

# Rewriting the Bible: Fedor Glinka and his Long-suffering *Job*

PAMELA DAVIDSON

‘Why move the sea to drown a mosquito?’

F. N. Glinka, Letter to A. A. Kavelin, 1838

THE close relationship between poetry and the Bible that has prevailed in the Russian literary tradition since its inception raises several important questions. How did Russian writers understand and express the link between the poetic word and the sacred word? Could biblical texts be transposed into literary form? If so, what was the correct method? How much artistic freedom could be exercised? To what extent were such attempts based on the imitation of Western European models? Was there anything distinctive about the way this relationship evolved in Russia? How was it shaped by the responses of leading figures representing the authority of church and state?

These questions will be explored through the analysis of a particularly interesting case-study — the protracted attempts of Fedor Glinka (1786–1880) to publish his poetic imitation of the Book of Job. Glinka was not the first writer to seek to bring the voice of Job into Russian literature. Mikhail Lomonosov initiated the tradition with his celebrated ode of 1751, based on Job 38–41; N. P. Nikolev followed his example in 1795 with a new version of the same chapters, and in 1817 S. A. Shirinskii-Shikhmatov produced a poem, incorporating parts of Job.<sup>1</sup> In a more imaginative vein, Aleksandr

Pamela Davidson is Professor of Russian Literature at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, UCL.

This article forms part of a wider project on ‘Prophecy and Power in the Russian Literary Tradition (1680–1930)’, generously supported by The Leverhulme Trust through the award of a two-year Research Fellowship. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers of *SEER* for their thoughtful suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> For details of the earlier texts and a comparison of the four different versions, see V. L. Korovin, ‘Kniga Iova v stikhotvornykh perelozheniiakh XVIII–XIX vv. (fragment o begemote i leviafane)’, *Izvestiia rossiiskoi Akademii nauk. Seriiia literatury i iazyka*, 75, 2016, 1, pp. 17–28.

Pushkin drew on the Book of Job to shape his tale of Evgenii's suffering and rebellion in *Mednyi Vsadnik* (*The Bronze Horseman*, 1833).<sup>2</sup> These works all followed in the wake of the European revival of interest in the Book of Job as an aesthetic touchstone, initiated in the eighteenth century by English and German Enlightenment writers and subsequently developed in new directions by the poets and thinkers of the Romantic period.<sup>3</sup>

Glinka's response to Job arose out of this common European and Russian context, but took on a different form. Unlike Pushkin, he did not choose to write a literary work engaging with the themes of Job; instead, he tried to do something more fundamental and — as it turned out — more controversial: to create a poetic version of the entire Book of Job. Unlike previous Russian transpositions, his ambitious enterprise covered all forty-two chapters of the original, framed by a prologue and epilogue. In bringing this project to fruition, he displayed the long-suffering perseverance of his biblical hero; he laboured to complete his version under difficult conditions, and fought for decades to overcome the objections of the ecclesiastical censors to its publication.

The main stages of this revealing drama were played out over nearly half a century. Glinka began work on his imitation in 1826 or 1827, soon after his post-Decembrist exile to Petrozavodsk, and managed early on to publish the first seven sections, dated 21 March 1827, in the Petersburg journal, *Syn otechestva*, produced by his friend Nikolai Grech.<sup>4</sup> A few years later, in 1831, four more sections appeared in the Moscow journal, *Teleskop*.<sup>5</sup> In July 1834, after finishing his first version of the entire book, Glinka composed an introductory preface.<sup>6</sup> In 1835 the first two chapters

<sup>2</sup> See Kathleen Scollins, 'Cursing at the Whirlwind: The Old Testament Landscape of "The Bronze Horseman"', *Pushkin Review*, 16–17, 2013–14, pp. 205–31.

<sup>3</sup> Leora Batnitzky and Ilana Pardes (eds), *The Book of Job: Aesthetics, Ethics, Hermeneutics*, Berlin, 2015, pp. 100–01.

<sup>4</sup> Fedor Glinka, 'Iov: Svobodnoe prelozhenie' (hereafter, 'Iov', 1827), *Syn otechestva*, 1827, chast' 112, no. 7, pp. 279–91. The verso of the title-page of Part 112 is marked as passed by the censor on 15 February 1827 (before the date of Glinka's contribution in the seventh issue). The seven numbered sections correspond to the early parts of the full text later published in 1859. Sections I–III are drawn from the prologue, 1–3; sections IV–VII are drawn from Chapters 1–4. A note indicates that a continuation will follow. *Ibid.*, p. 291. *Syn otechestva* had already published excerpts from Glinka's celebrated *Pis'ma russkogo ofitsera* (in 1815–16) and his poetic address to the exiled Pushkin (in 1820).

<sup>5</sup> F. Glinka, 'Prelozheniia iz Iova', *Teleskop*, 1831, chast' 2, no. 5, pp. 24–30 (sections XIV, XVI–XVII, XXIII). Permission to publish was granted by the censor, S. Aksakov, on 15 March 1831.

<sup>6</sup> Glinka worked on the first version of his imitation of Job for six or seven years. Seven years passed from August 1827 to July 1834 (from Glinka's first description of his work on Job in his letter to Ivanovskii to the date of his preface). However, in his explanations of 1837,

appeared in the Moscow journal, *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*.<sup>7</sup> Despite these intermittent publications in the periodical press, he then struggled for a record twenty-four years to obtain permission from the ecclesiastical censorship to publish the complete poem, leaving no stone unturned (for its duration and intensity, this battle is unmatched in pre-Revolutionary Russian literary history). Throughout this time, he continued revising his work and gave readings to select audiences. In 1859 the latest version of the poem, together with the preface of 1834, was eventually passed by the ecclesiastical censor and published in St Petersburg.<sup>8</sup> At this stage, however, Glinka was not allowed to include his accompanying essay on the Book of Job, or his compilation of the thoughts of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) on Job. These two pieces only appeared in 1872, alongside the poem and its preface, in the third volume of his collected works, produced by Mikhail Pogodin in Moscow.<sup>9</sup>

This long-drawn-out saga featured an impressive cast of prominent figures, including a whole troupe of civil and ecclesiastical censors in St Petersburg and Moscow, Sergei Uvarov, the Minister of Public Education, several priests, members of the Synod and even Tsar Alexander II. The arguments that flew back and forth reveal some of the tensions inherent in the relationship between literature and religion during this period of critical change. This article focuses on the dynamics of the power struggle that took place between the author's aspirations to artistic freedom and the censorship bodies representing state and church. The first part establishes

addressing the 1836 objections of the censorship committee, Glinka referred twice to having spent a total of *six* years working on his version of Job. See his 'Ob'iasneniia prelagatelia na zamechaniia g. tsenzora', Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (hereafter, RGALI), f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 24), in V. P. Zverev, *Fedor Glinka — russkii dukhovnyi pisatel*, Moscow, 2002, pp. 396–97. In his 'Pis'mo k tsenzoru' of 8 January 1849 he also referred to his 'shestiletanii trud'. Ibid., p. 414. The discrepancy could be due to an error of memory, or to having completed the poem a year *before* writing the preface.

<sup>7</sup> F. Glinka, 'Kniga Iova', *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, 1835, tom 12, pp. 90–95 (first pag.). Permission to publish was granted by the censor, A. Nikitenko, on 31 August 1835.

<sup>8</sup> *Iov: Svobodnoe podrazhanie Sviashchennoi Knige Iova F. Glinki*, St Petersburg, 1859 (hereafter, *Iov*, 1859).

<sup>9</sup> *Iov. Svobodnoe podrazhanie Sviashchennoi Knige Iova*, Moscow, 1872 (hereafter, *Iov*, 1872). Although the author's name and further details are not given on the title-page, this is the third volume of *Sochineniia Fedora Nikolaevicha Glinki*, ed. [M. P.] P.[ogodin], 3 vols, Moscow, 1869–72. The first part of the volume opens with Glinka's original preface and dedication to his wife, pp. v–x, followed by his essay, 'Vzgliad na knigu Iova', pp. xi–xiv, and 'Mysli o Knige Iova (iz Gerdera)', pp. xv–xxi. The second part comprises his narrative poem, *Kareliia, ili Zatochenie Marfy Ioannovny Romanovoi*. The volume was passed by the Moscow Committee of ecclesiastical censorship on 24 November 1869. For a detailed account of its history, see Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 382–436.

Glinka's approach to the Book of Job and his understanding of the personal, national and universal relevance of its message to his generation. The second part determines the methods he adopted to convey this message, paying close attention to the principles underpinning the differences between the original biblical text and his adaptation. Finally, the third part analyses the polemical exchanges over the poem's publication and seeks to clarify why Glinka's patriotic and religious enterprise met with such strong resistance from the ecclesiastical censor.

At the root of this struggle lies a fundamental question: who could lay claim to the authority defined by 'ownership' of the sacred word? As we shall see, the situation in Russia developed along very different lines from parallel initiatives in Europe, inspired by the desire of Protestant theologians to refashion the Bible in a new, post-Enlightenment spirit. Despite multiple obstacles, through his persistent efforts Glinka eventually succeeded in his ambition to carve out a secure niche for Russian writers in the contested site of biblical transposition.

*Glinka's approach to the Book of Job: personal, national and universal dimensions*

In keeping with Christian tradition, Glinka interpreted the Book of Job as a prophecy of Christ, and saw the account of the patriarch's trials and temptation by Satan as a prefiguration of the Saviour's path through suffering to redemption.<sup>10</sup> He presented Job in this framework as a model of enduring faith in the face of adversity. Over time, his application of the lessons of the book broadened from the personal to the national and universal. Such an approach was neither unusual, nor exclusively Russian; a striking visual precedent can be found in William Blake's 'Illustrations of the Book of Job' (1826).

Glinka's initial interest in Job was prompted by his own experience. Just as his younger contemporary Vil'gel'm Kiukhel'beker began work in prison on a long narrative poem about the psalmist, King David, so Glinka, once he found himself in exile, turned to the Book of Job. Immersing himself in this work and creating his own literary version of it provided an effective form of spiritual therapy, a vehicle for developing (and publicizing) a view of his personal plight and suffering as a providential trial. He conveyed

<sup>10</sup> Early Christian commentators read Job's words 'I know that my redeemer lives, and that in the end he will stand on the earth' (Job 19:25) as a prophecy of Christ. In a note to his preface of 1834, Glinka pointed out that the Russian Orthodox Church's custom of reading the beginning and end of the Book of Job during Holy Week services served to underline the parallel between the suffering of Job and Christ. *Iov*, 1859, p. vii.

this perspective in a private letter of August 1827 to his friend, Andrei Ivanovskii. After thanking him for his praise of Job (evidently in response to the recent publication of excerpts in *Syn otechestva*), he related how he would work on his version during his precious hours of evening solitude, when the life of the mind, destroyed by the day's paper drudgery, would begin to revive and moved into a higher element. Although the French, German, Polish, Italian and Slavonic versions that he was using contained obscure passages, he explained that the sorrowful mood of his soul, 'when tears mix with ink', enabled him to appreciate the mysteries of Job's suffering. His stated aim was to give as simple and clear a rendition as possible, striving not for poetic effect but for loyalty to the original.<sup>11</sup> The key point here is that his own personal experience of sorrow allowed him to identify with Job and to serve as a faithful conduit for his voice.

Glinka repeated this point seven years later in his revealing preface, dated 20 July 1834 but not published until 1859. Describing the genesis of his work, he noted that he could not at first understand the Book of Job. Although he had read it in his youthful days of civic activism, it remained a closed cipher to him, mysterious and impenetrable, drowned out by the noise of worldly affairs.<sup>12</sup> When times changed and he found himself in the 'deep silence of a wilderness' (his northern exile), the slow monotonous pace of life opened his soul to a 'calmer, more correct way of thinking'. The 'humble life of the heart' was awakened within him and, when he opened the Book of Job once more, he immediately understood and felt attuned to its contents: 'My soul involuntarily identified with the sufferer; the centuries disappeared, distance vanished...'<sup>13</sup> The suffering that accompanied the reversal of his fortunes and the isolation of exile facilitated his spiritual growth and appreciation of Job's trials. In 1833 the exiled Kiukhel'beker recorded similar feelings in his diary when he started re-reading Job in his Lutheran Bible.<sup>14</sup> Glinka mentions that he was about

<sup>11</sup> See Glinka's letter to A. A. Ivanovskii of 17 August 1827, in F. N. Glinka, *Pis'ma k drugu*, ed. V. P. Zverev, Moscow, 1990, pp. 482–83. At the end of 1825 Ivanovskii was appointed to the commission in charge of investigating the Decembrist conspirators. On his courage in saving and printing their literary work, see V. E. Vatsuro, 'Chinovnik sledstvennoi komissii', in V. E. Vatsuro, M. I. Gille'son, *Skvoz' 'umstvennye plotiny': Ocherki o knigakh i presse pushkinskoi pory*, 2nd edn, Moscow, 1986, pp. 9–21.

<sup>12</sup> *Iov*, 1859, pp. iii–viii (p. iii). As evidence of Glinka's earlier interest in Job, see his long poem 'Iov', *Russkii vestnik*, 1808, no. 12, December, pp. 341–47, republished in a revised version in 1818.

<sup>13</sup> *Iov*, 1859, p. iv.

<sup>14</sup> V. K. Kiukhel'beker, *Puteshestvie. Dnevnik. Stat'i*, ed. N. V. Koroleva, V. D. Rak, Leningrad, 1979, p. 224 (entry of 24 January 1833).

to abandon his work midway, but Providence sent him his wife, who helped him to complete it and to whom it is dedicated.<sup>15</sup>

Having thus 'validated' his right to assume the voice of Job through reference to his own personal experience, Glinka was then able to make the transition to the national dimension of his work. As he noted in his preface, the Book of Job represents the 'struggle of *good* and *evil*'. Satan, the master of evil, embodies the '*invisible hand*' of fate and afflicts Job with suffering. The righteous patriarch overcomes his adversary through patience and humility.<sup>16</sup> Glinka clearly embraced Job's path as a model not just for his own trials, but also, more broadly, for the Christ-like destiny of the long-suffering Russian people. In this respect, he anticipated the association between the humble endurance of the Russian *narod* and the cross-bearing Jesus later developed by Fedor Tiutchev in his poem, 'Eti bednye selen'ia...' ('These poor settlements...', 1855). The dialogue between Satan and God in the Book of Job enabled Glinka to combine the theme of providential fate with an implied warning against the demonic temptations that threatened to undermine the faith of the Russian people from within (internal strife, hedonism, materialism) and without (secular Western ideologies of the Enlightenment).

Significantly, in view of the relevance of the message of Job to the Russian people as a nation, Glinka's preface also dwelt at some length on the opinion that the Book of Job was authored by Moses during his forty years in the desert. He noted the Talmudic comment that Moses would go from tent to tent reading the Book of Job to the Israelites in the wilderness and surmised that its earliest readers must have been the twelve tribes of Israel, who had escaped from Egyptian slavery and witnessed the defeat of Pharaoh's soldiers.<sup>17</sup> These observations invite a comparison between Moses wandering in the desert of Sinai, writing the Book of Job, to be read by the Israelites after the defeat of the Egyptians, and Glinka exiled in the wilderness of Karelia, writing an imitation of the same book, to be read by Russians after the defeat of Napoleon.

The national message was closely linked to the universal message of Job. In the closing words of his companion essay, 'Vzgliad na Knigu Iova' ('A View of the Book of Job'), blocked by the censor in 1859 but included in the 1872 edition, Glinka defined the Book of Job as a prophetic work with a

<sup>15</sup> *Iov*, 1859, pp. iv–v. In 1830, after his move from Petrozavodsk to Tver', Glinka met his wife, Avdot'ia Pavlovna Golenishcheva-Kutuzova, who also wrote spiritual verses and collaborated with her husband.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. v.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. v–vi.

universal message of particular relevance to Glinka's contemporaries: 'The Book of Job — a prophetic tale about the *great sorrow of the progenies of Adam* until the end of time — finds a particularly sympathetic response in the general pensiveness of the *contemporary generation*.'<sup>18</sup> As the voice transmitting this message to his generation, Glinka was aligning himself with the authority of biblical tradition.

In a letter of 1849 presenting his poem to the censor, Glinka ingeniously wove all three strands of his approach to Job — the personal, the national and the universal — into a single organic whole. Describing his work on Job as a holy sacrifice placed on the altar of the Fatherland, he avowed that posterity would identify him with the holy patriarch and declare: 'There was a man [...] who, after merging his soul with the life and sufferings of the *biblical Job*, tried to convey, in his language, all the groans, all the nuances of this *great sorrow*.'<sup>19</sup>

*Glinka's method of adaptation: the principle of artistic freedom and its Western context*

This section will first examine Glinka's approach to the question of artistic freedom in literary adaptations of biblical texts by comparing his theoretical pronouncements on the subject to his practical implementation of the principle in three areas of his imitation. It will then consider the extent to which his approach was modelled on European post-Enlightenment responses to the Bible, such as those of Herder.

Although Glinka stated in his letter of 1827 that he aimed to give as simple and clear a rendition of the Book of Job as possible, striving not for poetic effect but for loyalty to the biblical text, the final published text shows that he took considerable liberties with the original. The discrepancy between his avowed aims and actual practice is reflected in the different terms that he used to describe his work — as we shall see, he adjusted these according to his audience. In his preface of 1834 he referred to it as a 'transposition of Job into verses, or rather, a free imitation of this book'.<sup>20</sup> The shift from the traditional term *perelozhenie* ('transposition'), used by poets from Lomonosov to Derzhavin to describe their versions of the psalms, to the looser description of *podrazhanie* ('imitation') is significant.

<sup>18</sup> *Iov*, 1872, p. xiv. Elsewhere, in various archival fragments not included in the published version of the essay, Glinka presented Job as the original proto-book ('kniga-praroditel'nitsa', 'kniga-pervenets'). Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 417.

<sup>19</sup> Glinka, 'Pis'mo k tsenzoru', 8 January 1849, Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Tverskoi oblasti (hereafter, GATO), f. 103, op. 1, ed. khr. 1016, in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 415.

<sup>20</sup> *Iov*, 1859, p. iv.

He underlined his right to exercise artistic freedom by appending the phrase *svobodnoe podrazhanie* ('free imitation') as a subtitle to the two book editions of 1859 and 1872. Apart from casting the narrative in poetic form (iambic tetrameter, mainly blank verse, with occasional rhymes), the most obvious difference can be found in the addition of many extended descriptions. These new passages develop three principal themes: the eastern setting, the suffering of Job and the figure of Satan.

Any changes made to a sacred text were highly controversial in the eyes of the ecclesiastical censor, and Glinka's additions naturally attracted considerable critical comment from the outset.<sup>21</sup> In the 1850s, still hoping to overcome these objections, Glinka composed an eloquent defence of the principle of artistic freedom in his work. Pointing out that he had generally adhered to the 'elevated text' of the original, he presented his interpolated descriptions as 'poetic pictures', simply *illustrating* the biblical narrative.<sup>22</sup> The comparison of poetic text to pictures may have been prompted by the fact that the depiction of biblical subjects was a core (and uncontested) component of the tradition established by the Petersburg Academy of Arts, which did not come under the purview of the ecclesiastical censor. Glinka's explanation was somewhat disingenuous, however, as he was clearly doing much more than simply 'illustrating' the scriptural narrative. A close examination of the additions reveals that they were designed to reinforce his own reading of Job and the messages that he wished his version of the text to convey.

Apart from indicating that the patriarch lives in the land of Uz, the Book of Job does not contain any descriptions of landscape. By contrast, Glinka's imitation introduces long and colourful evocations of the setting. These additions serve several different purposes. On the one hand, they suggest a relationship between the righteous individual and the life of the nation. Chapter 1, for example, opens with an evocation of the busy trading life in a city of the desert, contrasted with the lonely suffering of Job which follows.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, by reinforcing the sense of the divine presence in nature and enhancing the poetic qualities of the narrative, they also contribute to a sense of its transcendent, universal significance. At the beginning of Chapter 2, Glinka prefaces the arrival of Job's three friends

<sup>21</sup> For a detailed account of the ecclesiastical censor's objections in 1836, see Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 390–93.

<sup>22</sup> See the note on Job from the mid 1850s (GATO, f. 103, op. 1, ed. khr. 1000, l. 6–6 ob.), cited in *ibid.*, pp. 325–26, 403–04.

<sup>23</sup> *Iov*, 1859, pp. 13–14.



with a lengthy portrayal of the splendour of the heavens.<sup>24</sup> In the epilogue, an extended evocation of spring in the Arabian meadows and mountains precedes the account of the reversal of Job's fortunes.<sup>25</sup> The setting acts as a constant mediator between God and his creation; in the final section of the poem, an eight-line rhymed coda in iambic pentameter appended to the epilogue, the desert 'hears' Job's suffering and marvels at his forbearance.<sup>26</sup> In all these respects, Glinka's handling of the Eastern landscape differs from the agenda identified by Harsha Ram as a feature of the imperial sublime — the poet's purpose is religious and universal, not political.<sup>27</sup>

Glinka also added extended sections on Job's trials. In Chapter 1, he inserts a long description of the patriarch's physical and mental suffering, and develops the terse advice of his wife to 'blaspheme God and die' (Job 2:9) into a passionate tirade.<sup>28</sup> These amplifications not only accentuate Glinka's empathic personal identification with Job's suffering, they also reinforce the significance of this model on a national level. This is made explicit in the closing lines of the poem. Here Glinka refers to Job as 'our' patriarch, whose example will be taught by grandfathers to grandchildren, and rounds off by making the link between 'us' (the Russian people) and the value of suffering as an instrument of purification:

Темнит нас грех, но чистит огонь страданий,  
И сладок плод от горьких испытаний!...<sup>29</sup>

Sin darkens us, but the fire of sufferings cleanses us,  
And sweet is the fruit of bitter trials!...

The third and final area of Glinka's additions relates to the figure of Satan, whose terrifying appearance and evil characteristics are portrayed at length in the opening section of the prologue.<sup>30</sup> The accuser's brief responses to God, occupying only a few verses in the original (Job 1:7, 9–11), are expanded into a speech of fifty-eight lines, including a powerful

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 172.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 173.

<sup>27</sup> Harsha Ram, *The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire*, Madison, WI, 2003, pp. 27–29.

<sup>28</sup> *Iov*, 1859, pp. 14–16. In Chapter 3, Job's first long speech also places much more emphasis on his suffering. Ibid., pp. 19–22.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 173.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., pp. 2–3. A parallel can be drawn with the dominant representations of Satan in Blake's 'Illustrations of the Book of Job'.

indictment of the sinful ways of mankind.<sup>31</sup> The point of these extensive additions was to convey Glinka's view of the corruption of his own generation by Satan. In the following extract, the author's voice can clearly be heard, railing against the deficiencies of his contemporaries:

Дозволь мне, Боже, испытать  
Тобой хвалимого!... Я знаю, —  
Сии жильцы Твоей земли —  
Адама грешного потомство —  
Из персей матери сосут  
Любовь к греху, любовь к пороку.  
Забыв Тебя, отдавшись року,  
Путем погибели бегут  
За каждой тенью наслажденья...<sup>32</sup>

Allow me, Lord, to test  
The man You praise!... I know —  
The inhabitants of Your world —  
The progeny of sinful Adam —  
Imbibe from their mother's breast  
The love of sin, the love of vice.  
Forgetful of You, surrendering to fate,  
Along the path to perdition they run  
After every shadow of pleasure...

A further area in which Glinka amplified the original sheds light on his fears over the role of language in sowing demonic corruption. In the final chapter, God reprimands Job's three friends for their incorrect speech. Although this rebuke occupies only two verses (Job 42:7–8), Glinka develops it into a diatribe of thirty-four lines against those who speak from the mind rather than the heart and 'weave beautiful words' (*spletali krasnye glagoly*) to show off their 'magniloquent and cunning mind' (*um velerechivyi i lukavyyi*), seeking only praise and glory.<sup>33</sup> As a poet, he was strongly concerned with the abuse of the spoken or written word to spread false values. In his extended interpolations on the figure of Satan, he was not just exposing the sins of his generation, but was also attacking their

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., pp. 4–5.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 4. Korovin's argument that lines from Glinka's later description of the *begemot* and Leviathan (in God's speech to Job, Chapters 40–41) suggest an association of these creatures with the devil is not persuasive. Korovin, 'Kniga Iova', pp. 24–25.

<sup>33</sup> *Iov*, 1859, p. 170.

promotion in literature. Contemporary poems such as Pushkin's 'Demon' ('The Demon', 1823), Lermontov's 'Moi demon' ('My Demon', 1829) and narrative poem 'Demon' ('The Demon', 1831), explored the arch-tempter's methods for seducing individuals. In their novels *Evgenii Onegin* (1833) and *Geroi nashego vremeni* (*A Hero of Our Time*, 1840), the same authors went on to build up a portrait of contemporary man, representative of the society of his time and tainted by corrupt influences. Onegin, for example, is depicted as an 'arrogant devil' (*nadmennyi bes*), a 'Muscovite in Harold's cloak' (*Moskvich v Garol' dovom plashche*) and 'a complete lexicon of modish words' (*slov modnykh polnyi leksikon*).<sup>34</sup>

In a letter to a friend, written in February 1827 during the early stages of his work on *Job*, Glinka noted how well Pushkin's *Evgenii Onegin* captured the coldness, false 'enlightenment' and 'total worthlessness of contemporary society'.<sup>35</sup> Significantly, he completed his version of *Job* in 1834, one year after the publication of the first full edition of Pushkin's novel in verse. Given the prevalence of demonic protagonists in Russian literature of this period, it is hardly surprising that he was moved to challenge this trend by creating his own version of the canonical account of the defeat of Satan and justification of God. The figure of Job served as an important corrective, offering an alternative model of heroic behaviour, grounded in biblical tradition, based on the eternal values of faith and endurance, refined through suffering. The patriarch's example offset the widespread literary type of the disaffected Byronic hero or superfluous man beset by demonic temptations. His desire to expose the relation of transient fashion to unchanging truth explains why he worked numerous echoes of Pushkin's and Lermontov's poems on the demon into his description of Satan.<sup>36</sup> The new version of *Job* that he created was designed to counter the fashionable literary demonism and pleasure-seeking hedonism of his generation.

<sup>34</sup> *Evgenii Onegin*, chapter 7, stanza 24.

<sup>35</sup> Letter to V. V. Izmailov of 26 February 1827, in Glinka, *Pis'ma k drugu*, pp. 475–76 (p. 475).

<sup>36</sup> Compare, for example, the following phrases from Pushkin's 'Demon' (1823) with Glinka's description of Satan in *Iov*, 1859, pp. 2–3 (cited in this order) — 'Тоской внезапной осеня' with 'Он в небе наводил тоску'; 'какой-то злобный гений' with 'Сын злобы злобно задрожал'; 'Вливали в душу холодный яд' with 'Чтобы яд злословья изливать'; 'Неистощимой клеветою' with 'на человека клеветать'; 'Не верил он любви, свободе' with 'Он добродетели не верил'; 'Благословить он не хотел' with 'Скрывать он злобы не хотел'. Compare also the references to *buri* and the use of *mrachnyi* in Lermontov's 'Moi demon' (1829) with Glinka's *Iov*, as well as Lermontov's lines: 'Он презрел чистую любовь, / Он все моления отвергает' with Glinka's 'Стыдясь молиться и любить'.

We have seen, therefore, that Glinka rigorously defended the principle of artistic freedom, and made extensive use of additions and changes to the original to emphasize the moral message that he wished to deliver to his contemporaries. In adopting this method, he was latching onto an existing European tradition and trying to embed it in Russia. We shall now turn to this connection and try to understand exactly what he took from his Western predecessors.

As Yael Almog has noted, the individual reader's empathic identification with the Bible as a personal document was a pronounced feature of the new approach to the Bible which gained currency among Protestants in the eighteenth century.<sup>37</sup> Glinka's method grew out of this context; it drew on the work of several German Protestant thinkers, who promoted the study and translation of the Hebrew Bible into the vernacular as a vehicle for personal and national development. Through close commentaries and literary translations, Herder and his followers laid the foundation of modern, post-Reformation hermeneutics, shifting the authority of biblical exegesis from church theologians to the agency of the individual reader, whose interpretation was valued precisely because it was grounded in a personal response.

In his classic study, *Vom Geist der ebräischen Poesie* (*The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, 1782–83), Herder approaches his subject in this spirit as an ancient literary source, speaking of the universally shared childhood of mankind, accessible to everyone on a personal level.<sup>38</sup> Much attention is given in the early dialogues to the plan, antiquity and authorship of the Book of Job, illustrated by numerous extracts cited in Herder's own translation, cast in iambic metre. Moses is held up as the ancestor of all poets (because of his songs), whose moral teachings succeeded in building the people into a unified nation with a defined mission. Any country wishing to develop its own literature and sense of nationhood could therefore do no better than turn to these primary sources and translate them into its own language. Poets are the ideal people to undertake this task, since, in the words of Herder, 'A poet is a creator of a people; he gives it a world to contemplate, he holds its soul in his hand'.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Yael Almog, 'Sublime Readings: The Emergence of the Aesthetic Bible in Herder's Writings on Hebrew Poetry', *The Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook*, 12, November 2013, pp. 337–52.

<sup>38</sup> For an early English translation of the first volume, see J. G. Herder, *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, trans. from the German by James Marsh, vol. 1, Burlington, 1833.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted in Isaiah Berlin, *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas*, London, 1976, p. 203.

Not surprisingly, Herder's ideas were enthusiastically taken up in Russia. His insistence on the importance of personal empathy (*Einfühlen*) — the ability to penetrate or to 'feel oneself' into the essence of another work of literature — found a clear echo in Glinka's repeated assertions that he had only been able to reach a deep understanding of Job after undergoing a personal experience of suffering.<sup>40</sup> More broadly, the German theologian's cultural pluralism turned Russia's backwardness into a possible advantage; the special role he allocated to the Slavs in promoting religion to the West was particularly attractive to Slavophile thinkers.<sup>41</sup>

Glinka deliberately drew attention to his desire to take up a place in this tradition by making constant references to all the foreign commentaries and translations consulted by him during his work on Job. In the first publication of part of his imitation in 1827, he was still cautious, explaining in a footnote that he had checked the Slavonic text of the Bible against several (unspecified) texts in foreign languages.<sup>42</sup> In the preface of 1834, he grew bolder. As well as mentioning the interest of the Church Fathers, he also cited the opinions of Talmudic rabbis and the work of modern academics, including the German translation and commentary on the Book of Job by the Protestant theologian and Hebrew Bible scholar, Friedrich Umbreit (1795–1860). He referred enthusiastically to Umbreit's list of a further thirty scholars working on commentaries and translations of Job.<sup>43</sup> This account of his working methods is confirmed by materials held in his personal archive, documenting his use of translations (French, German and, to a lesser extent, Italian and Polish), listing thirty-two bibliographical items consulted to work out obscure passages in *Job*, and fifteen explanations of a difficult passage noted by Umbreit.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> On Herder's use of the term *Einfühlen*, see *ibid.*, pp. xxii, 173.

<sup>41</sup> The first five books of Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (*Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Humanity*, 1784–91) appeared in Russia in 1829: *Mysli otnosiashchiesia k filosoficheskoi istorii chelovechestva, po razumeniiu i nachertaniiu Gerdera*, St Petersburg, 1829. For an excellent analysis of Herder's views on Russia, see 'Johann Gottfried Herder: Russia as the Future of Civilisation between Europe and Asia', in Peter Speck Reto, 'The History and Politics of Civilisation: The Debate about Russia in French and German Historical Scholarship from Voltaire to Herder', unpublished PhD dissertation, Queen Mary University of London, 2010, pp. 210–63 <<https://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/423/SPECKHistoryandPolitics2010.pdf?sequence=1>> [accessed 29 January 2017].

<sup>42</sup> Glinka, 'Iov', 1827, p. 279.

<sup>43</sup> *Iov*, 1859, p. vi. Umbreit's translation was first published in Heidelberg in 1824.

<sup>44</sup> See Glinka's notes and explanations on the Book of Job (GATO, f. 103, op. 1, ed. khr. 972), in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 326.

Although Glinka did not mention Herder by name in his preface of 1834, his interest in the German thinker's view of Job developed rapidly after this point. An important mediating influence in this respect, shaping his understanding of the relevance of Herder's ideas for Russia, were the lectures on Hebrew poetry given by Stepan Shevyrev (1806–64), Professor of Russian literature at Moscow University, and published as a series of three essays in 1834–35 in *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*.<sup>45</sup> Shevyrev took up Herder's ideas on Hebrew poetry as the original and highest form of poetry, and invited Russian writers to assimilate its divine truth and prophetic spirit into their work. He devoted the whole of his third lecture to the story of Job, describing it as 'the book of our very own life, drawn from its very depths, from the depths of suffering', and as a 'theodicy' (Herder's term) for 'our proud century'.<sup>46</sup> He quotes Herder liberally throughout, and draws on his German translation of Job for the passages he cites in Russian.

When submitting his imitation to the censors, Glinka liked to enclose extracts copied out from Shevyrev's essay by way of supportive back-up and commentary.<sup>47</sup> He also engaged directly with Herder's original writings. We know from his letter of 1 April 1837 to M. P. Pogodin that he made substantial changes and additions to his imitation after comparing it closely with versions by Herder, Johann David Michaelis (1717–91), Umbreit and others.<sup>48</sup> His desire to see a compilation of thoughts on Job taken from Herder printed alongside his imitation was finally realized in the edition of 1872.

Glinka's constant references to Western sources were evidently designed to demonstrate the authenticity of his imitation ('checked' against 'authoritative' foreign translations and commentaries) and its universality (transcending the narrow realm of the approved Church

<sup>45</sup> Shevyrev's lectures were published as 'O dukhe evreiskoi poezii: Lektsiia pervaiia', *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, 1834, 8, August, pp. 187–214; 'O evreiskoi poezii: Lektsiia vtoraiia', *ibid.*, 1834, 11, November, pp. 169–95 (references to Herder on pp. 182, 186); 'O evreiskoi poezii: Lektsiia tret'ia. Kniga Iova', *ibid.*, 1835, 2, February, pp. 207–28 (references to Herder throughout). On Glinka's familiarity with the essays, see the archival fragment on Job (GATO, f. 103, op. 1, ed. khr. 1000), in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 402, where he notes that he consulted the new exposition of the whole Book of Job in Professor S. P. Shevyrev's lectures on Hebrew poetry, as well as Russian versions by Lomonosov, A. V. Boldyrev (the orientalist) and I. M. Snegirev (the translator of ancient literatures).

<sup>46</sup> Shevyrev, 'O evreiskoi poezii: Lektsiia tret'ia. Kniga Iova', *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, 1835, 2, February, pp. 211, 227–28.

<sup>47</sup> Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 403.

<sup>48</sup> Glinka, *Pis'ma k drugu*, p. 495.

Slavonic text by being embedded in the broader tradition of European post-Enlightenment responses to the Bible). In creating his version of Job, Glinka was articulating — whether consciously or unconsciously — some of the principles of modern hermeneutics. This is particularly evident in his determination to establish the true meaning of the original text (hampered by a lack of biblical Hebrew, he tried to make up for this deficiency by consulting many different translations). Strangely, he seemed to be unaware of just how controversial his independent approach to canonical texts would be from the point of view of the Russian Orthodox Church. Despite his flair for deploying a range of strategic arguments, at times he appeared curiously naive. As we shall see in the next section, his failure to realize that flaunting his use of foreign sources might annoy the ecclesiastical censor led to significant complications, the consequences of which he was to suffer.

*Glinka's polemics with the ecclesiastical censor: conflict and resolution*

The difficulties that Glinka experienced in trying to transplant the model set up by Herder and his successors into Russian literary tradition by creating a new version of the Book of Job were partly due to a major change of political and cultural climate. Following the Decembrist uprising of 1825, the biblical societies and new Russian translations of the Bible that had flourished under the encouragement of Alexander I were viewed with suspicion as fronts for the dissemination of revolutionary ideas. Admiral A. S. Shishkov's reform of the censorship system in June 1826 was designed to address additional concerns over the spread of mystical and sectarian beliefs. It was soon followed by Nicholas I's much harsher Statute of 1828, banning whatever was deemed to endanger the faith or the throne. Strict new measures were applied to literary works of religious content. All texts dealing with biblical topics now came under scrutiny by the ecclesiastical censor, responsible for checking their conformity with the canonical Church Slavonic Bible.<sup>49</sup>

Glinka's project was caught up in the transition to the new regime. His different (and sometimes inconsistent) ways of presenting his imitation reflect his attempts to satisfy (or evade) the criteria. He was well acquainted with the complexities of the system, as his older brother S. N. Glinka (1776–1847), a censor from 1827, was forced into retirement in 1830 following disagreements with the Moscow committee.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Charles A. Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804–1906*, Toronto, ON, 1982, pp. 52–58.

<sup>50</sup> Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 389.

At first, to avoid problems connected with the ecclesiastical censorship, Glinka tried to get his work evaluated by the more liberal committee for civil censorship. In July 1835, he asked his old friend Alexander Nikitenko (appointed censor in 1833) to help secure permission for its publication. He carefully emphasized that his 'purely *poetic* work' contained nothing that was subject to the ecclesiastical censor, pointing out that extracts had already appeared in secular journals. Although Nikitenko signed off permission in August 1835 for two chapters to be printed in *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, he was unable to resolve the problem of the publication of the whole poem. Glinka wrote again in September, 'touched to tears' by his friend's sympathy and response to his poem, but still fretting: 'For Job's verses I gave up the last fire of my soul, not yet extinguished by the storms of my life. And must all this really perish?' He let drop that he had also written to Sergei Uvarov, the Minister of Public Education and author of the Official Nationality policy first formulated in 1833, asking him to lend his protection to his Job and to request the committee for civil censorship to examine it as the 'poetic work of a lay person', prepared in accordance with 'the most recent lay writers', Herder, Michaelis and Umbreit.<sup>51</sup> Glinka's designation of these three German Protestant Bible scholars as 'lay writers' was evidently designed to deflect attention from the religious (and non-Orthodox) context of his enterprise.

Glinka's persistent efforts to circumvent the system by stressing the 'lay' character of his work failed. The intercession of Nikitenko and Uvarov did not help. In December 1835, after examining the work, the St Petersburg committee of civil censorship of the Ministry of Public Education referred it to the city's committee of ecclesiastical censorship. The matter was entrusted to Ioann Kolokolov (1799?–1869), a priest who taught Greek at St Petersburg Theological Academy and translated the works of the church fathers from Greek into Russian. His critical report, submitted in June 1836, recorded several objections. Starting with the preface, he faulted Glinka's description of the Book of Job as a drama, a term that properly belonged to the world of theatre. He also objected to his use of the phrase 'evil principle', as it implied a dualist world-view. Moving on to the imitation itself, he criticized its 'freedom' and inclusion of thoughts and passages absent from the Hebrew and Slavonic texts. He condemned the dedication to Glinka's wife as inappropriate for a canonical book of scripture. Finally,

<sup>51</sup> Letters to A. V. Nikitenko of 22 July 1835 and 30 September 1835, in Glinka, *Pis'ma k drugu*, pp. 494–95. The statement, 'Стихам Иова отдал я последний огонь души моей, еще не догашенный бурями жизни моей', is repeated more or less verbatim from Glinka's preface of July 1834.



he pointed out that the anonymous extract from an essay on Job appended to the imitation could not be allowed; if resubmitted, it would have to be approved by the Holy Synod.<sup>52</sup> These concerns reflected the unease of the ecclesiastical censorship over literary adaptations of Holy Writ, and the considerable difficulties encountered by a religious poet trying to straddle both worlds.

The committee's decision to refuse permission for publication was taken in August 1836 but not communicated to the author until December.<sup>53</sup> Glinka did not give up, however. He immediately wrote a detailed response, rebutting all the censor's objections and agreeing to a few changes. He pointed out that Herder, Michaelis, Umbreit and various Russian writers had all described Job as a drama, and that he had deliberately used the phrase *nachalo zloe* ('the evil principle') to avoid cruder terms such as the devil. Nevertheless, in the revised version of the preface published in 1859 and 1872, the reference to Job as a drama was cut, and the offending reference to the 'evil principle' was replaced by *s zlonachal'nikom* ('with the master of evil'). On the question of the 'freedom' of his adaptation, he explained that he had taken a conscious decision to depart from the literal version of Lomonosov, applying the same principles that he had successfully used in his imitations of the psalms and prophets, published in 1826. He defended his addition of the speech of Job's wife on the grounds that he had taken it from a French 'translation' of Job. As for the dedication, Glinka could not fathom why he should not be allowed to acknowledge the devoted help of his lawful Christian wife. He agreed, however, not to include the extract from an essay on Job. This was a shrewd concession, as the essay was the work of the controversial priest Gerasim Pavskii. After pioneering the translation of the Bible into Russian under Alexander I, Pavskii fell from favour and was dismissed by Nicolas I from his post as the tsarevich's tutor in divine law in 1835.

Glinka rounded off his defence with two more valid points: parts of his imitation had already been printed in the periodical press, and all previous poetic versions of Job since Lomonosov's had been approved by the committee for *civil* censorship. In submitting his revised manuscript, he begged the committee once more to consider it as the *literary* work of a *lay*

<sup>52</sup> For details of the referral, dated 21 December 1835, and the report, dated 30 June 1836, see Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 391–93. In a note Zverev identifies the anonymous essay 'Kriticheskii razbor na Kn. Iova' as the work of Gerasim Pavskii, *ibid.*, p. 396. In his role as ecclesiastical censor Pavskii had previously granted permission for the publication of Glinka's collection *Opyty Sviashchennoi poezii* in 1825.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 393.

person.<sup>54</sup> The matter was then escalated to the Synod, prompting Glinka to exclaim ‘why move the sea to drown a mosquito?’. Despite efforts made by Vasiliï Zhukovskii, who carried considerable influence in high circles, permission was once more denied.<sup>55</sup>

Remarkably, despite this succession of setbacks, Glinka continued, undeterred, to work on his version right up until its final publication in 1859. Clearly he saw this project as an undertaking of absolute value, a personal mission to be pursued, irrespective of practical outcomes. As noted above, in April 1837 he wrote to Pogodin that he had completely revised his poem after reading several German commentaries on Job. The version that he sent Pogodin at this stage was not the most recent one (described as a confusing ‘labyrinth’, only navigable by its author), nor the same as the text originally submitted to the censor, which he continued to use for the readings he gave at home.<sup>56</sup> As this example shows, he circulated manuscript copies and gave private readings of his work, regularly reviewing it in the light of comments. In the late 1830s and early 1840s he even enlisted the help of a young specialist in ancient languages, who translated for him difficult passages from the original Hebrew Book of Job.<sup>57</sup> He deplored the injustice of the censor’s verdict. In January 1849, he penned an indignant letter to Kolokolov, complaining that his work had been squashed like a mosquito and crushed like a moth before being thrown to feed the rats. He compared the censor to an architect who noticed a few crooked boards in one wing of a house (the preface) and ordered the whole building (the poem) to be torn down. All this had taken place despite the work’s enthusiastic reception in the highest quarters; as he reported, even the heir to the throne, Alexander Nikolaevich, had requested a copy for his personal library after hearing the entire work read out to him by members of his entourage, including his tutor, Zhukovskii.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>54</sup> For the full text of Glinka’s ‘Ob’iasneniia prelagatelia na zamechaniia g. tsenzora’ (RGALI, f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 24), see *ibid.*, pp. 394–97.

<sup>55</sup> See Glinka’s subsequent correspondence with A. A. Kavelin in March 1838, in *ibid.*, pp. 397–98.

<sup>56</sup> Letter to M. P. Pogodin of 1 April 1837, in Glinka, *Pis’ma k drugu*, pp. 495–96.

<sup>57</sup> Kaetan Andreevich Kossovich (1815–60), a Belorussian son of an orthodox priest from Vitebsk and graduate of St Petersburg University, specializing in Hebrew and Arabic, worked from 1839 to 1843 teaching Greek at the Tver’ gymnasium. See his letters to Glinka of 25 June 1842 and 9 July 1842, sewn together with Kossovich’s prose translations of extracts from the Hebrew text of Job (RGALI, f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 23), in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 400–01, 512.

<sup>58</sup> Glinka, ‘Pis’mo k tsenzoru’, 8 January 1849 (GATO, f. 103, op. 1, ed. khr. 1016), in *ibid.*, p. 414.

The attempt to pit the authority of the tsarevich against that of the ecclesiastical censor did not pay off. Glinka's associates, appalled by the censor's ban, offered the poet constant encouragement. One devoted admirer was instrumental in bringing about the poem's eventual publication. Mikhail Shavrov (1828–84), Professor of Philology at St Petersburg Theological Academy, held Glinka in high esteem as Russia's foremost religious poet. He was well equipped with all the necessary diplomatic skills to act as an intermediary between the author and the censor. In a letter of August 1858 asking Glinka for the final text of *Job*, he also requested permission to reprint his earlier collection, *Opyty Sviashchennoi Poezii* (*Experiments in Sacred Verse*, 1826), which reworked the voices of the psalmist and prophets to frame personal and national experience. The reason he gave reveals an interesting dual agenda: 'By recalling an earlier age of our poetry, when it walked hand in hand with religion and shared the same interests with it, the proposed publication may once more draw together these two close sisters — *Mary* and *Martha*.<sup>59</sup> Returning poetry to religion is compared to reuniting two different forms of divine service, the contemplative and the active paths, represented by Lazarus's two sisters, Mary of Bethany and Martha. The republication of Glinka's milestone collection was designed to turn the clock back by resurrecting the religious spirit of the 1820s in the secular-minded 1850s. Although Shavrov's wish to reprint *Opyty Sviashchennoi Poezii* did not come to fruition, his efforts to publish the poet's version of *Job* met with success.<sup>60</sup> In February 1859 it was finally signed off by Archimandrite Feodor, the ecclesiastical censor, and printed in March, together with its preface.<sup>61</sup>

This breakthrough was in no small measure due to the unusual qualities of Archimandrite Feodor (Aleksandr Bukharev, 1822–71), who had only recently, in 1858, been appointed to the Petersburg committee for ecclesiastical censorship. A graduate of Moscow Theological Academy, Bukharev had taken his monastic vows in 1846, taught Holy Scripture for some years at the Academy, and then moved to a professorship in theology at Kazan' Theological Academy (1854–58). From the outset, he displayed

<sup>59</sup> Letter from M. V. Shavrov to Glinka of 11 August 1858 (RGALI, f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 445), in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 406–07. In a later letter of 22 February 1859, Shavrov reported that the censor had objected to the inclusion of Glinka's introductory essay, 'Vzgliad na knigu Iova', and advised Glinka to drop it. *Ibid.*, p. 407.

<sup>60</sup> *Opyty Sviashchennoi Poezii* was later reprinted in 1869 as the opening section of *Dukhovnye stikhi*, the first volume of Pogodin's edition of Glinka's collected works.

<sup>61</sup> The verso of the title-page notes that the book was passed by the ecclesiastical censor Archimandrite Feodor on 8 February 1859.

a keen interest in building bridges between Russian Orthodoxy and the world of lay culture. His celebrated three letters to Gogol', written in 1848 but not published until 1860, defended the writer's *Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druz'iami* (*Selected Passages from Correspondence*, 1847) from attack, arguing for the organic unity of his religious and literary works. In 1859, after approving the publication of Glinka's *Job*, he published a booklet on Aleksandr Ivanov's influential painting 'Iavlenie Khrista narodu' ('The Appearance of Christ to the People', 1857). Later, he examined Fedor Dostoevskii's *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* (*Crime and Punishment*, 1866) in the light of contemporary thought and learning.<sup>62</sup> Like Shavrov and Glinka, he wished to elevate the values of contemporary society by closing the gap between religion and culture. In many ways, he was far ahead of his time, anticipating the philosophical approach to theology and art developed during the Silver Age by thinkers such as Pavel Florenskii and Sergei Bulgakov.<sup>63</sup> He also shared with Glinka a strong interest in prophecy and the Apocalypse. His major life's work was an exploration of the Book of Revelation, alongside several studies of the prophets, including Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel and Job.<sup>64</sup> It is therefore easy to understand why he viewed Glinka's *Job* with a sympathetic eye.

According to the memoirs of a close friend, Feodor found his duties as an ecclesiastical censor difficult and burdensome.<sup>65</sup> From an office inauspiciously located in the middle of Aleksandr Nevskii cemetery, he had to navigate between his conservative superiors and a constant stream of visitors and petitioners. He was much more open-minded and liberal than many of his predecessors and colleagues. This discrepancy no doubt contributed to his dismissal from his post in April 1861, just two years after

<sup>62</sup> See Bukharev's *Tri pis'ma k N. V. Gogoliu, pisannye v 1848 godu*, St Petersburg, 1860; *O kartine Ivanova 'Iavlenie Khrista miru'*, St Petersburg, 1859; *O romane Dostoevskogo 'Prestuplenie i nakazanie' po otnosheniiu k delu mysli i nauki v Rossii*, Moscow, 1884.

<sup>63</sup> On Bukharev's prophetic promptings, engagement with the modern world and legacy, see the excellent study of Paul Valliere, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov. Orthodox Theology in a New Key*, Edinburgh, 2000, pp. 19–108.

<sup>64</sup> Bukharev's general study of the Hebrew prophetic books, *O podlinnosti i tselosti sviashchennykh knig Prorokov: Isaii, Ieremii, Iezekiilia i Daniila*, Moscow, 1864, was accompanied by a series of books on individual prophets, such as *Job* (*Sv. Iov Mnogostradal'nyi. Obozrenie ego vremeni i iskusheniia, po ego knige*, Moscow, 1864), *Isaiah* (*Sv. Prorok Isaiia. Ocherk ego vremeni, prorocheskogo sluzheniia i knigi*, Moscow, 1864), *Daniel* (*Sv. Prorok Daniil. Ocherk ego veka, prorocheskogo sluzheniia i sviashchennoi knigi*, Moscow, 1864), *Ezekiel and Jeremiah*.

<sup>65</sup> P. A. Ilinskii, 'Iz vospominanii ob Aleksandre Matveeviche Bukhareve (byvshem archimandrite Feodore)', in *Arkhimandrit Feodor (A. M. Bukharev): Pro et contra. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo arkhimandrita Feodora (Bukhareva) v otsenke russkikh myslitelei i issledovatelei. Antologiya*, ed. D. K. Burlak, St Petersburg, 1997, pp. 91–101 (pp. 95–96).

having approved Glinka's *Job*. In the following year, the Synod withdrew his work on the Apocalypse from printing and banned its publication.<sup>66</sup> As a result, in 1862 he took the drastic step of asking the Synod to strip him of his monastic status, and ended up, impoverished and silenced, without the right to publicize his views.

Glinka was extremely fortunate to benefit from the window of opportunity that opened during Feodor's short-lived tenure of the post of ecclesiastical censor. In early April, he was already excitedly despatching copies of his new book to friends. Nikitenko was one of the first to reply. He compared the fate of the poem to the extended sufferings of Job, thereby drawing a parallel between the poet and the patriarch. Regretting that his earlier efforts to help had been ineffective, he praised Glinka's unique ability to convey the miraculous beauty of biblical poetry through his mastery of the Russian language. He declared that *Job* would always remain one of the poet's best works and a treasured achievement of Russian literature. Although interests and trends had changed, the truly beautiful does not drown in the waves of the contemporary world, because it belongs not to the minute but to eternity.<sup>67</sup> Glinka thanked his friend for this 'testimonial in favour of my Job', which he planned to have bound into his book 'for remembrance and preservation'. True to his words, this copy, complete with Nikitenko's inserted letter, survives in his archive.<sup>68</sup>

The battle had been won, but at a considerable price. As Nikitenko intimated, by the late 1850s the cultural climate had changed and interest in biblical adaptations had waned. An anonymous critic writing for *Russkoe slovo* found numerous faults in the poem (its excessive length, poor versification, awkward language) and preface (its naively intimate tone and dedication). Although he then quoted three short extracts from Chapters 34 and 36 as evidence of 'sincere poetry and noble convictions', the overwhelming tone of his review was distinctly lukewarm.<sup>69</sup>

Other reviewers, with closer connections to the poet, were more encouraging. Shavrov, who had arranged for the work's publication, wrote

<sup>66</sup> *Issledovaniia Apokalipsisa*, Sergiev Posad, 1916, was eventually published with the help of Pavel Florenskii, who was entrusted with the theologian's archive by Bukharev's widow.

<sup>67</sup> A. V. Nikitenko, Letter to Glinka of 10 April 1859 (RGALI, f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 21), in Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 409–10.

<sup>68</sup> Glinka, Letter to A. V. Nikitenko of 15 April 1859, in Glinka, *Pis'ma k drugu*, p. 503. Glinka's copy of the 1859 edition of *Job* into which he glued letters and printed reviews is held in RGALI, f. 141, op. 1, ed. khr. 21. See Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, p. 512.

<sup>69</sup> [Review of] 'Iov: Svobodnoe podrazhanie Sviashchennoi Knige Iova F. Glinki', *Russkoe slovo*, 1859, no. 6, June, pp. 106–08 (2nd pag.).

a very positive piece for the religious journal he helped edit. He hailed the new poetic version of *Job* as a moral as well as literary event, capable of reviving and elevating the contemporary soul. Noting its link with the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century enthusiasm for the Bible, he hoped that it would serve not just as an echo of the past, but also as a 'bold summons to continue the service of sacred poetry'.<sup>70</sup> Another critic, M. N. Likhonin (1802–64), the son of Glinka's friend and patron, had already penned a poem in 1846, eulogizing Glinka as a 'poet-prophet' with a sacred lesson to impart to the 'lost children of the age'.<sup>71</sup> In his overwhelmingly positive review he linked the imitation to Lomonosov's ode on *Job*, compared its use of blank verse to Zhukovskii's, and promised that it would cause the forgotten poet to be remembered.<sup>72</sup>

Likhonin's assurance was fulfilled in an unexpected way. Following the presentation of a copy of *Job* to Alexander II (who remembered enjoying the poem being read out to him in his younger days), an official notice appeared in *Severnaia pchela*, announcing the tsar's pleasure at the gift and his bestowal of a diamond ring upon its author as a sign of imperial favour.<sup>73</sup> This symbolic gesture echoed the biblical ideal of a strong alliance between the ruler and the prophet and validated Glinka's contentious enterprise. In the previous year, the tsar had given similar support to another religious work of art familiar to him from his youth: he first exhibited and then agreed to purchase Ivanov's painting, 'Iavlenie Khrista narodu'.<sup>74</sup> Both works carried a message of hope for the Russian nation — the promise of redemption through faith. Ten years after the publication of Glinka's *Job*, Il'ia Repin (1844–1930) produced a powerful visual representation of the same message in his large oil painting, 'Iov i ego druz'ia' ('Job and his Friends', 1869). Although the suffering patriarch and his grieving friends dominate the foreground, a golden haze surrounds the rocky mountain that rises behind them, casting some light upon the figures, ruined building and broken tree below.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>70</sup> M. Shavrov, 'Iov i druz'ia ego', *Dukhovnaia beseda*, 1859, no. 48, pp. 333–64 (p. 334).

<sup>71</sup> For the text of Likhonin's poem, 'Poet' (25 December 1846), see Zverev, *Fedor Glinka*, pp. 78–79.

<sup>72</sup> On M. N. Likhonin's review, published in *Moskovskii vestnik*, 1859, no. 49, and Glinka's subsequent correspondence with him, see *ibid.*, pp. 411–12.

<sup>73</sup> On the announcement, published in *Severnaia pchela*, 1859, no. 137, see *ibid.*, p. 413.

<sup>74</sup> Alexander first saw the painting at an earlier stage of its development in Rome in 1838. On the imperial family's support of Ivanov's magnum opus, see Pamela Davidson, 'Aleksandr Ivanov and Nikolai Gogol': The Image and the Word in the Russian Tradition of Art as Prophecy', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 91, 2013, 2, pp. 157–209 (pp. 200–03).

<sup>75</sup> 'Iov i ego druz'ia', 1869, canvas, oil, 133 x 199, Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei, St Petersburg. Repin was given the subject as an assignment to complete during his studies at

After Glinka's imitation, the most extended literary engagement with the trials of Job was developed by Dostoevskii in his late novels. As he confessed to his wife in 1875 while working on *Podrostok* (*The Adolescent*, 1876), reading the Book of Job brought him into a state of 'painful ecstasy'; it was 'one of the first' books to make a profound impression on him when he was still a young child.<sup>76</sup> He took up its treatment of the suffering of the innocent most openly through the mouthpiece of Zosima in his final novel, *Brat'ia Karamazovy* (*The Brothers Karamazov*, 1880).

### Conclusion

The story of Glinka's *Job* is an instructive one, which reveals some of the common ground as well as the significant differences between Russian and Western approaches to literary adaptations of the Bible. On the one hand, it shows how indebted Glinka was to the post-Enlightenment view of the Hebrew Bible developed by certain German Protestant thinkers. In grounding his response to the Book of Job in personal experience, in striving to reach his own, independent understanding of the text, and in choosing to create a free imitation as a vehicle for conveying a message of national and universal import — in all these respects, Glinka was taking up the model set by Herder and his successors. This model, together with the principle of artistic freedom, enabled him to emphasize those aspects of the original which resonated with his own concerns, such as the desire to counter the fashion for literary demonism.

On the other hand, although this approach was not original, the attempt to embed it in Russian literary tradition was new and altered its nature. In Europe, a figure like Herder could harmoniously combine the roles of clergyman, Bible scholar, theologian, poet, critic and translator, without attracting negative attention from the church. In Russia, the situation was more complex. Although it was fine for a university professor like Shevyrev to echo Herder's views and translations of Job in his lectures, it was an altogether different matter to create a poetic imitation of the Book of Job. A writer seeking to follow this path was bound to encounter serious difficulties. The various parties involved — state and church, tsar and clergy, lay and ecclesiastical censors — were all competing for authority in a hotly contested sphere defined by 'ownership' of the sacred word. Caught between these conflicting agendas, Glinka was unable to satisfy everyone.

the Academy of Arts. For a reproduction, see <<http://www.virtualrm.spb.ru/ru/node/2568>> [accessed 26 May 2017].

<sup>76</sup> F. M. Dostoevskii, Letter to A. G. Dostoevskiaia of 10 (22) June 1875, in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, vol. 29/2, *Pis'ma 1875–1877*, Leningrad, 1986, p. 43.

The greatest opposition to his project came from the party which had the most to lose — the church, anxious to safeguard its authority over scripture. As a result, despite enjoying the support of close friends and influential admirers, Glinka was for many decades unable to break through the wall of resistance erected around the church by the ecclesiastical censorship.

The broader context of this conflict revolved around the following question — did Herder's approach to the Bible represent an aestheticization (and thereby debasement) of religion, or a sacralization (and thereby elevation) of the literary word? The answer to this question varied according to the background of the respondent. From the conservative point of view of the Russian Orthodox church, defended by the ecclesiastical censor, any attempt to turn sacred scripture into a literary artefact was deeply suspect. From the point of view of 'enlightened' religious laymen, such as Glinka, Shevyrev and Shavrov, returning art to the service of religion was a means of strengthening the alliance of Mary and Martha and constituted the true goal of all cultural activity.

The change of fortune in the fate of Glinka's *Job* only came about because the post of ecclesiastical censor fell into the hands of an unusual and original thinker. Bukharev's desire to build bridges between culture and religion as a means of creating a more deeply Christian society was far ahead of his time. If Glinka's perception that the previous censor had regarded his *Job* as a mosquito to be drowned was correct, then, with hindsight, his long drawn out struggle to ensure the survival of this problematic 'mosquito' marked a significant stage: it paved the way for the fundamental shift in attitudes that culminated in the Silver Age cult of religious art as a vehicle for the theurgic transformation of life itself.