Abstract

During the first two decades of the 20th century, Greece's philosophical scene was dominated by neokantianism. In the so called “Heidelberg group” of philosophers we come across a company of people educated in post-WW 1 Germany, close to some of the most influential philosophers of their time. Immersed in neokantianism, the triad Theodorakopoulos-Tsatsos-Kanellopoulos served the spirit of this philosophical school not just within the university classroom, but also for a much wider public. Within this dominant framework, what was the role and significance of other philosophical trends, such as phenomenology, in the genesis of contemporary Greek philosophy? The main working hypothesis of our research is that the phenomenological movement in Greece was caught since its beginning in the tension between two dominant philosophical currents, neokantianism and existentialism. A more serious effort to cope with phenomenological thought on a systematic basis began in the 1980s. It was accompanied by the increasing recognition of phenomenology as an autonomous field of European philosophy within the Greek academic community. We will then try to demonstrate that this was contingent to the way in which Greek philosophy evolved in the 20th century, inside as well as outside the academia.
Small has been the number of publications on the evolution of 20th century Greek philosophy. This is due to many factors, including the obvious gap between the *ex cathedra* philosophy teachers, who determined the identity of Greek academic philosophy, and the dynamism and profusion of many "paraphilosophical" occurrences. Those latter are difficult to classify and evaluate, as it is not always easy to draw the line between neighbouring discursive practices, for instance, between philosophy and literature or poetry. Questions related to the intellectual identity of contemporary Greece have been quite often debated on the grounds of literature, but not much on the grounds of contemporary Greek philosophy, academic or not. The first two decades of the 20th century have been dominated by Greek university professors, such as Alexander Kotzias, Constantinos Logothetis, Margarites Evanghelidis and Nikolaos Louvaris who have been influenced by German philosophy, mainly by Hegelianism, a remainder of 19th century Greek philosophy. But the acknowledgment of the debt to the European tradition of thought could never counterbalance the hellenocentric discourse of intellectuals, poets and literary people, who sought to establish the continuity of hellenism through the centuries, often with a romantic and nationalistic overtone. A whole "paraphilosophical" literature came out of this idealistic discourse, which at the end encouraged the split between Greek and non-Greek culture and thought.

In the so called "Heidelberg group" of philosophers we come across a group of people educated in post WW 1 Germany, close to some of the most distinguished 20th century philosophers. In a 1933 article on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of Heinrich Rickert, his University teacher, Ioannis Theodorakopoulos, one of the leading figures of the "Heidelberg group" wrote: "I found in Rickert whatever a man who came from the South needs in the North, the depth of the ego and the strength of the philosophical orientation within the world". Immersed in neokantianism, the triad Theodorakopoulos-Tsatsos-Kanellopoulos tried to serve the spirit of this philosophical tendency not just within the University classroom, but also to a much wider public, mainly through the *Archeion Filosofias and Theorias*.
The spirit of the group was strongly idealistic, as its European orientation soon turned into an objective, Plato-inspired, idealism and retained this form till the late 50's. In his 1929 study on *Ignoseologia tou Rickert os eisagogi eis ton neokantianismon* [Rickert's Theory of Knowledge as an Introduction to Neokantianism] Theodorakopoulos pointed out that: "The special culture of Plato which prevails in Germany today has its roots in neokantianism. Neokantianism reposited the problems of Platonism...Pure reason is for Plato, as for Kant, the regulator of philosophical thoughts". Nevertheless, what is of an even greater interest is the way Theodorakopoulos aligns Plato and the Neokantians with Hegel: "The accusation which was earlier addressed to neokantianism, that it puts aside the rest of the philosophers, especially Hegel, is no longer valid, because neokantianism, after the revival of Plato, turns itself to Hegel, through Natorp, Lask, and Heidegger". Here we come across a clear misreading of a phenomenologist, such as Heidegger, regarded by Theodorakopoulos as a neokantian, a typical misappropriation of the early 20th century Greek reception of phenomenology. Moreover, the idealistic trend of the "Archeion-circle" was coupled with a strong reaction to determinism and historical materialism: "Kant’s philosophy was viewed by this group as a liberating one in relation to Marxism, and Plato’s as a liberating one in relation to Kantianism".

Still, even within the "Heidelberg group", the gnoseological purism was not respected to the same extent by all its members. In the case of Ioannis Theodorakopoulos, the dislike of the philosophy of history and civilization was obvious and expressed in many occasions, e.g. in his essay on Oswald's Spengler’s philosophy of history, whereas in the case of Panayotis Kanellopoulos, things were different. This was mainly due to Kanellopoulos’ systematic study of sociology along with philosophy, as well as a wider range of intellectual affinities and influences. Even if Theodorakopoulos mentioned the presence and intellectual power of Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg, his discourse was clearly differentiated from his true philosophical likings. The case was different for Kanellopoulos, who saw the split between the traditional, speculative philosophy - represented by the Neokantian philosophers with their emphasis on pure reason and the priority of science and their dislike for Nietzsche – and the philosophy of existence.
lopoulos even generalized the controversy by placing, on the one side, H. Rickert as the main representative of the 'Professorenphilosophie" and, on the other side, K. Jaspers along with social theorists such as A. Weber and the poet F. Gundolf. As early as 1937, he brought Jaspers “psychologically very close" ("psychika poli konta") to Max Weber, and also to his brother Alfred Weber.

For Kanellopoulos, Jaspers’ critique of Kant along with his recognition of Nietzsche’s philosophical weight became the trademark of a new philosophical era, where radical philosophers and poets, such as the expressionists of the Stefan George circle”, coexisted in a harmonious manner. Kanellopoulos translated for the *Archeion Filosofías and Theorias ton Epistimon* the introduction to Jasper’s much influential book on Nietzsche published in 1935 and accompanied his translation with a short but comprehensive comment on Jaspers’ philosophy, where he tried to show its unique place in today’s philosophy. Much later in his intellectual journey, Kanellopoulos repeatedly pointed out that he was the first to introduce existentialism in Greece through a series of articles in the framework of the *Archeion*. As it is the case for contemporary Greek philosophers in general, the introduction of a new philosophical current is launched by the critical discussion, or by the annotated translation, of an influential work. In the case of Panayotis Kanellopoulos, the introduction of “ypostasiakh filosofía” is worked out by the review of Karl Jaspers’ *Descartes und die Philosophie* (1937) in the first issue of the 1938 *Archeion*. This is the concluding remark of Kanellopoulos’ review: “Jaspers succeeded in opposing to Descartes’ technical construct the lively, veritable man. For that reason Jaspers’ critique is a genuine philosophical critique, a critique which edifies and gives life”. The extended book review is followed by the translation of a series of conferences by Karl Jaspers on “ypostasiakh filosofía”. Those conferences were published in the *Archeion* before even being published in their country of origin. A first translation of Jaspers’ study on Nietzsche had already taken place in the sixth volume of the *Archeion*. The translation was preceded by a text where Kanellopoulos points out that Jaspers is the most important representative of contemporary German philosophy, because: “Jaspers, by philosophizing “acts”... he does not teach philosophy, he philosophizes.”
Is there a special place for phenomenology in the genesis of contemporary Greek philosophy? Our claim will be that the contemporary reception of phenomenological philosophy by the Greek community of professional philosophers and intellectuals was caught in the dominant tension between neokantianism and existentialism. Consequently, only a few Greek philosophers did follow the work of major phenomenologists, and they most certainly did not produce an original phenomenological philosophy till very recently. We will try to show that this was not accidental, but inherent to the way in which modern Greek philosophy, academic or not, evolved. In fact, the claim that phenomenology has been caught up between the dominant trends of neokantianism and existentialism goes back to the 30s. In his 1938 Necrology in the *Archeion Filosofías kai Theorias ton Epistimon*, I. Theodorakopoulos produces a rather encyclopedic, linear presentation of Husserl’s work, starting from the *Logical Investigations*, where is already revealed for the first time Husserl’s “fundamental philosophical manner, of which the main feature is that it is subjective and objective at the same time” and concluding with the 1929 Sorbonne lectures entitled *Cartesian Meditations*. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that Theodorakopoulos views Husserl’s phenomenology in the light of neokantianism. In his 1929 treatise on Rickert’s *Theory of Knowledge as an Introduction to Neokantianism*, he clearly acknowledges Husserl as one of the founders of neokantianism, in the sense that he, like other Neokantians, aims at continuing and at the same time at correcting the problems of Kant’s critical philosophy.20 Husserl, at different terms than Rickert, also fights against psychologism.21 He thus pursues the goal of saving the validity and truth of scientific consciousness (*to kat’epistimon syneidós*): “The term phenomenology with the aid of which Husserl characterizes the theory of knowledge should not mislead the reader into believing that what is meant is the simple kind of knowledge or what Rickert designates as the pro-scientific type of knowledge. Husserl’s phenomenology, with the exception of some elements which are also present in the Scholastic philosophy, remains a methodology of the natural and mathematical sciences”.22 Theodorakopoulos then reaches a point where he argues that Husserl’s idea of knowledge is far narrower than that of Rickert, because the latter goes against Kant’s priority of scientific knowledge over all other types of knowledge, as he thematizes even the simplest and most rudimen-
tary types of knowledge. He distinguishes between the reason of science (kat’epistimin logos) and the reason of philosophy (kata filosofian logos). He then argues that: “The reason of philosophy, in other words the immediate reference of a conscious being (syneidos) to itself, according to which the categories are considered to be the principle of life and reason of the conscious being, is not a matter of investigation neither for Kant nor for Rickert. The same goes also for Cohen and for Husserl. In them Logic is restricted to the concept of a theory of reason”.

A far more critical approach to the phenomenological enterprise is the one presented by Theodorakopoulos later on in his philosophical journey. Here Husserl is accused of setting scientific knowledge aside in order to thematize the prescientific field of consciousness. The focus of Theodorakopoulos’ critique is the status of intuition in phenomenology: “The phenomenologists’ effort to escape the interference of human intellect in his relation to reality is undermined by the phenomenologists themselves, because whatever they claim is nothing but the outcome of the intervention of the human intellect, which they misinterpret, thus presenting it not as intellectual (dianoitikon) but as intuitive (eoptikon). Besides that, the phenomenologists try to turn all the problems of the transcendental critical philosophy into constatations of simple facts. The phenomenologists’ error stems from their exaggerated tendency to limit as more as possible the simple elements of conscious reality, in other words, to reach the primitive state of the states of consciousness. Phenomenology by accepting this denies right from the start what Kant called quaestio juris...” Further on in the same essay, Theodorakopoulos complies fully with Rickert’s critique of phenomenology, first, as being devoid of system and, second, as focusing on the primacy of the Schau, thus, proposing nothing more than a revival of the Platonic theory of ideas. For him, the same is true of Heidegger’s phenomenology which starts with the claim to go back to things themselves: “Someone remarked that Heidegger’s word is similar to the catchword of modern European painting, that is turning to the things themselves. Nevertheless, what we ought to have in mind is that philosophy’s right to life is valid only from the moment when the concept emerges, which means that it takes place from the point when the human intellect is set to motion”.

It is thus clear that Theodorakopoulos’ evaluation of phenomenology is thoroughly biased by his debt to Rickert’s neokantianism. In this sense,
it is also worth noting the distance kept between Husserl and Heidegger. If Husserl is close to Rickert, Heidegger is closer to Natorp due to the way the latter perceives the relation between theory of knowledge and dialectics: “As someone goes through the systematic theses of neokantianism, he notes that its weakest point is the relation between theory of knowledge and dialectics, which it never examines. The few points which we find in Lask are not of decisive importance for determining the relation between theory of knowledge and dialectics. Those who posed in a fecund manner the relation between theory of knowledge and dialectics are Natorp and Heidegger”.27 In this spirit, Theodorakopoulos reaches an arbitrary conclusion - if not a clear-cut misreading of – as to Heidegger’s Being and Time: “The dialectical relation between form and matter is formulated in a creative manner by Heidegger in his work “Sein und Zeit”, where the sensible and the suprasensible world are dialectically related to each other”.28

Nevertheless, if in Theodorakopoulos’ case the treatment of Husserl and Heidegger present similarities, a different path was followed in the Greek reception of Husserl’s and Heidegger’s phenomenology. This was due mainly to Heidegger being viewed as an existentialist thinker, a thinker of human existence and its historical destiny.29 “Scientific” phenomenology remained at the shadow of the widespread Existentialist movement before and, even more, after WW II. A few exceptions do nothing else than confirm this: Constantinos Georgoulis’ treatment of Husserl’s transcendental phenomenology30 as well as Scheler’s phenomenology of values31 was no more than an introductory presentation of their work, with no claim to originality. Nevertheless, Georgoulis relates closely Heidegger’s existential anthropology to Husserl’s phenomenology, whereas he clearly distances himself from Theodorakopoulos’ insistence on the priority of scientific knowledge over all other types of knowledge, and the neglect of everyday, prescientific states of conscious life.32 He also brings phenomenology closer to the philosophy of life – Husserl to Bergson – on the grounds that they both elaborate on the rudimentary stream of consciousness, emphasizing their anti-Cartesian spirit, their hostility to mentalism and scientism, and their effort to bring philosophy back to the lived conscious experience.33 Finally, what is also present in Georgoulis’ essays is, once more, the hellenocentric trend, as well as a strong Christian spirit which pervades his readings to their very
core. This is quite apparent in the way Georgoulis treats of Scheler's axiology, for which the highest value is divine love. He thus brings together Max Scheler and Dionysios Areopagitis.34

IV

A significantly different situation is that of phenomenology from the 60's on, a fact mainly due to the late first attempt to translate phenomenological texts into modern Greek. Nevertheless, what remains the same is the non-systematic and random way in which those translations take place. It is not Husserl, Heidegger or Scheler who are translated, but texts by the second generation of German, French, or American phenomenologists. A case with a special interest is that of the Greek translation of Jacques Derrida's selection from Husserl's work for the monthly review *Epoches* published by Angelos Terzakis.35 Except from Derrida's analysis, his selection of texts rendered into modern Greek by Eleftherios Platis is the first translation of phenomenological texts into modern Greek we dispose of. It is worth mentioning here that Eleftherios Platis (*The Erotic Element in Mysticism*, 1964; *The Aesthetic Society. An Aesthetic Essay*, Athens 1976; *Hermeneutical Comments to Plato's Criton*, Athens 1979), who offered an inspired first translation of phenomenological texts, was an intellectual clearly influenced by the unpronounced existentialism of Panayotis Kannelopoulos, while developing the affinities between existentialism and mysticism as well as orthodox faith.

We could claim with no reservations that those are the first translations of original phenomenological texts into modern Greek, next to the rather schematic presentations of phenomenology till then. Once more, it is not the *ex cathedra* philosophy which paved the way for the reception of European philosophical thought, but the latter grew also within intellectual circles, not necessarily in academic milieus.36 It is only in the 70's that the work of academic teachers who have studied phenomenology while cultivating special philosophical interests, such as the philosophy of art,37 the theory of knowledge38 and the history of modern philosophy,39 among others, helped phenomenology acquire a larger institutional recognition, and, in addition to that, produced for the first time an original phenomenological discourse.40
Still, the gap between academic teaching and research and the "para-academic" production – independent publications or translations of phenomenological studies and papers by eminent phenomenologists, such as W. Biemel, E. Fink and E. Husserl himself, in scientific and intellectual journals such as the review _Epopteia_ and the periodical journal _Deukalion_ published by the _Kentron Filosofikon Ereunon_ [Center for Philosophical Research] – remained. From all those efforts to introduce phenomenology to the Greek intellectual community, volume 12 of the philosophical journal _Deukalion_ dedicated to Husserl's phenomenology is by far the most comprehensive and scientifically valid. The philosophy professor Nikos Skouteropoulos was the translator of three major phenomenological essays by E. Husserl, W. Szilasi and A. Diemer. He also provided us with a first phenomenological glossary and a bibliography of Husserl's work as well as with a secondary phenomenological bibliography.

Moreover, the marginal character of the Greek phenomenological studies is clearly witnessed by its hesitant flourishing outside the rather traditionalist National and Capodistrian University of Athens, mainly in the Faculty of Philosophy of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, which was considered to be less conservative in its general philosophical orientation. Still, the non-systematic way of translating phenomenological thinkers or of investigating into phenomenology is characteristic of the way in which phenomenology has been integrated into the modern Greek philosophical community. Only later on, in the 80's, Husserl himself was translated into modern Greek.

V

The case of Martin Heidegger has been sensibly different from that of his predecessor right from the first steps of phenomenology within the Greek philosophical community. A first translation of parts of his _Introduction to Metaphysics_ took place in the monthly review _Epoches_, as was the case for Husserl. The selection of the passages and the their translation by Nelli Saveriadou was accompanied by a concise introduction to his early work with a focus, once more, on _Being and Time_ and only in part to other works, such as his _Introduction to Metaphysics_. Saveriadou's evaluation of Heidegger's thought reflected much of the intellectual climate of those times: no men-
tion of the place of Heideggerian phenomenology within the phenomeno-
logical movement in general was undertaken; emphasis was placed solely
on the anthropological and sociological parameters of Being and Time's exis-
tential analytics; last but not least, Heidegger's hasty comparison to other
Existentialists, such as Sartre, proved him to be of a lesser quality due to the
absence of political engagement in him. Nevertheless, Saveriadou did enrich
her translation with specific remarks on the rendering of phenomenological
terms, yet in a non-systematic manner. Another fragmentary translation
of Heidegger's Ti einai I filosofia; [What is philosophy?] by Agisilaos Dokas
also took place in the next volume of the review Epoches.45

But the more widespread reception of Heidegger's phenomenology in
comparison to that of other phenomenologists was due to the great inter-
est in his philosophy on the part of Greek Existentialist philosophers and
theologians who engaged themselves in studying and translating his
work. It is without doubt that Yannis Tzavaras' translation of Being and
Time determined a new era in the reception of Heidegger's hermeneutic
phenomenology. Nevertheless, the study of Heidegger's phenomenology
remained non systematic and always centered either on his anthropologi-
cal-existential features, or on his link with the Christian, in particular, Or-
thodox tradition. The hellenocentrism of Greek Heideggerian existential-
ists is quite apparent in their writings: "also when we examine Heidegger's
contribution, its presence honors the ancient Greek thought and language.
Nowadays, Heidegger is the only big voice in the world which pronounces
that the Presocratic Greek philosophers were the prophets of humanity.
But Heidegger says also something even more important: the history of hu-
manity starts with the Greek philosophers, because from then on being was
revealed to the world and real history started, history as an ontological
determination". In this respect, it is by no means fortuitous that in his 1972
essay on the "Modern Greek Core" Malevitsis brings to an unprecedented
osmosis contemporary existentialism (Sartre, Heidegger) and philosophy of
culture (Spengler) with the national poetry of Kostis Palamas and the writ-
ings of Ion Dragoumis and Ioannis Sikoutris on the character of Hellenic
civilization and culture.

As for the case of other phenomenological thinkers – with the excep-
tion of French existentialist phenomenologists, such as Jean-Paul Sartre,
who enjoyed a much wider acceptance not so much within the academic
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community, but among educated Greeks – the study and translation of their works took place in an even less systematic manner thanks to the individual work of intellectuals. Contrary to the increasing interest in Heidegger’s phenomenology, few of the German and French phenomenologists were translated into modern Greek in the first post-WW II decades. Few were also the studies dedicated to phenomenological thinkers, except from those who viewed them in the light of their existentialist reception. A far more serious effort of translating not just isolated conferences or papers, but systematic phenomenological works began from the 80’s on. They were accompanied by the increasing recognition of phenomenology as an autonomous field of contemporary European philosophy within the Greek universities and the Greek intellectual community in general.

VI

Taking the abovementioned frame of inquiry into account a series of issues could be raised for future research concerning the contemporary reception of the phenomenological movement in Greece. A first issue is related to the continuity or discontinuity between modern and contemporary Greek philosophy as well as to the dependency upon its past. Several historians of ideas have seen in this the sign of the definitive continuation of the Byzantine, Plato-inspired, philosophical heritage to the present. A second issue worth discussing is the idealistic consideration of Hellenism by the generation of the 30’s and, after the tragedy of WW II, its transformation into a critique of contemporary culture and an inquiry into Greece’s contribution to the contemporary world. The question rises as to the way in which a scientific philosophical trend, such as phenomenology, is appropriated within such a cultural context. A third issue is the ideological background of the struggle of philosophical ideas and also the fate of a generation of Greek philosophers and intellectuals who matured in the West, especially in France and Germany and were faced up with the tragedy of history. This is exemplified in the decline of neokantian idealism and the bringing forth of the historical present especially through existentialism or existentialism-inclined phenomenology. Further on, historiographical issues are of importance, as there has been a constant tension between the ex cathedra philosophy professors and the intellectuals who moved in a more independent manner, through publications in less specialized,
paraphilosophical journals, e.g. *Nea Estia*, *Epoches*, *Epopteia*, *Efthini*, *Deukalion*, or in encyclopaedias and dictionaries of ideas destined to a wider educated public (*Megali Paidagogiki Egkuklopaideia*, *Neoteron Egkiklopaidikon Lexikon* "Iliou"). It is worth noting that one of the first occurrences of phenomenology as a philosophical movement was the analysis of the entries "Husserl" and "phenomenology" in the eighteenth volume of the *Neoteron Egkyklopedikon Lexikon* "Ilios".

Other issues worth raising are, on the one side, the difficult balance between the transferring of European trends of thought and original research on genuine philosophical questions and, on the other side, the distance between university professors and intellectuals who investigate into "*to elliniko genos*" and those who study philosophy in a systematic manner. This issue is related to the "mimetic" character of modern Greek philosophy, and what lies in its heart as its creative core. For historians of ideas, contemporary Greek philosophy has been creative only as a national philosophy.62 What has been often the case is that questions of national identity have often mixed with a less systematic philosophical paradigm, e.g. existentialism.63 It is worth noting that a philosopher who studied phenomenology and hermeneutics, like Yorgos Antonopoulos (1920-2010), was nevertheless inclined, next to their scientific work, to work on the special nature of neo-hellenic values, the latter being the heir of the idealistic philosophy of the first half of 20th century.64

Still, it is evident that, from the 70's on, the situation of philosophy in Greece, in and outside the academia, underwent a considerable evolution in the direction of scientific research with a high status, and a proliferation of societies, centers and periodical publications, which promoted the active participation in the international philosophical becoming.65 What is also true is the gradual disappearance of philosophy from Greece’s effort to articulate an autonomous discourse related to its identity and its past or to formulate a "national philosophy".66 From the '80s on, the distance between university teachers and intellectuals, due mainly to the increasing need for specialization, but also the new structure of philosophical studies within Greek universities67, brought a new perspective on contemporary European philosophy and its impact upon Greece’s intellectual climate.

Last but not least, an important factor with a great impact on the way in which Greece appropriated the European spirit, in philosophy too,
is “geophilosophy”. For Evangelos Papanoutsos, rationalism is French, romanticism is German, whereas empiricism is British. Still, the point where Greece stands from the viewpoint of “geophilosophy” is not easy to determine, even if this “geophilosophical” separation lies on the grounds of the well-known analytic-continental split, which became increasingly important within Greek universities from the 70’s on. The analytic-continental split also determined to a large extent the reception of phenomenology in Greece within the last three decades. Despite recent attempts to appropriate phenomenology within the analytic tradition – a trend followed by several young Greek academics today – phenomenology is generally considered to belong to the continental philosophical tradition.

Notes
5 One of the main features of the modern Greek philosophical evolution is the coexistence of philosophical writing with the translation of influential philosophical works into the Greek language. Such is the case of the “Heidelberg group”: Paul Natorp's groundbreaking Platos Ideenlehre (1903) was translated into modern Greek by Michalis Tzamados [I peri ton Ideon Theoria tou Platonos], one of the active members and writers of the Archeion Filosofias and Theorias ton Epistimon, in 1929. The translation was foreworded by Ioannis Theodorakopoulos: "O Neokantianismos kai o Paul Natorp. Prolegomena eis to ergo tou Natorp "I peri ton Ideon Theoria tou Platonos" ["Neokantianism and Paul Natorp. Preface to Natorp's work "Plato's Doctrine of Ideas"] (Ta prota mou filosofimata 1927-1930 [My First Philosophical Writings 1927-1930], Athens: Vivliopoleion tis Estias, 1978, p. 396-425).
7 I. Theodorakopoulos, Ta prota mou filosofimata 1927-1930, p. 283.
9 Kanellopoulos translated existentialism as “ypostasiakh filosofía” to distinguish it from other, rather vague in meaning, intellectual movements of the 30’s (“Heidelberg, o chrissos krikos tou pneumatikou desmou mas” Kanellopoulos 1980, p. 128, note 278).

10 Ibid, p. 52.


15 P. Kanellopoulos, “Karl Jaspers. Ypostasiaki filosofía Kanellopoulos” (the article was published in three parts in the Archeion Filosofías kai Theorias ton Epistimon of the year 1938).


21 Ibid, p. 291, 293-4. Cf. "Neither of the three founders of neokantianism, Cohen, Husserl and Rickert wrote a psychology. The only one of the neokantians who wrote a psychology, but not an empirical one, was Natorp." ("Filosofía kai psychologia [Philosophy and Psychology]" (1929), in: Ta prota mou filosofimata 1927-1930, p. 217).
23 Ibid, p. 352, 374.
24 "Theoria tou logou i Gnoсеologia [Theory of Reason or Theory of Knowledge]" (1928) in: Ta prota mou filosofimata 1927-1930, p. 64.
26 Ibid, p. 120. See also: "Kritiki tis ontologias tou M. Heidegger" ["A Critique of Martin Heidegger's Ontology"], Proceedings of the Academy of Athens, 47 (1972), pp. 279-285.
27 I. Theodorakopoulos (1929), Ta prota mou filosofimata 1927-1930, p. 310.
28 Ibid, p. 311.
34 C. D. Georgoulis, "O Max Scheler kai h epi tou pediou tis filosofikis iathikis ereunai tou, p. 56. Cf. "Ai sigchronai kateuthunseis tis iparxiakis filosofias. Atheistikos kai christianikos iparxismos", Ai sigchronai filosofikai kateuthunseis, Athens: Papadimas Publishers, 74-96. The coexistence of existentialist phenomenology with orthodox faith is one of the most interesting points in this respect (N. A. Nissiotis, Yparxismos kai christianiki pistis kata ton Soeren Kierkegaard kai tous sigchronous iparxistas filosofous Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger kai Jean-Paul Sartre, Athens: Minima, 1956). Due to the fact that this is one of the most enduring elements in the Greek reception of existentialist phenomenologists, such as Heidegger, we will abstain from developing this issue further.
European philosophy seems to have been higher evaluated at Schools of Philosophy of the Greek periphery. Spyros Kyriazopoulos, professor of philosophy at the University of Ioannina transferred a philosophical spirit shaped by the existentialist and phenomenological tradition and aware of the critical questions of the after-war period into the newly founded School of Philosophy (1964). His special interest in the philosophy of civilization and technology made of Kyriazopoulos an academic teacher with a vivid perception of the risks and challenges of his times and fully aware of the intersections between philosophy and the sciences: S. D. Kyriazopoulos, *The Origin of the Technological Spirit* (Katagogi tou technikou pneumatos), Athens 1965; *The Language of Today. Linguistics of Technology* (I simerini glossa. Glossologia tis technikis), Athens 1964; *The Presence of the Natural Science* (I parousia tis fisikis epistimis), Athens 1963.


See note 39.

M. Farber, *Fainomenologia (Oi skopoi tis fainomenologias)* (Phenomenology (The Ends of Phenomenology)), translated by L. Bargeliotis with an introduction by N. Avgelis, Athens: Grigoris Publications, 1970. This is a lengthy presentation of Husserl’s phenomenology by the eminent American phenomenologist Marvin Farber. Still it is quite interesting that Nikos Avgelis’ “Introduction” to the Greek translation does not focus on phenomenology itself, but on its exchange with American naturalism (p. 7-14). Avgelis stresses the points where Farber distances himself from phenomenological orthodoxy in Husserl and Heidegger, and speaks of “phenomenological naturalism” in him. This shows clearly that this first systematic presentation of phenomenology was biased and gave a rather narrow perspective on phenomenology itself.


Skandalaki 1953; N. A. Nissiotis, *Yparxismos kai christianiki pistis kata ton Soeren Kierkegaard kai


57 C. Cavarnos, *Modern Greek Thought*, op. cit., p. 37-8. In his foreword to the English translation of a Plato-inspired text on the soul by Theodorakopoulos, Constantine Cavarnos points out that the latter has Byzantium in mind (p. 102).
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