

Markos GALOUNIS
Athens
Zorka ŠLJIVANČANIN
University of Cyprus

Books on Dostoevsky in Greece: an Overview

The following text constitutes a chronological overview of the fifteen main monographs on Dostoevsky published in Greece since the post-war period.

Τάσος ΑΘΑΝΑΣΙΑΔΗΣ, *Ο Ντοστογιέφσκη. Από το κάτεργο στο πάθος* [Tasos ATHANASIADIS, *Dostoevsky: From the Penal Colony to Passion*] (first ed. Αθήνα: Εστία, 1955; second ed. Αθήνα: Εστία, 1978), 407 pp.

Tassos Athanasiadis stands as one of the last representatives of the Generation of the '30s, a literary movement that profoundly reshaped the course of Greek literature during the interwar period. This generation sought to align Greek prose with foreign currents, notably drawing upon models such as Dostoevsky, thereby moving away from the earlier, more localized literary style known as “ηθογραφία” (ethografia), which focused on depicting the customs, morals, and everyday lives of people, particularly in rural or provincial communities. Over the course of his distinguished literary career, Athanasiadis engaged in nearly all forms of prose, including short stories, novels, biographical fiction, and travel writing. His contributions to biographical fiction, in particular, are noteworthy, as he undertook extensive studies of the lives and works of prominent figures such as Victor Hugo, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Albert Schweitzer. In recognition of his contributions to the development of the biographical novel in Greece, he was repeatedly honored, in 1956, 1964, and 1979. His first significant award was for his book *Dostoevsky: From the Penal Colony to Passion*.

The book comprises five chapters, an epilogue, an introductory note, and a postscript. The second edition of this biographical novel, published twenty-three years after the original, includes a preface titled “The Timelessness of Dostoevsky”, which offers critical insights into Athanasiadis’ creative methodology. The preface reveals that Athanasiadis undertook a comprehensive study of the critical literature concerning the Russian writer’s life and works before composing the book. His research, which encompassed both Western and Rus-

sian critics, led him to conclude that Dostoevsky is a deeply multifaceted figure, with a body of work characterized by intricate layers open to multiple interpretations. Moreover, Athanasiadis emphasizes the importance of adopting a biographical approach, asserting that Dostoevsky's personal experiences played a decisive role in shaping his creative identity. This perspective encourages Athanasiadis' own decision to examine Dostoevsky's literary persona through a synthesis of biographical and fictional elements.

Among the key sources that informed Athanasiadis' composition of this biographical novel, two stand out: Dostoevsky's *Correspondence* and Count Melchior de Vogüé's *The Russian Novel*. Vogüé's work, in particular, appears to have served as a foundational reference, especially in its depiction of Dostoevsky's temperament and its framing of suffering as a central thematic concern in his oeuvre. This influence is explicitly reflected in the title of the first chapter, "Life Begins Anew from Suffering". Vogüé, who was active in the intellectual circles of late 19th-century Russia and had personal acquaintance with Dostoevsky, played a significant role in shaping the early reception of his works among Greek scholars, particularly those educated in the French intellectual tradition. His influence extended into the twentieth century, as exemplified not only by Athanasiadis but also by figures such as Nikos Kazantzakis.

In addition to the chapter titled "Life Begins Anew from Suffering", the book includes other sections: "Among the Humble and the Downtrodden", "An Angel from St. Petersburg", "Farewell with Champagne", "At War with the Steppe", and an epilogue titled "A Fateful Omen". Each chapter has a distinct title and is accompanied by an epigraph from the Russian author's works (with the exception of the epilogue, which is preceded by a phrase from one of Dostoevsky's letters). These epigraphs serve as indicative markers for the central themes that unfold in each narrative section. Throughout these five sections, Athanasiadis meticulously examines Dostoevsky's life, beginning in 1854 after the author's four-year imprisonment in a Siberian penal colony and his subsequent relocation to Semipalatinsk. In the preface, the biographer justifies his focus on this specific phase of Dostoevsky's life by asserting that this period played a formative role in shaping the Russian author's creative identity, particularly through his relationship with his first wife, Maria Dmitrievna – a figure, he argues, who had been significantly overlooked by previous critics.

Athanasiadis combines biographical facts and fictional elements to reconstruct Dostoevsky's life in the town where he was stationed as part of his military service, required by the court-martial that sentenced him. Although the novel draws heavily on verified biographical details, Athanasiadis introduces numerous fictionalized aspects to more vividly portray Dostoevsky's personality,

temperament, intellectual process, and literary output. In the novel, the Russian writer emerges as a solitary and deeply conflicted figure – at times withdrawn and introverted, yet at other times markedly extroverted. The reader witnesses his daily struggles: contending with financial difficulties, teaching French, frequenting churches and monasteries, engaging in conversations with ecclesiastical elders, enduring epileptic seizures, writing, donating books, and displaying contradictory behavior toward individuals of lower social status. Dostoevsky is also portrayed as a complex individual, prone to self-characterizing as peculiar, with an ambiguous yet deeply rooted religious faith. His faith, depicted as a source of hope, is juxtaposed with his belief that suffering and pain are as integral to human life as happiness, emphasizing their existential significance.

Athanasiadis also offers a broad and detailed portrayal of the social landscape of Semipalatinsk, presented through Dostoevsky's relationships with those in his immediate environment and with broader social circles. In addition to Maria Dmitrievna, her son, and her first husband, several other figures from Dostoevsky's life are introduced, such as his close friend, Baron Alexander Egorovich Wrangel. Characters from Dostoevsky's literary works also make appearances, including Makar Alexeyevich. In his depiction of these characters, Athanasiadis incorporates features typical of Dostoevskian literary archetypes. Their behavior and speech mirror those of Dostoevsky's characters, characterized by sensitivity to physical beauty, dreams open to various interpretations, religious discourse, emotional intensity, and moments of weakness – all of which evoke the great psychological and existential themes present in Dostoevsky's works. Athanasiadis thus aims to achieve a dual objective: to faithfully reconstruct the biographical events of Dostoevsky's life while simultaneously adopting a Dostoevskian narrative style, particularly in terms of character development and philosophical inquiry. The biography is infused with subjectivity and mysticism, embedding religious thought within a framework of theological critique of rationalism.

Another distinguishing feature of the text is Athanasiadis' adept recreation of the Russian cultural atmosphere. This is achieved through his strategic use of the Russian language within the Greek text and the inclusion of naïve illustrations that depict scenes from Russian provincial life. Written over approximately eighteen months, from the spring of 1954 to the autumn of 1955 – one century after the time of the events in the novel – this book represents a significant moment in the reception of Dostoevsky in Greece. While its artistic merit may not be its most prominent feature, its importance lies in reflecting the growing interest in Dostoevsky in post-World War II Greece, particularly in terms of translation and fiction writing.

Z. S.

Αμύντα ΠΑΠΑΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟΥ, *Ντοστογιέφσκι. Τόμές στο έργο του* [Aminta PAPA-VASILIOU, *Dostoevsky. Incisions to his work*] (Αθήνα: Φέξης, 1965), 123 pp. (second extended edition: *Ντοστογιέφσκι. Το ύφος του ιλίγγου* [*Dostoevsky. The Style of Vertigo*] [Αθήνα: Αρμός, 1990], 141 pp.)

This book consists of 14 short essays: 1. The moral problem, 2. Virtue and courage, 3. The multi-dimensional, 4. The tragedy of personality, 5. “The consciousness, this sickness”, 6. The power of the idea, 7. Reverie and ideal, 8. Eroticism, 9. The metaphysics of disbelief, 10. The justification of malice, 11. The diary, 12. The uniformed time, 13. The style of Dostoevsky, and 14. Dostoevsky and the style of vertigo.

These essays are described by the author as “incisions that the work of Dostoevsky created to the consciousness of the author” (p. 9).¹ This “personal approach” to the work of Dostoevsky produces short contemplative vignettes of an existential strand. Papavasiliou often crystallises to an aphorism what he perceives as the main thrust of the work of Dostoevsky as in the following: “Dostoevsky is a continuous challenge, because it is the incessant renewal of our destiny” (p. 18). It is noteworthy that in this pioneering (and neglected) essay the religious, confessional approach on Dostoevsky, which will prevail 20 years later in the decade of 1980, is absent. What is brought into the fore is Dostoevsky as a seeker and not as an apologist for Christianity.

M. G.

Νίκος ΜΑΚΡΗΣ, *Ντοστογιέφσκι και Μπερνανός* [Nikos MAKRIS, *Dostoevsky and Bernanos*] (Αθήνα: Αιγείο, 1981), 85 pp.

This book is a comparative study of two Christian writers. At the beginning the role of nature in Bernanos and Dostoevsky is examined. Nature in Bernanos is personified and expresses the inner world of the characters of the novels, whereas in Dostoevsky, nature is almost absent, since what prevails is the closed space. However, for both writers nature expresses the Christian cosmology. Equally, there is a sense of mystery in the conception of the person, since in the works of both novelists the flesh is endowed with a metaphysical dimension. Against the passions of the flesh, Bernanos would oppose the virginal feature of the divine which is manifested in an exemplary way in children. The divine in Dostoevsky appears in the kenosis, the folk religiosity and negative theol-

1 Here and elsewhere the translation is the reviewer's own.

ogy. However, both writers express the mystery of the person, the irrational character of passions and the virginal character of virtues. All the virtues point to sainthood and to a mystical knowledge. Hell consists in the inability to love. Contrarily, the presence of sainthood is the most profound expression of things. Since the virginal feature is common in children and in the saints, Makrakis examines the role of children in Dostoevsky and Bernanos. A Christian personalistic reading of the two writers.

M. G.

Μιχάλης ΜΑΚΡΑΚΗΣ, *Ο σοσιαλισμός του Ντοστογιέφσκι και η σοβιετική κριτική. Στα χρόνια του Λένιν, του Στάλιν και του Χρουστσόφ* [Mikhalis K. ΜΑΚΡΑΚΙΣ: *Dostoevsky's Socialism and Soviet Criticism in the Years of Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev*] (Αθήνα: Εστία, 1984), 296 pp.

In this book, the writer examines the position of Soviet criticism from 1917 till 1959. The book is divided into 4 parts:

a) From the October Revolution till the Second World War (1917-1945). In this part he examines the ambivalent stance of Soviet criticism towards Dostoevsky.

On the one hand we have a recognition of his aesthetic merit and on the other, the need to combat his “reactionary” ideas. This ambivalence is manifested explicitly in the position that Gorky adopted towards Dostoevsky. The two poles of the Soviet criticism on Dostoevsky of this period according to Makrakis are the sociological criticism of the school of Pereverzev on the one hand and the stylistic [sic] criticism of Bakhtin on the other. In the 1930's and the years of terror, Dostoevsky was seen as an “enemy of the people”, despite the efforts for compromise by Lunacharsky. Nevertheless, during the Second World War, for nationalistic reasons, an “amnesty” was granted to the Russian Writer. His “humanistic” teaching is opposed to Nietzsche's philosophy of the Superman (taken as the foundation of the ideology of the Third Reich). In addition, his prophecies for the universal mission of the Russian People are taken to strengthen the morale of the country.

b) From the celebration of the 125 years from the birth of Dostoevsky in 1946 till 1956. This is deemed as the darkest period of Dostoevsky's legacy in the Soviet Union. Due to the ideology of Zhdanov the publication of his works was forbidden and there were no books or articles published on him.

c) The third period is between 1956 and 1958. In this period of time, we have

the publication of the first 10 volumes of Dostoevsky's Collected Works. In this edition are included the most "reactionary" texts of Dostoevsky (hitherto censored), while the Soviet criticism on him is less harsh, following Lenin's views on him.

- d) The fourth period is between 1957 and 1959. In the years of Khrushchev we notice a shift from the reaction against Dostoevsky's ideas to the acknowledgment of his artistic merit.

In the preface to the volume, Makrakis announces the publication of a second volume (never to be published) which would consist of four parts: a) the decade of the 60s, mainly the examination of Bakhtin's book; b) the decade of the 70s, with the publication of the 30 volume edition of Dostoevsky Collected works; c) 1981, which marks 100 years since the death of Dostoevsky and the special volume on him of *Sovetskaya literatura*; the final chapter would recapitulate the Soviet criticism on Dostoevsky and its comparison with the "Russian" (of émigré writers?) and international criticism respectively.

In order to evaluate Makrakis's book on the reception of Dostoevsky in the Soviet Union till 1959 we should see to what extent the author relies on or diverges from the two books by Vladimir Seduro that preceded his own: a) *Dostoevsky and Russian Literary Criticism. 1846-1956* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957) and b) *Dostoevski's Image in Russia Today* (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishers, 1975). But this exceeds the limits of this short presentation.

M. G.

Μιχάλης ΜΑΚΡΑΚΗΣ, *Ο Ντοστογιέφσκι και η επανάσταση των νέων* [Mikhailis K. MAKRAKIS, *Dostoevsky and the Revolution of the Young People*] (Αθήνα: Imago, 1984), 146 pp.

This book is a translated memoir of the young student of the Theology Academy of Petersburg, Aleksey A. Zelenetsky, about his visit with the late Dostoevsky. Zelenetsky is a confirmed atheist till this visit, but he is transformed to a believer after the short discussion with Dostoevsky that he records. Makrakis offers a long comment on the talk, touching on topics like the influence of Dostoevsky on young people, Dostoevsky's advice to Zelenetsky in relation to *The Brothers Karamazov*, social revolution compared to a religious one, Dostoevsky contra Tolstoy, and the Russian Christ. A book of confessional theology.

M. G.

Μιχάλης ΜΑΚΡΑΚΗΣ, *Η λυτρωτική δύναμη του πόνου στην ζωή και το έργο του Φιόντορ Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Mikhailis K. ΜΑΚΡΑΚΙΣ, *The Redemptive Power of Suffering in the Life and Works of Fyodor Dostoevsky. In special reference to his last work The Brothers Karamazov*] (Αθήνα: Αποστολική Διακονία, 1984), 334 pp.

This book is a PhD dissertation that was submitted in the Theology School of Athens for the position of assistant professor. Makrakis contrasts the idea of redemption in Tolstoy with that of Dostoevsky. As Makrakis writes in the English summary of the book: “Whereas for Tolstoy the search for redemption is seen as an attempt at liberating oneself from death [...] for Dostoevsky the search for redemption is not an attempt at liberation from suffering but an attempt at liberation through suffering, which may be the result not only of physical but also of moral evil”. Since for Makrakis the redemptive power of suffering always works in relation to one’s own life, the introductory chapter is purely biographical. It is based upon Dostoevsky’s recollections from his incarceration in the prisons of Siberia. The second chapter discusses Dostoevsky’s philosophical view of suffering and its relation to evil and freedom. In the third chapter, the Augustinian distinction between freedom as choice and freedom as adherence to the good is employed in order for a shift to be made from philosophical freedom to religious redemption. In the fourth chapter, *Notes from the Underground* is discussed, which contains Dostoevsky’s basic philosophy on “suffering as a unique case of conscience”. In the fifth chapter, which is devoted to *The Brothers Karamazov*, the religious significance of suffering is examined, namely the idea of joy as it springs from suffering. In the sixth chapter, the religious and theological significance of suffering in *The Brothers Karamazov* are compared with similar ideas of Kierkegaard, Santayana, Strindberg and Faulkner. The concluding chapter compares Dostoevsky’s ideas of suffering with other authors.

Let us add that the three books on Dostoevsky written by Makrakis represent a typical approach to Dostoevsky by the theologians in Greece. Dostoevsky serves his confessional purposes. The tension and multi-layer character of his novels are diminished, for the sake of a Dostoevsky who is reduced to an apologist for Christianity and specifically for Orthodoxy. Neither is Dostoevsky’s idiosyncratic version of Christianity discussed. To conclude, besides a glorification of Orthodoxy, the Greek theologians like Makrakis failed to engage creatively or be influenced by Dostoevsky as was the case with other theologians of the other denomination of Christianity like the Protestant Karl Barth and the Catholic Hans Urs von Balthasar to name two seminal ones, for whom their contact with Dostoevsky was a watershed for their work.

M. G.

Μήτσος ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Ο μεγάλος αμαρτωλός. Ο Ντοστογιέφσκι και τα ιερά του τέρατα. Μυθιστορηματική βιογραφία* [Mitsos ALEXANDROPOULOS, *The Great Sinner. Dostoevsky and His Sacred Monsters. A Fictional Biography*] (Αθήνα: Κέδρος, 1984), 489 pp.

The Great Sinner: Dostoevsky and His Sacred Monsters is the third book in M. Alexandropoulos' series, which explores the biographical elements of key Russian literary figures through a fictionalized lens. Following his previous works on Maxim Gorky (*Bread and the Book*, 1980) and Anton Chekhov (*More Freedom*, 1981), this book continues Alexandropoulos' mission to deepen the exploration of Greek-Russian literary relations.

Alexandropoulos has emerged as a key mediator of Russian literature in Greece during the latter half of the 20th century. His trilogy exemplifies his years of dedication to bridging the cultural and literary lives of Russia and Greece. Noting a gap in the Greek-language bibliography on Russian literature, Alexandropoulos remarked in 1977 that there was "no clear understanding of what has been written or translated into our language" (*Russian Literature*, Athens: Kedros, 1977). This realization inspired his extensive research on figures like Gorky, Chekhov, and now, Dostoevsky.

In *The Great Sinner: Dostoevsky and His Sacred Monsters*, Alexandropoulos focuses on eight key moments in Dostoevsky's life, dedicating a chapter to each. The title, inspired by Dostoevsky's unfinished novel, sets the tone for an intimate exploration of the writer's struggles – ranging from madness and money to his personal relationships, health issues, and his complex relationship with death. These themes are not only biographical but often veer into creative territory, as Alexandropoulos incorporates fictional elements into his portrayal of Dostoevsky's inner world.

The book occupies a unique space between genres, functioning neither as a novel nor as a conventional biography, but rather as a "fictional biography". Alexandropoulos constructs his narrative on well-documented historical facts, but also takes artistic liberties, particularly when exploring Dostoevsky's thoughts and monologues. While crafting a humanized portrayal of the Russian writer, he primarily relies on the correspondence with his family and social circle.

In *The Great Sinner: Dostoevsky and His Sacred Monsters*, the utilization of correspondence occurs on three levels. First, the letters serve as the most reliable source of information for Alexandropoulos. Second, excerpts from letters or entire letters are employed as part of the argumentation in the attempt to outline Dostoevsky's personality. Third, a portion of this correspondence is included as an appendix to the book. Specifically, 66 letters from Dostoevsky

and six from his second wife have been translated to provide readers with direct access to the material that underpins the fictional biography. The emphasis placed on correspondence relates to its nature as a resource conducive to understanding the Russian author as a person. It constitutes an authentic material that preserves the genuine expression of Dostoevsky's personality, imbued with lyricism, sarcasm, humility, aggression, despair, and lamentation.

As for the abovementioned creative additions in the book, they are subtle and primarily related to the author's attempt to revive the human side of the Russian writer. The biographer's fictional instincts are activated in those moments where he seeks to reveal Dostoevsky's character in a more personal light. According to Alexandropoulos' words, his goal was to present him in his own way – not as a philosopher, political thinker, or even a novelist per se, but as a complex human being. Although Dostoevsky might seem strange, paradoxical, or even impossible to us today, Alexandropoulos argues that he was perhaps “the most human of the great literary figures”.

He describes him as clumsy, suspicious, demanding, and impatient. In his depiction of the young Dostoevsky, he emphasizes the Russian author's unusual appearance, which was accompanied by a profound and intense inner world. Alexandropoulos also highlights the writer's struggles with his nerves, frequent boredom, epilepsy, and recurring headaches. He stresses that Dostoevsky's character was full of highs and lows, and in his inner world, he identifies the presence of a “divided man”. Despite these hardships, Alexandropoulos notes that Dostoevsky's boredom and physical and mental numbness had a strange element of action, as if they encourage his creativity.

Furthermore, he explores Dostoevsky's fears, obsessions, rivalries, friendships, and loves, painting a picture of a man who was both honest and brave in the courtroom, but also envious of certain fellow writers. One of biographer's goals was to give readers some typical examples of Dostoevsky's behavior. In particular, he sheds light on how Dostoevsky lived his life – the struggles of his work, and the personal and professional challenges of his time. He is especially interested in the human, professional, and social aspects of Dostoevsky's everyday problems, which, he suggests, carry such intensity and interest that they alone could form the basis of a first-rate novel.

In his effort to describe Dostoevsky's personality, the author of the fictional biography avoids focusing on his philosophical or political ideas. He does not analyze Dostoevsky's works in depth but provides valuable comments on the formation of his literary personality and the conditions in which he worked, such as his struggle to get his already completed books published and his attempts to pre-sell books that existed only as ideas. The author also examines

Dostoevsky's creative intentions and the significance his works held in his life, notably describing *The House of the Dead* as a "bridge between Siberia and Russia". Additionally, Alexandropoulos occasionally explores Dostoevsky's writing method, noting, for instance, that writing actually was an interruption of his inner work – a process of articulating thoughts and ideas still in the process of unfolding, not yet fully formed.

Furthermore, despite not critically engaging with Dostoevsky's political ideas, Alexandropoulos follows their genesis or, better put, their transformation. He underlines that, starting in Semipalatinsk, Dostoevsky began formulating a patriotic belief that he would develop further in his articles. He observes significant changes in Dostoevsky's views on religion, the people, Russia, and Orthodoxy. Alexandropoulos points out that the patriotic line of Dostoevsky's thought would eventually become highly developed and critically influence his entire spiritual and political activity. He asserts that Dostoevsky's monarchist views went further than even some staunch monarchists of his time. As a leftist intellectual, he also highlights the tension between Dostoevsky and the other Russian intelligentsia – the democratic and liberal factions, as well as the European émigrés. He informs Greek readers that Dostoevsky was under secret surveillance until his final years, thus casting doubt on the sincerity of his patriotic beliefs.

In conclusion, *The Great Sinner: Dostoevsky and His Sacred Monsters* succeeds in offering a refined, humanized portrait of one of literature's most contradictory figures. Its author skillfully combines facts with fiction, creating a work that encourages readers to see the Russian writer not merely as a monumental literary figure, a contradictory political thinker, or an inspiring philosopher, but as a human individual. Alexandropoulos' portrayal is both factually based and imaginative, filling gaps left by traditional biographies and bringing to light aspects of Dostoevsky's life that have been overlooked by previous scholarship.

Z. S.

Κωστής ΠΑΠΑΓΙΩΡΓΗΣ, *Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Kostis PAPAGIORGIS, *Dostoevsky*] (Αθήνα: Καστανιώτης, 1990), 385 pp.

Kostis Papagiorgis (1947-2014) has a unique place in Modern Greek Letters. He was self-taught (he did not have a single university diploma), and he became the most well-read writer of his generation. His readings spread across many disciplines and genres including philosophy, novels and history. His erudition gave him the ammunition to become the most prolific and probably

the best essay writer of Greece after 1974. He emerged on the scene with monographs on philosophy (Plato, Heidegger, the Bible). In the decade of the 1980's he abandoned philosophy in order to turn his attention to the human vices. He wrote monographs which built a corpus of what could be called a morbid philosophical anthropology (the resentful, the alcoholic, the envious, the violent, the flatterer, the sycophant, the bully etc.) These essays consisted of "an anthropology of the negative" as Dimitris Karabelas labeled them. The novel seen as a rich reservoir of the human condition would be his main source rather than the abstract ideas of philosophy.

Through these lenses he turned his attention to Dostoevsky with the book under examination, published in 1990. It is, then, totally understandable that also in this book on Dostoevsky, he burned his bridges with any theological or philosophical approach to the Russian writer. Although in this book on Dostoevsky, he links Dostoevsky's work with the broader question of Russianness, he distances himself from any historical or sociological approach. What interests him is predominantly the novelistic world. It is taken as an autonomous domain whose merit cannot be traced outside of it. As he would say in one interview: "If we read the 'what' through the 'how' [...] there remains an oeuvre that was born as if due to a miracle and which discards any context" (cited in: Dimitris KARABELAS, "Kostis Papagiorgis and the Antinomies of the Spiritual"²). Papagiorgis would also assert: "The writer can be religious but does not owe to religion his literature" (*ibid.*). These statements can be understood as programmatic statements against any ideological (philosophical or theological) approaches to Dostoevsky, such as the following: "If the great novels could be interpreted based on their ideas, as the works of the theoretician, then for what reason the novel?" (p. 12) Or "The creator [Dostoevsky] succeeded not to defeat – this would be catastrophic – but rather to seize and finally to make his own, the 'believer' and 'ideologue' Dostoevsky. Because his books did not become classic as a vindication of some ideas, but as renowned vindications of themselves only" (pp. 238-239). He would even speak scornfully about "the scaffold of ideology and theological interpretation" (p. 14).

It is true that Papagiorgis focused on the novelness of Dostoevsky's works, that is to say the creative process rather than the abstract ideology. For example, he devoted many pages on the decisive switch from first-person narration to the third in *Crime and Punishment*, that leant an aura of omniscience to the

2 Δημήτρης ΚΑΡΑΜΠΕΛΑΣ, "Ο Κωστής Παπαγιώργης και οι αντινομίες του πνευματικού", *Νέα Εστία*, τχ. 180/1872, Μάρτιος 2017, σ. 53.

author. But, since his universe was the human vices, he would reduce Dostoevsky's creative impulse to morbidity, a sine qua non not only for Dostoevsky but also for his reception from his readers. More precisely, morbidity is reduced to only one vice: Resentment. The recurring mantra of Papagiorgis's reading is the humiliation that Dostoevsky underwent in his youth in the circle of Belinsky. According to this reading, resentment became the sole creative factor and also the most important interpretative tool in order to approach Dostoevsky's novels. Speaking about Dostoevsky's rift with the Belinsky circle, Papagiorgis would assert: "[This incident] became a permanent nidus of infection in his life – because he never overcame it – but it deeply influenced his life. Resentment and the syndrome of 'literary retaliation' that tormented him in all his life, were born that period" (p. 137). In an interview characteristically he said: "Every great literary work knows that it explicitly or tacitly makes agreements with the kingdom of the devil"³

It is true that this line of interpretation works in the early novels of Dostoevsky that form the second part of the book (*The Double, Notes from the House of Dead, Notes from the Underground*). (The first part consists of an inspired sketch of Russia and the question of Russianness that was posed de facto from the time of Peter the Great and thereafter, and in Russian letters with the case of Gogol). Papagiorgis's philosophical underpinnings will enable him to dedicate inspired and exquisite pages on these three novels, which are approached through the lenses of inter-subjectivity. (One has the feeling that what is lying beneath is "the Look" from Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*). Interestingly, he distances himself from Girard. But as he proceeds with his reading in the third part of the book which is dedicated to later novels of Dostoevsky (*Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, Demons, The Adolescent, The Brothers Karamazov*), one has the feeling that this line of interpretation is exhausted and also reductive, that it cannot address the broader issues that are posed in these novels. (It is indicative that the chapter on *The Idiot* is – in my view – the weakest).

Papagiorgis was probably the most important (and prolific) essay writer of Greece after 1974. This was due to his unparalleled erudition across many disciplines, and also to the unique style that he mastered. Both erudition and style enable him to capture the essential in a short succinct phrase: "The phrase out-balances the meaning", he would assert in one interview (cited in KARABELAS, p. 41). Nevertheless, this almost – one could say – fetishism with the phrase is what enables him to crystallise in an aphorism the crux of the matter. In addition, his equally personal style that he cultivated, his idiom that borrows freely

3 Cited in ΚΑΡΑΜΠΕΛΑΣ, σ. 51.

from all the multi-layers of Greek language (formal, informal, archaic, vulgar, slang, usage of proverbs, sayings, metaphors or even the language of sports), made possible renderings of the following – see on *Demons*: “In the small provincial circle, the event have a bigger impact like a gun-shot in a small room” (p. 302). Or “Myshkin’s figure is like a white thread in a black weft” (p. 239).

Notwithstanding any objections that I expressed, it is Papagiorgis’s erudition and exquisite style that grants to this book on Dostoevsky (as most of his books) bravado and makes it a pleasure to read.

A well-informed, idiosyncratic, succinct, captivating and beautifully written book on Dostoevsky.

M. G.

Μήτσος ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Δαίμονες και Δαιμονισμένοι. Επιστροφές στον Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Mitsos ALEXANDROPOULOS, *Demons and Possessed. Returns to Dostoevsky*] (Αθήνα: Δελφίνι, 1992), 180 pp.

Alexandropoulos’s personal reading of *Demons* cannot be read independently of the author’s life as it is interwoven with it. Alexandropoulos (1924-2008) was part of the Resistance movement during the period of the Nazi occupation of Greece (1941-1944). He followed the trajectory of most of the young people that joined the resistance: partisan in the Greek Civil War, member of the Greek Communist Party, political exile in the USSR till 1975 when democracy was restored in Greece, and he was granted a permit to return to his homeland.

Alexandropoulos studied Russian literature in Moscow. He was the one that introduced Russian literature to Greece with monographs on Chekhov, Gorky, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky (his monograph on Dostoevsky *The Great Sinner* is here reviewed by Zorka Šljivančanin), Mayakovsky, Mandelstam as well as an authoritative three-volume *History of Russian Literature*. With these books and also his classic translations of seminal works of Russian literature, Alexandropoulos basically brought Russian literature to the fore in Greece (he was awarded the Pushkin medal for his contribution on the study of Russian literature).

The “adventure of Communism”, as he called it, in his life and readings, took the form of a life-long engagement with Russian culture, “the spiritual history of these People” (p. 6). What started as a partisan engagement with Communism continued as a delving into Russian culture. It is noteworthy that he chose *Demons* (usually deemed as an “ultra-conservative novel”) in order to pose the question of what was – at the bottom line – Communism just a few

years after its Fall (1992). He takes *Demons* not as an anti-nihilist novel but rather as a dystopian one. Interestingly he compares *Demons* to Zamyatin's *We*.

Alexandropoulos would not hide his lineaments: He says that his work "dovetails with my stance towards socialism, even towards this particular system that I did not want to be destroyed but also I did not want to remain the same" (p. 7).

Alexandropoulos uses *Demons* as a yardstick not only for the Russian radicals but also for their heritage – the regime that followed Tsarist Russia. What is valuable in this novel is not only its criticism or even libel but also prophecy: "Dostoevsky was vindicated in all his predictions, despite his exaggerations – or rather thanks to them" (p. 22). "[Dostoevsky] fought socialism as an uncompromising heretic of tomorrow" (p. 22). "As he described [socialism] in that way it became" (p. 5). "The truth is that Socialism passed from all the crossings that Dostoevsky [had foreseen and it was as if] he ambushed and waited for [Socialism to fall into his traps]" (p. 104).

In addition, important adages are included in this essay. For example, when speaking about the way in which the idea unfolds in Dostoevsky, he links the idea with the precise man who incarnates it. The idea is always "an incarnated feeling" (p. 39) interwoven with the novelistic story. Or when, contra to Bakhtin and prefiguring research on Dostoevsky that followed the publication of Alexandropoulos' work in 1992, he argues about the importance of what he deems as "backstage", that is, the link with what is told on the scene. Backstage is what Dostoevsky in an authoritative way (quasi-monological to use Bakhtin's terminology) has created, that determines for the reader the reception of what is said in the scene (the voice). Or, when he stresses the role of the comic in Dostoevsky, like in the following aphorism: "The ridicule in Dostoevsky is one of the most important vicissitudes of the idea inside the human, or of man from the idea" (p. 109). Or "Nothing strikes with such an annihilating force, as the power of laughter" (p. 104).

There is a deeply humane strand in Alexandropoulos's thoughts and writing. For example he speaks about the possession of ideas in *Demons* and labels it as "men from paper, men from a book" (p. 85). The incarnated idea is not only a recurrent theme in this essay. It is moreover what prevents us from taking the ideas *in abstracto*, as it is taken in abstract dialogue: "There do not exist absolute ideas. There is only what comes into the fore from the crossing of the idea with a singular man" (p. 90).

A deeply humane essay, from the hands of the most authoritative scholar of Russian literature in Greece. A product of life-long reading of Dostoevsky and personal engagement with his ideas. It manifests intellectual honesty, a gained

wisdom attained from a life-long devotion to the cause that vehemently supported Dostoevsky's enemies, like Alexandropoulos himself and that Dostoevsky lambasts in this novel. An apologia written in the aftermath of the Fall.

M. G.

Γιάγκος ΑΝΔΡΕΑΔΗΣ, *Ο Ηλίθιος του Ντοστογιέφσκι και το μηδέν της γραφής* [Giangos ANDREADIS, *Dostoevsky's The Idiot and the Zero of Writing*] (Αθήνα: Πλέθρον, 1994), 141 pp.

Having as a point of departure Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*, the writer examines the enigma of writing. *The Idiot* – which Dostoevsky considered once as his highest achievement and once as a failure – is taken as a testimony to the mystery of writing. For Andreadis, this novel is primarily a narrative on the art of narration. “*The Idiot* is a ruined masterpiece, its ruptures reveal the essence of writing in its totality: from the Gospels to Cervantes, Pushkin and Balzac. Its gaps disclose horizons that exceed its monumental form” (from the back cover). The subject-matter of this novel is nothing else than the act of writing: “The answer to the enigma of writing is something more than that which we call reading. It is the opening to danger, to ridicule, to embarrassment and – why not – to idiocy. In what we call – a little bit with optimism – creation” (from the back cover). Andreadis jettisons the analytic tools and arguments per se in order to delve into this novel, to invoke the impression that it created on him when he read it as an adolescent. But in this apparently impressionistic essay they are found precious germs, rarely developed but rather taking the form of a succinct aphorism. A post-modern essay on a liminal novel.

M. G.

Γιάννης ΠΑΝΟΥΣΗΣ, *Ο Εγκληματίας στο έργο του Ντοστογιέφσκι. Υπο-χρόνιος ή υπέρ-ανδρωπος?* [Giannis PANOUSIS, *The Criminal in the Work of Dostoevsky. Underground Man or Superman?*] (Αθήνα: Νομική Βιβλιοθήκη, 2012), 289 pp.

The author, Professor of Criminology in the University of Athens, in this book examines the role of the criminal in the works of Dostoevsky. The main focus is on Raskolnikov and Ivan Karamazov. Panousis describes the many facets of the criminal in Dostoevsky (underground criminal, tragic criminal, irrational criminal, existential criminal, superman criminal). Then he examines the criminal as he is defined by the science of criminology. After that, the criminal in Dostoev-

sky's works is analysed through the lenses of criminology. A systematic study, a contribution on Dostoevsky and criminology which does not downplay the philosophical, theological and psychological dimensions that the criminal is bestowed in the works of Dostoevsky.

M. G.

Ελένη ΛΑΔΙΑ, *Δοκίμια για τον Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Eleni LADIA, *Essays on Dostoevsky*] (Αθήνα: Αρμός, 2020), 232 pp.

Eleni Ladia is widely regarded as one of the most prominent female literary figures in contemporary Greece. Throughout her prolific career, she has produced a significant body of work that includes novels, short story collections, poetry, travelogues, and essays, many of which have earned her numerous awards. Beyond her contributions to literature, Ladia has conducted research in Classical Greek studies and has also made notable achievements as a translator, with five translated works to her credit, including *Notes from the Underground*.

Her recent essay collection, which spans nearly five decades, from 1972 to 2020, is a comprehensive assemblage of twenty-two essays, arranged chronologically by their original date of publication. Some of these essays had previously appeared in anthologies or literary journals, while others served as afterwords in her translations. Notably, a few of these essays are being made public for the first time in this collection.

The opening essay, “Ordynov in *The Landlady*”, written during her youth, offers insight into the defining features of Ladia’s critical approach to Dostoevsky’s work. In this piece, she focuses on character analysis, with particular attention to the emotional and psychological complexity of both primary and secondary figures. The essay explores the dynamics between two key characters, Ordynov and Katerina. Ordynov, a dreamer consumed by bitterness, is marked by indecision and passivity, while Katerina is depicted as struggling with conflicting emotions, torn between romantic love and psychological dependence. Ladia’s application of Jungian theory to interpret the character of Murin adds an interdisciplinary dimension to the essay, enriching the analysis with psychological depth.

Stylistically, Ladia’s language is highly evocative, blending literary creativity with analytical rigor. This stylistic approach, particularly evident in her early work, allows her essays to engage in a creative dialogue with Dostoevsky’s texts, transcending traditional critical frameworks. However, this literary-infused essayistic style is less prominent in her later works, except for the concluding essay in the volume, where this approach resurfaces.

The second essay of the volume, written in the same year (1972), shifts toward comparative literature, drawing parallels between Ivan Karamazov and Josef K. Here, Ladia explores the concept of “pre-existential guilt” as a key point of convergence between Dostoevsky and Kafka, arguing that both authors accept an a priori notion of guilt and original sin. This thematic exploration is supplemented by references to philosophical authorities such as Kierkegaard and Jean Wahl, which Ladia uses to elucidate the nature of guilt and its implications for both characters. Despite identifying these similarities, she also highlights significant differences: Ivan is portrayed as a tragic intellectual figure detached from practicality, while Josef K. is weighed down by the mundane struggles of a meaningless existence. The theme of love serves as another crucial point of divergence between the two.

Ladia’s re-engagement with Dostoevsky after a thirty-year hiatus, likely prompted by her translation of *Notes from the Underground* (Athens: Armos, 2003), reveals the evolution of her critical perspective. The essay “Long Live the Underground! To Hell with the Underground!” – originally written as an afterword to her translation – demonstrates her deepening analysis of Dostoevsky’s characterology. In this essay, she uses the inversion of the Delphic maxim “know thyself” (γνώθι σαυτόν) as a framework to analyze the underground man, who initially embraces but ultimately rejects this ancient Greek principle. Moreover, she emphasizes the underground man’s opposition to concepts like wholeness and rationalism, highlighting his intellectual malice, masochism, self-sarcasm, and jealousy toward the rational “positive man”. Ladia’s analysis also underscores the underground man’s tendency toward self-doubt, self-analysis, and self-rejection, portraying him not as a static theoretical figure, but as an embodiment of a restless, evolving spirit.

This integration of ancient Greek thought into Ladia’s interpretation of Dostoevsky extends beyond this essay to several others in the collection, including “The One, the Whole, and the Law of the Stronger (Callicles and Ras-kolnikov)”, “Greece and Dostoevsky”, and “The Problem of the Fourth Brother in *The Brothers Karamazov*”. Her interpretative approach can be organized around two central axes. The first axis involves the tension between the individual and the whole, explored through the ethical dichotomy of master-slave morality, and linked to the Platonic figure of Callicles, Socrates’ opponent in the dialogue *Gorgias*. Callicles’ theory distinguishes between law and nature, advocating for the supremacy of natural strength, while asserting that laws are created by the weak masses. Ladia applies this framework in her analysis of Ras-kolnikov’s character, as well as in her exploration of the philosophical intersections between Nietzsche and Dostoevsky.

The second axis of Ladia's interpretative approach concerns the notion of the "Euclidean mind", which Dostoevsky critically interrogates across a range of his works, especially in *Notes from the Underground*, *The Brothers Karamazov*, and *Demons*. Of particular note is Ladia's analysis of Kirillov, whom she situates within the tradition of ancient Greek hubristic figures such as Odysseus, Sisyphus, and Niobe. Kirillov is represented as a modern embodiment of hubris, transgressing the limits imposed by rational, Euclidean thought. Ladia posits that the psychology of hubris involves arrogance, pride, and the violation of established boundaries.

The author's attempt to align Dostoevsky's characters with ancient Greek traditions is also evident in the second part of her essay *Greece and Dostoevsky*, published in 2012. In this piece, she offers a critical examination of Dostoevsky's ideology, focusing on his views regarding Russia's claim to Constantinople following the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Drawing from *A Writer's Diary*, Ladia critiques Dostoevsky's assertion that Russia should inherit Byzantium's legacy, positioning herself in opposition to his Pan-Slavist stance.

However, the essayist's engagement with Dostoevsky's ideology is somewhat problematic, likely due to her limited access to *A Writer's Diary*, the texts of which were translated into Greek only years after the publication of her essay. Specifically, she focuses on two articles from the journal, despite the fact that Dostoevsky, through fifteen articles, offers a detailed analysis of the Eastern Question, providing a comprehensive overview of the political landscape of his time and the intentions of the major powers regarding Constantinople.

The author's limited access to key texts may account for her oversight of Dostoevsky's more nuanced views, particularly his affiliation with "pochvennichestvo", a movement that distanced him from the core of Pan-Slavism. Moreover, Ladia's essay forms part of a broader intellectual tradition in Greece that has engaged with Dostoevsky's ideology since 1877, when the first reference to the Russian writer appeared in the Greek newspaper *Efimeris* (May 3, 1877). Within this tradition, Dostoevsky's political ideas have often been perceived as antagonistic to Greek national interests, particularly the long-standing vision of reclaiming Constantinople.

In conclusion, Eleni Ladia's critical engagement with Dostoevsky's work is marked by a deep, evolving analysis that draws on both classical Greek thought and comparative literature. Her early focus on character analysis has developed into a broader interdisciplinary approach that integrates philosophy, psychology, and ancient Greek ethical frameworks. Ladia's ability to merge creative and analytical styles has made her a distinctive voice in Dostoevsky scholarship, particularly within the Greek intellectual tradition.

Z. S.

Κώστας ΔΕΣΠΙΝΙΑΔΗΣ, *Δαιμονισμένοι και μηδενιστές. Ο πολιτικός Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Kostas DESPINIADIS, *Possessed and Nihilists. The Political Dostoevsky*] (Αθήνα: Πανοπτικόν, 2023), 158 pp.

The merit of this book is that it is published by the editor of a publishing house that expresses the culture of anarchism. Having as a point of departure *Demons*, Despiniadis tries to examine the political ideas of Dostoevsky. He knows sufficiently the realia of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia and identifies (somehow in a simplistic and questionable way) the characters of the novels with actual members of the intelligentsia (Pyotr Stepanovich Verkhovensky with Nechaev, Stavrogin with Bakunin etc.). Moreover, he pays attention to the revolutionary past of the young Dostoevsky and stresses the way in which censorship might have influenced the writing of the novel. This will legitimize him to assert that although the mature Dostoevsky (as it appears in *Demons*) has significantly departed from the socialism of his youth, something from this partisan period is reflected in this novel. And although somebody might have some objections with parts of his perspective (for example regarding whether this novel can be interpreted in a Bakhtinian reading, as Despiniadis proposes), what is valuable is that Despiniadis treats *Demons* not as an ultra-conservative novel but rather one that manifests that Dostoevsky takes his opponents (the “nihilists”) seriously and is interested in discussing their ideas. An essay on Dostoevsky from an anarchist who extracts himself from the prevailing Greek Christian confessional reading.

M. G.

Γιώργος ΚΥΘΡΑΙΩΤΗΣ, *Ο ανοικτός κόσμος του Ντοστογιέφσκι* [Giorgos KITHREOTIS, *The Open World of Dostoevsky*] (Αθήνα: Αρμός, 2023), 253 pp.

This monograph proceeds from the claim that the West has misunderstood Dostoevsky. The introduction and first chapter (“The Reception”) consist, accordingly, of citations evincing the difficulty of interpreting Dostoevsky in the West. In response to the chapter’s tendentious character – an example of the anti-Western current in modern Greek theology – one could object that the author’s sources, for the most part, go up only to 1950s. Sources from after this date are few and highly selective.

The root of the misunderstanding and distortion of Dostoevsky, according to the author, lies in a lack of engagement with distinctive formal aspects of Dostoevsky’s works that stand in sharp opposition to the aesthetics of the re-

alistic novel of the West. The second chapter (“Persons”), in seeking to redress this misunderstanding, deals with the philosophical anthropology informing Dostoevsky’s characters. The author stresses the notion of absolute freedom and a conception of personality that is open to the “other”, in contrast to (Western) individualism. Bakhtin, of course, underpins this reading (and is cited extensively). With the emphasis on Orthodox theology, however, one notices the absence of any mention of the influential work of the Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1997).

The third chapter (“Time”) examines the depiction of time in Dostoevsky’s work. What is stressed is the open character of the Dostoevskian plot (again in sharp distinction to the deterministic character of Western novels), that guarantees the characters’ freedom. Instead of a closed plot, we have choice. The underpinning of this chapter is Gary Saul Morson’s book *Narrative and Freedom: The Shadows of Time* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1994), which is cited extensively. The fourth chapter (“Image”) approaches Holbein’s painting in *The Idiot* as a quintessential anti-icon. The ekphrasis of this anti-icon points *via negativa* to what is missing: a depiction of Christ in the way of Byzantine icons. In the beautifully written fifth chapter (“Space”), the author focuses on the depiction of space in *The Gambler*, showing that space is defined as a way rather than a locus.

The book is well informed and employs a non-Greek bibliography (English and French), which is a rarity in Greek books on Dostoevsky. And here is the irony: if an anti-Western current permeates this book, its merit also lies in its creative usage of a Western bibliography that is totally unknown to Greek readers. A significant contribution to the Greek bibliography on Dostoevsky.

M. G.

Αντρέας ΠΑΝΤΑΖΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Η πολιτική της αντιπροσώπευσης. Ντοστογιέφσκι, Παπαδιαμάντης, Κόντογλου* [Andreas PANTAZOPOULOS, *The Politics of Representation. Dostoevsky, Papadiamantis, Kontoglou*] (Αθήνα: Αρμός, 2024), 190 pp.

In the preface, the writer, an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Salonica, states that the scope of his investigation is to trace, amidst the crisis of political trust and political representation of Western Democracies, the pre-conditions of another more authentic and representative politics. In his “critical representation” of the political thought of these three Orthodox writers, he examines “the more political” of their works, as a

way out from the crisis of democracy and liberalism. Taking for granted that “Orthodoxy cannot, neither wants and also must not have any relation with politics” (p. 11), the author seeks in these three Orthodox authors the contours of politics differentiated from the Western Catholic and Protestant paradigm. This engagement is offered for fruitful discussion against the “general recent tendency of a post-modern communal renovation of Orthodoxy” (p. 11) – a hint probably to the influential work of the Greek theologian John (Ioannis) Zizioulas, which is taken outside Greece mostly for granted, as the standard manifestation of Orthodoxy nowadays.

The 40 pages that comprise the essay on Dostoevsky (pp. 13-53) are entitled “The Political Spirit of Dostoevsky. A Sketch for Further Thought”. Dostoevsky’s works that are used by the author are *The Diary of a Writer*, *The Brothers Karamazov* and to a lesser extent *Demons*. In the first of seven brief sections Ivan’s poem on the Grand Inquisitor from *The Brothers Karamazov* is examined as an exposition of Dostoevsky’s political theology. The spectre of Carl Schmitt is visible here and in sections that follow. But Pantazopoulos, besides posing Dostoevsky as a possible forerunner and interlocutor of Carl Schmitt, draws sharp contrasts between the two. Contrary to Carl Schmitt’s vision of the Church as the quintessential institution which has the power to represent and is able to reconcile opposites, in the “Grand Inquisitor” we have precisely an absolute rejection of the secularism of the Church. Pantazopoulos offers a forceful condemnation of the Church seen as an institution and its concomitant legal aspect, since these features of Occidental Catholicism historicizes the eschatological promise. However, trying to counter-propose a positive image of the Church, a “de-politicized” Church, Pantazopoulos discerns the vague, mystical, spiritualistic character of the Church envisioned by Dostoevsky, concluding that paradoxically there is a humanistic flavour in Dostoevsky’s catechism pointing to a limited “Western” humanistic influence of the author. Here Pantazopoulos – rightfully – cites the almost unknown in Greece Konstantin Leontiev. The second section on identity examines the relationship between the people, the nation and God. Referring to the views of Shatov in *Demons*, Pantazopoulos deems them as a form of essentialism against an abstract Universalism. In the third section, which bears the title “The religion makes the nation”, the writer examines Shatov’s conception of the need for a single God that underpins every particular nation. Pantazopoulos deems this stance as “a theologically inspired pre-political identification of the people with the nation taken as the precondition of the political” (p. 31). For Pantazopoulos what is offered by Dostoevsky as a theological and messianic foundation of the national imaginary is but a bunch of

“mystical ideas”. Interestingly, Dostoevsky’s and Schmitt’s particularism seem to converge.

Without a doubt Pantazopoulos engages in a fruitful dialogue with Dostoevsky. His text succeeds in offering “a sketch for further thought”, which is the subtitle of the chapter on Dostoevsky. He posits Dostoevsky squarely in the theological political discussion that blossoms nowadays in the West. He takes Dostoevsky mostly as a potential interlocutor of Carl Schmitt and secondarily of Leo Strauss (the primary and secondary bibliography on them is taken from French). The brief size of this chapter (merely 40 pages of small size) obliges the author to offer short but important comments, which are precious germs for a further discussion. The most important is that this short chapter is one of the very few that exist in Greek (the other – in my view – is the work of Mitsos Alexandropoulos) that manifest the author’s thoughtful engagement with the work of Dostoevsky, that provokes a thoughtful discussion with him, instead of eliminating him to a confessional exponent of Orthodoxy or relying on a limited foreign bibliography taken, most of the time, uncritically.

M. G.

Journals’ issues dedicated to Dostoevsky

- ▶ *Διαβάζω [Diavazo]*, vol. 103, 1984
- ▶ *Σύναξη [Sinaxi]*, vol. 160, 2021
- ▶ *Στέπα [Stepa]*, vol. 18a & 18b, 2021
- ▶ *Πειραιϊκή Εκκλησία, [Piraiiki Ekklisia]*, vol. 224, 2024.

Books with Collections of Articles on Dostoevsky.

- ▶ *Ντοστογιέφσκι, Εκατό Χρόνια από τον θάνατό του [Dostoevsky. One hundred Years from his Death]*, (Αθήνα: Ευθύνη, 1981).
- ▶ Μιχάλης ΜΑΚΡΑΚΗΣ (Εκδ.), *Σπουδή στον Ντοστογιέφσκι [Mikhailis Makrakis (ed.), Study in Dostoevsky]* (Αθήνα: Imago, 1982)