



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/17639

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/17639>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

HUMAN ONTOLOGY FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PSYCHOANALYTIC APPROACH

Novakos Ioannis

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 28 July 2023

Final Accepted: 31 August 2023

Published: September 2023

Abstract

Certainly for Orthodox Christian anthropology, the person – man is undoubtedly and unquestionably its most fundamental and main issue. In this sense, in the specific scientific opinion/work, various ontological constants are dealt with and studied in relation to its constitution, as mentioned basically in the development content of Orthodox Christian anthropology. In addition, an attempt is made to render the "Ontology of the person" in accordance with the opinion of the Most Reverend Metropolitan of Pergamum Ioannis Zizioulas. Among other things, an attempt is made to analyze and attribute the contribution of the Cappadocian Fathers in terms of the active explanation of the differences of the confusion that existed until then, regarding the identification of the terms "substance" and "person" and the shift of the context of the time towards the face". Finally, a comparison will be attempted between the assumptions that Orthodox Christian anthropology advocates for the person with some other theoretical approaches regarding the creation and evolution of the human entity. Regarding the method of writing the specific theological work, the thorough and careful study and discussion of theological texts and theoretical approaches regarding the importance of the formation of man based on Orthodox Christian anthropology is used. Under these circumstances, it is noted that this work constitutes a thorough study of the interpretations of human performance according to the view of Orthodox Christian anthropology.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2023.. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

The constitution of the creation of man according to Orthodox Christian anthropology

Man as a person, according to Orthodox Christian anthropology, constitutes a hypostatic built reality and ontological constant that can only be given meaning through the triune hypostatic Godhead. The person of man, therefore, cannot be given any reasonable definition as it is not expressed through abstract classes of things and categories (Turcan, 2019). In this sense, it can be seen that the human person constitutes an independent existence of a certain spiritual nature that is expressed as a mystery that is revealed in the midst of individual reality. From these data, the essence of man is revealed in a very emphatic way and form, which, seen from another perspective and point of view, composes all his main components and characteristics. The spiritual and material complex nature of man as a whole, beyond the others, constitutes the essence of man (Karmiris, 1973). Man, in other words, was transformed into a perishable and mortal entity, after he fell into sin of his own free will. Nevertheless, it is an undisturbed, self-contained and unwavering creature that holds the position of king on earth (Berger, 2014).

Human nature, however, is twofold since it is made up of body and soul –both before and after– the fall. At this point, it must be emphasized that the duality plays a catalytic role in the ontological freedom of man. Despite all this, it is evident that the soul directly determines the course of man, hence it occupies a hegemonic position in Orthodox Christian anthropology (Logos ke', f. 222r). The soul, too, is seen as a component of human existence and not as a mental creation (Kant, 2007). During the conception of man in his full dimension, among other things, there is the simultaneous birth and genesis of the body and the soul, since the immaterial, in contrast to the material, are not amenable to fluctuations. After all, the substance which constitutes the expression and manifestation of the energies of the soul was created preemptively in an active and perfect way and is invisible, invisible, intangible and immaterial. Consequently, it becomes perceptible and understandable that in Orthodox Christian anthropology and, by extension, in Christian Theology, the construction and interpretation of the concept of "person" was more based on the proper utilization of texts of important, eminent and prominent philosophers and theologians of Orthodoxy, as well as and in the existence of unique texts of the Fathers and the Holy Bible (Plessner, 2004; Terezis, 2002).

However, it must be pointed out and emphasized that Orthodox Christian anthropology was influenced to a very large extent and dimension –in relation to the creation, formulation and formation of the concept of "man"– by the texts of the Ancient philosophers, especially Plato and Aristotle (Florovsky, 1983). In addition, it is considered that the spiritual and biological constitution and creation of the "man – person" is inescapably intertwined with Orthodox Christian anthropology. In this spirit, it is recognized that the study and treatment of the concept of "man" occupies a prominent position in Orthodox Christian anthropology, while it is also approached and analyzed by Christian Ethics, Eschatology and Ontology (Zizioulas, 1985). The existence of "man" is primarily social and secondarily individual, hence the human entity is inextricably intertwined with unity, that is, with the physical and social environment and reality and, more generally, with the developing relationship with God. The "man" in short, constitutes the "individual whole" since it is composed of a diverse palette of psychological, biological and moral elements and characteristics, which in turn form the unity of the "person" which is translated as being (Melissaris, 2002).

In the light of reasoning from above, God is also a "person" who expresses himself through the presence of the Holy Trinity, as he possesses all those elements and characteristics that structure and constitute a holistic unity. The uniqueness of the "person" and the community of nature (fellow human beings) therefore, is expressed by the existence of man. According to the similarity of the Holy Trinity, it is established that the "human person" constitutes nature in its real state (Plexidas, 2001). "Man" together with the infinite unique advantages that God has bestowed upon him, therefore, constitutes the most brilliant and indestructible creation and unique conclusion of his creator, with the result that he occupies the most prominent position above and within creation (Aristotle, *On the soul*, II, 4, 413). Based on the above, it is recognized that "man" is the most complex creature in the world, because on the one hand he participates with his material body created from the soil of the earth in the material-sensible world, on the other hand, he participates through the immaterial and mental logic of his soul –created and given meaning by God from scratch– in the world of spirituality (Papavasiliou, 1995).

Man, in essence, is the most perfect creation of the material world, since he was created by the almighty God in long overlapping periods of time, having an evolutionary course from the most imperfect and simple to the most perfect and complex (Cohn-Sherbock, 1998). Established, it is now recognized that God as a forger and through his communicator, communicator and creative inaccessible Trinitarian nature, brought the most perfect creature into the world out of unflinching love and goodness (Freeman, 2009). According to the Orthodox Christian anthropological understanding and approach, in short, the main constituent parts of human nature are the body and the soul. This implies that with regard to the body that was formed from the soil of the earth, that is, the first component, it is from its creation perishable –it dies– a fact and event that would be avoided if man did not fall into sin. On the contrary, now, it can be seen that the soul, which is the other and second constituent part of the nature of "man", is an indestructible, immortal, immaterial and mentally transferable substance as a divine emphysema and a gift from the created God to "man" so that to animate and move his body. Despite this, it is noted that the soul is a substance that does not originate and originates from God (Christou, 2003; Springsted, 2005).

In the Holy Bible, on the other hand, there are passages that partially establish the trichotomous view, which, incidentally, was developed in the logic of the teachings of Platonic philosophy (Attrep, 1999). The specific approach that has many supporters and preachers such as the ancient Fathers of the Church, refers to the three constituent parts (body, spirit and soul) that make up the nature of man (Ayres, 2003). However, it is noted that the distinction between soul and spirit is not real, only superficial (Cameron, 1991). The "man" attached to the material

things and actions of the earth and cut off from God is called by the Bible carnal and/or mental, while the one who is raised up and carried along by the grace of the Holy Spirit and is devoted to God is called spiritual (Behr, 1999).

According to the Bible, "man" was created "in the image" and "likeness" of God. The material body of man does not depict the infinite spiritual essence of God, because the Lord does not have a tangible body (Staniloae, 2011). In this sense, it is considered that the human body does not refer to the image of the Lord, since man constitutes the image of God who is the model (Karazafiri, 1995). Man as a free and rational soul and as an immaterial spiritual entity therefore represents God. Obviously God has to an absolute degree his free soul, his spiritual element and his mental logic. Based on what has been said, it appears that "man" as a person is unique and functions as a way of activating nature and its idioms. With the term "homousio" therefore, the Patriarchal Orthodox Christian theology defines and gives meaning to a situation where all persons are not only contained within nature, but contain all nature together (Chiotis, 1984).

In this way, it is recognized that the face of the "man" is directly intertwined with otherness, since it is considered as an independent personality compared to others and the rest of its kind if it is understood as a separate and distinguished entity (Triantari, 2008). Based on this logic, the concept of the existence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit does not create confusion and disorientation for us, since the existence of God is special and, for this reason, we confess to the undifferentiated word and essence of God (Philippenk, 2010). In short, it is pointed out by Orthodox Christian anthropology and theology that, on the one hand, the person of "man" is distinguished and stands out for his heterogeneity in relation to the other elements of his environment and/or other persons, on the other hand, possesses a unity of its own characteristics as an individuality in and of itself. From this point of view, it can be seen that just as the divine Persons are identical to each other, so are human persons. The desire of the human existence to be in communion with other existences is due solely to the total inclusion of the existence in all nature (Tempelis & Terezis, 2008).

Given these, it is pointed out that the difference between the Trinitarian Persons and the persons of "humans" consists in the fact that in the former there is no continuity between them –apart from the divine nature– as their society and their community is infinite, while in the persons of "humans" their –hypostatic nature– is separated and split - guilty of sin (Koios, 2007). In simple words, the coexistence of God and humans cannot be identified and confused, since the unity of the human will is considered different and separate from its nature. Each person, therefore, experiences in a special and distinct way and form the human nature and, always in relation to the other persons. As a society, in other words, persons are not confused as parts of the common essence, but exist by themselves. The individuality and otherness of the person, therefore, strengthens his desire for a society where his status remains distinct, while he is not naturally isolated from other like-minded persons (Zizioulas, 1977; Lossky, 1976).

Regarding the ontology of the Most Reverend Metropolitan of Pergamum, Ioannis Zizioulas, it is observed that he develops and puts forward an ontological, person-centered view and rendering of God, shaping the eucharistic experience and ontological perspective with –as the axis of the person– the Eucharistic experience. The metaphysics of the person, in other words, is considered and is the metaphysics of Christianity (Wahl, 1988). In the spirit of logic from above, he approaches the various doctrines with the contribution and in the light of the problems and searches that arise in the life of modern man. It has now been established that the character of (O)being is attributed to God. The reference to the personal existence of God is allowed through the use of ontological categories (Yagazoglou, 1995). The person of God, therefore, is shaped and formed based on the otherness of the immanent properties of each person in God. The non-existence of a personal-substantive ontology, therefore, does not facilitate the creation of an environment for the development of a "discourse" about the Trinity. In his work, the reduction of the person to the level of a protolia and active personocracy and/or existentialism is very often found, and it is not circumscribed and confined only to the use of the ontology of the person and/or personality (Ludovikos, 2002; McPartlan, 1993).

The use of ontological language in the formulation of his theological work is clearly visible, without questioning the inherent existential character of his speech. Man's relationship and life with God, after all, are assumptions that run horizontally through his work (Harrison, 1998). In any case, it extends and insists on the in-depth understanding and analysis of the human person, drawing ideas and foundations from the Trinitarian Doctrine of the Orthodox Christian tradition (Nicolaidis, 2002). The initiatives and actions of the Metropolitan of Pergamon, in short, highlight in an emphatic way in his work, the human face with the human existential anxieties, expectations and searches of the man of the present era (Reid, 2009). Given the circumstances, he believes that the Orthodox thought

that draws its appearance in the Fathers of the Church and is of decisive importance for the analysis and interpretation of the existence of the human person, needs immediate and substantial restoration in the field of its semantic content (Papanikolaou, 2003). Consequently, it becomes clearly perceptible and understandable that for the Metropolitan of Pergamum there can be no references to the Holy Trinity, without there being an inescapable interconnection with a personal hypostatic ontology (Ables, 2011).

The shift of the center of gravity of ontology from substance to person according to the view of the Cappadocian Fathers

In questions about the creation of the world –out of non-being– and about bridging knowledge between modern Western philosophy and ancient Greek philosophy, the Cappadocian Fathers come to provide documented and thorough answers and assumptions (Vassilopoulos, 2006). To this day, their teaching influences the philosophy of the Orthodox Eastern Church and is the litmus test for Western Christianity. From the point of view of the Holy Bible and realizing the deeper meaning of the crucifixion and incarnation of Jesus Christ, the Cappadocian Fathers proposed the soteriological significance of Christian cosmology. Through the senses of sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch which the poet God gave to man, he became the main sharer in the enjoyment of the natural world (Balsamis). The Cappadocian Fathers (Gregory the Theologian, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa), therefore, did not reject ancient Greek philosophy, but on the contrary, used it to analyze and approach the concept of the world according to Christian philosophy (Varlas, 1986).

Cosmology and anthropology in the thought of the Three Hierarchs, therefore, are mutually interpreted and divided under the framework of the wider framework of Theology. In addition, they argue that the glory of creation must extend to man in order to have ontological value and distinction (Tsamis, 1977). Among other things, it should be emphasized that based on their reports, they consider that freedom constitutes within the miraculously built creation of (un)enrichment. God's gift to man's ontological existence in the world is essentially "consciousness" under the logic and interpretation of a philosophical, ethical and metaphysical order of things (Theodorou, 2015). But the enormous contribution of the Cappadocian Fathers is in the distinction between the concepts of "substance" and "substance" which until then were considered and interpreted as identical. Hence also in the First Ecumenical Council, the anathema is observed of all those who confess and accept the identification of the essence with the existence of God. According to the Cappadocian Fathers, the terms nature and essence are identical, since they denote the One God and unity (Romans, 8,21).

In this sense, it now appears that they attribute the term existence to the person of man. In Greek, therefore, it can be seen that the term hypostasis is identified with the term person. The person, in other words, means three beings since it is identified with the essence. Based on the foregoing, it is established that the specific henceforth change, distinction and identification of these terms constitutes a pivotal reference both for historical events and for Orthodox Christian theology (Christou, 1978). The man who evolves spiritually, after all, as an imitator of Christ towards an ever-revealing course of completion, constitutes the crown of his creation. In any case, their work highlights the identification of the ontological term substance with the term person, which was never ontologically defined. With their contribution, therefore, the term status actually denotes the person's status. This implies that each person has his own entity which is different from the entity of any human person in and on creation (Vasiliev, 2006).

In the context of the above interpretations, the contribution of the result of the Theology of the Cappadocian Fathers consists in the fact that God is one in essence and/or nature and three in Persons and/or Substances, in terms of terminology (Harrison, 1984). In this way, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is formulated to this day. The question that the Cappadocian Fathers answer through their work is that while there are references to many people we cannot refer to many Gods (Giannaras, 2004). Obviously, because we humans have our human nature divided by construction. The absolute balance between "hypostasis and substance" actually reflects the very great contribution of the Cappadocian Fathers to the transition of ontology from substance to person. In short, it can be seen that the theology of the Cappadocian Fathers is of revolutionary importance and weight, as it provided for the first time the possibility for a clear understanding of ontological categories such as the person, thus proceeding to the distinction between the terms essence and substance, a fact that it escapes even today from the science of the history of philosophy (Florovsky, 1962; Giannaras, 1995).

The essential contribution of Eastern Orthodox Christianity, however, lies in the fact that they facilitated the understanding of man's personal relationship with Christ, through which the reality of God is revealed in all its dimensions (Mertzelos, 2009). Christian theology, therefore, also deals with the analysis and interpretation of topics

and issues such as love, the problem of freedom, death, life, human existence and autonomy, etc. In this way, it becomes clear that man's transformative experience and, not just his moral improvement, constitutes an event of enormous dimensions regarding the experience of his relationship with God. Within the material creation and its treasures, man enjoys the divine goods of his freedom and human autonomy, thus glorifying the greatness of God. Hence God created the world for this purpose (Gregory Nyssis, *On the Creation of Man*, PG44, 133).

Man prefers –by the grace of God– the face instead of the essence, continuing in this way his venture towards the –road and path of his freedom and existential autonomy– constantly fighting against the commitment of his creation. The freedom and autonomy of human existence, in other words, requires its assimilation with the Creator – God, so that it is freed from the biopsychic compulsions of its essence and/or nature. The limits of human freedom and autonomy according to Orthodox Christian theology, in this sense, are determined and delimited within the Divine co-liberty of persons (Kyril, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, 2011). Given the circumstances, it is recognized that, on the one hand, man is solely responsible and free to decide and respond negatively to his Creator's invitation to participate in the "being" of real life, and on the other hand, to define again freely and completely autonomously his positive response for accepting the divine invitation, in order to determine his existential relationship with God. Inductively, it can be seen that man, through Divine Grace, realizes himself as a person and overcomes his individualism and egoism, while at the same time he opens up to the "other" and "You" through a process of social and spiritual development and advancement, which emanates from the mercy of his faith in God (Marathevtis, 2011).

Comparison of Eastern Orthodox Christianity with the Psychoanalytic theory of Jacques Lacan

In the Orthodox Christian anthropology of the East, the "human person" is found to be subject to a particularly distinct position in terms of its interweaving and discussion and study with Eschatology, Ontology and Ethics as a whole. In addition to the others, there is an additional interconnection of the concept of the person, of course –in terms of the performance and interpretation of its content– with the pre-eminent and prominent ontological principles of Orthodox Christian Theology which are "otherness" and "unity". However, it must be pointed out and emphasized that Orthodox Christian anthropology deals with the biological and spiritual construction and constitution of the human Being (Terezis, 2008). In this sense, it is recognized that man is approached according to the Christian Anthropological view as a creature possessing valuable and moral Christian conditions of the virtuous life, while when approached teleologically and metaphysically he constitutes a reasonable psychosomatic entity that is characterized and distinguished from the available collective and social properties, utterances and experiences (Thermos & Augustidis, 2002).

Man, therefore, is held together by a shaped "oneness" in relation to God and his fellow men (Callahan, 1958). In short, it appears that Eastern Orthodox Christian anthropology constitutes a methodological tool for promoting the well-being of the "person" which becomes a means to an end and not just a supreme end and good (Whitefield, 1990). On the contrary, there are the various psychoanalytic theories and approaches, where they function more –as a means– of facilitating the subjects to conquer and achieve self-awareness, than as a body of knowledge that has been created and developed for an end in itself (Bracher, 1993).

In the light of psychoanalytic considerations there is Lacan's approach where man deals under the logic of (Three Registers) namely, the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real. In more detail, it is noted that these three dimensions are fundamental in terms of the formation and shaping of human mental subjectivity. With the Imaginary Register, man experiences his everyday life as a psychoanalytic reality. In this way, it interweaves the Fantastic with the peristaltic spheres of self-awareness and consciousness. The Phantom Register, however, is a phenomenon of fabricated illusions that refers to the existence of speaking psychics. As far as the Symbolic Register is concerned, it refers to the institutions, laws, customs, rules, customs and practices that apply and are practiced in various cultures and societies. The Real Register, finally, is used to refer to various material existent beings that is, to everything that is beyond, behind and/or below the phenomenal appearances (Lacan, 1977). It is obvious that in this particular psychoanalytic theory there is nowhere the existential relationship of man with God, the "human person", freedom through the loving relationship with the other, as well as the possibility of personal choices with the resulting consequences (Karakolis, 2006).

References:-

1. Ables, T. (2011). On the very idea of an ontology of communion – being, relation and freedom in Zizioulas and Levinas. *Heythrop Journal*, 52, 672-683.

2. Attrep, A. (1999). From the old to the new: Some of St. Gregory of Nyssa's teaching and the modern era. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 42(3/4), 287-298.
3. Ayres, L. (2003). On not three people: The fundamental themes of Gregory of Nyssa's trinitarian theology as seen in "To Ablabios: On Not Three Gods". In S. Coakley (Ed.), *Re-thinking Gregory of Nyssa* (pp. 15-44). UK: Oxford.
4. Behr, J. (1999). The rational animal: A rereading of Gregory of Nyssa's *De hominis opificio*. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 7, 219-247.
5. Berger, C. (2014). Towards a theological gnoseology: The synthesis of Fr. Dumitru Stăniloaia in Romanian (N. Dărăban, Trans.). Sibiu: Deisis.
6. Bracher, M. (1993). *Lacan, discourse and social change: A psychoanalytic cultural criticism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
7. Callahan, J. (1958). Greek philosophy and Cappadocian cosmology. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 12, 29-57.
8. Cameron, A. (1991). *Christianity and the rhetoric of Empire. The development of Christian discourse*. Berkeley, US: University of California Press.
9. Chiotis, M.A. (1984). *The Christian teaching about man as a person*. Athena.
10. Christou, P. (1978). *Basil the Great, life and state, writings, theological thought*. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Foundation for Patriarchal Studies.
11. Christou, P. (2003). *Ecclesiastical Literature. Fathers and theologians of Christianity, Volume I*. Thessaloniki: Kyromanos.
12. Cohn-Sherbock, L. (1998). *Who's in Christianity*. London: Routledge.
13. Florovsky, G. (1962). The concept of creation in St. Atanasius. *Studia Patristica F. L. Cross*, 4, (1962), 36-57.
14. Florovsky, G. (1983). *Creation and redemption* (P. Pallis, Trans.). Thessaloniki: Pournaras.
15. Freeman, C. (2009). *A new history of early Christianity*. US: Yale University Press.
16. Zizioulas, I. (1977). From face to face. The contribution of patristic theology to the concept of the person. In *Charistaria in honor of Metropolitan Gerontos Chalkidonos Melitonos, Patriarch*. Thessaloniki: Studies Foundation.
17. Zizioulas, J. (1985). *Being as communion. Studies in the personhood and the Church*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
18. Giannaras, X. (1995). *Propositions of critical ontology* (3rd ed.). Athens: Ikaros.
19. Giannaras, X. (2004). *Ontology of the relationship*. Athens: Ikaros.
20. Harrison, V. (1984). Yannaras on person and nature. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 33(2), 287-296.
21. Harrison, V. (1998). Zizioulas on communion and otherness. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 42(3/4), 273-300.
22. Kant, I. (2007). *Religion within the limits of the Word and only* (Androulidakis, Trans.). Athens: City.
23. Karazafeiri, N. (1995). *The teaching of Saint Maximus the Confessor about the person*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
24. Karakolis, X. (2006). The world in crisis and the judgment of God: Designing a biblical approach. *Syntax*, 100, 22-27.
25. Karmiris, I. (1973). *Doctrinal Department E'. Orthodox Ecclesiology*. Athens: Parisianos.
26. Kirill, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia (2011). *Freedom and responsibility: Human rights and the value of the person* (A. Peloriadou, Trans.). Athens: At sea.
27. Koios, N.G. (2007). *Theology and experience according to Elder Sophronius, 1986-1993*. Holy Monastery of Vatopedi.
28. Lacan, J. (1977). *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York, US: Norton.
29. Lossky, V. (1976). *The mystical theology of the Eastern Church*. New York, US: St. Vladimir Seminary Press.
30. Ludovikos, P.N. (2002). *The apostate Ecclesiology of the same school*. Athens: Armos.
31. Marathevtis, M.I. (2011). *Personality and education. Studies and essays*. Nicosia: Spiritual Renewal Group.
32. McPartlan, P. (1993). *The eucharist makes the church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in dialogue*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark.
33. Melissaris, A.G. (2002). Orthodoxy and the affirmation of the human person. In H. Terezis, et al., (Ed.), *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man, Volume II* (pp. 59-78). Patras: EAP.
34. Mertzelos, D.G. (2009). *Essence and actions of God according to Basil the Great. Contribution to the historical-dogmatic investigation of the Orthodox Church's teaching on the essence and actions of God*. Thessaloniki: Pournaras.
35. Nikolaidis, N. (2002). *Analects about the true Being and the Beings, Volume I*. Thessaloniki: Pournaras.

36. Papanikolaou, A. (2003). Divine energies or divine personhood: Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas on conceiving the transcendent and immanent God. *Modern Theology*, 19, 357-385.
37. Papavasiliou, A. (1995). *Christian psychology (according to Saint Gregory of Nyssa)*. Nicosia.
38. Philipenk, E. (2010). *Person im Sakrament*. Regensburg, Germany: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.
39. Plessner, H. (2004). *Texts of philosophical anthropology (I. Theodoropoulos, Trans.)*. Preveza.
40. Plexidas, I. (2001). *Person and nature: Controversies surrounding the concept of person in the Thought of John Damascene*. Athens: Nisides.
41. Reid, D. (2009). Patristics and the Postmodern in the Theology of John Zizioulas. *Pacifica*, 22(3), 308-316.
42. Springsted, E. (2005). *Philosophy. The encyclopedia of Christianity (J. Bowden, Trans.)*. UK: Oxford University Press.
43. Staniloae, D. (2011). *About God Orthodox Christian teaching*. Athens: Armos.
44. Tempelis, H., & Terezis, X. (2008). The concepts of substance-nature, person-substance in Neoplatonic philosophy and Orthodox theology. In S. Triantaris, H. Tempelis & H. Terezis (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as heritage. Theology and philosophy in the age of the Fathers*. Patras: EAP.
45. Terezis, X. (2002). Orthodoxy and respect for the human personality. In H. Terezis, et al. (Ed.), *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man, Volume II*. Patras: EAP.
46. Terezis, X. (2008). Cosmological issues in Neoplatonic philosophy and Orthodox theology. In S. Triantaris, H. Tempelis & H. Terezis (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as heritage. Theology and philosophy in the age of the Fathers*. Patras: EAP.
47. Theodorou, P. (2015). *Introduction to being and time – phenomenological interpretation and analysis of preliminary existential analytic*. Athens: SEAB.
48. Thermos, B., & Augustidis, A. (2002). Orthodoxy and psychology. In H. Terezis, A. Melissaris et al. (Ed.), *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man, Volume II* (pp. 113-121). Patras: EAP.
49. Triantari, S. (2008). The philosophical topics of orthodox theology. In S. Triantaris, H. Tempelis & H. Terezis (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as heritage. Theology and philosophy in the age of the Fathers*. Patras: EAP.
50. Tsamis, D. (1977). *Man and environment in the thought of the Three Hierarchs*. Thessaloniki: A.P.Th.
51. Turcan, N. (2019). Theo-phenomenology of love in Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae's thought. *Diakrisis Yearbook of Theology and Philosophy*, 2, 69-83.
52. Yagazoglou, S. (1995). *Society of deification*. Thessaloniki: Domos.
53. Val, Z. (1988). *Introduction to the philosophies of existentialism (H. Malevitsis, Trans.)*. Athens: Armos.
54. Valsamis, G. The eleventh speech of Saint Gregory of Nyssa. Retrieved on 23/09/2023 from website: http://www.myriobiblos.gr/texts/greek/valsamis_nyssa.html.
55. Varlas, M. (1986). *The holy bible and sacred tradition during the reign of Basil the Great*. Thessaloniki: A.V.S.Th.
56. Vasiliev, A. (2006). *The history of the Byzantine Empire 324 – 1453 (D. Savramis, Trans.)*. Athens: Pelekanos.
57. Vasilopoulos, X. (2006). *Basil the Great*. Athens: Orthodox Press.
58. Whitefield, K.R. (1990). *Between God and Man: Personhood, trinity and the metaphor of text*. Scotland, UK: University of Aberdeen.