

**PANAJOTIS KONDYLLIS /**  
**PANAGIOTIS KONDYLLIS /**

**Die Aufklärung**  
**im Rahmen des**  
**neuzeitlichen Rationalismus**

*The Enlightenment in the*  
*framework (context) of new-*  
*times rationalism*

**FELIX MEINER VERLAG, HAMBURG, 2022**

© TRANSLATED FROM DA GERMAN AND DA GREEK BY DA KRAZY MAN  
BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN IDIOT

STARTING 07-07-2025, AND WILL DEFINITELY NEVER FINISH IT. KRAZY.

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ  
ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ  
Ο ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟΣ  
ΔΙΑΦΩΤΙΣΜΟΣ

*The European Enlightenment*

ΤΟΜΟΣ Α (VOLUME A)

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟ, 1993, Β΄ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ

ΤΙΤΛΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΟΤΥΠΟΥ (TITLE OF ORIGINAL) :

*Die Aufklärung im Rahmen des neuzeitlichen Rationalismus*, Klett-  
Cotta-Verlag 1981

© TRANSLATED FROM DA GERMAN AND DA GREEK BY DA KRAZY MAN  
BARBARIAN IDIOM BARBARIAN IDIOT

STARTING 07-07-2025, AND WILL DEFINITELY NEVER FINISH IT. KRAZY.

# PRELIMINARY REMARK<sup>i</sup>

The great book about the Enlightenment by Panagiotis Kondylis appeared in the German language in a hard-cover edition in 1981 by Klett-Cotta and then one more time in 1986 as a paperback/soft-cover edition (dtv 4450). In 1987 a Greek edition followed by Themelio in Athens (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1998). The German editions have been out of stock/print for a long time. The author could no longer prepare any new edition of this standard work of Enlightenment research; he died, all too early, in 1998. In the following, some of the central aspects of the book will be outlined.

German research into the Enlightenment stood for a long time in the formidable, overpowering, over-bearing shadow of idealism, of classicism, of the new humanism and of romanticism. Kondylis's book fundamentally changed our conceptions, notions, perceptions about the Enlightenment. Kondylis did not undertake any epoch reconstruction, he traverses the national Enlightenment traditions (of England, of France, of Germany), he does without, foregoes a social history of authors and intellectual groupings, he rather investigates the exchange processes between philosophy and the theory of science in the early New Times. At the (epi)centre of his book stands/is the reformulation (new formation) of philosophy from 1750. The book is oriented towards the reconstruction of the relationship between spirit (intellect) and matter. Kondylis distinguishes two phases of development of Enlightenment thought: first of all, the Cartesian separation of soul (psyche) and body (res cogitans – res extensa) dominates early new-times rationalism, which around 1750 was

replaced by a “rehabilitation of sensoriality”. The newly constituted sensualism<sup>ii</sup> gives up, abandons, surrenders, relinquishes the older ideal of the methods of mathematics and mechanistic physics and orients itself towards the new life sciences of biologism. Kondylis follows (pursues) the theories of dualism or else the unity of body and soul back to late European humanism, he then / subsequently discusses the influence of mechanistic physics (Newton) on the rationalistic processes of system formation (development) of / in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, he determines, defines, specifies, identifies the relationship between the mathematical (methodological) ideal ((in respect) of methods) with / towards neo-Platonism and defines rational theology in the field of influence of mechanistic theories of the cosmos. In the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century a serious, grave conflict emerges, looms / is looming. Mechanistic intellectualism falls into crisis. The constructive Reason of God is no longer supposed to be the primal ground / very basis of creation, but the self-organisation of organic substances tends to replace the mechanical explanation, explication of God, cosmos, world and man (humans). With this paradigm shift pertaining to the theory of science, Kondylis may begin the second section of development of the European Enlightenment: the critique (criticism) of metaphysics and intellectualism leads to a revaluation, reappraisal of the concept of matter and of evolution (development) as well as a complementary theory of nature and culture. Aversion to / The turning away from the time-indifferent and place-indifferent arguments ((leading of) evidence) in favour of rationalism makes possible / enables the new putting in order / classification of the categories of thought and volition / wanting (willing), feeling and Reason, Nature, History and culture and leads to a relativisation of the difference between facticity and normativity. Through / By means of (the) consideration of the relationship between theories of science and philosophy, Kondylis expands, extends, widens, enlarges the reference and

object fields (fields of reference and of objects) of the empirical Enlightenment. Through / By means of the reappraisal, revaluation of the events of French research of the sixties and seventies of the theories of science of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Kondylis succeeds in proving that between the points of tension as regards “Nature” and “culture”, new sciences (natural history, ethnology, cultural history, sociology, history) can be developed / unfold, which first, only in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century are eliminated from (rejected by) philosophy. In this overview of the relationship between philosophy and the conceptions of Nature, of History and of culture, the philosophical traditions of England, France and Germany move closer together<sup>iii</sup>, the German “special way / path” in the history of philosophy begins (if at all) only, first with German idealism or else (the) new humanism. Ferment(ation)s between philosophy and the theory of science are in the 18<sup>th</sup> century the effects, impact(s) of the philosophy of Spinoza and Leibniz. At the same time, Kondylis succeeds in integrating Kant and Kantianism directly, immediately in the determinations of the problem of (the) Enlightenment grounds, substantiations of empiricism. A united European axis of argumentation comes into being, which begins with English empiricism, [[and]] which is continued by French pre-materialism and is concluded / completed by the organicistic philosophy of Nature and culture of Germany. In this concept(ual plan), the boundaries between philosophy, the theory of Nature (natural theory), History (history), aesthetics, literature and culture become fluid, flowing. In this respect, Kondylis succeeds in analysing in the framework of a study pertaining to the history of philosophy, at the same time, the interdisciplinary possibility/potential in respect of argumentation of adjacent, abutting, neighbouring sciences in the mirror, reflection of spirit-matter problem. With the replacement of dogmatic rationalism by the empiricism pertaining to the philosophy of life in (the) Europe of / in

**the 18<sup>th</sup> century, numerous interdisciplinary border crossings (i.e. crossing or the overstepping of erstwhile boundaries between disciplines) are anticipated, which we know from today's discussions (in respect) of science.<sup>iv</sup>**

***Jörn Garber***

***Ulrich Kronauer***

**TO FOTI(S) APOSTOLOPOULO(S)**

*in memoriam*<sup>v</sup>

# **Table of contents**

## **I. Basic (Fundamental) concepts**

**for the apprehension (understanding) of the texture, essence,  
nature of the Enlightenment**

- 1. Spirit(-intellect) and sensoriality (senses, what is sensed) or the  
question of being / Is and the question of value(s) (/ the  
ontological and axiological problem) . . . . . 10**



## NOTE FOR THE GREEK EDITION<sup>vi</sup>

*The Greek edition of this work constitutes a faithful and complete, full rendering of the German edition, as it circulated for the first time in 1981 by the [Publishing] House of Klett-Cotta and for a second time in 1986 by the [Publishing] House Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag (dtv). In order to make things easier for the Greek reader, I have also rendered in Greek the quoted excerpts from the French, English, German, Italian and Latin language(s), which in the German edition have been given in the, on each and every respective occasion, original.*

**P.K.**

# **I. Basic (Fundamental) concepts for the apprehension (understanding) of the texture, essence, nature of the Enlightenment**

## **1. Spirit(-intellect) and sensoriality (/ senses, what is sensed) or the question of being / Is and the question of value(s) (/ the ontological and axiological problem)**

**The question (problem) in respect of the relations between spirit/intellect and sensoriality (/ senses, what is sensed) can, in a certain respect (/ from a certain point of view), be looked at as / considered to be the central problem of all philosophy. From a historical point of view / Historically, the central meaning / significance of this question is proved, certified, verified already through the pointing to the adherence of the first approaches of philosophy with the animistic way of looking at the world (/ if we ponder, consider the relationship of the first forms of philosophy with the animistic perception of the world).<sup>1</sup> The first organised and all-encompassing, full, complete world image is**

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Radin [[[April 2, 1883 – February 21, 1959), a ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID]] has shown that the animistic world view must be considered, class(ifi)ed as a philosophical achievement (performance) (/ composed, structured philosophy), and indeed both in regard to its setting of the question (problem examination) (the origin(s) and the composition, texture, constitution of the world, the meaning of human life, rules of moral / ethical behaviour etc.) and its capacity for, ability at abstract thought (/ abstract capability) as well as regarding, concerning its provenance from the intellectual / thought endeavours, efforts (/ on account of its formation on the part) of certain, only, individuals. Radin confutes, rebuts above all the perception represented by Levy-Bruhl [[né le 10 avril 1857 à Paris et mort le 13 mars 1939 dans la même ville, another ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID]] and Cassirer [[28. Juli 1874 in Breslau; † 13. April 1945 in New York, another ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID, so we have JOOZ TORKING TO JOOZ ABOUT JOOZ in a ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-FUCK-FEST]] of a pre-logical, mythical thought, which is sharply, intensely counterposed to “rational” thought and should be subordinated, subjected (/ is inferior) to it (i.e. the said “rational” thought) – a perception, which, as Radin correctly remarked, only reflects, mirrors the complacent, smug, self-satisfied evaluations, assessments and the habits of thought of European scholars, savants (Primitive Man as Philosopher, esp. xxiv ff., 30ff., 99ff., 208ff., 246ff., 252ff., 292ff., 345ff.). In his critique, criticism of / Rejecting Levy-Bruhl’s separation between “rational” and “irrational” thought, Lévy-Strauss [[né le 28 novembre 1908 à Bruxelles et mort le 30 octobre 2009 à Paris 16e, another ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID, so P.K. is in full Werner Conze et al. ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-PARTY MODE !!!]] to a great extent, largely, extensively confirmed Radin’s results, findings (La pensée sauvage, see esp. ch. 1, the first part of 8 and the final part of 9.). The analyses of Topitsch [[\* 20. März 1919 in Wien; † 26. Jänner 2003 in Graz]] about / regarding the continuity of thought / intellectual (/ conceptual) structures in mythology and traditional philosophical metaphysics must be looked at as a corroboration, reinforcement, confirmation of the same position (Vom Ursprung und Ende der Metaphysik, esp. 3ff., 18ff., 95ff., 221ff., 285ff.).

dualistic, i.e. it comes into being on the foundation, basis of the “discovery” of the spirit(-intellect) or else of the spirits, which are separated from the sensorial-perceptible (/ regarded as separate from the sensory world) and are supposed to guide its (i.e. the sensorial-perceptible’s) fates, destinies (/ it is believed that they direct its (i.e. the sensory world’s) fortunes). That is why it is no coincidence, accident, chance when philosophemes (/ philosophical theories), which were determinative for the spiritual-intellectual tradition of the so-called Occident (Western world) pay homage to, embrace, advocate dualism, i.e. the fundamental, programmatic opposition, antithesis of / between spirit(-intellect) and sensoriality (the senses / what is sensed). It suffices to recollect / remind ourselves of Platonism, whose original, initial version is precisely deeply connected, with reference to the dualistic principle, (/ owed a lot) to (the) animistic-religious ideas / body of thought of the Orphic-Pythagorean cult<sup>2</sup>, and whose historical impact, effect, influence, no least of all through / especially with the mediation of Christendom, Christianity,<sup>3</sup> was so lasting, persistent (/ exceptionally intense); the Cartesian separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa*<sup>4</sup> as well as the Kantian separation between the intelligible and the sensible<sup>5</sup> equally, also, likewise represent and constitute prominent examples for the same thing (facts of the case). Nonetheless, it would be inappropriate, errant (/ not be correct) to hold, consider the question (problem) of the relations between spirit and sensoriality (senses) to be / as central only when a dualistic thought structure is present/exists, or to assume the primacy (priority, precedence) of this question will be visible exclusively in dualistic thought structures (/ when we are dealing with dualistic philosophies). The not to be disregarded / indispensable spiritualistic or materialistic signs of our already well-known monistic philosophemes (/ of all of the until today known monistic philosophical theories) irrefutably show that the latter monistic philosophical theories) constitute in themselves an eloquent argument for the thesis that here it is a matter of the attempts to overcome, surpass, transcend exactly the antagonism between spirit and sensoriality in the sense (/ from the point of view) of the former or of the latter – in other words; not only does this antagonism constitute the starting point and consequently the *conditio sine qua non* of the thought (intellectual) endeavour / effort at thought (/ philosophical thought), but also each and every “overcoming, surpassing, transcendence” is achieved on the basis only through / (by means) of the absolutisation of one of its competing limbs (/ of one of the two antagonistic elements); it is (has), therefore, polemically meant (/ a polemical character), and because of this it cannot also bring about the conclusive end of the above-mentioned antagonism.

---

<sup>2</sup> In relation to that, Leisegang, “Platon”, lines 2421, 2424, 2433. Cf. Nestle, *Vom Mythos zum Logos*, p. 540..

<sup>3</sup> See in general / generally, Ivánka, *Plato Christianus*, esp. 68f., 469ff..

<sup>4</sup> Descartes had connected his separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa* not least of all with the teaching, doctrine, theory of Platonic innatism (/ innate (inherent, immanent, inborn) ideas). But the Platonic definition of *νόησις* would have to have been known to him (i.e. Descartes) too. See Taylor, *Platonism*, 51ff.,; Gilson, *Études sur le rôle . . .*, 28f.; Smith, *New Studies*, 194 note 1. Cf. below, p. 182.

<sup>5</sup> The influence of metaphysical-religious traditions, customs, lores on Kant’s teaching, theory, doctrine of two worlds was investigated, worked upon, processed recently by Topitsch, *Die Voraussetzungen der Transzendentalphilosophie*, p. 21 ff.. [[Sensible as in pertaining to the senses]]



---

**[[ALL END NOTES ARE BY THE KRAZY MAN, WHEREAS THE FOOTNOTES ARE P.K.'s UNLESS SPECIFICALLY INDICATED OTHERWISE]]**

<sup>i</sup> To the German edition being translated.

<sup>ii</sup> Obviously, here we are talking about what the senses perceive and not hedonistic life stances, experiences etc..

<sup>iii</sup> A reflection of, at least in part, the concentration of ZIO-JOO-KIKE-YID-M-C-M-CAPITALISTIC-IMPERIALISTIC POWER, from ZIO-Great Britain to ZIO-USA.

<sup>iv</sup> I suggest yooz all read Kondlyis's "the multi-dimensional Enlightenment" I've translated on the P.K. site ( <https://www.panagiotiskondylis.com/the-multi-dimensional-enlightenment.php> )

to get a much meatier "preliminary remark" than the waffle of this preliminary remark.

<sup>v</sup> Only in the Greek edition.

<sup>vi</sup> Obviously, only in the Greek edition.