



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/18669

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/18669>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF FREEDOM AND THE PERSON IN THE "GREAT INQUISTOR" BY DOSTOYEVSKY AND IN THE THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT OF THE METROPOLITAN OF PERGAMO IOANNIS ZIZIOULAS

Novakos Ioannis

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 29 February 2024

Final Accepted: 31 March 2024

Published: April 2024

Abstract

In this particular work, a tightrope and as accurate as possible rendering of the relationship between the "person and freedom" and freedom as our obligation and attitude towards the Other is attempted. The concept of freedom, in essence, is undoubtedly and inescapably intertwined with the authenticity of the person and, in particular, with the deeper meaning of human destiny and existence. In this sense, Dostoyevsky focuses in his work on the dual phenomenon of freedom, that is, on the function of man between internal and external freedom, as well as on the individual responsibility of each subject, towards society and the Other. Subsequently, an in-depth theological and existential analysis and interpretation of the "person" is presented, which is based on the work of the Metropolitan of Pergamos, Ioannis Zizioulas, who recently passed away/fallen asleep, as well as the meaning of the content of the concept of "person" in modern theological anthropology. Finally, the interweaving of theology and literature is attempted through the active and analytical presentation of the "person" and "freedom".

Copy Right, IJAR, 2024,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Interpretive approach to the myth of the Great Inquisitor

Dostoyevsky, as a thinker and writer, was the preeminent exponent and at the same time forerunner of the principles and ideas of existentialism. The person, his interpersonal relationships and his very existence, were the driving force and inspiration of his writing ventures and his main themes in his works (Toumayan, 2004). As the main exponent of the philosophy of existence and of the subjectification of the person as such, he was vehemently opposed to any form of objectification of man (Tulloch, 1952). On key questions about life and existence, therefore, Dostoyevsky presented his views through a holistic philosophical theory and literary stream. His novels, in other words, were the medium and the tool of a strict and universal systematic recording of his positions, regarding the freedom of the person (Bakhtin, 2000).

In addition to the others, the greatness of the element of the otherness of Dostoyevsky's reflection in his literary texts is established, since through the veil of clothing of his central characters, the enormous existential problems of man emerge and at the same time the thorough search for the outstanding ideals of life. Given these facts, we can observe in the work of the "Inquisitor" on the one hand, a departure from entities/beings and/or individuals who lack evolution and dynamism, on the other hand, his transformation into real persons who unfold before our eyes the weaknesses, possibilities and advantages them in social science and becoming (Giannaras, 1987).

In his specific work, the development of each character is determined by the manner and form of expression of his ideas (Thayer, 1889). The ideas of each person, in this sense, are removed from the watertight entrenchment of their self-referential and utopian microcosm and undergo the criticism and test of diverse and complex ideas, such as personal relationships. The concept and meaning of the person itself is inextricably intertwined with the Other, since a "referentiality" emerges that refers to the person and its characteristics, such as dialogue, communication and its interconnected and interconnected relationships at all levels and aspects of it of his daily life, which invisibly and covertly govern his existence above and within society (Begzos, 2000).

In this way, the person's self is distinguished, since the association of any form of relationship with the Other person, uniquely defines and self-determines his particularity and individuality. In particular, individuality is the point of reference and differentiation of the person from the Other (Skleris, 2013). In Dostoyevsky's Inquisitor, the uniquely defining mark of "Between" and "Being" pervades throughout his work and especially as a key moment in the relationships of persons. This implies that each uniquely created and autonomous person is identified and separated from the other persons –whether negative or positive– for his actions, through the sieve of his opposition from his relationship always, with someone and/or someone else/other person(s) (Berdiaev, 1996).

Certainly, his writing creation as a whole, and especially that of the Inquisitor, sprinkles it with the distinct colors of his unique quality –of another level of thought– but also the characteristic that brings this feeling to another level, which is the “Between” of persons. The question of our responsibility towards the Other and our relationship to him, consequently, firmly, horizontally and persistently occupies the content of the Inquisitor. All the quotations are derived as meaning and significance from the readers of the specific literary work (Apostolopoulos, 1991). In this sense, he distinguishes that between the neighbor and at the same time the unknown Other, the person recognizes and learns about real situations, issues and problems that he encounters in his life, such as kindness, beauty, poverty, alienation and revenge. In this way, Dostoyevsky points out the inalienable face of the subject, while also echoing the universal postulate where the person is more responsible and bound than everyone, for everyone against everyone and for everything (Levinas, 2007).

Based on the above, it is considered that the person, while being irreplaceable and irreplaceable, can at the same time replace everyone. Furthermore, it is stated that only to the extent that the person is responsible for himself, he is judged and counted as an irreplaceable ego. In addition to the others, it is observed that a key position in Dostoyevsky's work is occupied by the term freedom, which is essentially intertwined with the purpose and meaning of human existence (Tourneisen, 2016). In this way, the issue and at the same time problem of freedom is recognized by Dostoyevsky, either at the beginning or at the end of his thought process, as an object of another order of things, where its interpretation requires the essential approach to the authenticity of the person and the in-depth study of the meaning of human destiny and existence (Berlin, 2001).

In essence, it is argued that the overarching question of real freedom is left as much to the conditions around and outside of us as it is to our internal hypostatic condition. Nevertheless, it must be emphasized that the boundaries between objective reality and the subjective sense of freedom are completely blurred and indiscernible. Throughout Dostoyevsky's work, therefore, the tragedy of man is very deeply rooted, as the contrast between the objectively determined freedom of the person and his absolute desire for free will and realization is distinguished (Berdiaev, 2002).

Each person, in this sense, attempts due to his freedom to be freed from his suffering and cross the rubicon/ordeal of his perishable nature, when he moves between nihilism and absoluteness as well as between weakness and strength (Kyrillos, 2011). Throughout Dostoyevsky's work, therefore, the problem of freedom in all its manifestations is presented as the supreme challenge and experience of the human condition, in a very harsh way and form. Paradoxically, though, freedom leads first to pain and then to redemption, even though ostensibly it must mean immediate and somehow deliverance from pain. In essence, it is argued that the good that emanates from free will actually acquires a moral dimension and substance, since what is necessarily good is transformed into evil when it does not constitute the outcome of free will (Delikonstantis, 1997).

According to the adepts, freedom by nature pushes the individual away from the burden of conscience and responsibility, although it constitutes a unique paradox, since it detaches the person from stagnation and stagnation. In *The Great Inquisitor*, which is the crown of Dostoyevsky's works and at the same time masterpieces, man must lay down his freedom at the altar of general happiness and enjoyment and the common good. Certainly freedom can

never be defined as self-referentiality, but on the contrary, it is very clear that it is always defined and self-defined in relation to Others. Freedom in the Grand Inquisitor reaches the limits of the self-authority of the individual, thus providing a workable field, independent of the source of power (Levinas, 2007).

Moreover, the question posed to the Great Inquisitor is how and in what way –man regardless of circumstances– can conquer and manage his freedom. Through his silent presence, Christ, in essence, gives a deafening answer to the issue of freedom, since he makes the eternal image of –man– full of content with regard to his freedom, in contrast to man who as a person surrenders his freedom revolutionary, anarchic and peristaltic, in the form of a vicious circle and vortex that leads him with geometric precision to his destruction. In the question of negative freedom, therefore, Christ as an archetype and prime example to be imitated, functions as a response against such authority (Evdokimov, 1966). In this way, it becomes distinct in Dostoyevsky's work that his characters do not realize and complete their spiritual and real freedom, from the moment they choose illusion instead of -truth- which essentially leads to the hypostatic and per se formation of the personality and entity of man (Jones, 2005; MacCallum, 1967).

The litmus test in Dostoyevsky's contemplative literary edifice is the immortality of the soul. Without it, as he claims –which I mentioned in passing– it is, according to his admissions, the highest and incomparable idea and concept of life, there is neither a nation nor a "man". In fact he accepts that all other ideas emanate and draw their origin from the immortality of the soul and by extension the spirit of every entity on earth. As Dostoyevsky very cleverly states in *The Great Inquisitor*, the place of God is given to a higher Being who structures and constitutes from the beginning and –outside the framework of accepting the existence of God and the immortality of the soul– a new morality and another order things. In this spirit and logic, it is recognized that the climax of the core of Dostoyevsky's metaphysical reasoning in the legend of the Great Inquisitor, is the scene of the denial of the existence of God, which confirms and at the same time strengthens with the most catalytic, frontal, fundamental and visible way the eternal existence of "God" (Dostoyevsky, 2014; Papagiorgis, 1990).

In Seville of the 16th century, i.e. at the time of the Inquisition, an allegorical scene unfolds, where people considered heretics are burned at the stake in the name and glory of God. In addition to the others, it should be emphasized that Ivan, the author of the poem, turns out to be a believer in the end, even though he is a fanatically declared atheist. After the admonitions, it is observed that the Grand Inquisitor, with the pretext *ad majorem gloriam Dei* (*for the greater glory of God*) burned a hundred heretics in front of the Kings, knights and Cardinals. Christ, however, descends quietly and without leaving his mark on this worldly scene. In other words, the God-man appears as a merciful God –full of love and compassion– observing the horrible sufferings of condemned innocent people. His worldly arrival following the martyrdom of men is not considered critical, but on the contrary, compassionate, demonstrating the greatness of his simplicity and humility, according to the teachings of the Holy Bible (Pachmuss, 1979).

The people in the Grand Inquisitor, nevertheless, seem to manifest in God an active faith, regardless of the degree of corruption and sin. The issue that Dostoyevsky poses at this particular point in time in the scene is the recognizability of God by the crowd of faithful people. Their offering, after all, to some other God who does not resemble him, is not at all considered an offering to Christ. That is why they flock en masse around him and miraculously discover his forgotten existence. However, Christ watches this horrible event and the degeneration of human nature, being saddened, bewildered, saddened and silent by what is happening. But in a desperate movement of inexpressible joy, the people in this particular myth accept Christ as they did in Jerusalem, even though they are immersed in pain and despair (Bruss, 1986).

The Great Inquisitor, however, does not shy away and, while he sees the God-Man in silence, he recognizes him by calling him "You Are", thus exceeding the limits of human hypocrisy and hypocrisy. Given this, he decides to judge and imprison the Deity, raising his stature and demonstrating that he does not feel insignificant and insignificant. The Inquisitor, influenced and dominated by his pride, although the uncertainty regarding the triumph of his ideology has grown inside him, tries to convince Christ of the rightness of his positions. The voiceless presence of Christ at the moment of his arrest gives this scene greatness and unparalleled divine power, thus demonstrating the victory of good and at the same time the freedom of the spirit (Buber, 1953).

In front of the eyes of his scorned subjects, the Grand Inquisitor attempts to establish his authority, since he feels its ideological basis being eroded, asking Christ, "Why have you come to disturb us", apparently worried about the risk of the total collapse of his image. The crowd, despite all this, submits and does not react to the unjust order of the

Great Inquisitor for the arrest of Christ, even though they rejoice with love at once when he appears before them. The weak nature of man, therefore, is revealed in this dramatic powerful scene, where conformity overcomes freedom. All of the above demonstrate the incredible unimaginable ingratitude of people, who, in the face of coercion and fear, easily reject and renounce even the face of Christ that exudes mercy and love (Cicovacki, 2003).

In this sense, it is recognized that the abolition of freedom by the Inquisition, like any other kind of power, constitutes the deposition of freedom without struggle and struggle, even at the time of the hopeful divine advent. The Catholic Church, according to the Grand Inquisitor, has established happiness as the highest value, thus freeing people from the insurmountable burden of free choice and will (Fange, 2006). The price the Grand Inquisitor pays, after all, is the loneliness of the widespread misery he experiences, as he is forced and obliged to bear the total burden of remorse and guard the guilty secret of his subjects, so that they remain carefree beings and happy controlled subordinates (Davidson, 1997).

Mental vigor absent from the general life of men leads to their isolation, subjugation, utter confusion, unhappiness and despair, conditions which act as obstacles in their struggle for freedom. Christ, faced with the monologue of the Great Inquisitor, quotes –his silence because instead of an answer he kisses him– demonstrating in this way the greatness of the value of the God-Man, as through forgiveness and the shocking act of mercy, the essence and meaning of real freedom and will of the human being and entity (Kirillova, 2001; Paris, 2008).

The content of the concept and the importance of the person in the theological thought of Metropolitan John Zizioulas of Pergamos and in general in modern theological anthropology

Man cannot exist outside his own ecclesiastical "extension", that is, his own Christification. Therefore, man can become a unique, free and selfless being, when his salvation is identified with his personification. In this sense, Zizioulas (1977) considers and strongly argues that the realization of the personal life of the Holy Trinity in the human condition is essentially the meaning of salvation. Human existence which is essentially the capacity for the love of sin and the lust for existence, becomes after the fall a kind of parasite on the individualized and divided nature. Somehow after the fall, the natural volitions are observed to be transformed into blind and impersonal expressions of nature, which differentiate and individualize –through dissolution and death– the hypostatic mode and form of existence from human nature, while on the other hand face and nature are differentiated (Zizioulas, 1991).

In the midst of all this, the fact remains that man on his own, intensifies the individualization of his nature and stimulates the total and in every way dissolution of his Being, cutting off his autonomy, in order to grant and realize his freedom (Zizioulas, 1979). Over interpreted, his way of being turns into a pathological, passionate and unnatural lust. In a categorical and emphatic way, after all, the Metropolitan of Pergamum believes that love and the body, as manifestations of the human condition, should not be destroyed as they are considered basic and fundamental components of biological existence, so that the fallen existence can be freed and saved out of favor due to personal bad choices. The change of the constitution of the existence, on the contrary, entails the salvation of the existence and the birth and at the same time the emergence of a new way of existence, completely different from the moral one, which the Metropolitan calls the "ontology of existence", of course, of the ecclesiological existence (Zizioulas, 2010; Giannaras, 2004).

The person in the ontology of the Metropolitan of Pergamum Zizioulis, needs a hypostatic constitution without ontological necessity, as it is governed by an absolute ontological freedom. In this sense, it is recognized that God's Being, which is identified in every way with his freedom as a person, constitutes the truth of being (Zizioulas 2016). Certainly, it constitutes a new revolution for philosophical thought and approach, the concept of person and its identification with substance, obviously, as formulated by the Fathers in the East in the 4th century AD, because horizons are opened for a new view of the world, of man and God. Christ makes the basis and essence of the person of each person, because it is He who ends the same reality of the person. The basis of man's ontology, therefore, is Christ himself (Zizioulas, 2018).

Just as the three hypostases of the Christian God, which are the Father, the Son and the Spirit, do not constitute three distinct identities, but only one, hence God is undifferentiated and his essence is one, so the person is a uniquely hypostatic unity, since it is a creation of God and, therefore, is composed of the Whole of soul and body, emphasizing the fact of the unity of the divine element. In other words, it is established that as an individuality the person is distinguished by his relationship with other persons and/or the other elements of his environment –for his

heterogeneity— while at the same time, he possesses the unique and unbroken unity of the same characteristics and traits of his. The person, however, constitutes for Orthodox Christian theology the aspect of a certain natural whole and, for this reason, it does not need to be taken and implied as something separate and distinct from the Whole of its environment (Megas Basilios, Epistle 236,6, PG 32, 884 AB; Petroulakis, 2011).

In a very clear and comprehensible way, therefore, the Metropolitan of Pergamum seems to mention in his work that man as a person is a "perfect man", since he is possessed by the Christian essence of God, who by nature is a perfect God (Zizioulas, 1992). Under this spirit and logic, it is considered that the overcoming of death by man, can become a capable and real condition, only when the person joins undisturbed and inescapably in his relationship with the person of Christ. Taking into account the above, it is actively demonstrated that only the person can transcend death because his relationship stems from and at the same time is inextricably intertwined with his relationship with Christ (Zizioulas, 1982). That is why it is recognized that, while the nature of man is perishable, mortal and built, man as a being per se will never cease to be a built Being (Zizioulas, 1997; Zizioulas, 2014).

In the way in which, however, God gives existence to man's being, man's ontological being is due and, obviously, not to man's actions and/or will per se. Given these, it is noted that man is a being that is free from any destiny and coercion—in the logic and philosophy of the principle and axiom of personal love and otherness—and is not only a manifestation of the divine word and/or an imminent principle. The existential possibility for a loving society and participation is the way of the personal existence of man. Additionally, it should be pointed out at this point, the thought of the Metropolitan of Pergamum on freedom in all its ontological dimension. For him, the reason, perception and understanding of the Fathers about freedom is placed at the opposite of the so-called "moral freedom" (Zizioulas, 2011). In essence, as he states, moral freedom is determined by the individualization of being, which actually characterizes the fall and, by extension, narrows freedom itself. However, for Zizioulas, freedom is not a given and/or a choice, hence he places it in the afterlife (Zizioulas, 2000; Koios, 2007).

When the Metropolitan of Pergamum refers to the personal dimension of the "personocratic ontology" in terms of human existence, then, it is evident that compared to the ontology of necessity and/or nature, he places more emphasis on an ontology of love. After all, only the person can be hypothesized in the relationship of Father and Son in the Holy Spirit, because the two components of the relationship, which are love and freedom, create people as a relationship – person. However, at the same time—the truth of the person—is intertwined with the ecclesiological synthesis between Spirituality and Christology and at the same time it is revealed by the Trinitarian ontology. In this light, only the ecclesiastical person is considered a free person, which is why theology connects the concept of the person with freedom. The person, in short, makes possible the existence of the nature-substance, since nature no longer determines the person (Tembelis & Terezis, 2008). The being-existence of man, therefore, is identified with ontological freedom (Triantari, 2008). The Metropolitan of Pergamum, in this way, understands the person as an ecstatic and hypostatic event. The person, at the mercy of the necessity and construction of his nature, is identified beyond the necessity that surrounds human existence with transcendence (Melissaris, 2002; Terezis, 2002).

The meeting between theology and literature focusing on "person" and "freedom"

Theology refers to the knowledge of the actions and deeds of God, which is why it is obvious that theology constitutes the word of God and at the same time the word about God. The result of experiencing and experiencing the mystery of the living God, therefore, constitutes the very knowledge of God. The doxological and eucharistic character of theology, in other words, is inextricably intertwined with the theological lived experience and life attitude (Anagnostopoulou, 2006). Theology, above all else, must meet and be chosen with contemporary cultural conditions and realities, as a doxological and simultaneous eucharistic discourse. Based on the aforementioned logic, it is not understood that theology does not listen to and receives the signs and cries of the times from the world of arts, so that it can converse undisturbed with the various cultural and artistic expressions, just as with the other sciences (Athanasopoulou-Kypriou, 2008).

In this case, it is considered that the form of approach to literature by theologians and to theology by writers plays a prominent position during the contact between theology and literature. As for the former, they think that literature should use the language of theology and confirm theological principles and truths, while theology, on the other hand, is misunderstood in the minds of writers, since they become recipients of completely hazy and confusing information and data, which are disorienting and have nothing to do with the living reality of theology. The imagination itself emanates from both theology and literature, which are considered cultural legacies and data sources of the world (Athanasopoulou-Kypriou, 2013; Matsoukas, 2000).

In many literary texts, moreover, it appears that the desire of people stands out during the course of searching for God. Literature, therefore, is often the scientific means of approaching and revealing the redemptive role of divine reality. In addition to the others, it can be seen in many literary poems that the theme of hell is mentioned as the destruction of the image of man, that is, his alienation from the other and the loss of his logic and all his spiritual powers and self-determination. Particularly in the era of post-modernism, literature must remain faithful to its work which is the rational form of expression of speech, while theology utters and expresses from the perspective of the end times a speech of salvation and life (Zizioulas, 2008). Literature, however, continues to overlook basic theological parameters and logics, although in all artistic-literary creations there is always the face, which is a point of reference and a confronting fact in Orthodox theology (Igleton, 1989).

Under this logic, theology can be distinguished to have a literary nuance, to reshape and reconstruct the status quos of the world so that it moves in a perpetual uncertainty, since it constitutes a conceptually sacramental intermingling and eucharistic experience. Literature by its very nature is a work of free creation, where the writer/artist works in the image of God and creates the world with love and free will –without naturally being subject to the laws of necessity– as a work of art. Certainly the consideration of theology as doxology is a necessary and sufficient condition for the theological reading and interpretation of various literary texts (Chrysanthopoulos, 2012). The concepts and principles, therefore, related to the theological approach and understanding of the world, must be detected and located in the literary works (Gibellini, 2002; Maras, 2008).

Literature that has a revelatory character is a space for the expression of emotions, since it shows the reader aspects of everyday life that escape his attention such as memories, experiences, feelings, images, experiences. In this way, it is clear that literature constitutes a form of approach to man, where God places him in the world and, of course, does not leave him without his provision. Within literary works such as those of Kontoglou, Papadiamantis, Empirikos, etc. there are manifestly and fully visible religious beliefs and origins of God, which take diverse forms that indicate the multi-dimensional and multi-prismatic character between theology and literature. In literature, however, there are not only theological influences from the creators but also some that concern everyday life, the public sphere and the metaphysical phenomena of the universe. Among other things, the authors of the literary texts are concerned with themes, issues and problems related to the critical-philosophical view and interpretation of religion (Trivizas, 2005).

A very important position, of course, in the theological reading and understanding of literary works, is played by the individual reader, who, depending on his scientific origins and capabilities, must understand in depth and not superficially what the author of these works (Agouridis, 1984). The theological elements that emerge through the way of narration, from the vocabulary and from the expressions of the creators, can be not only of a doctrinal type, but on the contrary, of theological reflection, thought and reflection (Ganas, 2004; Kokolis, 1991). Topics such as the problem of theodicy, the creation of the person, the birth, origin and destination of man and the world, as well as the immortality of the soul, are found in the various and varied literary works and are objects of investigation and study of the scientific branch of philosophy of religion. Especially in the open literary artifacts (texts, prose, poems) the reader can look for and discover religious visions and attractions that draw from the distant future and refer to the salvation and freedom of man (Garantoudis, 1991; Vivilakis, 2007).

References:-

1. Agouridis, S. (1984). *Interpretation of the sacred texts*. Athens: O.E.D.V.
2. Anagnostopoulou, D. (2006). The copy and its functions in the work of Andreas Empirikos. In D. Anagnostopoulou & T. Tzavaras (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic reflections on the work of Andreas Empirikos*. Athens: Synapses.
3. Apostolopoulos, X. (1991). *Martin Buber and the problem of man, conditions, structures and limits of his philosophical anthropology*. Athens: Gutenberg.
4. Athanasopoulou-Kypriou, S. (2008). Theology and Literature. In *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man. Orthodoxy and [Post-] Modernity*, Volume III. Patras: EAP.
5. Athanasopoulou-Kypriou, S. (2013). The role of literature in religious education. *Scientific review of the postgraduate program "Studies in Orthodox Theology"*, Volume IV. Patras: EAP.
6. Bakhtin, M. (2000). *Issues of Dostoyevsky's poetics* (A. Ioannidou, Trans.). Athens: Polis.
7. Basil the Great, *Epistle 236.6*, PG 32, 884 AB.
8. Bezos, M. (2000). *Religious dictionary*. Athens: Greek Letters.
9. Berdyaev, N.A. (1996). *Five reflections on existence* (B. & S. Gounelas, Trans.). Athens: Presence.

10. Berdyaev, N.A. (2002). *The Spirit of Dostoyevsky* (N. Matsoukas, Trans.). Thessaloniki: Pournara.
11. Berlin, I. (2001). *Four Essays on Freedom* (G. Papadimitriou, Trans.). Athens: Scripta.
12. Bruss, N. (1986). The sons Karamazov: Dostoevsky's characters as Freudian transformations. *The Massachusetts Review*, 27(1), 40-67.
13. Buber, M. (1953). *Good and evil: Two Interpretations*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
14. Chrysanthopoulos, M. (2012). *A hundred years passed and a ship passed. Greek Surrealism and the construction of tradition*. Athens: Agra.
15. Cicovacki, P. (2003). Back to the underworld: Dostoevsky on suffering, freedom and evil. *Philotheos*, 3, 215-230.
16. Davidson, R. (1997). *Camus: Challenge of Dostoevsky*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.
17. Delikonstantis, K. (1997). *The ethics of freedom: Philosophical questions and theological answers*. Athens: Domos.
18. Dostoyevsky, F.M. (2014). *Brothers Karamazov* (A. Alexandrou, Trans.). Athens: Govosti.
19. Eagleton, T. (1989). *Introduction to the theory of literature* (D. Giovas, Trans.). Athens: Odysseus.
20. Evdokimov, P. (1966). *The struggle with God* (S. Gertrude, Trans.). New Jersey, Glen Rock: Paulist Press.
21. Fange, D. (2006). Apogee: Crime and Punishment. In R. Peace (Ed.), *Fyodor Dostoevsky's crime and punishment* (pp. 17-37). London: Oxford University Press.
22. Zizioulas, I. (1977). *From face to face. The contribution of patristic theology to the concept of the person*. Gifts in honor of Metropolitan Chalkidonos Melitonos. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Foundation of Patriarchal Studies.
23. Zizioulas, I. (1979). The eucharistic prayer and life. *Emmanuel*, 85, 191-203.
24. Zizioulas, I. (1982). Christology and existence. The dialectic of builder-doer and the doctrine of Chalcedon. *Synopsis* 2, 9-20.
25. Zizioulas, I. (1991). It is God's and it is man's. *Synaxis*, 37, 11-31.
26. Zizioulas, I. (1992). *Creation as thanksgiving*. Athens: Akritis.
27. Zizioulas, I. (1997). Out of nowhere. *Passage*, 10, 9-23.
28. Zizioulas, I. (2000). Symbolism and realism in Orthodox worship. *Sourozh*, 79, 2-17.
29. Zizioulas, I. (2008). Church and End. In P. Kalaitzidis (Ed.), *Church and Eschatology*. Holy Monastery of Simonos Petras, Ieratikon I', Mount Athos.
30. Zizioulas, I. (2010). *The one and the many: Studies on god, man, the church, and the world today*. Alhambra CA: St. Sebastian Press.
31. Zizioulas, I. (2011). The eucharistic communion and the world. New York: T&T Clark.
32. Zizioulas, I. (2014). *Kosmou Lytron - The Agathonikeia - i.e. theological texts about salvation in Christ and the Church*. Megara.
33. Zizioulas I. (2016). Orthodox theology and challenges in the 21st century. In P. Kalaitzidis & N. Asproulis (Eds.), *Person, Eucharist and Reign of God in an Orthodox and Ecumenical Perspective. Synaxis of the Eucharist in honor of the Metropolitan of Pergamum John D. Zizioulas*. Volos: Dimitriadis Publications.
34. Zizioulas, I. (2018). *Freedom and existence. The transition from ancient to Christian civilization. Five courses at the Goulandris-Horn Foundation* (1983). Athens: Domos.
35. Ganas, E. (2004). Novel and theology: paths incompatible?. *Nea Hestia*, 1765, Athens.
36. Garantoudis, E. (1991). The Great Oriental by Andreas Empirikos: A failed literary attempt for the erotic initiation of the Greek reader. *The Tree*, 60/61, 132-137.
37. Giannaras, X. (1987). *The face and love*. Athens: Domos.
38. Giannaras, X. (2004). *Ontology of the relationship*. Athens: Ikaros.
39. Gibellini, R. (2002). *The theology of the 20th century* (P. Yfantis, Trans.). Athens: Bread of Life.
40. Jones, M.V. (2005). *Dostoevsky and the dynamics of religious experience*. London: Anthem Press.
41. 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.
42. Kirillova, I. (2001). Dostoevsky's markings in the Gospel according to St John. In G. Pattison & D.O. Thompson (Eds.), *Dostoevsky and the Christian tradition* (pp. 41-50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
43. Koios, N.G. (2007). *Theology and experience according to Elder Sophronius, 1986-1993*. Holy Monastery of Vatopedi.
44. Kokolis, X.A. (1991). The Great Borer. *Funeral Home*, 14, 96-97.
45. Levinas, E. (2007). *Ethics and infinity, dialogues with Philip Nemo* (K. Papagiorgi, Trans.). Athens: Indiktos.
46. Levinas, E. (2007). *Freedom and command* (M. Pangalos, Trans.). Athens: Bibliopolion of Hestia.
47. MacCallum, G.C. (1967). Negative and positive freedom. *The Philosophical Review*, 76(3), 312-334.

48. Maras, A. (2008). Affirmative and affirmative theology in the Fathers. In A. Maras, H. Tempelis, C. Terezis & S. Triantaris (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as Heritage*, Volume III. Patras: EAP.
49. Matsoukas, N.A. (2000). *The dull mirror*. Thessaloniki: Pournara.
50. Melissaris, A.G. (2002). Orthodoxy and the affirmation of the human person. In N. Thermos, A. Kokosalakis, A. Melissaris & C. Terezis (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man*, Volume II. Patras: EAP.
51. Pachmuss, T. (1979). Prometheus and job reincarnated: Melville and Dostoevskij. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 23(1), 25-37.
52. Papagiorgis, K. (1990). *Dostoyevsky*. Athens: Kastanioti.
53. Paris, B.J. (2008). *Dostoevsky's the greatest characters: A new approach to "Notes from Underground", Crime and Punishment, and the Brothers Karamazov*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
54. Petroulakis, N.V. (2011). Person and person. Me and you. *ELLIEPEK*, 2, 1-2.
55. Skliris, D. (2013). Person, individual and opinion in the thought of Saint Maximus the Confessor. *Theology*, 84(3), 65-110.
56. 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.
57. Terezis, X. (2002). Orthodoxy and respect for the human personality. In N. Thermos, A. Kokosalakis, A. Melissaris & C. Terezis (Eds.), *Orthodoxy as a cultural achievement and the problems of modern man*, Volume II. Patras: EAP.
58. Thayer, J.H. (1889). *Thayer's Greek Lexicon*. New York: American Book Company.
59. Toumayan, A. (2004). I more than the others: Dostoevsky and Levinas. *Yale French Studies*, 104, 55-66.
60. Tourneisen, E. (2016). *Dostoyevsky, the ultimate limits of man* (M. Pirard, Trans.). Athens: Domos.
61. 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.
62. Trivizas, S. (2005). *The surreal scandal*. Athens: Kastaniotis.
63. Tulloch, D.M. (1952). Sartrean existentialism. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 2(6), 31-52.
64. Vivilakis, I. (2007). *Stefanos – Honorary offer to Walter Puchner*. Athens: Project.