I

Introduction

BOHDAN RUBCHAK

In 1925 the émigré poet Evhen Malaniuk characterized the stature of Taras Shevchenko as follows:

> Ne poet – bo tse do boliu malo,
> Ne trybun – bo tse lysh rupor mas,
> I vzhe mensh za vse – 'kobzar Taras,'
> Vin, kym zainialos i zapalalo.

He is not a poet, for that is painfully insufficient; / He is not a tribune, for that means a megaphone of the masses; / And least of all is he 'minstrel Taras,' / He, who became the spark and the conflagration.

Malaniuk's stanza synthesizes many problems affecting Shevchenko criticism and scholarship; more important, it reflects the 'cult of Shevchenko' among Ukrainians, since criticism too frequently depends on and develops cult. Malaniuk discards the image of the poet as a bull horn – an image cultivated by various socialists and communists. He negates even more vehemently the 'ikon' of Shevchenko as 'minstrel Taras,' an image promoted by the populists and their supporters in the second half of the nineteenth century. Malaniuk considers Shevchenko's significance as a poet and even as a central figure in the history of Ukrainian literature 'painfully insufficient,' regarding him as a symbol of national awakening and of the ensuing struggle of Ukrainians for independence. Malaniuk embodies this sentiment in the 'spark and conflagration' image.

The contemporary Polish poet and literary historian Czesław Miłosz

makes the following perceptive comment on the role of Polish romantic poets in shaping Polish national consciousness:

> Though Shelley called the poet a lawgiver of humanity, few people in England, we may suspect, took that claim seriously. As a consequence of national misfortunes, the reading public in Poland gave literal acceptance to a similar claim on the part of their own poets. The poet was hailed as a charismatic leader, the incarnation of the collective strivings of the people; thus, his biography, not only his work, entered the legend.[1]

When we consider the tragic history of the Ukrainian people as compared to the far easier lot of the Poles, we realize why among Ukrainians such honouring of their national poet as supporter of the right to personal and national freedom increases a hundredfold. Apart from literature, Shevchenko figures in many major works on philosophy, intellectual and social history, ethnopsychology, and in thousands of journalistic items and political propaganda.

This is not the place to describe the 'cult' of Shevchenko among Ukrainians or to speculate on its interesting psychosociological reverberations. Probably every Ukrainian who speaks the language has committed at least some lines from *Kobzar* to memory (there are many who know all of it by heart); in every Ukrainian community throughout the world his birthday is celebrated by solemn assemblies that become, particularly for emigrants, ceremonies of re-dedication to the national cause; there is hardly another poet in world literature with more monuments to his honour (in every major city of Ukraine, in Moscow, Leningrad, Paris, Rome, Washington, Cleveland, Winnipeg, Toronto, Buenos Aires, two in the state of New York) or with more towns, streets, city squares, schools, and museums named after him. Doubtless all this is crucial for the maintenance of the high level of Ukrainian national consciousness: the poet's name has become not only a symbol of the national rebirth that took place in the nineteenth century but also the incarnation of the continuity of the Ukrainian cause. However, such fame, bordering as it does on religious adulation and bearing awesome responsibility for Shevchenko's heritage, tends to overshadow his being a poet by implying the 'painful insufficiency' of such an occupation.

The 'cult of Shevchenko' tends not only to diminish but to distort his art. Indeed, his posthumous roles as 'minstrel Taras' and as the rallying

point for all sorts of revolutionaries have contributed frequently to a simplistic treatment of his best work. And since the poet's name has become synonymous with the national consciousness of his people, such distortions are by no means limited to more or less incidental well-intentioned educational or even ideological uses of his poems. Often the text of *Kobzar* has been flagrantly violated. Most such violations occur in Soviet editions of Shevchenko's works: for example, in the lines 'Za shcho skorodyly spysamy / moskovski rebra' (Why did we rake with our spears / the ribs of Muscovites), the adjective 'moskovski' is frequently changed to 'tatarski' (of the Tatars). During the Nazi occupation of Ukraine, the publishing of Shevchenko was predicated upon the soft-pedaling of his numerous unkind references to the Germans; and so, *nimota* (a pejorative word for Germans) had to be changed to *holota* (the rabble). Less frequently, such censorship has been imposed from within. As a result of clerical pressure, for instance, the line 'Ia ne znaiu Boha' (I do not know God) was changed in an 1870s popular edition of *Kobzar* to 'Ia vzhe znaiu Boha' (I already know God).

The most glaring distortions of Shevchenko's heritage have resulted from the tragic division of the Ukrainians into Soviet and western 'camps,' which Soviets characteristically call 'the struggle for Shevchenko.' Such a 'struggle' over the work of a man whose most cherished dream was to see a united and strong Ukrainian nation is both grotesque and profoundly sad; it is made sadder still by its historical inevitability. Although it began in the first years of the Soviet rule in Ukraine, since the early 1930s Soviet ideologues have been intensifying it by thoroughly 'remodeling' the poet. In their hands he has turned into a grateful house guest of Russian culture, a servile imitator of Russian poetry, and particularly a 'megaphone' for the political ideas of the 'revolutionary democrats' Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, and even the chauvinist Belinsky, who repeatedly attempted to undercut the poet's greatness. Needless to say, the mental acrobatics required for such a feat are spectacular indeed; they are more intricate than recent attempts to turn Dostoevsky into a 'revolutionary democrat,' since the question of Ukraine's independence obviously becomes central in Shevchenko's case. In their zeal to defend the poet's heritage, some critics from the Western camp have also been guilty of oversimplification and even distortion. It is, of course, Shevchenko's art that suffers most: *Kobzar* frequently ceases to be a living text and becomes an object of prejudiced

commentary or fanciful political improvisation, palmed off as literary interpretation.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for the Ukrainian-born commentator to 'see Shevchenko whole': the various 'uses' of the poet's work, layer upon layer of misreading, and also the veneration in which the nation holds it, inhibit him not only intellectually but also emotionally. The freedom with which some early critics treated Shevchenko is enviable, since he has now become a gilded idol, discouraging easy familiarity. Although every line of his poetry is closer than ever to the Ukrainian mentality, the totality of his life and work recedes. An alarming symptom of this is that in our time it has become a national duty to revere Shevchenko: to my knowledge, only the controversial émigré critic Ihor Kostetsky dares to express reservations about his art. As I will show later, such dissenting opinions were by no means so rare in the past.

This volume, therefore, becomes particularly important, and not only for the obvious reason of promoting the significance of Shevchenko in the Western world. The individual selections afford the reader various aspects of Shevchenko criticism: the biographical, sociological, historical, comparative, archetypal, philological, formalist, thematic structural, and phenomenological. Responsible examples of the 'ideological' approach have not been ignored, and both sides of the 'struggle' are represented. Some articles, moreover, provide an imaginatively illuminated background for Shevchenko's person and *persona*. The chronological arrangement of the pieces by itself demonstrates the continuity of Shevchenko criticism from one decade to the next, together with the various triumphs and pitfalls of its career. What is perhaps most interesting in the editor's catholic selection are the metamorphoses Shevchenko's image has undergone in the Ukrainian consciousness from one generation to the next. And since Shevchenko is not only historically linked with the Ukrainian consciousness but becomes its externalized, embodied symbol, this volume may also be read as an informal history of the progress of modern Ukrainian consciousness itself, of which literature has always been a vital part.

The 'struggle for Shevchenko' seems to have begun during the poet's own lifetime, its main outlines occasionally emerging in the earliest reviews of his poetry. The difficulties reviewers experienced with the startling phenomenon of the first *Kobzar*, published in 1840, and the publication of *Hamaliia* and *Haidamaky*, appear to have stemmed from the dichotomy

between the national and the social significance of his poetry: was Shevchenko a defender of the oppressed across national borders, or was he a champion of Ukrainian interests across the social strata of his nation? For Russian reviewers, *Kobzar* and the early poems often involved the question of the very existence of the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainian people as an ethnic entity. Even if some of them recognized the existence of Ukraine, they asked whether or not the 'peasant dialect' in which the poet wrote was suitable as a vehicle of literature. The ugly implication here was that it should never be allowed to become such a vehicle, since the political potential of any linguistic entity is incalculable. That implication became overt by 1876, when, largely as a result of Shevchenko's tremendous posthumous influence, Ukrainian culture became so threatening to the Empire that all public expressions of it had to be banned by imperial decree. Finally, even if Ukrainian were admitted to the status of a literary language, the next question was to what degree the nascent Ukrainian literature was dependent upon the Russian. There was no doubt about the answer in the minds of most Russian reviewers: in their chauvinistic blindness to Shevchenko's genius, even the friendliest among them thought that they paid him a high compliment by comparing him with the minor Russian 'folk poets' Koltsov and Nikitin.

The Russian attitude to the Ukrainian language and literature, catalysed by the appearance of Shevchenko's early work, cannot be charted according to political affiliation. The conservative journal *Maiak*, for instance, defended the maturity of the language as a vehicle for serious literature, while in this volume Viktor Swoboda reports on the proto-fascist stand of the radical Belinsky on that issue. The conservative journals *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* and *Syn otechestva* sneered at Shevchenko and the idea of Ukrainian literature, while Chernyshevsky, citing the example of Shevchenko, defended it and even went so far as to claim that it was now ready to wean itself from Russian tutelage. True, Chernyshevsky was writing in 1861, when Shevchenko's message became clearer than it had been in the 1840s and 1850s. Soviet critics attempt to convince us that at that time, had he been alive, Belinsky, too, would have supported the poet's legacy. This is doubtful, however: the clever Belinsky simply saw earlier than his cohorts that Shevchenko would be useless for any Russian revolutionary cause.

It was Shevchenko's Russian friend and translator, the poet Aleksei Pleshcheev, who was the first to recognize his true stature. In the following

comment of 1860, Pleshcheev incidentally throws light on the Russian attitude toward Ukrainian culture of earlier decades:

> The high degree of excellence of Shevchenko's poetical works serves as a plain negation of the opinion, prevalent in our literature ten or twenty years ago, that the Little Russian [Ukrainian] language is not capable of further development and that the Little Russian environment cannot yield themes for literary works. Notice how this language, which was then regarded as provincial, has fully developed under Shevchenko's pen and how the Little Russian poet, remaining a part of his people and accessible to the common folk, could nevertheless incorporate in his poetry elements of universal human concerns.[2]

We see in this quotation how the specific question of Shevchenko's *narodnist* still blinded the vision of the well-disposed Pleshcheev: as Hrinchenko and others were to insist towards the end of the century, it is quite doubtful that Shevchenko's greatest poems are so easily accessible to the common folk. But the image of 'minstrel Taras' already loomed large in Shevchenko's own lifetime. The history of that image, even in its origins, is extremely complex, since it was used by various groups for quite different purposes. Some unfriendly Russians, together with reactionary Ukrainians, insisted that Ukrainian literature, including that by Shevchenko, is too weak to transcend the geographical and spiritual borders of the 'Little Russian provinces' and therefore is fated, like the folk song or the proverb, to remain an instrument 'of household use.' Some Russian reactionaries simply laughed at Shevchenko's work as the babbling of a slightly demented peasant. Slavophile conservatives, on the other hand, did not look upon Shevchenko's *narodnist* as a drawback. Treating the poet like some 'primitive' or *fauve* artist, they saw him as an intuitive bard of the mystical Slavic ethos. The more extreme among them began to believe that he was something of a *iurodyvyi*, a 'holy fool,' whose 'folk poems' were inspired by the mystical energy of the Slavic spirit or even of the Slavic Christ.

Most westernizing radicals and liberals, such as Dobroliubov or Pypin, shared the view that Shevchenko was far from ready for Petersburg fame. What appealed to them in his work, however, was his passionate concern for social justice. Even when the friendly critic Chernyshevsky in passing compares Shevchenko to Pushkin and Mickiewicz, he does so only on the

basis of the revolutionary fervour of their poetry. Some of the Russian radicals realized that the conservatives' minstrel Taras image deliberately diminishes Shevchenko's significance as a protestant against the throne; it was, therefore, in their political interest to demolish that image. This, of course, implied its neutralization as a symbol of Ukrainian patriotism. Thus the image of Shevchenko as a 'tribune' or 'megaphone of the masses' slowly took shape.

The prevalent attitude of Ukrainians towards Shevchenko, from the beginning, was unabashed adulation: after all, he miraculously concretized their most daring dreams of cultural, if not political, rebirth. It was the intellectuals Panteleimon Kulish and Mykola Kostomarov who initially shaped Shevchenko's image as a *Ukrainian* poet. Included in this volume is an excellent article by Mykhailo Mohyliansky, dealing with Kulish's difficult emotional attitude to the poet's person and heritage; Mohyliansky, Iefremov, and Miiakovsky, moreover, give us an interesting composite portrait of Kostomarov.

It was in the interest of early Ukrainian critics to preserve and cultivate the image of minstrel Taras. To begin with, Kulish, Kostomarov, and other Ukrainian intellectuals of the time were not eager to join the Russian radical movement. They saw their primary task as the 'education' of the Ukrainian masses and the raising of the national consciousness of illiterate serfs and the demoralized gentry, without which calls to revolution would be nothing but noise. Moreover, even the most innocent signs of a national movement within the Empire would have been stopped immediately by the tsarist police (note the fate of the fairly meek Brotherhood of Sts Cyril and Methodius, described by Miiakovsky). Finally, neither Kulish nor Kostomarov were revolutionaries by temperament or conviction: both Mohyliansky's and Miiakovsky's articles elucidate their political views. Hence the minstrel Taras image, together with its would-be accessibility and simplicity, had the double advantage of being good strategic camouflage and an excellent educational tool. It goes without saying that the Russian version of that image had to be drastically altered.

The 'peasant class,' of which some Russians regarded Shevchenko as the bard, was limited by Ukrainian critics to Ukrainian villagers: intimations of 'all-Russian' peasant messianism were gently pushed out. While thus defined horizontally, the 'peasant stratum' was expanded vertically both upwards and downwards. By 'upwards' I mean that all Ukrainian social

strata were implicitly included in it: Ukraine was an agricultural country, the great majority of its people were tied, more or less directly, to the soil, and to be a man of the land was a matter of pride, rather than cause for embarrassment. Kulish made a point of putting the Ukrainian country gentry at the centre of Ukrainian culture, while Kostomarov claimed that urban culture and an 'intelligentsia' are foreign to the spirit of Ukraine. By 'downwards' I mean that the idea of 'folk culture' was implanted as it had never been before. Borrowing from the theories of nationality developed by the German romantics, Kulish and Kostomarov insisted that within the words of Ukrainian folk songs, folk tales, and other collective literature were the seeds of a noble, peace-loving, and idealistic national ethos, as opposed to its dark, gloomy, and basically immoral Russian counterpart. Kulish bluntly stated that contacts between Russian and Ukrainian culture were detrimental to the latter. Thus, the image of minstrel Taras acquired in its Ukrainian interpretation the stature of an incarnation of the Ukrainian spirit. Although Ukrainian critics of that time were still psychologically unprepared to confront Malaniuk's image of Shevchenko as 'the spark and the conflagration,' the subtle implications of such a possibility exist in their work.

Kulish and Kostomarov knew and respected Western art and thought. Hence in their view Shevchenko's minstrel Taras image did not preclude his participation in the highest activities of the human spirit, including Western culture. In purely romantic, proto-Hegelian terms Kulish claimed that the poet's genius reached the highest cultural plateaus common to all mankind through his unique and ineffable national soul, as interpreted by his unique personality. It is, indeed, possible to claim that Shevchenko himself 'transformed' Western romantic themes into Ukrainian 'peasant' terms (as Franko, Fylypovych, Schneider, and Pliushch show in this volume), in order to restore them to the common spiritual treasury of humanity. Kulish insisted that since Shevchenko had shown how Ukrainian literature was fed by folk poetry, which incarnates the Ukrainian spirit, and conveyed its energies into his own poetry, Ukrainian literature would henceforth have no need for foreign literary models: although Ukrainians would continue to read and respect Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Byron, and Schiller, they would find it unnecessary to imitate them. Even more important, Ukrainian literature would rid itself of its direct dependence upon the Russian, which had been more harmful than beneficial.

Kulish's seemingly anti-intellectual attack on bookish 'academism,' echoing Shevchenko's own 'Epistle,' implies criticism of Ukrainian intellectuals' slavish devotion to everything foreign, especially Russian, at the expense of their own national roots. Only in the villages and country estates, unsullied by imperialistic cultural influences, could one enjoy direct contact with the healthful national currents of energy that produced people 'noble in spirit, pure of heart, dignified, of high repute.' Kulish is not so just, however, when he inveighs against the Ukrainian literature of the baroque, which he despised for lacking the inspiration of the nation's collective genius, and for being expressed in antiquated, bookish language: he fails to see the tremendous influence of folk literature upon these works. Furthermore, Kulish's attack on Kotliarevsky for 'having made our simple life and wise customs seem like a refuse heap outside the door of the gentry' has been challenged by most twentieth-century literary historians. What Kulish and Shevchenko himself found lacking in the ironic Kotliarevsky is precisely that idealistic transmutation and elevation of folk material by individual genius which is so important for any romantic poet, particularly for a Ukrainian romantic poet. Moreover, Kotliarevsky seems even now a rather supercilious mocker of Ukrainian village ways.[3]

If Shevchenko did not yet symbolize the 'conflagration' of the Ukrainian spirit in the decades following his death, he certainly was its 'spark.' His life and work raised many Ukrainians' awareness of their place in their nation and their responsibilities towards it: the old-fashioned patronizing attitude towards Ukrainian culture among older Ukrainian writers like Kotliarevsky – writers who, as it were, experimented with the 'alternative possibilities' of Ukrainian – was no longer morally viable. Although the way towards the rebirth of Ukrainian consciousness had been indicated vaguely by the early romantics, Shevchenko's own radical choices forced many of his compatriots into crucial decisions about their own lives.

Russian reaction sharpened correspondingly. What a few years before had seemed to the government like a more or less interesting ethnic experiment now became something considerably more threatening, more difficult to understand and therefore to control. Thus, the question of the existence, let alone the efficacy, of Ukrainian as a language was taken out of the hands of contributors to the Russian 'thick journals' and was turned

over to the police. In 1863 the Minister of the Interior, Piotr Valuev, assured the throne in a secret circular that the Ukrainian language had never existed, did not exist, and would never exist; in 1876 Tsar Alexander II himself signed a decree in which he pronounced the publishing of Ukrainian books a state crime (with the exception of some *belles-lettres*), the production of plays and concerts in Ukrainian, any form of instruction in the language, and related activities. Much Ukrainian intellectual life, as a consequence, shifted to Western Ukraine (then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire) where the attitude towards 'ethnic groups' was much more civilized than in the Russian Empire, and also to various émigré centres in Western Europe. Writers who remained in Russian-occupied Ukrainian territories clandestinely sent their manuscripts beyond the western border, and printed books found their way, illegally, into Ukraine.

Encouraged by such harsh administrative measures, reactionary Russian intellectuals increased their vitriolic attacks on Shevchenko. Important people in the literary establishment such as Katkov and Miliukov denied any possible value of *Kobzar* or of Ukrainian literature in general. Hacks drew caricatures of the poet in their would-be novels, and someone called Veinberg even dared to besmirch his illness and death with malicious lies. The Russians were assisted in such smear campaigns by the assorted Sokovenkos, Khanenkos, and other 'Little Russian' servants of the Empire. The Russian poet and critic Apollon Grigoriev rather weakly defended Shevchenko's heritage, writing that at times his talent equalled and even surpassed that of Pushkin and Mickiewicz, but that in its totality his work belonged in the category of folk art, rather than with the great poetry in the 'European' sense. Shevchenko's sometime friend Nikolai Leskov admitted the poet's great talent but attacked his 'disloyal' anti-Russian sentiments. In the 1880s the literary historian Aleksandr Pypin, who earlier had doubted the importance of Ukrainian literature, defended Shevchenko, claiming that he combined the sentiments and the language of his people with the highest humanistic ideals. S. Shashkov unreservedly compared Shevchenko with great Russian poets like Pushkin and Lermontov, and towards the end of the century the scholar D. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky compared some of Shevchenko's lyrical poetry with that of Goethe, Schiller, and Heine.

Immediately after Shevchenko's death, Ukrainians began to search for his unknown poems and for documents pertaining to his life, to assemble

bibliographical data, to research names, dates, and events mentioned in his diary. Although by the beginning of the 1870s almost all of Shevchenko's manuscripts had been found, the first scholarly edition of *Kobzar*, edited by Viktor Domanytsky, was published as late as 1907. Only towards the end of the last century and the beginning of the twentieth were Ukrainian scholars ready to write serious scholarly studies on Shevchenko's work.

In the 1870s and the 1880s Ukrainians continued to do research, and to develop definitions of – or rather, approaches to – Shevchenko. His posthumous progress from a folk poet through a people's poet to a national poet and founder of a national literature was charted again and again, with increasing impact and on occasion, with increasing impatience and exaggeration. Sumtsov, for example, brilliantly demonstrated how Shevchenko's poetry incorporates foreign themes and motifs. Following the romantics, Sumtsov considered that capability an inner energy of *narodnist*, as differentiated from incidental 'outward' borrowings of themes, images, or rhythms from folk poetry. Iakovenko compared Shevchenko with Shakespeare on the basis that both embodied the spirit of their nations in every line that they wrote. In Ukrainian literature itself, the 1870s and 1880s were marked by countless imitations of Shevchenko's poetry; such imitations, in fact, became detrimental to the literary process of that time.

Parallel to such activities, as early as the 1870s new attitudes towards Shevchenko were taking shape. The literary scene then was under the spell of the political theorist Mykhailo Drahomanov; in the words of a contemporary critic, all threads of Ukrainian public life came together in his hand. Drahomanov, influenced by nineteenth-century French socialists, envisioned Ukraine as part of a community separated from the rest of the world only by ethnic and cultural differences; there were to be no borders and eventually no governments. Ukraine, like every other country, would be divided into self-sufficient and self-governing communities. An intellectual heir of the French Enlightenment, as his teachers had been, Drahomanov believed in the power of education to transform 'irrational' acts of violence and oppression into 'rational,' productive, planned activity. In his numerous articles on the mission of Ukrainian literature, he defined literature as the most eloquent instrument of 'scientific' education in the principles of liberty and equality. In its maturity, which Drahomanov put into the distant future, Ukrainian literature would be 'national in form and universal in content.' Deeply rooted in the language and culture of the

people, it would 'reach with its uppermost boughs the sky of reason,' which for Drahomanov meant the highest ideals of social justice.

Drahomanov's friend Fedir Vovk, a noted ethnographer who wrote literary criticism under the pseudonym of Sirko, in 1878 sent a long article on Shevchenko to the journal *Hromada*, which Drahomanov was then editing in Geneva. Evidently Vovk attempted to interpret the poet according to Drahomanov's own formula, although a dangerous admixture of Marx, Drahomanov's formidable adversary, cannot be missed in his article. Vovk interpreted Shevchenko as an atheistic rationalist, an enemy of institutions such as marriage and government, a believer in a depoliticized Ukraine in close federation with neighbouring nations, and in economic matters a radical socialist. Finally, he believed *Kobzar* to be a clarion call to revolution. Drahomanov published Vovk's article but followed it with his own angry rebuttal, excerpts of which are in this volume. It is obvious, incidentally, that his controversy with Vovk covertly challenges views from the diametrically opposite ideological camp, namely Kulish's opinions on Shevchenko.

Drahomanov's impatient attack not only on Shevchenko's 'cult' but on the poet's person and work has little intrinsic value for our time. Iurii Lavrynenko justly remarks: 'Sensible and interesting when condemning the cult, Drahomanov becomes a boring, pompous doctrinaire when he attempts to diminish the stature of the poet.'[4] Also, one cannot help agreeing with Pavlo Fylypovych's statement that only Drahomanov's claim that the poet is a product of his environment has some significance.[5] And Ivan Franko wrote as early as 1906 that all his life Drahomanov failed to see Shevchenko's value beyond the framework of serfdom and peasant freedom.[6] Drahomanov, who considers literature only as a vehicle for social philosophy or political indoctrination, simply does not imagine the indirect but nevertheless tremendous political impact of a genius like Shevchenko and, more important, the *modus operandi* of such an individual. This is obvious when, in the censorious tones of a schoolteacher, Drahomanov chastises the poet for not having read Saint-Simon. And when he writes about 'Son' (The Dream) – surely one of the greatest satirical poems in world literature – that 'it is even pitiful to witness the childish ineptitude with which the poet dealt with living people and scenes from real life,' we tend to pity Drahomanov's own childish ineptitude face-to-face with a work of art.

Yet the inclusion of the Drahomanov material in this volume is appropriate for several reasons. It points out some Ukrainians' readiness not only

to promote an image of Shevchenko in direct opposition to that of minstrel Taras, as Vovk did, but also thoroughly negates this new image. This shows a degree of intellectual freedom far beyond the narrow-minded wholesale rejection of Shevchenko by the majority of Russian critics on the one hand, and on the other the strait-jacketed thinking about the poet in today's Soviet Ukraine. Drahomanov's excerpts, furthermore, suggest a desire on the part of Ukrainians to reconstruct their country as a modern and Western nation, in which the fetish of Shevchenko stands in the way of progress. The Drahomanov selection, in short, tells us more about the critic's own intellectual climate than about Shevchenko's work. It is interesting that in 1906 Kost Arabazhyn, a follower of Drahomanov and subsequently a Marxist, continued to argue that *Kobzar* is an ineffectual pointer 'to a true path leading onto the highway of progress towards freedom.'[7] Arabazhyn, however, hastened to emphasize that no poetry should be expected to perform such tasks. In the thirty years dividing Drahomanov's and Arabazhyn's articles, Ukrainian critics (even those dedicated to the sociological mode of literary interpretation) learned much, not only about Shevchenko's poetry but about the nature of literature.

Many lessons also had to be learned in regard to Shevchenko's frequent, and frequently self-contradictory, poetic interpretations of historical themes. His deeply concerned and yet disturbingly shifting attitudes towards the Zaporozhian cossacks, the mainland Hetmanate, and the revolts of the later haidamaks obviously bore directly upon the self-definition of the Ukrainian people. Notice in Kulish's articles, his interest in Shevchenko's historical views. As Mohyliansky shows, it is precisely that problem which kept Kulish changing his mind about Shevchenko's work. Notice also how disturbed Drahomanov was by Shevchenko's 'historiography.' In such impassioned comments is an intriguing trend, symptomatic both of Shevchenko's tremendous reputation and of the intellectual climate in which nineteenth-century critics worked: most of them took Shevchenko's views on history literally, as if the poet were engaged in scholarly research, instead of art. It was Volodymyr Antonovych, a talented historian and activist, who attempted to put Shevchenko's 'historiography' in perspective. His article in this volume is also important as an indirect refutation of Drahomanov's views on Shevchenko.

Antonovych begins with a careful summary of the romantic definition of the historical poem as a sub-genre, subsequently combining that definition with the minstrel Taras image. Following Antonovych's argument, it is not

difficult to construct a model of Shevchenko's 'historiography' as a post-romantic critic would see it. The individual genius of the poet unconsciously intuits the deep strata of the collective national psyche, hidden from the scholar's lucid scrutiny. The poetic synthesis of disparate fragments from such strata in language is equally intuitive. In his metaphors, therefore, the poet embodies the essence or the idea of an epoch that is veiled from other modes of perception. Antonovych warns that in authentic poetry, factual accuracy must give way to such a synthesized or metaphorical image of the epoch: all aspects of that image will organically belong to it and therefore will seem mimetically 'right' or 'possible' as history. Hence, although a scholar has little trouble spotting many factual errors or instances of deliberate reshaping of historical material in Shevchenko's work, it would be superfluous pedantry to enumerate them, since Shevchenko's vision, in its metaphorical embodiment, is consistently faithful to the spirit of historical reality. Shevchenko's self-contradictions, furthermore, should be understood as instances of the dialectical movement within the total synthesis of the poet's specific vision of Ukraine, as intuited by his genius and as it restlessly grows with his own artistic development.

At their best, countless subsequent scholarly commentaries on Shevchenko's historical poems have either usefully elucidated historical sources, events, and people to which the poet alludes, or, following Antonovych, have interpreted such works primarily as artistic embodiments of historical themes. One of the best examples of the former procedure is the archaeologist Dmytro Iiavornytsky's seminal article on the Cossacks' and haidamaks' way of life compared to Shevchenko's treatment of them.[8] As to the interpretations of historical poems in terms of art, only in rare instances do critics avoid the various traps that history conceals for the literary interpreter. In the main, Shevchenko's historical poems, perhaps more than any other thematic group, have provided both Soviet and Western commentators with excuses for more or less clever ideological harangues.

The central star in the firmament of pre-revolutionary Shevchenko criticism is Ivan Franko. There is something symbolic in the fact that the second greatest poet in Ukrainian literature, and object of a cult of his own, became one of the most important interpreters of the greatest Ukrainian poet. On his tortuous road from early fascination with Drahomanov and Marx to a much profounder and broader humanism in his

later years, Franko used Shevchenko as a guideline as well as a point of resistance. The latter term, incidentally, has some interesting implications, since there is occasional competition with 'father Taras' both in Franko's critical writings (we see this in the very fact of his almost obsessive interest in *Kobzar*) and in his own poetry: a study of 'misprision,' à la Harold Bloom, simply begs to be written on that subject.

In Franko's prodigious output are over sixty prose pieces on Shevchenko, in Ukrainian, Polish, German, English, and Russian. He also dedicated some poems to Shevchenko's memory, in which his emotional difficulties with the master are even more obvious than in the articles; moreover, numerous incidental references to Shevchenko are scattered throughout his gigantic *œuvre*. In the critical and scholarly works are several thematic and methodological directions: meditations on Shevchenko's philosophy, discussions of his political and ideological significance, thematic interpretations, harsh comments on contemporary Shevchenko criticism and scholarship, formal analyses, close textual readings of single works, and a number of comparative studies. In the last group are articles on the relationship of *Kobzar* to mythology and folklore, classical literature, and Western European and Slavic (particularly Polish) romanticism.

Throughout his career, which was marked by ideological and philosophical shifts and adjustments and always conditioned by his highly tuned emotional nature, Franko seemed to have touched upon all four symbols of Shevchenko named by Malaniuk. In his early youth, under the influence of the cult, he committed most of *Kobzar* to memory. He began his career as a writer under the influence of Drahomanov and Marx, and consequently ignored Shevchenko altogether. In the early 1880s he addressed Shevchenko as the 'megaphone of the masses,' whose greatest value was in unmasking the Russian tyranny over the Ukrainian peasants. That attitude was soon replaced by the image of minstrel Taras, evident in several important studies on the influence on Shevchenko of Ukrainian folklore and mythology. As for political and ideological interpretations of Shevchenko's poetry in Franko's late criticism, he was the first to speak openly and courageously of Shevchenko's role as a 'spark and conflagration,' of the poet's decisive influence not only on the ethnic and cultural self-awareness of Ukrainians but on their struggle for unconditional political independence from all oppressors.

It is Shevchenko's fourth image, that of poet, that Franko developed most consistently. He certainly would not have agreed with Malaniuk that to call Shevchenko a poet is 'painfully insufficient.' To place *Kobzar* beside the great masterpieces of world literature, where it belongs, meant to see Ukraine itself 'in the circle of free nations': to prove Shevchenko's great worth as a poet in itself would support his image as spark and conflagration in Franko's thoroughly modern vision of the Ukrainian nation. In the essay included in this volume, although Franko mentions the importance of minstrels (kobzars) in Shevchenko's work, the image of minstrel Taras as such is undermined by his just opposition between the collective spirit of folk art and the romantic poet's powerful individuality. As could be expected, cultists of the minstrel Taras ikon immediately reacted in patriotic vituperation against Franko's 'internationalization' of the singer Perebendia.

In the first years of the twentieth century the two images of Shevchenko suggested in Franko's mature criticism, of spark and conflagration and of poet, were maintained by younger critics. The uncertain period in which Ukraine was defined merely as a cultural and ethnic entity was definitely over: poets, political thinkers, and civic leaders began to speak more openly of Ukraine's future as an independent state. Shevchenko's name, of course, symbolized such unreservedly nationalistic sentiments. Borys Hrinchenko's contribution to this collection is a rather mild example of that new revolutionary stance. This article, and his other critical pieces on Shevchenko, are in the tradition of Kulish, although that tradition is revised almost beyond recognition. Hrinchenko agreed with Kulish that Shevchenko was a national poet, rather than an advocate of a single social class. But he doubted Kulish's assertion that a peasant, unaided, could understand *Kobzar*: Shevchenko was a poet of the intelligentsia, since he wrote primarily for its members, attempting to convert them from being lackeys of foreigners to proud members of their own nation. Furthermore, Hrinchenko, like Franko, understood that Shevchenko's spark and conflagration image was based upon his greatness as a verbal artist. He therefore castigated patriots who limited their view of the poet to his political message. No wonder Hrinchenko's views on Shevchenko, like those of the mature Franko, had many opponents among Ukrainian activists. The article in this volume was attacked particularly vehemently by the younger and very talented short story writer Stepan Vasylchenko, who

resented Hrinchenko's reformed and modernized populist views and defended Shevchenko's 'classical' image as minstrel Taras.

Concurrent with Ukrainians' heightened awareness of the significance of their nation as a modern political entity, and the increasing importance of the intelligentsia in that new ideological climate, there was at the very end of the nineteenth and the first fifteen years of the twentieth centuries a radical modernization of Ukrainian literature. Lesia Ukrainka, Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky, Mykhailo Iatskiv, Vasyl Stefanyk, Marko Cheremshyna, Olha Kobylianska, Hnat Khotkevych, and other talented representatives of modern Ukrainian prose embodied themes from the life of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and peasantry in a 'modernist,' sometimes experimental, idiom, meant exclusively for the educated reader. Like Ukrainian writers of any generation, they found it necessary to discuss the significance of Shevchenko in Ukrainian literature as a whole and in their own work in particular. Short pieces on Shevchenko by Kotsiubynsky, Stefanyk, and Cheremshyna are particularly interesting in this respect.

In the second decade of the twentieth century, even more extreme modernists appeared on the scene. Although their careers were short-lived, they nevertheless left behind a modest but interesting body of work, impressive in its earnest attempts to introduce into Ukrainian literature the tradition of the anti-traditional. The groups Ukrainska Khata (The Ukrainian House), later Dzvin (The Bell), and the Futurists (who lasted until the beginning of the 1930s and were destroyed in Stalin's purges) in Russian-occupied Ukraine, and Moloda Muza (The Young Muse) in Western Ukraine worshipped 'art for art's sake' and proclaimed the independence of literature from social concerns. One can imagine how they were received among civic-minded Ukrainian intellectuals, let alone the common reader: it was the essentially modernist older writers Franko and Ukrainka who became their most dangerous, because the most erudite, adversaries.

Those writers too found it unavoidable to take a stand on Shevchenko. Mykyta Shapoval, leader of Ukrainska Khata and editor of the journal by that name, who wrote under the pseudonym Sribliansky, simply negated any influence by Shevchenko and other nineteenth-century Ukrainian writers on modern times. A follower of Nietzsche, Shapoval claimed that Shevchenko's poetry was too weak, too tear-stained, and too provincial to announce the coming of the new Ukrainian personality, the new Ukrainian

political community, and the new Ukrainian culture. Shevchenko's 'ethnographism' had been standing in the way of a truly modern and virile literature long enough; it must be removed.

Similar ideas, but without Nietzsche or politics, were expressed by the leader of the futurists, Mykhailo Semenko. A bitter enemy of Ukrainska Khata and other pre-symbolist groups, Semenko could not understand why Shapoval should reject Shevchenko to begin with, since his poetry was as boring and inconsequential as that of Ukrainska Khata itself. Admitting that Shevchenko was innovative for his time (all of his modernist opponents conceded that), Semenko claimed that now his place was in academic reports and certainly not as a cult figure in twentieth-century Ukraine. In a sarcastic gesture, the futurist leader called his own collection of experimental poetry *Kobzar*.

Most 'modernists,' however, immediately accepted Shevchenko. For example, Sydir Tverdokhlib, member of Moloda Muza and one of the most experimental prose writers of his time, made accomplished Polish translations of his poetry. They even proclaimed him a precursor of their own revolution in art, just as the Poles interpreted Norwid, the Czechs Macha, the Germans Hölderlin, the French some of Hugo's poetry and later that of Isidore Ducasse, Allen Ginsberg, and William Blake. The futurist Geo Shkurupii even wrote a programmatic poem, welcoming Shevchenko into the ranks of his group.

Doubtless, such reconciliation with Shevchenko is the purpose of Mykola Ievshan's thoughtful article in this volume. His other purpose, surely, is to stem the irresponsible pronouncements by Shapoval and other modernists. Ievshan, whose real name was Mykola Fediushka, produced in his relatively short life an impressive body of criticism, some of it collected in his book with the ironic, politically provocative title *Pid praporom mystetstva* (Under the Flag of Art, 1910) and the rest scattered in many contemporary journals. Although Ievshan himself was a Western Ukrainian, he did not like the passive, melancholy, 'decadent' poses that members of the Western Ukrainian group Moloda Muza kept trying out: influenced by Nietzsche but also an active Christian, he preferred the doctrine of 'strong individuality' preached by Shapoval and other members of the group around the journal *Ukrainska Khata*. In his criticism, however, Ievshan did not particularly promote that ideology; his main concern was the examination of psychological motivations of writers, as reflected in literary forms.

The motives of the article reprinted here are delicately understated. It begins with praise of Kulish: his poetry is intellectual, tough, the work of a willed individual who clearly foresees the future of his nation. Needless to say, this is precisely how most Ukrainians would characterize Shevchenko's poetry. Ievshan, however, refuses to characterize him thus: as Drahomanov negated Shevchenko as a socialist and as Richytsky, some years later, negated him as a 'Red proletarian' – Ievshan here negates him as a voluntaristic superman. By this subtle manœuver, he indirectly attacks the cult of Shevchenko among Ukrainians that Kulish himself helped to found, and, almost by the way, dismisses Shevchenko's interpreters and detractors who followed the Drahomanov line.

Even more surprisingly, next step, Ievshan returns Shevchenko to his minstrel Taras image: how else are we to understand the statement that 'manipulation of aesthetic qualities ... constitutes the similarity between his poetry and the folk song.' Following the stress on intuition in the Western and Polish theories of literature around 1910, Ievshan takes this step in order to proclaim the primacy of the unconscious in Shevchenko, and to go on to describe him as an authentic genius. Having nothing to do with philosophy or even rational thought, where he is singularly helpless, Shevchenko is a true genius because, like the folk singer, he relies exclusively on the highest and lowest registers of human consciousness where language meets the ineffable. (Ievshan here seems to forget Franko's significant distinction between the collective consciousness of folk literature and the individuality of a romantic poet.) As a true poet in the modernist – specifically symbolist – tradition, Shevchenko is inspired exclusively by the present and therefore by the pure lyrical principle (in the fashion current at the beginning of the century, the epic mode was the genre of the past, the lyric of the present, and the dramatic of the future). The lyrical nature of Shevchenko's *œuvre* is supported by the fact that no matter how many themes the poet may tackle in his work, the only successful subjects are himself, his self-confessions, and his inexpressible yearning for the most distant horizons of his own existence. Ephemeral as emotion itself, his world view changes from one poem to the next; hence he cannot be trusted as an ideological leader. Having thus drawn dangerously near to Drahomanov's opinions of Shevchenko's poetry, but for diametrically opposite reasons, Ievshan does not even bother to state his conclusion, that we should save ideological interpretations for the work of uninspired but wilful

Salieris like Kulish, and read Shevchenko as a fierce artist who ultimately wrote not for the sake of content, but for the sake of pure expression or, in short, art.

Doubtless no serious reader of Shevchenko would agree wholly with Ievshan's conception of *Kobzar*. There is equally little doubt, however, that he ably characterizes a single strain of Shevchenko's genius – the lyrical strain – and that he thus adds an important trait to the composite portrait of the poet presented by this volume. The article is also important as a document of its time. It is, after all, an alternative to prevalent Shevchenko criticism and also an ingenious way of wrestling with the giant which, I believe, is a secret wish of quite a few Shevchenko critics.

In his study *Iz sekretiv poetychnoi tvorchosty* (Some Secrets of Poetic Creativity, 1898), devoted in the main to comments on Shevchenko's creative process and the formal aspects of his poetry, Franko makes some interesting observations on the role of the unconscious in the poet's work. Ievshan's contribution is obviously grounded in speculations on the activity of the unconscious in creativity. The most important, and, in fact, the only sustained study of Shevchenko's unconscious to date, written from a moderately Freudian but heavily Christianized point of view, is Stepan Balei's *Z psykhologii tvorchosti Shevchenka* (From the Psychology of Shevchenko's Work, 1916). Although on the whole somewhat superficial, it contains many valuable and exciting observations, particularly in confrontation with the monumental and hardly human effigy of Shevchenko on which most contemporary Ukrainians have been brought up. It is interesting that not the poet's person but the text is 'psychoanalysed,' and references to Shevchenko's biography are rarely made: rather, the 'blindness' of his reason is contrasted with the 'insight' of his psyche on the basis of comparisons of images and poetic statements from *Kobzar*.

Whereas Franko, Ievshan, and later Balei concentrate on Shevchenko's individual psyche, Kornei Chukovsky, an important Russian critic and talented translator of Shevchenko's poems, attempts in the selection included here something close to an investigation of 'archetypal remnants' in *Kobzar*. Chukovsky's article is a good example of serious thematic criticism: he takes a single motif – of abandonment – and discusses its development throughout the *œuvre*. Using records of Shevchenko's early years to prove that the poet had no personal reasons to feel abandoned in glittering Petersburg, since he was 'a Petersburgian to the very marrow of

his bones,' Chukovsky suggests that in his frequent metaphorical embodiments of the feeling of abandonment Shevchenko unconsciously reveals the age-old plight of his people: the feeling of abandonment on this earth in an absurd universe ruled by an indifferent God. Using parallels to folklore with a purpose directly opposite to that of Ievshan, Chukovsky claims that throughout *Kobzar* Shevchenko's own pressing interests are bracketed, and that he becomes a sensitive membrane artistically transmitting collective and unconscious images of the tragedy of his people, as ancient folk song transmits them.

Although abandonment becomes in Chukovsky's interpretation a profound, proto-Heideggerian philosophical problem, we nevertheless see here an intelligent and sensitive version of the Russians' grosser 'theories' from forty years earlier: Shevchenko, the 'Petersburgian to the marrow of his bones,' is in reality minstrel Taras, 'blindly' singing out the folk motifs of his people. The possibility that the recent serf might have been consciously tired of the 'sheepskin coat, not cut out for him,' of the supercilious patronizing attitudes of assorted 'liberals' in the salons of Petersburg, and that he might have been 'rationally' aware that the political plight of his nation parallelled his own 'abandonment' in the foreign and hostile city, is inadmissible in the world view of the hypercivilized companion of Bely and Blok.

Thus, at the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth, prior to the two Ukrainian revolutions and the ensuing civil war, Shevchenko scholarship and criticism won many victories over the superficiality, vulgarity, and occasional bad faith found in earlier treatments of his work. Concurrently, however, the cult of Shevchenko became more firmly rooted both in Russian-occupied and Western Ukraine; it was now fed by the Ukrainians' growing awareness of the possibility of their independence from Russia, as that hope became increasingly viable with the rapid development of events in the second decade of the twentieth century. The spark of Shevchenko's word would finally ignite the conflagration for which the Ukrainian people had been waiting so long.

In the first few years of the Communist régime in central and eastern Ukrainian territories Shevchenko was proscribed, his portraits trampled, and copies of *Kobzar* burned. This, however, did not last long. The Soviets soon realized that they could not undo the poet's tremendous influence

among the people. Consequently, Shevchenko as the megaphone of the masses, a Soviet partisan and John the Baptist of the revolution, became for a time the only ikon allowed in the land. The new religious cult of 'the Red Shevchenko' spread alarmingly. 'The Red Christ' was the title of one article on the poet, another author referred to him as 'the Evangelist of equality,' while 'the apostle of day labourers and hired hands' and 'the proletarian poet' became standard appellations. Along with such unabashed 'proletarization' (or what later Soviet critics called 'modernization') of Shevchenko, all traces of his image as a prophet of national independence, so popular in Ukraine only a few years before, had to be rapidly erased. Since hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians, both in Western Ukraine and in the massive political emigration of 1919-21, now adhered to that version of the cult more tenaciously than ever, and since military courts and firing squads could not resolve the 'ideological errors' of those people living beyond Soviet borders, the battle against Shevchenko as a 'nationalist' had to be continued relentlessly from one decade to the next. Thus the destructive 'struggle for Shevchenko,' which is now as strong as ever, was born and grew.

Andrii Richytsky (whose real name was Anatol Pisotsky) wrote his book, from which a chapter is translated in this volume, in order to counter the 'Red cult' of Shevchenko. The nature of his motives, therefore, is similar to Drahomanov's, although the circumstances in which the two authors wrote were obviously different. Richytsky's political credentials were impeccable: he was an Old Guard revolutionary, one of the founders of the original Ukrainian Communist Party, and a well-known journalist and activist. They did not, however, save him from eventual execution by a firing squad in the 1934 purges, mostly as a result of his book on Shevchenko.

Richytsky starts from the premise – compromised, as we have seen, as early as the 1870s – that Shevchenko was a peasant poet. Relying on Lenin's distrust of the peasants as a reactionary force, the author claims that Shevchenko's work contains not only non-proletarian but anti-proletarian elements: the cult of the patriarchal family, whose insularity extends to the cult of the nation; animistic and anthropomorphic religiosity in which God is identified not only with nature but with the land-owner, thus existing as a powerful patriarchal entity; fetishism of the land and the stability that it implies; fear and distrust of foreigners, represented by the

industrialized Germans. To be sure, Shevchenko occasionally managed to transcend such unproductive limitations of his 'peasant philosophy,' but he could never abandon its premises. Richytsky, therefore, allows that Shevchenko might have been a 'pre-proletarian poet' but never a proletarian one.

Richytsky's book was immediately dissected by serious scholars. One of the first was Pavlo Fylypovych, who pointed out that even as 'vulgar sociologism' the work is wrong-headed, since it concentrates on the poet's social origin without accounting for his social environment. Surely a man who spent most of his life among artists, writers, and intellectuals did not think and behave like a backwoods *muzhyk*. Oleksander Doroshkevych, a serious practitioner of the sociological method, accused Richytsky of taking as his model the old minstrel Taras ikon. Somewhat later, the powers that be officially labeled the book apocryphal and heretical, and its author as a traitor to the state, a counter-revolutionary, and a spy.

Richytsky's interpretation, obviously, does not tell us much about Shevchenko. As in the case of Drahomanov, however, it does suggest a great deal about its own period and intellectual environment. In it is the naïve but enthusiastic Marxism of early Soviet Ukraine, when issues around Shevchenko's poetry, together with other problems of Ukrainian culture, were still alive and open to debate. Indeed, the years 1923-31 were extraordinarily productive and exciting in Soviet-Ukrainian culture; there was a great deal of activity in scholarship, literature, painting, theatre, and film. Many intellectuals believed that Lenin's promises regarding the status of 'nationalities' within the Soviet Union had been sincere, and that history was offering Ukrainians the opportunity to build a truly modern communist society and culture, oriented not towards the East but towards the West. Shevchenko scholarship did not lag, an astonishing amount of good work was done in that short period, most of it now either lost or locked up in 'special collections' of Soviet libraries, unavailable for impartial examination and interpretation.

An interesting and characteristic phenomenon of early Soviet literary criticism and scholarship, including that dealing with Shevchenko, was the ongoing debate between the 'sociologists' and the 'formalists.' In the end, of course, both sides lost, and most combatants ended up either dead or in Siberia. But the enthusiasm of polemical forays in that debate yielded an impressive and alive intellectual legacy. True, the journalistic or, more accurately, propagandistic branch of the sociological 'school' was quite

distant from authentic criticism. Its proponents tirelessly 'struggled for Shevchenko': they battled both the pre-revolutionary cult of Shevchenko and his 'red cult,' 'exposed' 'bourgeois-nationalistic' strains in Shevchenko criticism abroad and within Soviet scholarship, castigated all academic scholars for wasting their own and their readers' time, which could be applied to more useful socialist production, and in the mid-1930s wrote denunciations against Shevchenko scholars from other 'camps' and finally against each other. Even such 'loyalty' did not save them in the Iezhov terror of 1937.

There was one refreshing aspect of their activities – their seemingly unquestionable patriotism. Volodymyr Koriak, for example, took the formalists to task for their 'all-Russian' tendencies in that they followed in the footsteps of their Russian colleagues (the ties between Ukrainian and Russian formalists were indeed close: some members of the Russian group, like Balukhaty, were Ukrainians, Shklovsky wrote a short study of Shevchenko's prose, and Eikhenbaum published his now celebrated definition of formalism in a Ukrainian journal). When Vasyl Desniak accused certain 'academics' of advancing Kulish at Shevchenko's expense – probably meaning a collection of essays that included the material by Mohyliansky in this volume and an important essay on Kulish by Mykola Zerov – he said nothing about Kulish's obvious anti-Russian stance but spoke only about his landed gentleman's lack of sympathy with socialism. What is striking in all this is that at that time it was still possible to compromise an adversary by accusing him of a pro-Russian bias. Imagine such a 'pejorative' argument in present-day Ukraine!

In 'academic' sociological Shevchenko criticism there was some serious activity, which was often directed against the 'vulgar sociologism' of the journalists. Its leader, Doroshkevych, was a capable scholar but by no means beyond occasional duplicity in political and ideological matters. Not limiting his investigations to thematic concerns, he called for 'sociological' analyses of Shevchenko's style. His colleagues heeded his call. Borys O. Navrotsky concentrated on the 'sociology' of Shevchenko's verse forms, while Borys B. Iakubsky, although 'officially' a 'sociologist' (it was safer to be known as a 'sociological critic' than as a 'formalist') was almost totally committed to the formal analysis of Shevchenko's poetry. Doroshkevych's, Navrotsky's, and particularly Iakubsky's 'sociological' analyses can be compared with the later Tynianov and younger Russian formalists like Propp, Bakhtin, and Balukhaty. It would be extremely useful to find,

translate, and publish the most representative examples of such a 'formal-sociological' method as it was applied to Shevchenko.

Although the work on Shevchenko's 'sociology of style' is occasionally difficult to distinguish from formalism, not only journalists but also scholars took frequent swipes at the formalist method, possibly as a self-protective measure: in time, 'formalist' became merely a pejorative term, as it did in the 1930s in Russia. Nevertheless, there was a large group of scholars who devoted their careers to the investigation of purely formal aspects of Shevchenko's poetry by rigorous, frequently statistical methods: the poets Dmytro Zahul and Andrii Paniv, Rodzevych, Dudar, and Savchenko are a few more prominent names in that large group.

The fact that in the 1930s formalism ceased to mean anything is attested to by the 'vulgar sociologists'' use of it against Fylypovych. The author of a purely 'sociological' study on Shevchenko's audience and its potential influence on the poet's own work, but on the whole a student of Peretts's 'philological method,' Fylypovych was disliked by the 'literary establishment' from the start. His fine poetry, redolent of neo-symbolism or even neo-romanticism, was branded by another meaningless but emotionally loaded label – 'neo-classicist.' His elegant dignity and his demands for excellence in art and scholarship must have irritated the 'proletarians' beyond belief. No doubt his talent as poet and his prodigious scholarly output provoked much envy among influential colleagues. By 1936, when at the age of forty-four he was imprisoned in a Russian concentration camp, Fylypovych had published three book-length studies, over a hundred scholarly articles and reviews, and edited a number of collections in all periods of Ukrainian literature; approximately twenty titles in his bibliography are devoted to Shevchenko. (Fylypovych's full bibliography is impossible to assess in the West and his work is proscribed in the Soviet Union.)

Fylypovych makes a number of valuable discoveries in the article included here; I find his discussion of the composition of Shevchenko's longer poems particularly useful. Steeped in neo-classical poetics, early critics invariably saw the 'spatial' or 'prismatic' composition of Shevchenko's narrative poems as a drawback. Using the example of Byron, Fylypovych shows that Shevchenko's method of composition is in fact an intrinsic feature of romantic poetics. Armed with such studies of twentieth-century literature as Joseph Frank's 'Spatial Form in Modern Literature' or Albert Cook's *Prisms*, we are prepared to take Fylypovych's thesis even

farther than he himself did: Shevchenko overtakes Byron, antedating the experimental composition of some twentieth-century modernist narrative poetry.[9]

In another insight, Fylypovych implies that models of the Byronic hero are recognizable in Shevchenko's Russian works, while in his Ukrainian poems the hero's metaphysical protest is channeled into action. One may go on to say that Shevchenko's alienated attitude towards his own Russian-language material and his consequent rather passive reliance on influences is opposed to the mastery in his Ukrainian poems and the ensuing active transformation of all foreign influences to conform to his unique poetic world. Grabowicz's article in this volume takes up the contrast between Shevchenko's Russian-language and Ukrainian-language works. Finally, developing Franko's thesis, Fylypovych makes the important point that Shevchenko's minstrel-Taras pose has less to do with his rural origin than with purely literary, romantic influences.

Serhii Iefremov and Mykhailo Mohyliansky belong to the older generation of critics who made their reputation in pre-revolutionary literature. Mohyliansky's article in this volume is a fine piece of research, supplying a number of new details to the biographies of Shevchenko and Kulish, and discussing particularly well the latter's stormy and psychologically revealing attitudes towards Shevchenko's reputation after his death, in which Pushkin's Mozart-Salieri opposition of artistic types seemed to have been imitated by reality. Iefremov, an uncommonly prolific scholar and critic, is a direct heir of later, reformed Ukrainian populism, more particularly, of Hrinchenko's enlightened civic criticism. Iefremov seems to have had no emotional or intellectual ties with the Soviet revolution. Although he worked hard and published much (particularly on Shevchenko) under the Soviet régime, he treated his surroundings with the mild but by no means hidden disdain of an old liberal. It is small wonder that he was the first important intellectual to have fallen in the purges. Some details of Shevchenko's biography that Iefremov reports are interesting but on the other hand, one misses in his impassioned 'retelling of events' and rather shallow psychological observations the counterbalance of formal or formal-psychological analysis, which in the case of Shevchenko's letters could have yielded particularly revealing results. I am aware of no such study of the epistolary genre in Shevchenko: this seems to be another project awaiting the attention of future Shevchenko scholars.

Besides the scholars of that period mentioned above, I. Aizenshtok did valuable work in textual research, the noted historians D. Bahalii, M. Markovsky, I. Zhytetsky, V. Miiakovsky, and especially M. Novytsky researched Shevchenko's biography and his intellectual environment, P. Tykhovsky and L. Koshova wrote studies on the sources of Shevchenko's historical poems, M. Bohush and F. Samonenko attempted psychological studies of *Kobzar*, M. Iashek assembled a bibliography of Shevchenko's scholarship (1903-21), and there was much other scholarly activity. Hundreds of people were involved in Shevchenko scholarship, writing not only on Shevchenko's poetical output but also on his plays, prose, diary, letters, painting, drawing, and sculpture, on Shevchenko in the classroom, Shevchenko in the theatre, Shevchenko on film.

There was a department of Shevchenko studies at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences: since it was considered too 'academic' and, more important, since it was headed by the 'nationalists' Mykhailo Hrushevsky and Iefremov, a special Institute for Shevchenko Studies was established in Kharkhiv. Later its even more 'sociological' and 'Marxist' branch was founded in Kiev. The Academy published variorum editions of Shevchenko's texts and biographical documents, while the Institute put out four book-length studies and collections of articles by single authors, four anthologies of articles by various hands, containing some of the most valuable shorter studies of the poet's work to date, and two volumes of the annual publication *Shevchenko*. A large number of shorter studies also appeared in various philological and literary journals, such as *Ukraina*, *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*, and *Chervonyi shliakh*, and non-academic publishing houses put out three book-length studies on Shevchenko by D. Bahalii, O. Bahrii, and P. Fylypovych. In 1923 a plan of the first multi-volume academic edition of Shevchenko's works was prepared, and two volumes of it published. When we remember that the time span of this activity was less than a decade, and when we think about the first-rate quality of much of the work produced then, we must consider that period the zenith of the history of Shevchenko scholarship: attempts by contemporary Soviet scholars to play down that activity, to claim that not much was done and that whatever was accomplished is 'incorrect,' cannot help but provoke amusement.

It is plain that they cannot speak otherwise. The first steps in the liquidation of Ukrainian culture by the Russians, a holocaust that raged

through the 1930s, were taken against scholars engaged in Shevchenko studies, for they were obviously working in the most sensitive area of Ukrainian culture. In view of Stalin's 'nationalities' program,' the Russian police simply had no choice; the least they could do was to liquidate honest Shevchenko scholarship, since attempting once again to 'liquidate' Shevchenko himself, to erase all traces of Ukrainians' memory of him, was patently impossible, as the experience of their tsarist forerunners had taught them. In the radical revamping and standardizing of Shevchenko's image, all present investigators of Shevchenko had to be destroyed. Simply put, control of Ukraine directly depended upon controlling Shevchenko's heritage and its influence upon the masses.

In the 1930s the Soviet régime progressively contained the 'chaos' of Ukrainian cultural life by the framework of party directives, in order to manage more easily its program of total 'Sovietization,' which in practice has meant total russification. Hence it substituted divergent interpretations of Shevchenko by early Soviet critics, from which a living, authentically *dialectical* portrait of the poet had been emerging, under a two-dimensional sign to be 'objectively' described, superficially 'corrected,' but never interpreted, illuminated, or thought about. After all, not only Shevchenko but Lenin himself was much safer in a mausoleum. Hence a new image of the poet was taking shape – an image that Malaniuk's stanza, written in 1925, could not predict – the image of Shevchenko as mannequin. That image has been obligatory in Shevchenko scholarship for the last forty-five years. It has been rather arbitrarily christened as that of a 'revolutionary democrat,' which is a blatant misuse of Lenin's term for the Russian radical journalists of the 1860s.

Shevchenko as mannequin was introduced not by scholars, nor even by hacks, but by the Department of Culture and Propaganda of the Communist Party of Ukraine, in a document known as *The Theses of 1934*. The catch-phrase 'revolutionary democrat' was supposed to cover the following official opinions: Shevchenko was a materialist; having shed the romantic delusions of romanticism in his youth, he soon became a 'critical realist'; his literary production depends directly on Russian literature, and he himself was forever grateful to the Russians for having taught him the art of poetry; he was a 'People's poet,' using folklore 'critically,' to discover

and identify in it revolutionary moments; since he worked in unenlightened conditions, and therefore could not help making 'ideological errors,' such as his nationalism, his problematic religiosity, or his failure to work out a program against the bourgeois foundation of his society, those 'errors' were to be 'unmasked' and 'correctly illuminated.'

The countless 'misunderstandings' and 'counter-misunderstandings' in the 'finalizing' of Shevchenko's mannequin image cease to amuse the moment that we recall the number of lives that they cost: literary matters were grotesquely metamorphosed into horrible crimes, in principle no different from the Nazi holocaust, the only important difference being that the Germans have recognized the horrors of their deeds, while in 1980 Shevchenko scholars are still forced with cynical callousness to call the 1930s a 'period of ideological adjustment.'[10] It is symbolic in the history of Ukraine that the Shevchenko scholars shared a fate similar to his own. It is equally significant that a humanist poet's heritage was thus involved; one can imagine his own reaction to such murderous misuse of his poetry.

The first wave of purges took place in 1930, with the 'liquidation' of Serhii Iefremov and a number of other older intellectuals. Beginning with 1933, each year brought new repressions. Finally, in 1937, those who had hounded and denounced everyone else were themselves 'liquidated.' In the years 1917-37 (but mainly in the 1930s), 107 Ukrainian literary scholars and critics were either killed or exiled to Siberia. Eleven switched to the Russian language. Seventy-four dropped out of scholarship entirely. Twenty-five emigrated, mostly in the early 1920s. Altogether, 202 scholars and critics, most of them having worked either exclusively or partially on Shevchenko, were lost to Soviet Ukrainian scholarship. Only *fifteen* more or less notable scholars of Ukrainian literature, who had begun their careers before the purges, survived and sporadically continued their work until the beginning of World War II.[11]

It stands to reason that in the years 1935-9, Shevchenko scholarship, together with all other serious work in Ukrainian culture, came to a standstill. The few articles that did appear in those years dealt with Shevchenko's prose (written in Russian), with his painting, and with music composed to his poems. As for 'ideology,' a typical contribution of that time to Shevchenko scholarship was an address, 'Dvi zhinochykh doli' (Two Fates of Women), about the miserable life of serf women as

described in *Kobzar*, in contrast to the glorious life of a female collective farm worker, and delivered at a scholarly conference by the collective farm worker Mariia Bondar.

The Party used the year 1939 (which marked the 125th anniversary of the poet's birth) for artificial resuscitaton of Shevchenko scholarship. This was necessary for several reasons: to show that the massacre of Ukrainian intellectuals was not a great loss; to support the mannequin image with permanent ideological scaffolding; and to prepare that mannequin for use as a rallying point in the impending war. The deluge of propagandistic material, in Russian and Ukrainian, 'firmly established' Shevchenko as a friend of the Russians; 'reinterpreted' Shevchenko's unkind references to the tsars as criticism of abstract autocracy, with absolutely no bearing on the tsars' nationality; criticized the party's *Theses of 1934* for dragging out Shevchenko's 'errors,' instead of concentrating on the 'positive' aspects of his work, especially his slavish submission to Chernyshevsky's ideas; and falsified facts in order to 'prove' that Belinsky was a great admirer of Shevchenko's poetry.

Nevertheless, some scholarly work was done in 1939 and 1940. Professional linguistic analyses of Shevchenko's style appeared, dealing with narrow factual topics. Some articles were published in the comparative literature branch of Shevchenko scholarship; most remarkable here is the synthetic essay by Oleksander Biletsky on Shevchenko and world literature and an article by Serhii Savchenko on the poet and romanticism; the latter author returned to Fylypovych's researches on Shevchenko and Byron, reviewed the problem of Shevchenko and English romanticism in general, and made some discoveries in Shevchenko's own reading of the romantic poets. Another interesting contribution in comparative literature was Chubach's study on Shevchenko and ancient literatures. Soviet scholars continued to investigate Shevchenko in conjunction with other Ukrainian writers: two fresh topics, namely Shevchenko and Skovoroda (by Popov) and Shevchenko and Franko (by Semenenko and Kobyletsky) opened new possibilities for research. In 1940 a collection of textual and critical studies by Aizenshtok, *Iak pratsiuvav Shevchenko* (How Shevchenko Worked) was published in Kiev.

No fewer than eight book-length biographical studies of Shevchenko appeared in 1939. It is in them that most of the distortions and falsifications of the poet's life, indispensable to the support of his new image as

mannequin, occur. On the other hand, in 1941 Marietta Shaginian, a novelist and scholar who works in the Russian language, published a series of excellent studies on Shevchenko's life and work under the title *Taras Shevchenko*. She openly used and even quoted ideas from the superlative biography of the poet by the émigré scholar Pavlo Zaitsev; she denied Pushkin's influence on Shevchenko's versification; and she showed convincingly that it was not Chernyshevsky who influenced Shevchenko but the other way around. Probably following Fylypovych, she also claimed that Shevchenko's Russian writings rather passively follow the literary current of his time, while his Ukrainian poems are far ahead of it. Besides her astonishing sense of intellectual freedom, Shaginian demonstrated a gift for solid and patient research: she discovered, in particular, new facts about the women in Shevchenko's life and about his existence in exile. It is characteristic that many of her 'errors' were corrected in the second edition of her work which came out in 1946.

During the war, and particularly during the German occupation of Ukraine, Shevchenko was allowed once again to become the megaphone of the masses in a very specific sense: he was recruited to spur the Ukrainians in the struggle against the Nazis. Authors of speeches and propagandistic articles were allowed to play up Shevchenko's devotion to the idea of Ukrainian autonomy, even at the expense of temporarily suspending the peddling of fabrications about his servile attitude towards Russian culture. Immediately after the war, however, Andrei Zhdanov was assigned to whip Soviet culture, including Shevchenko scholarship, back into the party line.

In the selection included here, Hudzii, an important Ukrainian scholar who worked both in Ukrainian and Russian literature, attempts to civilize, as it were, the post-war orgy of flunkeyism and self-abasement on the part of Ukrainian intellectuals. He does not claim, for example, that Herzen and Chernyshevsky taught Shevchenko all that he knew, as less sophisticated Soviet authors constantly do; instead, he hints at a 'mutual attraction' between Herzen and Shevchenko or at a 'similarity of views' between Chernyshevsky and the Ukrainian poet. What Hudzii neglects to point out, and what Shaginian stresses in the first edition of her book, is that although Chernyshevsky frequently mentioned Shevchenko with admiration, Shevchenko never referred to Chernyshevsky. Considering Shevchenko's views on life, it is indeed difficult to imagine the poet admiring Chernyshevsky's aesthetic theories or his novel *Chto delat* (*What is to be Done*).

Even when Hudzii suggests that revolutionary ideas may have arisen 'polygenetically' for the Russian radicals and for Shevchenko, he nevertheless hastens to add that the 'revolutionary democrats' helped Shevchenko to put his intuitive notions into proper perspective. Witness also Hudzii's completely unsubstantiated implication that in allying himself with the representatives of the Russian 'revolutionary-democratic' movement in Petersburg, Shevchenko simultaneously drew away from his liberal friends Kostomarov and Kulish . Hudzii plainly suggests that the one action depended directly upon the other, although we know that Shevchenko's occasional disagreements with Kulish and Kostomarov centred rather on the poet's impatience with his friends' excessive respect for the Russians and their views on the role of Russia in Ukrainian history.

As in the case of Drahomanov's and Richytsky's contributions, we should be grateful to the editor for including the piece by Hudzii more as an illustration of the time of its writing than of Shevchenko's time. It provides a fairly clear definition of the murky term 'revolutionary democrat'; it shows, by the author's gentle reservations and careful adjustments, the distance to which his more servile colleagues have been willing to take the term, and it is, on the whole, a telling example of more or less responsible mainstream Shevchenko criticism in post-war Soviet Ukraine.

The 1950s saw a rush of books on the 'world view' of Shevchenko. The main purpose of such 'studies' was once again to turn the poet, as one of them had it, into a 'stepchild of Russian culture.' In his careful description of Soviet scholarship on Shevchenko, the émigré critic Petro Odarchenko quotes a series of blatant falsifications of Shevchenko's diary, letters, and documents pertinent to his life, which were meant to 'prove' the poet's loyalty to Russia.[12] Even the Soviet scholar Oleksander Biletsky angrily spoke out against such distortions: 'The basic tendency of the majority of such works about Shevchenko's world view is to correct at any cost ... the poet's views in order to pull him up, by any means available, to our own times.'[13] Having quoted that passage, the authors of a Soviet report on contemporary Shevchenko scholarship interestingly remark: 'Although they were generally typical of ... the first [post-war] decade, such errors have not been totally eliminated in subsequent works on Shevchenko's world view.'[14]

It is characteristic that the first post-war decade of Shevchenko scholarship in Soviet Ukraine is currently criticized by Soviet commentators in almost the same way that 'vulgar sociologism' had been censured in the

1930s: Shevchenko's religiosity was treated too simplistically, his 'revolutionary democratism' was not thoroughly understood, the Ukrainian romantic movement as a whole was described one-sidedly, and Shevchenko was 'modernized,' made to conform too closely to the contemporary vision of Soviet communism. It is such anti-dialectical 'corrections' and 'adjustments' of the mannequin that characterize the ideological profile of Shevchenko scholarship in Soviet Ukraine from the end of the war to our days. They are anti-dialectical in that they stem from postulates outside Shevchenko's work – from an artificially posited structure, to which every mind must conform – rather than from the texts themselves.

True, there were more serious examples of Shevchenko scholarship in the first post-war decade. There was, for instance, a considerable number of articles on Shevchenko and the various nationalities within the Soviet Union: Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and the Kirghiz republic, etc. We do not know to what extent Shevchenko – that exemplary enemy of all enforcement – was forced, together with Pushkin and Lermontov, on the Kazakhs or the Kirghiz; such studies, nevertheless, are interesting. The complete ten-volume edition of Shevchenko's works, repeatedly attempted between the wars, was resumed. Beginning in 1952, Shevchenko conferences have been organized by the Literary Institute at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; with some recent interruptions, they have been held annually in various cities of the Soviet Union. Except for the first two years, the papers from each conference have been published in a separate volume.

As a result of some alleviation of restraints upon Soviet Ukrainian culture at the end of the 1950s, Shevchenko studies were perceptibly improving from year to year. In addition to the ten-volume edition of the poet's works and a four-volume supplement on his paintings, drawings, and prints, the Academy of Sciences published well-produced facsimiles of some of his manuscripts, the value of which cannot be overestimated. Other documentary publications, such as memoirs by the poet's contemporaries or day-by-day chronicles of his life, can be helpful only when used with discrimination, based on some previous knowledge of the subject matter. Several older publications of this type are already branded as 'incorrect.' We never know that the source published three or four months ago will not be condemned for falsifications, called by whatever euphemism, ten years from now. The two-volume bibliography of Shevchenko

scholarship and criticism (1889-1959) which appeared in the 1960s is useful only for the material of which current Soviet policy more or less approves. An additional hefty volume probably could be compiled of Western Ukrainian criticism (represented in the given publication very sketchily), émigré criticism (not represented at all), work by non-Ukrainian scholars in the West (also not represented), and numerous contributions by Soviet scholars of the 1920s that have been suppressed. The editors attempt to avoid trouble by restricting their bibliography to the present borders of Soviet Ukraine. Although this manœuver, even at the risk of a charge of rampant xenophobia, eliminates émigré scholarship, the suppression of thousands of Western Ukrainian and Soviet titles remains unexplained.

By far the most valuable and dependable are various contributions to the study of Shevchenko's language and style, although here too we must be wary of claims that the Russian language was crucial in Shevchenko's development. The two-volume dictionary of Shevchenko's lexical usage, with ample cross-references, is very useful in the study of the poet's semantics and its development. Some stylistic studies by individual authors have become extremely narrow but none the less valuable for that. All are rigorously descriptive and many statistical: here one would search in vain for the excitingly inventive use of linguistics in literary criticism that we see in the early Soviet formalists, let alone the French structuralists. Most recent Soviet work on Shevchenko's form has also remained 'scientifically' descriptive, frequently statistical, and almost invariably dry. Much attention has been devoted to textual criticism, and a number of descriptions of Shevchenko's manuscripts have appeared. Here again, one would wish for bolder speculation, particularly in the area of literary psychology, which textual investigations could yield.

Biographical researchers, when they are not busy perverting facts (which now happens more rarely, although many earlier distortions have entered the critical canon), are busy almost literally counting every button on every shirt that Shevchenko owned, and, more important, listing every Russian journalist and pamphleteer with whom he could have possibly exchanged a greeting. This practice inspired Oleksander Biletsky's ironic ire. He pointed out that the reader is surely more interested in what Shevchenko wrote than in where he went and whom he met every day of his life, and that scholars should be more concerned with the study of the literary

process in which the poet participated than with the trivia of his daily life.[15] Strangely enough, such meticulous research does not obtain in every area of the poet's activities; even Soviet commentators themselves complain that in the poet's biography there are still a number of lacunae, such as his relationship with the Brotherhood of Sts Cyril and Methodius. Neither the wide research in that specific problem by historians and literary scholars in the 1920s, nor (needless to say!) Miiakovsky's solid contribution, included in this volume, are taken into consideration. In a word, there are safer and less safe areas of the poet's life to investigate.

An amazing phenomenon in the area of biography, surely opposed to every definition of historiography, is the practice of writing Shevchenko's biography by committee or brigade. There are two such 'collective' biographies to date: H. Viazovsky, K. Danylko, I. Duz, M. Levchenko, A. Nedzvidsky, and V. Nestorenko, *Taras Hryhorovych Shevchenko: Biohrafiia* (1960) and Ie. Kyryliuk, Ie. Shabliovsky, and V. Shubravsky, *T.H. Shevchenko: Biohrafiia* (1964). Even the titles of the two books are almost identical. That 'group activity' is linked with commentators' repeated assurances that Soviet scholars were not 'ready' to write a full biography of Shevchenko until the 1960s. Reasons for this astonishing lack of readiness become plain when we recall that they depend on the readiness of the mannequin that was being constructed between 1939 and 1959 and on the progress of the 'ideological adjustments' that kept taking place in its fabrication. Hence it also becomes plain why Shevchenko's 'life' is to be written not from a single point of view, but as an 'objective' scientific report. All this becomes even more curious when we recall that as early as 1939 the émigré scholar Pavlo Zaitsev was 'ready' for a definitive biography of the poet, a beautifully written and impeccably researched work, which in every respect stands head and shoulders above the two collective efforts by the Soviets.

Some new work has been done in Soviet Ukraine on Shevchenko and the Ukrainian literary process, for instance P. Prykhodko's *Shevchenko i ukrainskyi romantyzm* (Shevchenko and Ukrainian Romanticism, 1963) and several articles on this problem. The trouble here is that the definition of romanticism in such works becomes considerably more narrow and distorted than in the 1920s, in order to get Shevchenko out of it and send him on his way to 'critical realism' as quickly as possible. The other problem in such works is obvious historical distortion of Ukrainian romanticism and of

its individual representatives. Although Soviet commentators keep saying that they have finally 'corrected' the 'ideological errors' of their predecessors in recognizing that not all Ukrainian romantics were reactionary land-owners, matters in that area are still far from 'objective.'

As for comparative studies, the nineteenth-century French model of proof of influence obtains in methodology, and speculative attempts to search for parallels or analogies are rigorously excluded. Work on Shevchenko's relationship to Western literatures has been severely curtailed, while investigations of his ties with Slavic literatures and the literatures of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the satellite countries are greatly expanded. In the collection of papers of the twelfth Shevchenko conference, for example, there is a useful contribution by D.S. Nalyvaiko on Shevchenko in French criticism of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, and M.M. Pavliuk's report on nineteenth-century translations of Shevchenko in German. On the whole, however, Oleksander Biletsky's article 'Shevchenko i svitova literatura' (Shevchenko and World Literature), published in 1939, remains the most interesting Soviet piece on that subject, and his more recent call to study Shevchenko against the background of world literature, by and large, remains unheeded. On the other hand, a substantial number of studies on Shevchenko and Slavic literatures, particularly Polish, but also Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Belorussian, Serbian, and Slovenian, have appeared in recent years. Exercises on Shevchenko and the literatures of non-Slavic nations of the Soviet Union have increased spectacularly since the first post-war decade; there are scores of articles on Shevchenko and Tadzikistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaidzhan, the Turkmen Republic, and many similar exotic places. Although the value of such efforts (mostly appreciations by native writers and scholars, some doubtless 'made to order' to underscore the brotherhood of Soviet peoples) is in principle beyond doubt, the situation becomes rather lopsided when we recall that the volume of serious and often first-rate scholarship being done on Shevchenko by native and émigré authors in Canada, the United States, western Europe, and South America is generally ignored, and the study of the relationship of *Kobzar* to Western European literatures badly underdeveloped.

There is little of lasting value in literary interpretation of Shevchenko's poetry in Soviet Ukraine: scholars and critics shy away from discussing the text of a Shevchenko poem. It seems safer to list the poet's Russian friends

than to venture into areas where one has the uncomfortable choice of denying one's personal convictions or risking employment as 'inspector of the Northern Lights' (as Soviet wits call imprisonment in concentration camps in the northern regions of the Union). It is difficult not to notice Soviet scholars' avoidance of such a choice in their preference for the technical, statistical, 'objective' aspects of Shevchenko studies, and it is equally difficult, in view of their situation, to blame them for this. Furthermore, syntactic parallels, alliterative patterns, or the predominance of the iambic foot in Shevchenko's poetry are likely to remain pretty much the same, while official attitudes towards his symbol of the three ravens, let alone towards his association with Kostomarov, may change overnight, burying forever the long years of a scholar's work and, in extreme cases, the scholar himself. And, finally, how else but by formulas is one to describe the systems that activate a mannequin?

Iurii Ivakin's book-length study on Shevchenko's satire (1959, second 'corrected' edition 1964) has moments of literary interest, especially in the author's careful differentiation between satire as genre and as mode, and in his analysis of some key images, but it is marred throughout by an insistent political bias that does not avoid distortion. This is particularly unfortunate, since Ivakin seems to be one of the most responsible scholars in the 'top-level establishment' of Soviet Shevchenko studies. An impressively produced two-volume encyclopedic dictionary on Shevchenko's work, biography, environment, and Shevchenko scholarship came out in 1978. Although on the whole it is a comprehensive and rather impressive work, it too is spoiled by countless distortions and perversions of the poet's writings.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s an occasional Soviet article would astonish us by its devotion to the text, its calm authority, and its profundity of interpretation. Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska's reading of the poem 'Ne kydai materi' (Do not Abandon Your Mother), published in the collection of papers of the Tenth Shevchenko Conference (1962), is one of the best examples of Soviet literary criticism after the war. The articles in this volume by Rylsky and Nenadkevych show a level of excellence reminiscent of the kind of work done in Ukraine in the 1920s. At the time of their publication, the authors were old men who had gone through the purges and now probably felt that they could afford to speak calmly about literature. Besides, 1959 was the year of liberalization in

Ukraine, when many interesting things in culture began to happen. Now that the 'thaw' of 1959 has been refrozen, Nenadkevych's and Rylsky's articles in their turn belong to history. What remains is the 'objective,' mannequin-building mockery of literary criticism, whose overall effect, in contrast to the early Soviet debates which in spite of their many instances of irresponsibility had the revolutionary spirit of authenticity, enthusiasm, and excitement, is one of unrelieved boredom.

Shevchenko's name was known and began to be venerated in Western Ukraine, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, during the poet's lifetime. Later, in the 1860s and early 1870s, Western Ukrainian populists set about to develop a lively cult of Shevchenko among the people, canonizing him, building an entire educational program of the masses around his name, and at the same time making forays into serious scholarship. When, in the 1870s, intellectuals from Russian-occupied Ukraine were forced by repressions to place their writings in Western Ukrainian publications, to travel to Western Ukraine and, in some cases, to settle there, Shevchenko scholarship, together with other aspects of Ukrainian culture, became a single stream, transcending the artificial borders set up by the respective foreign powers dividing the land among themselves.

In the 1870s, pioneering efforts in Shevchenko studies were connected with the Western Ukrainian journal *Pravda* and the cultural and educational association Prosvita. In 1873 Drahomanov and other émigrés from the Russian Empire, together with Western Ukrainian intellectuals, founded in Lviv the Shevchenko Literary Society, which in 1892 was reorganized as the Shevchenko Scientific Society. The Society's voluminous publications, particularly in the first two decades of the century, remain a useful source of Ukrainian studies. It was that organization which promoted Shevchenko scholarship for many years. In 1898 Franko and others established the journal *Literaturno naukovyi vistnyk*, which published scholarly articles on Shevchenko's life and work.

After the revolutions in Russian-occupied Ukraine and the Polish occupation of Western Ukrainian territories, political borders divided Ukrainians more rigidly than ever before. Western Ukrainian scholars did not enjoy the kind of fully developed academic environment in which Soviet scholars worked in the 1920s. Most important, many of them (and after 1934, practically all of them) were forbidden entry into Soviet Ukraine and

thus were cut off from all primary sources. Moreover, only a few were connected with universities or research institutes. The Polish occupation of Western Ukraine forbade higher education in Ukrainian: before World War II, an underground Ukrainian university existed in Lviv, but obviously it could not provide the facilities of a normal academic institution. Most scholars were forced either to teach in secondary schools or to hold non-academic jobs. All the funds that they managed to scrape together from private donations went into publishing their work and maintaining their scholarly organizations. Ironically, the Western Ukrainian scholars and émigrés who resided beyond Ukraine had a greater opportunity to teach in institutions of higher learning than those who lived in Western Ukraine itself. The celebrated Slavicist Dmytro Chyzhevsky taught in various German universities; Lepky at the University of Cracow; Smal-Stotsky, O. Kolessa, and Biletsky at Charles University in Prague and the Ukrainian Free University (supported by the Czech government) in the Czech town of Podebrady. In the 1920s the prominent Western Ukrainian scholars Smal-Stotsky, F. Kolessa, Vozniak, Shchurat, and Studynsky were corresponding members of the Kievan Academy of Sciences, but during the purges they, together with most of the established Soviet scholars, were deprived of their membership in that prestigious institution. Needless to say, in the 1930s Western Ukrainian and émigré scholars were not forced to follow Shevchenko's footsteps to Siberia, and the responsibility of carrying on the work of Ukrainian scholarship fell entirely upon their shoulders.

Between the wars there were three important centres of Shevchenko studies in the West. The original base was in Lviv, with Shchurat, F. Kolessa, Studynsky, Hordynsky, the émigré Doroshenko, and a great number of other scholars. With the influx of émigrés from the newly formed Soviet Ukraine, a strong centre developed in Czechoslovakia, connected with the Ukrainian Free University and led by Biletsky, Antonovych, and Bohatsky; somewhat later, they were joined by the Western Ukrainian scholar, Smal-Stotsky. In Warsaw, the émigré from Kiev, Zaitsev, and other scholars joined the Institute of Ukrainian Studies and used its facilities to prepare the definitive edition of Shevchenko's works which was published in 1937.

As early as the 1870s and particularly in the 1880s, Western Ukrainian populists – that is, most of the prominent intellectuals, with the exception of some young socialists and followers of Drahomanov – regarded Shev-

chenko primarily as a 'prophet' of Ukrainian autonomous statehood. Hence in Western Ukraine, somewhat sooner than in the Russian-occupied Ukrainian territories, the cultural image of minstrel Taras turned into the revolutionary spark and conflagration image of national rebirth. In the 1870s the literary historian Ohonovsky and the critic Barvinsky were already far beyond the stage of speculation about Shevchenko's work as a re-embodiment of folklore sources of of Ukrainian ethnicity, unequivocally reading the poet's 'message' as the central expression of Ukrainians' struggle for independence. That line of interpretation of Shevchenko's poetry was continued in Western Ukraine until the beginning of World War II by scholars like Lototsky, Simovych, Lepky, Hrytsai, and many others; it prevails in the émigré view of Shevchenko in our time. In the 1930s, avowed or 'integral' nationalist critics, enthusiastically doing their part in the 'struggle for Shevchenko,' took that line of criticism to its limit or perhaps even beyond it: in some of their writings there is a new image of the poet as a mystical spirit of the cossack élite, hovering over the Ukrainian people in order to cause, at the appropriate moment, their miraculous resurrection.

Smal-Stotsky's interpretive essay in this volume, taken from his collection of articles which has the distinction of drawing the most frequent Soviet fire even in 1980, is based on a rigorous philological method designed to support the author's relatively mild nationalistic bias: the image of Shevchenko as spark and conflagration is present on every page of that book. Smal-Stotsky warns the interpreter not to bring any 'forestructures' to the text. Indeed, he does not seem to veer from the text at all, even while proclaiming his message. He uses a sort of hermeneutical circle: claiming to have observed a uniform ideological direction in Shevchenko's œuvre, he then proceeds, on the basis of careful readings of single poems, to find their place in that ideology. Nevertheless, on occasion the treatment of a given text is somewhat too obviously guided by the interpreter's ideological conviction. In the essay included here, this is evident particularly in Smal-Stotsky's provocative but rather fanciful conclusion that 'Ukraine had liberty and will have it again but only Ukrainians *with Cossack eyes* will return to freedom – those with their eyes plucked out or those who are corpses will *never again* return to liberty!'

Although, as should be plain by now, politically uncommitted interpretations of Shevchenko's poetry are rare in Ukrainian criticism (even

stylistic, formal, and textological studies are frequently so committed), a number of Western Ukrainian and émigré scholars between the wars treated Shevchenko primarily as an artist. A number of them, for example, researched the poet's life and intellectual environment. Simovych wrote on Shevchenko and the early Ukrainian romantics, Doroshenko speculated on his relationship with the educational system of his time (concentrating on his interest in Ukrainian textbooks in the last years of his life), and P. Bohatsky reported on new documents pertaining to his life. Shchurat, Vozniak, and Zaitsev did significant work in that area of Shevchenko studies. Shchurat wrote a number of articles on Shevchenko's Polish friends in Kiev and elsewhere: some of those pieces were subsequently collected in his volume *Z zhyttia i tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka* (From Shevchenko's Life and Work, Lviv 1914). Vozniak, a scholar who did valuable work in many areas of Ukrainian literature, prepared a series of short, meticulously researched studies on Shevchenko's intellectual environment, his imprisonment, and on other factual topics. Even before his emigration to Poland in 1919, Zaitsev published some valuable biographical studies on Shevchenko, particularly bearing on the peasant girl Oksana Kovalenko, who had played such an important and mysterious role in the poet's childhood and early youth. In 1939 Zaitsev's excellent biography of Shevchenko was printed in Lviv. In October of that year, when the signatures were ready for the binder, the Soviet Army occupied Lviv and confiscated the whole edition. Soviet scholars in Kiev obviously had immediate access to copies of the unbound book, because even in the early 1940s they began pillaging it; Marietta Shaginian, as mentioned above, was the only author courageous enough to acknowledge quotations from it. It was finally reprinted by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in 1955, from one of the few sets of signatures brought to Western Europe during the war.

Understandably, Western Ukrainian scholars devoted a great deal of attention to the history of the proliferation of Shevchenko's poetry in Western Ukraine. In 1930 Vozniak showed that as early as 1843 Shevchenko himself was interested in the cultural life of Western Ukrainians, and during World War II, Ie. Iu. Pelensky published a book-length study on the dissemination of Shevchenko's poetry in Western Ukraine over the years. Shevchenko and Poland was another lively topic in Western Ukraine and in the emigration. Besides his numerous articles on that problem, mentioned above, Shchurat brought out a monograph on Shevchenko and

the Poles in 1917; in 1934 Zaitsev published a book on that topic in Polish. As well, Oleksander Kolessa did some valuable work on Shevchenko and Mickiewicz. Considering the circumstances, surprisingly little was written on Shevchenko and Western literatures, certainly much less than had been done in Soviet Ukraine in the 1920s. The excellent critic and comparatist Mykhailo Rudnytsky wrote articles on translations of Shevchenko (1924) and on Shevchenko and Western European critics (1931); I have not come across more substantial Western Ukrainian or émigré work in that area from the period between the wars. During the war, Ie. Iu. Pelensky published a provocative study, *Shevchenko-kliasyk* (Cracow 1942), in which he attempts to dismiss Shevchenko's importance as a romantic in favour of Western European neoclassicism.

Western Ukrainian and émigré critics did some significant work on Shevchenko's language and form. Ohiienko, Simovych, F. Kolessa, and many younger scholars discussed the poet's use of Ukrainian and his contributions to the development of the language. As early as 1925, Smal-Stotsky published a book-length analysis of Shevchenko's rhythm, in which he traces its sources to Ukrainian folklore. In the 1930s, Nykyforiak and Chekhovych reviewed that problem in important articles. But it is F. Kolessa who described the connections of Shevchenko's rhythm and folklore most broadly. His collection of long articles, published under the collective title *Studii nad poetychnoiu tvorchistiu T. Shevchenka* (Studies of the Poetry of Taras Shevchenko) in 1939, is perhaps the most meticulous work on Shevchenko and folklore. In the first article, the author compares hundreds of quotations from folk songs to excerpts from *Kobzar*, showing numerous thematic and particularly melodic parallels. In the second article, using musical (instead of the standard metrical) notation, the author carefully discusses parallels between Shevchenko's rhythm and that of Ukrainian folk songs. In his article included in this volume, Chyzhevsky combines the two approaches, claiming the derivation of Shevchenko's rhythms from folk songs, and yet analysing them in the conventional manner.

Other problems in Shevchenko scholarship were treated equally interestingly in Western Ukraine and by émigrés between the wars. I have already mentioned Balei's psychological study of *Kobzar*. Dmytro Antonovych, Volodymyr Sichynsky, and Sviatoslav Hordynsky made important contributions to the topic of Shevchenko as an artist. Volodymyr Doroshenko's work in Shevchenko bibliography is also valuable.

By far the most ambitious contribution to Shevchenko studies by Western Ukrainian and émigré scholars is the monumental sixteen-volume edition of his collected works, completed by the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw in 1937. Prior to that edition, the most reliable was the one-volume *Kobzar*, prepared by the Western Ukrainian scholar Simovych and published in Katerynoslav in 1921. Although the editor's long introduction and copious annotations are intended for the 'common reader' and, in some instances, may now sound naïve and superfluous, many of the textual glosses are still useful. In any event, that edition has served supremely well as an educational tool: although it is banned in the Soviet Union, its post-war reissue in Canada is still used in many Ukrainian-language schools in the West. The Warsaw academic edition, obviously, has quite a different purpose. Annotations are brief and scrupulously factual, while textual variants are abundant and well explained. By far the most valuable element of the edition is the nearly fifty interpretative essays, by Zaitsev himself and a large number of émigré and Western Ukrainian scholars, dealing with every major work, as well as with larger aspects of Shevchenko's œuvre. Together with the collections of scholarly articles on Shevchenko published in the 1920s and early 1930s in Soviet Ukraine, the short studies in that edition are the most important source of Shevchenko criticism. In the 1960s a thoroughly revised edition came out in the United States. The editor, Bohdan Kravtsiv, greatly expanded the original, bringing all pertinent information up to date, and adding a number of new articles and a whole new volume of sixteen short studies, including some Soviet authors whom the original editors, in the throes of 'the struggle for Shevchenko,' had conspicuously ignored. Kravtsiv added a volume of translations of Shevchenko's poetry in many languages, with an informative introduction that is the most reliable survey to date of *Kobzar*'s career in the world.

Dmytro Chyzhevsky, an émigré who left Ukraine at the beginning of the 1920s and who subsequently became one of the leading Slavic scholars of our time, in his article on Shevchenko and religion tackles one of the most ticklish issues of both the 'cult' and the scholarship. In the 1870s, as pointed out earlier, some Western Ukrainians had been known to 'amend' *Kobzar* in order to 'tone down' the tension of the poet's passionate quarrels with God. In the same decade, Vovk claimed that Shevchenko was an atheist, while Drahomanov pointed out that, regrettably, he was a believer. In our century, Kornei Chukovsky described all of Shevchenko's poetry as

a prolonged cry *to* God and *for* God, and Ievshan, in an interesting article on Shevchenko's religion, similarly claimed that Shevchenko's basic aesthetic impulse, like that of all authentic art, was religious. Shchurat wrote voluminously on Shevchenko's religion: his 'Shevchenko and the Bible,' for example, is an interesting contribution to comparative studies of Shevchenko, since he supports his thesis with a battery of valid textual parallels between the two sources. In 1914, on the other hand, the Russian Orthodox archbishop Nikon published a formal denunciation of Shevchenko as an atheist, which gave rise to the notorious official repressions of the 'cult' of Shevchenko in Russian-occupied Ukraine, begun in that year. In Soviet criticism the Shevchenko and God motif has been constant; it began, as pointed out above, with a combination of Communism and religious messianism. More recently, journalists have proclaimed Shevchenko's atheism, while responsible critics like Oleksander Biletsky have warned that the issue is not so simple. In Western Ukrainian and émigré criticism that problem is also current. Since the war, two notable studies on it have appeared: Leonid Biletsky's *Viruiuchyi Shevchenko* (The Believing Shevchenko, 1949) and Vasyl Barka's *Pravda Kobzaria* (The Truth of 'Kobzar,' 1961).

Chyzhevsky's thesis, in its general outline, was not new in the 1930s. His apology for Shevchenko as a 'mere' poet, relying on his emotions and the truth of the heart rather than on his intellect, had been heard since the early 1870s. As for the core of Chyzhevsky's argument, as early as 1915 O. Kalyshevsky had been saying, similarly, that Shevchenko's attitude towards God was extremely personal and based directly on human suffering; that Shevchenko believed God should not be a distant emperor before whom people tremble but rather the God of the insulted and the suffering of this world. What is very interesting in Chyzhevsky's work, however, is the direction of the argument and the profound conclusion in the last few paragraphs, based on the author's careful and imaginative use of sources. Chyzhevsky's central claim is that in religion Shevchenko prefers content over form. Although we indeed find many instances of critique and even ridicule of religious institutions in *Kobzar*, I do not believe that this is the most important issue, as Chyzhevsky intimates: Shevchenko's most bitter accusation is that God is indifferent to human suffering; in my opinion, this has to do less with the empty liturgical forms of the imperial Russian Church than with the extremely bold charge of divine omission or, more bluntly, divine dishonesty. Even if we grant Chyzhevsky his point, we soon

see that he takes a direction diametrically opposite that of the usual social or humanist views on Shevchenko's religion. He implies that the basis of Shevchenko's belief, inherited from thinkers like Rousseau or Diderot, is anthropocentric and therefore unfaithful to authentic religiosity; it is based on human freedom and hence on human history, which are not authentic religious concerns. Almost like Drahomanov, but more gently and with an opposite intent, Chyzhevsky chides Shevchenko for not having appreciated philosophy enough to understand correctly the transcendental, essentially ahuman, nature of God.

Whether we agree with Chyzhevsky or not, his wealth of information, skilful interpretation of texts, and deliberately 'baroque' style make the article a masterpiece of informed and elegant critical writing. Moreover, Chyzhevsky's basic bias, carefully concealed beneath the mantle of 'scientific objectivity,' tells us much about his own view of the world, which in itself is important. In most of his interpretations, the great scholar prefers the ascetic, the transcendental, the medieval to the anthropocentric, the earthly, the renaissance: his renaissance comes out as essentially medieval, and his baroque is certainly much more Miltonic than late Shakespearean. This is perhaps why Chyzhevsky wrote so little on Shevchenko: his view of the world is as different from Shevchenko's as night from day.

During World War II, in the mass exodus of Ukrainians, many Soviet scholars escaped to the West and joined Western Ukrainians and earlier émigrés in various countries and on various continents: Volodymyr Miiakovsky, who had written on Shevchenko even before the Revolution, and who had been exiled to Siberia in the Soviet purges; Viktor Petrov, ethnographer, novelist, critic, and sometime philosopher who in the 1920s and the early 1930s published articles on Shevchenko's intellectual environment; Volodymyr Derzhavyn, a noted critic and scholar of classical literature, who had contributed an article to one of the collections edited by Fylypovych in the 1920s and had done other occasional work on the poet; Hryhorii Kostiuk, a corresponding member of the Shevchenko Institute in the early 1930s and Soviet concentration camp prisoner; Petro Odarchenko, who had done some work on Shevchenko in the late 1920s, before his exile to Kazakhstan; Iurii Shevelov, a noted linguist and literary critic, whose occasional contributions to Shevchenko studies are of the highest quality; Stepan Iu. Haievsky, Iurii Boiko-Blokhyn, and many others.

Shevchenko scholarship, along with the feverish mimeograph publishing of popular editions of his selected works, resumed immediately after the war, as if the survival of the Ukrainian spirit in the West depended directly on the constant presence of the poet's images and rhythms. When the Ukrainian Free Academy of Arts and Sciences was founded in Bavaria in 1946, its first concern was the organization of Shevchenko conferences and the mimeographing of the papers presented for wide distribution. Some useful short studies appeared in that series, notably Viktor Petrov's paper on the main stages in the history of Shevchenko scholarship (1946); Dmytro Chyzhevsky's study of Shevchenko's versification (1947), translated for this volume; Ia. Rudnytsky's analysis of stress in Shevchenko's poetry (1947); Leonid Biletsky's contribution to Shevchenko's biography 'Shevchenko in Iahotyn' (1949), and other works. In 1947 the Academy also published a collection of articles, called *Shevchenko i ioho doba* (Shevchenko and His Age). The Shevchenko Scientific Society, reorganized immediately after the war, published some material on Shevchenko in its *Zapysky* (Memoirs) and its journal *Siohochasne i Mynule* (The Present and the Past). The prestigious literary journal *Arka* contained several excellent articles on Shevchenko, particularly Viktor Petrov's study on his aesthetics, as expressed in his central image of the heart (1948). In the four-year transition period (1946-50), a large number of articles on the poet appeared in other émigré periodicals.

Immediately after resettlement in the United States, Canada, South America, and Australia, Ukrainians created new conditions both for the cult of and scholarship on Shevchenko. Although the former had been very strong already among emigrants who had settled in the United States and Canada before World War II, little scholarship had been done at that time; as far as the cult itself was concerned, the newcomers gave it their own stamp. The Free Academy of Arts and Sciences and the Shevchenko Scientific Society renewed their activities. As early as 1949, Leonid Biletsky's study *Viruiuchyi Shevchenko* (The Believing Schevchenko) was published in Winnipeg by the Canadian branch of the Academy. In the years 1952-4 that branch published a well-produced four-volume edition of Shevchenko's *Kobzar*, edited and annotated by Leonid Biletsky. Subsequently, more specialized scholarly editions of *Kobzar* came out: *The First 'Kobzar' of 1840*, edited by K. Bida (Ottawa 1961), *The 'Kobzar' of 1860* (Winnipeg 1960), and *The 'Kobzar' of 'Osnova,' 1861*, the last two edited by J.B.

Rudnyckyj (Winnipeg 1961). The Canadian branch of the Academy also published a series of short studies on Shevchenko in pamphlet form. The United States branch of the Academy established a short-lived Institute of Shevchenko Studies, which published ten annual collections of articles and studies on Shevchenko, a facsimile of the manuscript of two poems owned by the Academy, and, together with the Shevchenko Scientific Society, reprinted Smal-Stotsky's *Interpretations*. Perhaps the most valuable publication on Shevchenko by the Academy is an English-language collection of nine articles, published in 1962, all but two written especially for the occasion. I have already quoted from Lawrynenko's and Odarchenko's contributions, and Miiakovsky's and Shevelov's articles are reprinted in this volume. The Academy sponsors annual Shevchenko conferences in New York.

The Shevchenko Scientific Society, with strong branches in Europe and the United States, has also promoted the poet's work. Several studies have appeared in its *Zapysky* (Memoirs) since 1950, particularly Volodymyr Ianiv's ethnopsychological inquiries into the problem of Shevchenko and the Ukrainian nation. Oleksander Kulchytsky, a senior member of the Society, has done some interesting work in the archetypal (more specifically Jungian) interpretation of Shevchenko's poems. The Society's most important contribution was the publication, in 1955, of Zaitsev's biography of Shevchenko. The Society also organizes annual Shevchenko conferences.

Outside these two organizations, but with their close co-operation, a number of other major efforts in Shevchenko studies have been undertaken. I think the expanded and corrected edition of the Warsaw collected works is the single most important post-war achievement in Shevchenko studies by émigrés. Several attempts to translate Shevchenko's poetry into English should also be noted here. The most important is a comprehensive volume of Shevchenko's translations by Watson Kirkconnell (1964). This generally excellent work suffers on occasion from the translator's penchant for the English Victorians; he makes Shevchenko sound much more like Tennyson than like Shevchenko. In order to capture the poet's images and ideas, Vera Rich, in her slim volume *Song Out of Darkness* (1961), rendered Shevchenko's poems in loose prosody, occasionally bordering on free verse. The Canadian Communist author John Weir (Vyviursky), in his *Taras Shevchenko: Selections* (1961), achieved some truly impressive translations. The volume, however, is marred by a doctrinaire introduction,

whose perversion of facts to please the Soviet régime was censured even by Soviet critics.

In recent years, the centre of Shevchenko scholarship has shifted from learned societies to American and Canadian universities, as the possibilities of Ukrainian studies within the North American academic structure are becoming more and more viable. Although this shift is too new to have given many significant results, nevertheless George Luckyj's useful study *Between Gogol' and Ševčenko* (Harvard Ukrainian Studies 1971), as well as the volume in hand, show that serious work in that sector is under way.

The last part of the volume addresses itself exclusively to Shevchenko as man and poet. Both Miiakovsky's study and the rigorously scientific report by Swoboda are models of biographical research. The pieces by Shevelov, Luckyj, Schneider, and Pliushch treat *Kobzar* primarily as a literary text. Shevelov's article belongs to the philological-hermeneutic tradition, in which stylistic analysis allusively suggests the poet's calm, concentrated philosophical world view before his death. By comparing the 1860 texts with earlier poems, Shevelov unveils not only the synchronic frame of Shevchenko's last phase but the diachronic process of development which led up to it: The author interprets on the basis of careful observations on Shevchenko's style, which in turn leads him to discuss the poet's growth from restless revolutionary youth into balanced philosophical maturity. Luckyj applies methods of archetypal criticism, with a sociological approach to the theme of the bastard in Shevchenko's *œuvre*, which for Shevchenko symbolizes the destruction of the family as an institution. This is a continuation and refinement of Kulchytsky's pioneering effort mentioned above.

Pliushch's contribution to this volume is indeed a surprise. The author spent a good part of his mature life in Soviet insane asylums for radical political dissent. Although he repeated Shevchenko's bitter destiny in his own life, he does not worship a ready-made cultist image of the poet or erect a new one. There is no trace of bitterness or pathos in his writing: what we have instead is a thoughtful interpretation of a poem from a modified structuralist approach, based in the main on Bakhtin and Propp, which, if not mastered, is exciting, dynamic, and alive. It is significant and even somewhat disturbing that a man who has lived in the West for only a little over two years, and who, when he found time, studied mathematics,

provides 'Westerners' of many years' standing a truly contemporary insight into Shevchenko's work. It would take too long to list all the discoveries Pliushch lightly tosses off in his article; following are a few instances worthy of development in fuller studies. Shevchenko 'raised the genre' of the sentimental ballads, as Shklovsky would put it, and forced it to embody interests quite different from sentimentalism. Shevchenko put the 'dialogue' form of his poetic discourse to various psychological and philosophical uses, all aimed at harmonizing poetically an initially discordant world view. In his most important discovery, Pliushch uses the central structuralist idea of 'transformation' to connect it with the 'indeterminate,' dialectical fluidity of the dialogue form, and to show how it uses plot, image, meaning, and motif, sometimes ending in complete inversion (or formal denial) of elements found in earlier works. Pliushch's application of transformation to the problems of good and evil, and to Shevchenko's view on religion, is thoroughly convincing and profound. Finally, Pliushch shows how Shevchenko's seemingly pure Ukrainian situations are 'transformed' into universal manifestations of the tragedy of life, an insight which goes directly against Chyzhevsky's view of Shevchenko. According to Pliushch, it is in this fatalistic evaluation of human life that Shevchenko finds the final meaning of existence. The only hope for human dignity in the midst of a tragic existence is the metaphorical transformation of evil into good and distrust into love. Perhaps here is the implied reason for Pliushch's own refusal to use his pen as an instrument of vengeance.

I have endeavoured to show, on the basis of the volume in hand, how much has been done in Shevchenko studies in the past hundred and thirty years. It should be equally obvious that whatever has been done is not enough. Soviet scholars are chronically handicapped by their régime, and dissident writings on Shevchenko from the Soviet Union that occasionally reach us – the early Dziuba, Sverstiuk, and Svitlychny – suggest what powerful work would be accomplished there given freedom. Emigré scholars, on the other hand, seem to miss many opportunities for research, for which the absence of manuscript collections or complete libraries of Shevchenko's criticism is insufficient excuse: their living in the West may be of even more aid in the work that needs to be done than being near comprehensive libraries and concentration camps. Perhaps the most obvious gap in Shevchenko scholarship is a series of studies on Shevchenko and Western romanticism, based not on the outdated method of direct influ-

ences but on an imaginative development of affinities. Iurii Boiko's brief report on Shevchenko and Western literatures, Mykola Hlobenko's equally brief essay 'Zhyvyi Shevchenko' (The Living Shevchenko), and notes on Shevchenko and Robert Burns by J.B. Rudnyckyj are practically all that we have in that area. It is embarrassing that the Soviet scholar Oleksander Biletsky's incidental essay of 1939 remains the best, and the most frequently quoted, work on that subject.

Innovative and imaginative readings of Shevchenko, obviously impossible in the Soviet Union, are also practically non-existent in the West; it is as if we were afraid to tamper with canonical interpretations of sacred texts. We should also take stock, by publishing bibliographies, of important studies on Shevchenko available in the West, and develop a program to reprint the best and most useful of that material. This would help younger scholars to wean themselves from dependence on contemporary 'predigested' Soviet reports on sources, reports that are obviously undependable. We should reveal the influence of Shevchenko in twentieth-century Ukrainian literature beyond the Soviet framework. Only we in the West can build an adequate corpus of translations of Shevchenko into foreign languages, particularly into English; the co-operation of native poets is imperative in that endeavour. We should collaborate more closely with historians of the period and of the problems bearing more or less directly on Shevchenko, in order to establish interdisciplinary study. Finally, by scholarly reviews of Soviet works on Shevchenko, we should endeavour to counteract the 'objectivizing' petrification of his image. To accomplish all this, or at least a part of it, we sorely need a clearing-house of information, which can be created only within a research institute of Shevchenko studies.

Much remains to be done. Meanwhile, this volume is an important step towards a mature and discriminating phase of Shevchenko scholarship in the West. It performs many useful tasks that in turn call for assimilation and development, charting ever more daring journeys into the mysterious and vast country of Shevchenko's imagination.

NOTES

1 Czesław Miłosz, *The History of Polish Literature* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. 1969) 203.

2 A. Pleshcheev, 'Zametki koe o chem,' *Moskovskii vestnik*, 13 (April 1860) 208. Cited in V. Ie. Shubravsky, 'Pryzhyttieva krytyka,' in *Shevchenkoznavstvo: Pidsumky i problemy* Ie. P. Kyryliuk, ed., 'Akademiia nauk Ukrainskoi RSR, Instytut literatury im. T.H. Shevchenka' (Kiev: Naukova dumka 1975) 24.

3 Interesting discussions of Kotliarevsky's significance in the twentieth century can be found in Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, *A History of Ukrainian Literature* (Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press 1975) 381-403, Mykola Zerov, *Nove ukrainske pysmenstvo: Istorychnyi narys* (1924; Munich: Instytut literatury 1960) 39-94, and Ievhen Sverstiuk, *Clandestine Essays* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute 1976) 69-96.

4 Jurii Lawrynenko, 'Shevchenko and His *Kobzar*,' in *Taras Ševčenko: 1814-1861*, Volodymyr Mijakovs'kyj and George Y. Shevelov, eds, 'Slavic Printings and Reprintings' ('S-Gravenhage: Mouton 1962) 197. This article is a thoughtful and extremely useful survey of nineteenth-century Ukrainian attitudes towards Shevchenko's work; it is exceptionally good on Drahomanov and Franko.

5 Cited in *ibid.* 200.

6 Ivan Franko, 'Suspilno-Politychni pohliady M. Drahomanova,' *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk*, 8 (1906) 227.

7 K. Ne-ia [K. Arabazhyn], 'Ukrainskyi Prometei: Z pryvodu 45-kh rokovyn smerti Tarasa Shevchenka,' *Vilna Ukraina*, 3 (1906) 5-16. Cited in V. Ie. Shubravsky, 'Shevchenko v krytytsi kintsia XIX-pochatku XX st.,' in *Shevchenkoznavstvo* 103.

8 D.I. Evarnitsky, 'Zaporozhtsy v poezii T.G. Shevchenko,' *Letopis Ekaterynoslavskoi uchenoi arkheologicheskoi kommissii*, VIII (1912) 102-59.

9 In Frank's *The Widening Gyre: Crisis and Mastery in Modern Literature* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press 1963) 3-62; Albert Cook, *Prisms* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press 1967).

10 See, for example, Iu. O. Ivakin, 'Etapy rozvytku radianskoho Shevchenkoznavstva,' in *Shevchenkoznavstvo*, 175. In this case such obscene 'euphemisms' are that much more shocking since Ivakin's article is an informative, useful, and – considering the conditions in which the author worked – fairly honest account of Soviet Shevchenko scholarship.

11 See Bohdan Kravtsiv's detailed report on the destruction of Ukrainian scholarship in the 1930s, 'Rozhrom ukrainskoho literaturoznavstva 1917-1937 rr.,' in *Zbirnyk na poshanu ukrainskykh uchenykh znyshchenykh bolshevytskoiu Moskvoiu*, Mariia Ovcharenko, ed., Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka, 173 (Paris, Chicago: NTSh 1962) 217-307. Also see Hryhorii

Kostiuk, 'Ukrainske naukove literaturoznavstvo v pershe porevoliutsiine desiatylittia,' in *Zbirnyk* 185-216.

12 Petro Odarchenko, 'Shevchenko in Soviet Literary Criticism,' in *Taras Ševčenko* 284-91.

13 O. Biletsky, 'Zavdannia i perspektyvy vyvchennia Shevchenka,' in *Zbirnyk prats IX naukovoi shevchenkivskoi konferentsii*, Akademiia nauk Ukrainskoi RSR, Instytut literatury im. T.H. Shevchenka (Kiev: AN USSR 1961) 19.

14 [Authors' Collective], 'Shevchenkoznavstvo v pisliavoienni roky (1945-1970),' in *Shevchenkoznavstvo* 214.

15 Biletsky, 'Zavdannia i perspektyvy ...' 17.