. The modern Lambda-CDM Cosmological Model (Lambda-Cold Dark Matter) was based on the Big Bang Theory.

However, despite the truly revolutionary achievements in understanding the structure of the Universe, modern cosmology does not take into account the role and influence the properties as well as the evolution of the Universe and cosmic biospheres and noospheres. Mathematics, physics, astronomy and cosmology, which determine the meanings of modern ideas about the main stages of the development of the Universe, do not consider the evolution of biological organisms and man in

¹ In the book "What is Ancient Philosophy?" Pierre Hadot showed that all the philosophers, which founded their schools: Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Plotinus, etc., formed a certain way of life, with the meaning of *καλόν* – the desired ideal. In the Platonic tradition, philosophy is a way of life, and education is a deliberately molding human character in accordance with an ideal of a certain way of life.

² The history of the development of modern ideas in cosmology is set out, for example, by Steven Weinberg (Weinberg, 2013).

their models. It is for this reason, from our point of view, the modern idea of the structure of the Universe is explained deeper and better not by the Standard Model that has been developed in cosmology, but the model of Vladimir Vernadsky that we have called "Evolving Matter."¹ Vernadsky never dealt with the construction of cosmological models. However, his generalisation of the geological and biological chronicles of Earth, which he did in the first half of the 20th century, was equal to a simulation at the scale of a separate cosmic object.

Vernadsky's ideas and his followers about the Earth's biosphere were based on Charles Lyell's ideas, which themselves were no less fundamental and important for the understanding evolution of the Universe. These ideas lay in the fact they were the first that showed the natural relationship between geological and biological evolution. Vladimir Vernadsky first scientifically proved that not only the Universe evolved (according to his terminology – Inert Matter). Having originated from a space vacuum (quantum fluctuations), under the influence of certain physical and chemical processes, Inert Matter, through a transitional state, acquires a qualitatively new structure and functions – Living Matter, at the same time it is continuing to evolve in its primal state. That is, having reached a certain inner perfection, one state of matter transitions logically into another that on the one hand, is a certain hierarchy of the previous ("mother") state of matter and continues to evolve in complete dependence of it, but on the other hand, creates a basis (space) for placement of a qualitative new ("daughter") state of matter.²

Vernadsky's model of the structure of the Universe does not deny the Standard Model. According to Vernadsky's model, the Universe and biological life are two self-sufficient structures that evolve in close interaction with each other. The Universe as Inert Matter develops according to the laws of physics, as envisaged by the Standard Model. Biological life as Living Matter (including man) develops according to the laws of biology, as it is envisaged by the synthetic theory of evolution. The main feature of Vernadsky's model lies in the fact that in it, using the example of the Earth, the main stages of the formation and development of biological life in certain parts of the Evolving Universe are revealed. The

¹ The author considered this issue in numerous articles and books, for example, (Bazaluk & Kharchenko, 2018).

² See (Bazaluk & Kharchenko, 2018).

model shows that, as a result of physical and chemical processes, macromolecules transform into biopolymers, and then into the simplest structures of life, which transforms the surface of an individual cosmic object into the sphere of its existence – the biosphere over several billion years of evolution.

After the first publication of Vernadsky's ideas about the biosphere, much has changed in the world of science. The modern scientific community recognizes the imperfection of the Standard Model and the synthetic theory of evolution. New theories are being created, in which not only the structure of the Universe is clarified, but also the models are proposed, in which the evolution of the Universe, the cosmic biospheres and noospheres are considered as a single process.

§ 3. The replacement of the geocentric world picture with Vernadsky's model "Evolving Matter" led to the formation of a new philosophy of knowledge. The Earth lost its place as the "centre" of the Universe and became an ordinary planet in the expanding Universe. Man discovered that Gods (God) had not created the world, it had constantly been changing and complicating according to the laws of physics, chemistry, biology, etc. The Universe, the biosphere, the noosphere – everything changed in a whole and in parts. For the last four centuries, the philosophy of knowledge is in the constant search, understanding and evaluation of new significative meanings of Being. Among the key thinkers of the second stage, we want to note René Descartes, Immanuel Kant, Georg Wilhelm Hegel and Martin Heidegger. We again take the liberty to denote in Laconian style the meaning of the philosophy of knowledge of the second stage in the development of the theories of education according to Plato's line by a metaphor "*Those who transform the Earth.*" The key phrase of the philosophy of knowledge of this period is the phrase of Friedrich Nietzsche: "God is dead!" Nietzsche wrote about it very impressively and emotionally in the book "The Gay Science":¹ "Have you not heard of that madman who lit a lantern in the bright morning hours, ran to the market place, and cried incessantly: "I seek God! I seek God!" <...> "Whither is God?" he cried; "I will tell you. We have killed him – you and I. All of us are his murderers. <...>Do we hear nothing as yet of the noise of the gravediggers who are burying God? Do we smell nothing as yet of the divine decomposition?"

¹ Nietzsche wrote the book in the winter of 1881 and 1882 in Genoa.

Gods, too, decompose. God is dead. God remains dead. And we have killed him" (Nietzsche, 1990: 592).

Nietzsche's categorical statement "God is dead!" drew a line under the history of world culture in his own way, leaving the philosophy of knowledge "Created by Gods (God)", the meaning of life "the necessity of serving Gods (God)" and the cultural ideal "man of faith" in the past. Humanity needed new fundamental markers of their identification in the material world. Plato's philosophy, which had been determining the basis of world knowledge, the meaning of human life and the cultural ideal for four millennia, was replaced by a new philosophy, in which there was no place for God, the necessity to serve Him and believe in Him. We shall conditionally call the new philosophy of knowledge as Heidegger's philosophy.

Heidegger's philosophy, as a general definition of the philosophy of the Modern Age, is built on certain sets of new fundamental meanings of Being, each of which has its history. We would like to highlight the following:

1. The world around us is the Universe, the biosphere and noosphere of the Earth, which evolve.

2. The Universe, biological life and man have resulted from natural physicochemical processes, some of which have been scientifically established and proven.

3. Life and man on Earth arose as a result of abiogenesis or panspermia.

4. Modern man is a *Homo sapiens*. He has emerged from primates and differed from other anthropoid apes by a number of significant anatomical and physiological changes. For example, the brain structure and volume; bipedalism; the hyoid bone and laryngeal cartilages; the appearance of menstrual cycle; the reduction of hair cover, etc.

5. Man carries out activities that can be compared with the geological chronicle of Earth. In essence, human manifestations in the history of culture continuously and nonlinearly change the structure and appearance of the planet Earth.

The philosophy of knowledge "Those who transform the Earth" has established qualitatively new markers of human identification. Instead of an obedient, with low self-esteem, doomed to the eternal service to the Gods (God) creature, man has begun to identify himself with planetary force that is capable, in conditions of uncompromising competition with geological and biological processes, to create a sphere of his existence on Earth – the noosphere. Or, as Moisey Rubinstein summed up in one phrase

the entire essence of the book “The Vocation of Man” (in German: Die Bestimmung des Menschen) by Johann Gottlieb Fichte:¹ “the ultimate goal of man, in respect of himself and others, as well as in respect of the world and nature, is the accession of reason and the endless imposition and expansion of his power” (Rubinstein, 2008: 126). The philosophy “Those who transform the Earth” freed man’s worldview from dependence: “master – slave” and opened new horizons of development for man of the Modern Age.²

§ 4. From our point of view, at a given historical moment, the basis of philosophy “Those who transform the Earth” is formed by the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. Without belittling the merits of previous philosophical teachings, we believe that at present Heidegger’s philosophy fully embodies the traditions of the theories of Plato’s line and establishes the fundamental markers of human identification. In his research, Heidegger not only constantly appeals to the ideas of Plato, Aristotle and other classics of Ancient Greece, but also relies on philosophical insights and generalisations of the philosophers of the Modern Age: Georg Wilhelm Hegel, Wilhelm Dilthey, Edmund Husserl and others.³ This allowed Heidegger, on the one hand, to transform philosophy into a continuous return to the initial, into the removal and destruction of everything that “conceals the truth,” into the possibility of “the restoration of the dawn’s early light at the surprising and hence *overwhelming* arrival of *Dasein* in the world.”⁴ On the other hand, constantly looking into life, in such a way, as if he was “doing this for the first time”⁵ to build a new philosophical doctrine of human, *fundamental ontology*. The meanings of Being, on which the modern educational practices of Isocrates’ line are based, follow from Heidegger’s fundamental ontology.

In Heidegger’s philosophy, Nietzsche’s phrase “God is dead!” is a borderline that separates the preceding philosophy of knowledge from new

¹ Fichte originally published the work in 1799.

² See, for example, (Rudenko et.al., 2018)

³ In a letter to Karl Jaspers, Heidegger characterized himself as “the museum attendant, who draws the curtains aside so that the great works of philosophy should be seen more clearly” (Safranski, 2005: 565).

⁴ See (Safranski, 2005: 566).

⁵ See (Safranski, 2005: 566).

meanings of Being. In his works, Heidegger repeatedly emphasized the difference between the “old” and “new” worldviews. For example, in the “Letter on Humanism,” polemicizing with rationalism and its derived forms: humanism and metaphysics, Heidegger further clarifies the previous understanding of humanism: “The “*humanum*” in the word points to *humanitas*, the essence of the human being the “-ism” indicates that the essence of the human being is meant to be taken essentially. <...> That requires that we first experience the essence of the human being more primordially; but it also demands that we show to what extent this essence in its own way becomes destinal. The essence of the human being lies in ek-sistence. That is what is essentially – that is, from being itself – at issue here, insofar as being appropriates the human being as ek-sisting for guardianship over the truth of being into this truth itself” (Heidegger, 1949: 262-263). Werner Jaeger wrote that the concept of “humanism”, since the time of Varro and Cicero, meant the process of educating man in his true form, the real and genuine human nature.¹ In the concept of “humanism,” the Romans laid the main markers of human identification, on the basis of which the educational practices according to Isocrates’ line were later built. Therefore, by laying new fundamental meanings in the concept of “humanism,” Heidegger further exacerbated the difference between the “old” and “new” worldviews, as well as between the “old” and “new” technologies of influencing the human brain from the social environment.

Heidegger’s understanding of humanism is important for our research the fact that it focuses on the meanings of three key markers of human identification: the philosophy of knowledge “Those who transform the Earth,” the meaning of human life and the cultural ideal.” “Humanism” now means, in case we decide to retain the word, that the essence of the human being is essential for the truth of being, specifically in such a way that what matters is not the human being simply as such” (Heidegger, 1949: 263). In this definition of humanism, on the one hand, Heidegger emphasises the self-sufficiency of human being and the understanding of man as a powerful transforming planetary force. It follows that the philosophy of “Those who transform the Earth” has a place to be, this is a fact proven by the history of culture for the last four centuries. However, on the other hand, in the definition of humanism, Heidegger emphasises

¹(Jaeger, 1946: xviii).

that the transforming power of man has borderlines that are not dependent on the being of man.¹

The level of scientific and philosophical knowledge of the 20th century allowed Heidegger to penetrate and survey the ontology of being better than his predecessors were and, accordingly, to discover new, deeper sources of human existence. It is from the primordial depths, that is, from the fundamental ontology a true understanding of human as an idea is proceed. Therefore, Heidegger's philosophy is to convey the original destiny of human in being, the meaning of his birth in the Universe and, perhaps, the most successful attempt of this time to highlight the main markers of human presence in the Universe – Dasein's existentials.

§ 5. Philosophy of knowledge "Those who transform the Earth" defines a new meaning of human life and a cultural ideal. We denote the meaning of human life by the metaphor of "*born to create*," and the cultural ideal as an "*intelligent person*." First, we briefly review the history of the formation of the meaning of life "*born to create*."

In the course of lectures on pedagogy, which Immanuel Kant read to students in winter semester 1776–1777,² Kant replaced the "the necessity of serving God" as the meaning of human life by a new meaning that follows from the new philosophy of knowledge. Kant wrote:

One principle of education which those men especially who form educational schemes should keep before their eyes is this – children ought to be educated, not for the present, but for a possibly improved condition of man in the future; that is, in a manner which is adapted to the idea of humanity and the whole destiny of man. ... Parents usually educate their children merely in such a manner that, however bad the world may be, they may adapt themselves to its present conditions. But they ought to give them an education so much better than this, that a better condition of things may thereby be brought about in the future [Kant, 1900].

Unlike the teachings of the Church Fathers, Kant not only allowed the possibility of man's influence the development of the world but also argued that the ability to create and change the world depends on

¹ The author, however, develops this issue as well as Heidegger's philosophy in some of his works, for example, (Bazaluk & Kharchenko, 2018).

²The Kant Lectures were published by his student Theodor Rink in 1803 under the title of "On Education" (Kant, 1900).

education:¹ “Man can only become man by education. He is merely what education makes of him” (Kant, 1900). “It may be that education will be constantly improved, and that each succeeding generation will advance one step towards the perfecting of mankind; for with education is involved the great secret of the perfection of human nature” (Kant, 1900). In the book “On the Meaning of Life,” Moisey Rubinstein revealed the transformation process of the meaning of life in the works of key thinkers of the Modern Age: from Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Immanuel Kant, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, Georg Wilhelm Hegel and others, to Friedrich Nietzsche, Vladimir Solovyov and Henri Bergson. Rubinstein showed how “the necessity of serving God” was replaced by man’s desire to “...identify with himself, be free, active, autonomous and, therefore, moral” (Rubinstein, 2008: 127).

“Born to create,” as the meaning of human life, found its clear form already at the end of the 18th century, in the work of the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte, who formulated it with the phrase “action for the sake of action.” Fichte presented his imperative as follows: “Act! act! it is to that end we are here. Should we fret ourselves that others are not so perfect as we are, when we ourselves are only somewhat less imperfect than they? Is not this our greatest perfection, – the vocation which has been given to us, – that we must labour for the perfecting of others? Let us rejoice in the prospect of that widely extended field which we are called to cultivate! Let us rejoice that power is given to us, and our task is infinite!” (The Christian Pioneer, 1842: 182). The new meaning of human life gave man the possibility for free realisation of the inner creative potentials. From an obedient and diligent executor of someone’s will (“the necessity of serving the Gods (God)”), man passed into “*born to create*,” to act and transform. Man “gained” freedom, which he had only to competently use. As Rubinstein’s analysis showed, it was Fichte who first discovered new perspectives of human life that followed from the new world picture and the philosophy of knowledge “Those who transform the Earth”:

...man acts as the creative power, as a builder of the essence of the world.
...nothing is given to man, he relies on himself, – his existence does not arise from essence, but, vice versa, his essence comes from his existence. Man can perfect himself by perfecting the world. However, for Fichte the existence is to act that stands at the beginning, then to act means to assert and create the moral

¹ See (Tytarenko & Rudenko, 2018).

order of the world, in which the essence of the world is laid. It is clear that man, perfecting himself and the world, creates not only his own, but its essence (Rubinstein, 2008: 129).

In 1946, the best-selling book “Man’s Search for Meaning” of the Austrian neurologist and psychiatrist Viktor Frankl was published (Frankl, 1990). The author chronicles his experiences as a concentration camp inmate and the importance of finding the meaning of life in all forms of existence to survive. Frankl introduced the concept of the “existential vacuum,” or feeling of meaninglessness into scientific literature, which was the complete opposite of “born to create.”

In reality, the meaning of life formed by Fichte at the end of the 18th century on the basis of a new world picture and the philosophy of knowledge opposes the subjective state of boredom, apathy, and emptiness, which arise from the existential vacuum. This meaning of life causes the opposite subjective states: interest, enthusiasm, passion, fullness and richness of life, purposefulness, etc. Moisey Rubinstein formulated the meaning of “born to create” as follows: “...live is to act, create, build a kingdom of reason; this meant to live with an idea, meaning conscious participation in solving global problems, participation in the infinite world creativity” (Rubinstein, 2008: 130).

§ 6. Philosophy of knowledge “Those who transform the Earth” revealed not only a new meaning of man’s existence but also formulated a new cultural ideal an “intelligent person.” The State model of education, in which the place of the Church was occupied by the State, and the place of Christ was given to the University as a social institution, moulding a free comprehensively, harmoniously developed personality, replaced Christian paideia.¹ It was in universities that scholastic thinking, which renewed the cultural ideal “man of faith” with new ideas, was replaced by the understanding of a new future human image, that was, an “intelligent person.” The need for knowledge and the cult of knowledge revived in the society again since the Enlightenment.

The understanding of knowledge in the Modern Age had and has its own distinctive feature. As we already know, Plato regarded knowledge as

¹ The history of the transition from Christian paideia to the State model of education is revealed in the book of Bill Readings (Readings, 2010).

the basis of any virtue and the path to the Divine. His world of ideas and the basis of his ideal State is a certain variety of special knowledge aimed at revealing the Divine and the possibility of contact with it. In Book 7 of the "Republic," Plato listed the knowledge that "...all arts and forms of thought and all sciences employ, and which is among the first things that everybody must learn":¹ arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music and dialectics,² or as Ilsetraut Hadot wrote: "...rather theology and philosophy of number, figure, sound and motions of celestial bodies" (Hadot, 2002: 10). In the Middle Ages, the Church Fathers encouraged only the knowledge that served to strengthen the prestige of theology and the Church as an institution of state and spiritual power. St. Augustine, inspired by Neoplatonic ideas, and then Martianus Capella, Severin Boethius and others, presented this knowledge as the Seven Liberal Arts, which formed the basis for all medieval education: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music (sciences based on mathematical patterns), as well as grammar, rhetoric and dialectics. In Augustine's theory of education, the divine order established the order of divine knowledge.³

A new understanding of knowledge, as the basis of the cultural ideal an "intelligent person," refers to the Age of Enlightenment, when on the basis of mathematical methods the philosophy of rationalism was formed. The understanding of knowledge as *consumer knowledge* that was very close to Isocrates' understanding, i.e., the practical application of scientific achievements for the benefit of "Those who transform the Earth" and "born to create" that followed from the ideas of René Descartes, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and Baruch Spinoza. "Man of faith," who used knowledge to achieve the sublime spiritual goals and to build an ideal State in the Kingdom of Heaven, was replaced by an "intelligent person," who saw a purely practical sense in knowledge. The spiritual orientation of the development of society was replaced by rationalism and freethought. An "intelligent person" needed the knowledge to become a planetary force and to expand his presence on Earth. Knowledge lost the sublime goal in the guide to the realm of the divine (according to Plato) and the possibility of contemplation and compliance with the divine law (according to

¹ (Plato, 1994: 304).

² According to Plato, dialectics is the art of discourse through questions and answers (Plato, 1994).

³ See (Hadot, 2002: 117-118).

Augustine.¹ They became a daily necessity, an attribute of daily existence. It was in the Enlightenment that Isocrates' ideas finally triumphed over Plato's ideas!

The new cultural ideal completely changed the human values and the goals of education as deliberately moulding human character in accordance with an ideal. In the emerging State models of education of the Modern Age, the need for self-realization and creativity began to be regarded as a purpose of man's life, his mission, vocation, and destiny. The mentoring institute, which originated in the traditions of the theories of education according to Plato's line, and which presupposed the dialogical form of learning, i.e. a question/ answer method that the teachers had been using nearly decades to prepare students for making their choices, in order for them to follow a certain way of life, was lost. Investigating this issue, Pierre Hadot pointed out that two important changes occurred in modern philosophy (Hadot, 2005). Firstly, philosophy has ceased to be regarded as the highest stage of education and a way of life. In the theories of education according to Plato's line of the second stage of development, practically nothing remains of the Platonic school traditions. School/university unification of training programs, which allow anyone to get a diploma in order to be an official and to make a career; teaching in the numerous student groups, i.e. to teach no one; etc. are teachings according to the Isocrates school traditions. Secondly, philosophy has turned into a purely formal research of another generalising system that further distances it from people's lives, from its true destiny, which follows from the life and death of Socrates, and Plato's theory of education *is a way of life*. Even in Heidegger's fundamental ontology, which, from our point of view, defines contemporary meanings of being, *producing discourse about philosophy* prevails over the necessity of *being a philosophy* in Socrates' understanding.

The educational theories of the second stage are devoted to continuous rethinking and reevaluation of the meaning of "born to create" and the achievement of the cultural ideal an "intelligent person." For example, starting from the theories of education by Wolfgang Ratke, Jan Amos Komensku, John Locke, Wilhelm von Humboldt, etc. and finishing with the modern theories proposed by Ivan Illich, Paulo Freire, John Bowlby, and others, which developed the education technologies influencing the human brain, in order to maximize the full disclosure of his internal creative

¹See (Augustine, 2000).

potentials. The cultural ideal of an “intelligent person” concentrated on man’s wish to realise his inner potentials in objective reality; achieve inner harmony as well as social and material benefits through a standard set of knowledge and information.

§ 7. Using the theories of education of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Johann Pestalozzi, Marie Montessori and Paulo Freire, we shall briefly consider the features of the formation and development of new fundamental meanings of human being over the last 400 years of the history of culture.

In the second half of the 18th century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau emphasized the importance of education as follows: “We are born weak, we need strength; we are born destitute of all things, we need assistance; we are born stupid, we need judgment. All that we have not at our birth, and that we need when grown up, is given us by education” (Rousseau, 1889: 12). Rousseau differentiated education into three components, among which there was no philosophy “Created by God.” Rousseau wrote in his work “Emile, or on Education”:

This education comes to us from nature itself, or from other men, or from circumstances. The internal development of our faculties and of our organs is the education nature gives us; the use we are taught to make of this development is the education we get from other men; and what we learn, by our own experience, about things that interest us, is the education of circumstances (Rousseau, 1889: 12).

In Rousseau’s theory of education, the meaning of human life was no longer connected with the necessity of serving the Gods (God), it was laid in act: “To live is not merely to breathe, it is to act. It is to make use of our organs, of our senses, of our faculties, of all the powers which bear witness to us of our own existence” (Rousseau, 1889: 15).

At the beginning of the 19th century, developing the philosophy of education “Those who transform the Earth,” a new understanding of the meaning of human life and a cultural ideal, Johann Pestalozzi formulated the basic principle of education: education should be built according to the natural course of mental development in a child. Michael Heafford, a researcher of the works by Pestalozzi, writes: “The three elements “head, heart, and hands” are inseparable from each other in Pestalozzi’s method: “Nature forms the child as an indivisible whole, as a vital organic unity