

**‘The Grand Inquisitor’ Poem: Antanas Maceina and posteriors (on contemporary discussions of 1990<sup>th</sup> - 2000<sup>th</sup>)**

After the intense discussions around a Poem about Grand Inquisitor by Dostoevsky, which took place at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> - beginning of 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, its silence has set. The Antanas Maceina's researches after World War the 2<sup>nd</sup> make up (in certain sense) common results to these discussions. His brilliant trilogy (The Whirled Heart), opened by research on Grand Inquisitor Poem, is not only philosophical, but also theological work. It is the classical point of view on a problem going following to ideas of the outstanding Russian philosophers. Maceina puts problems, which in the pointed form fix tragically realities of the 20th century. He puts them not less pointedly, than his predecessors, however precisely expresses main (whole) Christian point of view, in many respects integrating Catholic and Orthodox conceptions.

On my sight, the Maceina's conception is much closer to poetic treatment of the text untitled as «The Grand Inquisitor» (as is known, Dostoevsky itself named this fragment just a Poem), and, hence, to Mikhail Bakhtin point of view on Dostoevsky creativity. For this reason, I do not use the title «Legend about Grand Inquisitor», entered in a philosophical and literary traditions by Vasily Rozanov, and becoming very popular.

Let's put some base ideas of the famous Lithuanian philosopher. They concern central plots of the Dostoevsky's Poem, namely problems of freedom, conscience, miracle, mystery, and authority.

According to Maceina, the desire to believe to someone is «a main secret of a human nature». The understanding of it is obvious. in new philosophy of religion. As philosopher write, Max Scheler in «Wom Ewigen im Menschen» asserts, that religious act is necessary for human soul, therefore question here is inappropriate, whether its man executes or does not execute. He executes it always. A question here is possible only, whether the man finds the appropriate object for this act or, probably, he chooses the object of the reverence in sacral sphere. Scheler categorically asserts, that any limited soul trusts either in the God, or in an idol. However that the object of this religious act was fit for reverence, it should be experienced by the man as deep for him, as authority. He should have certain force and power. Owning with bread just satisfies to these requirements. Who owns bread, that holds in the hands destiny of the man. Who gives bread, that provides physical existence of the man, as well as subordinates the man. Man's existence is taken in the hands. Thus, if Christ has heeded spirit of desert and would submit the

people the mark, they bowed before Him and mapped Him. But Christ has not wished, that the people ran behind Him as «grateful and obedient herd». He wanted free choice and free love. The believe should not be called by flesh and blood. It should be a sort of interaction between frank faith and human freedom. Therefore Christ denied the temptation of spirit of desert. But thus He has refused from certificate of the force and power, most important argument of His divinity.

Problem of bread (in its grandiose context) is not unique and not last problem, which torments historical mankind and which it tries to decide in different ways. The vital famine is not the most important obstacle for creation of happiness in this world. It is accompanied by internal anxiety, which is hardly s determined, but which is always felt and always is experienced. This anxiety is more difficult for transferring, than famine of flesh. It torments the person stronger, than melancholy on bread. Dostoevsky names this internal alarm as «freedom of conscience». Also names it so completely true. The conscience, according to Maceina's point of view, is a voice of ours deepest "Ego".

It does not depend, like Maceina treats, on a fortress of our spirit. It does not lie on a surface, but included to our essence. It cannot be leaded into error, as mind, or to pervert, as will. Through it our personality speaks with God and world. And for this reason it never cannot be leaded into error or pervert in original sense of this word. The voice of conscience is always truthful, for them speaks our being, and life.

Thus, Inquisitor in the order between conscience of the man and particular life erects a miracle, mystery and authority - force which is not allowing for conscience to make solutions concerned to internal world of the man. Miracle, mystery and authority are powerful. On the one hand, they destroy free selection of the man, and on the other hand, they stay before the man as impossible things. The one who trusts in a miracle, is subordinated by force the one who creates miracles. The miracle is one from the forces, most influencing for man. In the same way the mystery influence for man. The one who trusts in mystery, is predetermined by existence of these mysteries, too. If mysteries exist, the man should in them trust. Certainly, he can deny existence of mysteries, but if once he recognizes this existence, he can not to be defined in relation to their contents. This contents is mystery. Therefore Inquisitor announces existence of mysteries in context of the God's name, and then — proves several of particular events by these mysteries. Also, the same power authority has. The one who trusts in authority, is guided by external motive, but not in case of determination in his faith. The authority has subordinating force, too. Once being is recognized, it does not give a capability for free selection - to trust or to not trust. It requires to trust. Thus, the conscience, by confronting with a miracle, mystery and authority, should fall dumb.

After Maceina's trilogy different points of view concerning «The Grand Inquisitor» Poem were stated. In USSR discussion practically was not ordered, as the religious philosophy was impossible for objective research. It is true, that in well known film by producer Ivan Pyrjev «The Brothers Karamazov» (of 60<sup>th</sup>) this motive of the novel is not mentioned at all. On this background, since the end of the 80<sup>th</sup>, were generated two research positions. On the one hand, the point of view which was close to Vasily Rozanov, Nikolaj Berdyaev, Sergij Bulgakov, Antanas Maceina, and others develops. On the other hand, there is a reassessment of the given point of view. Dostoevsky's thought, as well as aspect of his Poem, is subjected to paradoxical treatments. The first role in this process belongs to philosophers.

Well known St.Petersburg philosopher Igor Evlampiev point of view (2002, 2006, 2007) is indicative one. He doubts practically all basic ideas of the first position. Let's put (this time without any comments) those main questions, which become center of contemporary discussions.

1. Whether it is possible to judge about Dostoevsky as the «pure» philosopher, leaving to the second plan his Christian worldview?
2. Is the Ivan Karamazov image kind of «auto portrait» by Dostoevsky?
3. Whether is Svidrigailov (hero of the «Crime and Punishment» novel, as well as other Dostoevsky's personages) represents Alter Ego to Ivan Karamazov and in this sense one more a stroke to Dostoevsky's «auto portrait» ?
4. Whether Dostoevsky proves, that Christianity during the centuries lost main divine measurements of the person and mankind?
5. Whether Dostoevsky's Christ and Grand Inquisitor are colleagues, whether their position is unified?
6. What is a Christ's kiss in the ending of a Poem (‘comparative’ problem: what is Judas kiss)?
7. What Dostoevsky means, when selects a «Catholic background» for the Poem?
8. Is Dostoevsky Christian (as far as are strong occult, Gnostics, and other unchristian motives in his creativity)?
9. Whether it is actual to treat a Poem, as well as other Dostoevsky's fragments, in context of antisocialist (anticommunist) manifest?

The data questions do not settle a problem field of discussion. They reflect the space of paradoxes and alternatives, in which there is today creativity of the Great Russian writer and, in particular, his famous Poem.

On my mind, the attempt to refinement Dostoevsky's philosophy from natural Christian position, with all its contradictions and inconsistency, does not maintain criticism. Precisely just as such approach is impossible in relation to such outstanding thinkers, as Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, Kierkegaard, Maceina ... Today, when in Russia (and not only in Russia) the interest to religious philosophy

revives (just as to classical theology) the Antanas Maceina's ideas become especially urgent.