

UDC 821.161.2

doi: 10.15330/jpnu.1.4.9-20

## Section:

### UKRAINE AND WORLD

#### THE POETIC WORLD OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO: PRINCIPLES OF ARTISTIC THINKING (TO THE 200<sup>TH</sup> ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOBZAR)

STEPAN KHOROB

**Abstract.** The article deals with the three aspects of Taras Shevchenko's artistic genius – creative mentality, dualistic world view and poetic imagery. The poet's psychological identity predetermined a unique combination of conceptual, philosophical and aesthetic elements in his works.

The analysis of Shevchenko's poetic works, his 'Kobzar' collection in particular, reveals the process of merging 'personal identity' with 'social identity'. At the very beginning of his creative career, the two principles developed independently – from outer macroworld and inner microworld; Shevchenko's mature works offer evidence of their natural synthesis responsible for the phenomenon of his poetic genius. The analysis of Shevchenko's shorter poems and his heroic poem 'Haidamaky' shows that dualism is the underlying principle of his poetry: Shevchenko's 'social identity' is presented in terms of mythological consciousness, his 'personal identity' (owing to life circumstances), in terms of existential philosophy.

The analysis of Shevchenko's artistic mentality, philosophical, mythological, existential, and aesthetic concepts adds to our understanding of the unique world of the great Ukrainian poet. His poetry reflects his own knowledge of the world; at the same time, it represents this world in all the complexity of national and universal phenomena; Shevchenko could only become a great world writer by becoming a great Ukrainian writer.

**Keywords:** artistic mentality, dualistic world, poetry, poetic images, Taras Shevchenko.

The times when literature and other cultural and spiritual phenomena were viewed from simplified ideological perspective have passed. Evidently, we return to the original view on literature as a complex and even contradictory synthesis of various factors, the major ones being the author's world view, their ability to artistically transform the real world into a system of specific imagery in accordance with their priorities and values.

Taras Shevchenko's genius is undoubtedly the best representation of Ukrainian mentality, hence the ever-growing scientific interest in his world view and imagery. G. Grabowicz rightly states that 'the phenomenon of a writer who is a hero of national culture can be found in many nations, though obviously no other writer occupies this place so firmly as Shevchenko does, no other author is loved so greatly by the whole nation as he is' [5, p. 8]. An interesting dilemma presents itself, 'As it often happens, the great dazzling truth illuminates, but it also darkens: the brighter the light, the deeper the shadow' [6, p. 105]. Grabowicz's metaphor highlights an old problem of ideological manipulation of Shevchenko's poetic legacy, the fact which other scholars have pointed out so often, 'Since the

publication of *‘Кобзар’* (*‘Kobzar’*, or *‘The Bard’*) a never-ending ideological, political, literary and aesthetic struggle has begun, merely changing its outward form’ [2, p. 67].

The significance of Shevchenko’s work was emphasized by Ivan Franko, who wrote that ‘the publication of Shevchenko’s *“Kobzar”* in Petersburg in 1840 must be considered an as epoch-making event in the Ukrainian belles-lettres, the second one after Kotliarevskyi’s *“Aeneid”*’ [9, p. 276]. His point of view was shared by Shevchenko’s contemporaries, who were deeply impressed by *‘Kobzar’*; H. Kvitka-Osnovianenko, A. Metlynskyi, P. Hulak-Artemovskiy, O. Korsun, M. Kostomarov, O. Afanasiev-Chuzhbynskyi and other Ukrainian men of letters expressed their sincere admiration for the book. Shevchenko’s *‘Kobzar’* changed the face of Ukrainian poetry and most convincingly, through the works of an exceptionally talented poet, demonstrated its true value.

*‘Думи мої, думи мої’* (*‘My Thoughts, My Thoughts’*) is the opening poem of *‘Kobzar’*. It was apparently written at the time when the matter of publishing the collection was settled; Shevchenko wanted, so to speak, to provide a general motivation for the act of publishing his works, of putting his long-cherished thoughts and poetry at stake, quite a thrilling event for the poet. According to Ivan Dziuba, ‘it is a kind of overture to the whole collection; moreover, it is an open-hearted message to prospective readers, a message sent to Ukraine; Shevchenko makes his fatherland the permanent, eternal addressee of his innermost thoughts, which he calls his children (*“В Україну ідіть, діти, в нашу Україну”*) (*“Go then to Ukraine, my children, / To Ukraine, so dear.”*); there he hopes to find understanding and compassion (*“Там найдете щире серце / І слово ласкаве, / Там знайдете щирю правду, / А ще, може й славу...”*) (*“There a true heart you will find, / A word of kindness for you, / There, sincerity and truth, / And even, maybe, glory...”*); his hopes and dreams fly to Ukraine. Here we feel the depths of his nostalgia for his native land; idealized in his lasting memories, it is contrasted to Russian serfdom and despotism (*“Там широко, там весело / Од краю до краю ... Там родилась, гарцювала / Козацька воля ...”*) (*“From end to end, there, it is broad / And joyful ... There was born the Cossack freedom, / There she galloped round...”*); but there comes a searing realization of the fact that the time of freedom and glory **has passed** (*“козацька воля” “лягла спочити ... А тим часом / Виросла могила”*) (*‘the Cossack freedom’ “lay down to take her rest ... Meanwhile the gravemound grew”*) – hence *“сльози за Україну” “чуже поле поливають, / Щодня і щоночі / Поки попи не засиплють / чужим піском очі ...”*) (*“tears for Ukraine” “soak this foreign field, day and night, / Until at last the priests with foreign / Sand shall close my eyes ...”*) – this motif of a hopeless foreign land, the fear of dying in a foreign land started to ring in Shevchenko’s poems so early, and it will keep ringing till his last days’ [5, p. 94].

Ivan Dziuba highlights another motif, a distinctive feature of Shevchenko’s poetry, – ‘no other world poet has ever expressed it in such a form, but in Shevchenko’s poems it will sound, spoken or unspoken, for his whole life, *‘Одну сльозу з очей карих – / І ... пан над панами!..’* (*‘One tear from those dark eyes – and I / Am lord of lords in glory!..’*); there is this special, personal need for a feedback from the human soul (not a loud public recognition, not power over the cohorts of adherents), a feedback like a sincere girl’s love; and maybe, the premonition of his invincible tragic loneliness’ [7, p. 94].

The researcher is absolutely right – this is really the ‘overture’ to the great symphony of Shevchenko’s poetry, to his poetic activity as a whole: it is as though Shevchenko had used short musical phrases in order to outline almost all of his future themes, those of the Petersburg period and some others. Shevchenko unintentionally gives a clue as to the mystery and magic of his poetic world, *‘Серце рвалося, смялось, / Виливало мову, / Виливало, як уміло ...’* (*‘The heart was rent – and smiled again, / Pouring forth its words; / Poured them forth, as best it could ...’*); this magma of feelings, these constant changes – from wrath to tenderness, from hope to desperation, from reproach to meekness; this fullness of the heart, which obeys no rules and recognizes the only power, the power of feelings – taken together, these things make the unique phenomenon of Shevchenko.

The author who represents the world view of the whole nation, whose ideas are perceived by his people ‘as their own’ (C.G. Jung), Shevchenko is greater than any ideology; to comprehend his poetic philosophy of life, one has to dig deep, to look for the asymmetrical lines along which his authentic poetic world is split. The idea of the dualistic nature of Shevchenko’s world view suggests itself. Though it is quite clear that it is not the classical dualism which polarizes only two notions –

materialism and spirituality. There is something deeper and more significant here. As a poet, Shevchenko could rely on the experience of Shevchenko as an individual, on what emerged as a result of his inner struggle, doubts and contradictors.

As Oles Honchar puts it, 'in his "Kobzar", the poet expressed himself, his personality in the first place ... We feel his, Shevchenko's, temperament, his soul, sincere, open and defenceless. Here there are his pained thoughts, injustices experienced by him ... And his language ... Everything is his, Shevchenko's own, tinged with his emotions' [3, p. 248]. That is why the analysis of his psychology, his philosophy and aesthetics can help us tackle the problem of his world view and poetic dualism, for each creation, before it comes to exist, is filtered through the prism of individual essence (skills, temperament, perception of the world, etc.) – the world view of the creator and the principles of recreating the world in a work of art.

Firstly, I will present the general framework of Shevchenko's world view; then I will show how his poetry is built around the backbone of his personal and social philosophy.

For a number of objective reasons (an orphaned childhood; lack of knowledge of high, elite culture and pragmatic experience; a fine ear for music; painting skills that ensured his 'aesthetic entry into the realm of reality' [8, p. 12], conforming to folk moral standards, etc.) Shevchenko's primary world view is mythological, the one in which collective values dominate and the life of an individual is perceived as part of the community's life. Nature, God and society are regarded as a natural single entity.

Each of these factors adds to our understanding of the psyche of the thirteen-year-old teenager. Consider the following lines,

*Я пас ягнята за селом.  
Чи то так сонечко сіяло,  
Чи так мені чого було?  
Мені так любо стало,  
Неначе в Бога...  
Уже покликали до паю,  
А я собі у бур'яні  
Молюся Богу ... і не знаю,  
Чого маленькому мені  
Тоді так приязно молилось,  
Чого так весело було.  
Господнє небо, і село,  
Ягня, здається, веселилось!  
І сонце гріло, не пекло!*

\*

*I herded lambs  
Beyond the village on the lea.  
The magic of the sun, perhaps,  
Or what was it affected me?  
I felt with joy all overcome,  
As though with God ...  
The time for lunch had long passed by,  
And still among the weeds I lay  
And prayed to Go .... I know not why  
It was so pleasant then to pray  
For me, an orphan peasant boy,  
Or why such bliss so filled me there.  
The sky seemed bright, the village fair,*

*The very lambs seemed to rejoice!  
The sun's rays warmed but did not sear!*

Thus Shevchenko's primary identity is merged with social identity. Simultaneously the reverse process, the realization of his personal identity, takes place: my life, my ambition to become an artist; we know how persistently Shevchenko keeps looking for a teacher. The basis for his dualistic thinking was laid in his childhood: social identity (at the moments of weakness 'not-I') and personal identity. Interestingly, this dualistic 'I' did not originate from one point, neither the two of his hypostases got separated later; they arose peripherally – one from the outer macroworld, the other, from the inner microworld. At the beginning, they just coexisted and did not intersect. Having matured, they merged in a natural way providing the basis for Shevchenko's poetic philosophy.

In my opinion, the proof of the aforementioned theory is the absence of love poetry in the literary legacy of the Kobzar\*, in his early poetry in particular (the fact pointed out by Yu. Ivakin). Instead, Shevchenko writes such works as *'Вітре буйний, вітре буйний'* ('Violent Wind, Violent Wind!'), *'Нащо мені чорні брови'* ('Why Do I Need Black Eyebrows'), *'Тече вода в синє море та не витікає'* ('Water Flows into the Blue Sea, but It Does Not Flow Out'), in which his personal feelings are masked as feelings of other people. We know that the poet was not above romantic feelings; for instance, well-known is the story of Shevchenko's relations with Jadwiga Gusikowska.

Let us consider the following lines which give us the idea of the boy's consciousness,

*А дівчина  
... почула, що я плачу,  
Прийшла, привітала,  
Утирала мої сльози  
І поцілувала ...*

\*

*And then a lass  
... Heard my lament and came  
Across the field to comfort me;  
She spoke a soothing phrase  
And gently dried my weeping eyes  
And kissed my tear-wet face ...*

The poet's personal feelings are open and undoubtedly belong to the domain of social identity, a characteristic feature of the mythological type of thinking. The absence of later love poetry indicates that gradually romantic feelings become part of his personal identity and are not made public.

New circumstances (redemption from serfdom, entering the Academy of Arts, being involved in the social life of Petersburg, arrests, exile) bring new impressions and new information; Shevchenko rises above his 'I'; there is a growing realization that it actually does not differ much from the social and historical image of Ukraine. Moreover, if his social identity has no future, the future of his personal identity will also be wiped off – an ex-serf will wear the brand of serfdom as long as serfdom exists. For his personal identity to change, social identity must be changed. Facing this problem, Shevchenko seems to resign himself to timeless existence, 'I do not seem to have any future. Can constant misfortunes have such a sad effect on a person?' [10, p. 294]. At this stage the synthesis of his I's ends. The poet's social identity is represented through mythological consciousness; his personal identity, due to life circumstances, through existential one.

---

\*The name under which Taras Shevchenko is known in the Ukrainian world

According to existential philosophy, people exist in some temporal environment; existence comes to its end at some moment in the future, which stimulates their activity; concern is a form of such activity. If this stimulus disappears, a person lingers in their present and dissolves in it. Shevchenko finds himself in such existential dead end. But his creative nature and firm mythological basis help him break the bonds of this present. At first, mythological world view seems to dominate. In a myth, consciousness turns to the past, to 'the golden age', to the first ancestor. The poet becomes a kind of intermediary between the past (mythological consciousness) and the present (existentialism). It looks as if he belongs both to the present and the future, while actually he is neither here nor there; finally he starts identifying himself with Ukraine. The poet's voice always sounds in unison with the voice of the whole Ukraine. Since this voice sounds also from the past, it is prophetic in what concerns the present. That is why Shevchenko is a Prophet. This is not my own conclusion: all roads lead to Rome; following my own, new line of reasoning, I have achieved a predictable result.

G. Grabowicz rightly states that in Shevchenko's early works, in the poem 'Думи мої, думи мої' ('My Thoughts, My Thoughts') in particular, nostalgia for Ukraine, the sadness of his Petersburg's period are mingled with the theme of lost freedom as the most important attribute and the symbol of Ukraine throughout its history, the basic element of national consciousness [4, p. 53]. The poet's thoughts, his heart and words fly to his native land,

*Там родилась, гарцювала  
Козацька воля;  
Там шляхтою, татарами  
Засівала поле,  
Засівала трупом поле,  
Поки не остило ...  
Лягла спочить ... А тим часом  
Виросла могила, [ ...]*

\*

*There was born the Cossack freedom,  
There she galloped round,  
With Tartars and with Polish lords  
She strewed the plain about  
Till it could take no more; with corpses  
All the plain she strewed.  
Freedom lay down to take her rest;  
Meanwhile the gravemound grew, [...]*

According to the researcher, 'The binary opposition of Cossack freedom (glory) is traced in both reflections about the past and the depiction of the past ...' [4, p. 60]. This opposition is a component of Shevchenko's 'Ukrainian myth'; I would also add here, a component of his general dichotomy of 'the heroic past – the colonial present' [1, p. 416], an element of the poet's philosophy.

'Freedom' (alongside 'glory') remains the key metaphor in Shevchenko's exile poetry; but now it most often is linked with another emotionally charged semantic unit – 'bondage' which, so to speak, opposes 'freedom', the two creating a binary structure [1, p. 416].

The process of the merging of these two world-view systems is quite complicated. In the consciousness of Shevchenko as an individual their obvious disharmony reveals itself recurrently, if not permanently. The poet's inner 'I' gravitates now to one system, now to the other. Their complete synthesis is achieved only in his art; the poet removes contradiction by shifting and 'mixing' the polar points; as a result, there appears a certain poetic masterpiece, which compensates for the disharmony. The following examples can illustrate the process.

In Shevchenko's world, the village is the symbolic image of Ukraine. The village as a mythological archetype is inseparable from nature; the village is the ideal, it is the ideal world,

*Меж горами старий Дніпро,  
Неначе в молоці дитина,  
Красується, любиться  
На всю Україну.  
А понад ним зеленіють  
Широкії села,  
А у селах у веселих  
І люде веселі.*

\*

*Our ancient Dnieper between steep banks,  
Like a child swimming in milk,  
Is rejoicing in beauty  
And all Ukraine is proud.  
Above the Dnieper large villages  
Are dressed in lush greens,  
And in those happy villages  
The people too are happy.*

The village is timeless, universal. It is a world-view model – if the object is viewed from outside Ukraine. The spatial centre predetermines the point of view – the Ukrainian village is a canonical ideal world as, for instance, in the poem 'Марія' ('Mariia'). But in the real-world Ukrainian village there reign disharmony, chaos, conflicts. People are weak, powerless. They need help. These are actually the basics of existentialism. Ukraine's whole history is disharmony, though on the other hand, it seems to perfectly reflect the myth. The past, full of blood, struggle, and sins, is still better than the present. But existential world view breaks connecting links of mythological one; though the past is better than the present, it is not 'the golden age'; the latter is part of the future, as it should be, according to the laws of existentialism,

*І на оновленій землі  
Врага не буде, супостата,  
А буде син, і буде мати,  
І будуть люде на землі.*

\*

*And on the renovated land  
There'll be no enemy, no foeman,  
There'll be a son, will be a mum,  
There will be people on the earth.*

These lines have always been famous and they remain popular nowadays. Let us highlight key concepts: the son is the future; the mum is the past, as heritage, as history; people are an ideal community, which is achieved through the synthesis of past and future happenings – it is conventional existential approach to time and history.

These considerations lead me to the assumption that the poet's artistic thinking originates from the intersection of the two world-view types. It is a well-known fact that folk songs, folk traditions and

morality underlie Shevchenko's mythological consciousness. M. Dziuba, M. Zhulynskyi, S. Kozak, G. Grabowicz, O. Zabuzhko and other scholars research into this aspect of his poetic activity. Having reread *'Катерина'* ('Kateryna') and *'Гайдамаки'* ('Haidamaky'), I suggest we adopt a somewhat different approach to the analysis of Shevchenko's works. In the first poem, the parents banish Kateryna from their home, their decision is predetermined by the folk moral code – the purity of blood must be preserved. In the second, Yarema abandons his sweetheart to face certain death, because the duty to defend his homeland is above the duty to the family. Honta\* kills his children because he cannot break the oath. Collective consciousness always prevails. Besides, many things are hyperbolized: 'the sea of blood', 'much blood', etc. If the mother of Honta's children is Catholic, they are Catholic too (the fact that they have their father's blood in them is disregarded). In the myth it is either black or white, 'tertium non datur' – the purity must be absolute. Mutual love and faithfulness are idealized; when one dies, the balance is disturbed, the other cannot find happiness and also dies. Nature is idealized too. The descriptions of the village and personifications are conspicuous features of Shevchenko's works. Taken together, these elements are clear evidence of the fact that the poet's ethical and aesthetic concepts are mainly the product of his mythological consciousness.

The basics of the poet's mythological world view are presented here just to show how it is superimposed by existential philosophy, which is less conspicuous in Shevchenko's works but no less important. Kateryna has two options – to listen to her parents or to follow her heart. It is a specific phenomenon of Ukrainian national mentality; in Georgian literature, for instance, such a choice would be out of the question. The parents also had a choice – to advise their daughter to be careful or to forbid her going out with a Moscal\*\*. This choice is not prescribed by collective consciousness. That is why Kateryna enjoys comparative freedom: she is free to love but the parents warn her about possible consequences.

At first, things seem to be in balance, even after her sweetheart's departure. Disharmony and tragedy break into Kateryna's world when the child is born. Now the character's existential world view prevails.

Kateryna's conversation with her parents exacerbates the situation. They seem to have a choice and, at the same time, realize that they do not. To let the daughter stay at home means to break with the established tradition, to disregard collective and family values. And the parents make their choice, they do what is prescribed by the society. Like in the myth, collective interests prevail over personal ones. Kateryna does not protest, she is ready (in accordance with the laws of existentialism) to take responsibility for her choice. The end of the poem is quite remarkable. The accident rules the world – Kateryna does meet her sweetheart. If he found some kindness for her in his heart, the outcome might be different. But both the mother and the child are spurned. Kateryna faces a crisis. Driven to despair, she cannot take responsibility for her actions,

*Чорнобрива Катерина  
Найшла, що шукала.  
Дунув вітер понад ставом –  
І сліду не стало.*

\*

*So the dark-browed Kateryna  
Found what she was seeking!  
The wind howled across the gully  
All traces erasing.*

---

\*The other spelling of the name is 'Gonta'.

\*\*In Shevchenko's time, Moscal/Moskal (plural Moskali / Moskali) was a Ukrainian term for a soldier or an officer of the Russian Imperial Army; now it is a derogatory term for Russians (people from Moscovia).

This is a major theme of existentialism and its central question: is life worth living?

... It is evident that readers perceive the story as a tragedy set against a completely different historical backdrop. The world of the Ukrainian village with its ethics and traditions is not yet subjugated to Moscovia, whose spirit is naturally rejected, though without extreme hostility, just as something which should be avoided. This is the ethical and common-sense meaning of Shevchenko's warning refrain, *'Кохайтесь, чорнобриві, / Та не з москалями, / Бо москалі – чужі люде, / Роблять лихо з вами'* ('Fall in love, O dark-browed maidens, / But not with the Moscali / For Moscali – they are foreign folk, / Bringing naught but grief'). Here strange mentality is the point; the verse has a deep meaning a modern reader can easily miss. In Ukrainian villages, girls enjoyed considerable freedom (for instance, *'Кличе мати вечеряти, / А донька не чує; / Де жартує з москаликом, / Там і заночує'* ('Mother called to sup in vain, / The daughter unheeding; / Where she dallied with her love, / There she ended sleeping')); still, this freedom was limited by a strict, verging on cruelty, code of virginity. 'Local' boys were aware of it and, for the most part, did not dare to ruin a maiden's reputation; moreover, any abuse would draw firm condemnation of the community.

A 'stranger', a Moscal, has quite different life principles and does not take into account the matter of a maiden's honour; for him to seduce a village beauty is an act of valour. (P. Chubynskyi in his *'Труды этнографическо-статистической экспедиции в Западно-Русский край'* ('Writings of Ethnographic and Statistical Expedition to the Western-Ruthenian Region') (V.1883) mentions Ukrainian folk songs which give girls a warning, *'Гуляй, гуляй, красна дівка, / Гуляй з молодцями; / Та не гуляй, красна дівка, / З москалями [...]* Вони твою русую косу / Розтріпають, / Вони твою честь дорогу / Розтерять' ('Go out, go out, a fair maiden / Go out with good fellows; / But don't go out, a fair maiden / with the Moscali [...] They will touse / Your dark blond plait, / They will lose you / Your dear honour'). I. Dziuba suggests that 'This might be Shevchenko's implicative meaning, he did not mean to put any typological ethnic hostility against Russians, Moscali, into his poem; otherwise he would not have dared to present it to Zhukovsky, a poet who harboured Russian patriotic feelings. But the very fact that Moscow bureaucracy and Moscow army felt quite at home in Ukraine (quartermen the latter was a real disaster for the Ukrainian village) made this central motif – "... та не з москалями" ('... But not with the Moscali') – sound differently; it gets a broader meaning and the fate of disgraced Kateryna became the symbol of the tragic fate of Ukraine for generations of readers' [7, p. 104–105].

This is actually the difference between Shevchenko's poem and many other poems about the fate of a female victim in world literature, in romantic literature in particular. The difference also lies in the great poetic force with which a wide range of the character's feelings, her love, humiliation and despair; her parents' sufferings; the whole village 'context' of the tragedy are reproduced. Being a humanist, Shevchenko is full of deep sympathy for Kateryna, but he also understands her parents' grief and does not blame them for their verdict. He just keeps warning, *'Кохайтесь, чорнобриві, та не з москалями ...'* ('Fall in love, o dark-browed maidens, but not with the Moscali ...').

Structures similar to the one discussed above are typical of Taras Shevchenko's poetry. It is easier to analyze their dynamics in his longer poems (*'Наймичка'* ('The Servant Girl'), *'Гайдамаки'* ('Haidamaky'), *'Мар'яна-черниця'* ('Mariana the Nun') and others). In his short lyrical poems, the author usually focuses on one thing; it is a holistic approach to Shevchenko's poetry that reveals the general dualism, mythological and existential elements of his world view. Reality and people's actions are predetermined by folk morality, the interests of the community prevail over those of an individual. Though the morality itself is free, there is a place for freedom and love in it. It is not Confucian morality, it is not so rigid and cruel as the Eastern moral code; it is flexible, it gives one a choice. Often the choice leads to tragedy. Tragedy is not accidental because the choice is to be made in a cruel and unstable world, there is too much evil around – masters who rape village girls, venal countrymen, jealousy. Hazardous situations, in which a person cannot control themselves, arise again and again. But the author's voice does not echo the mythological tradition of punishing the unfaithful and sinners; quite the other way round – Shevchenko emphasizes existential priorities.

When his character gets into trouble, mythological, collective morality is rejected. Then existential factors prevail: a person is weak, defenceless, a victim of their own fate and actions, of the cruel world.

Though the society condemns Kateryna, the author feels deeply sorry for her ordeal. Though Honta had his reasons for murdering his children, the author weeps with him on their grave. Honta is both an executioner and a victim. The victim of his own choice, the only possible decision, he slays his sons.

'For more than a century and a half, a horrible action of Shevchenko's Honta causes controversial, diametrically opposed moral judgements – from perceiving it as the highest act of patriotism to feeling disgusted with his blind rage and even mental perversion. It seems to me that the superficial way we read the poem is the root of such polar judgements,' states Ivan Dziuba. 'In general, all Shevchenko's works ("Haidamaky" in particular) resolutely resist unambiguous interpretations. Is it worth while "questioning" Shevchenko about his "view" on Honta's sacrifice when we have a completely different thing: the poet's choice of the episode (historic or fictitious) which dramatically highlights the horror of religious hostility between people, especially when it is superimposed on the social and national hostility' [7, p.157]. In the chapter 'Honta in Uman', we read,

*Встала й весна, чорну землю  
Сонну розбудила,  
Уквітчала її рястом,  
Барвінком укрила;  
І на полі жайворонок,  
Соловейко в гаї  
Землю, убрану весною,  
Вранці зустрічають ...  
Рай та й годі! А для кого?  
Для людей. А люде?  
Не хочять на нього й глянуть.  
А глянуть – огудять.  
Треба кров'ю домальовувать,  
Освітить пожаром ...  
[...] Пекла мало!..  
[...] Не спинила весна крові,  
Ні злості людської.  
Тяжко глянуть; а згадаєм –  
Так було і в Трої.*

\*

*Spring came and woke the sleepy earth  
From its deep winter sleep:  
With primroses it was adorned  
And periwinkles sweet;  
The larks in fields and nightingales  
In groves each morning sing  
Their sweetest songs in joyful praise  
Of earth adorned by spring ...  
A heaven truly! And for whom?  
For people. Yes, but they?  
They do not even want to look,  
Or that it's poor, they say.  
They want it tinted up with blood  
And brightened with a blaze; ...  
[...] Too little hell!..*

[...] *To blood and human savagery*  
*Spring did not bring a halt.*  
*It's terrible ... Yet 'twas the same*  
*In ancient Troy.*

Thus in the works of the great Ukrainian author, there intersect two sophisticated world-view systems, one build around family values; the other, around the inner freedom of an individual; moreover, they intersect at their highest points and complement each other so perfectly, that the question of priority or prevalence of one system over the other never arises, there has never been so much as a hint of it. Both the interests of the society and an individual's inner freedom represent the same phenomenon – human existence. As to human existence, it transforms into quite interesting conceptual models in terms of mythology and existentialism.

In my opinion, two models – those of the woman and of God – are the most important ones. The latter is considered to be the acme of Shevchenko's interpretation of existence, which is why it attracts attention of many researches, even those in whose consciousness the place of God is empty. These and some other spheres of human existence represented in Shevchenko's poetry require further in-depth research from different perspectives, including the one suggested in this paper.

My other idea might seem too modernistic and mystical, though I think it is worth being mentioned here. For the past two millennia, the human spirit (in all spheres of its existence) has been stubbornly looking for a single-plane representation; monistic world view as a classical model of cognition has prevailed in human culture. Now the model seems to have exhausted itself. Today we perceive the world as a much more complex phenomenon which requires a fresh analytical approach. We reconsider acquired experience condensed in the numerical expression of the millennium as a symbolic revelation concerning the magic of number and rise to a new level of spiritual knowledge (decoding acquired experience, people code it again; the process is a certain recoding of the spirit). After all, this idea is not new; ancient Greek, Latin and Oriental cultures have worked out different invariants – monistic, dualistic, pluralistic world-view systems. Which is why the suggested approach to Shevchenko's works is neoclassical rather than modernistic.

A finishing touch. The suggested dualistic analysis of the great poet's legacy makes it possible to investigate the phenomenon so aptly termed by Myknailyna Kotsiubynska as 'the art of simplicity' [8, p. 239]. Shevchenko's works represent his fragment of the world, the world predetermined and limited by two principles, mythological and existential (metaphorically speaking, the principles of art and simplicity). Thus he managed to communicate something entirely new, unique, a product of his heart and mind. Constant interpretations of other people's ideas lead to inevitable dependence on their originators and finally to identification with them. It is not enough for an author to provide only aesthetic and formal content of their work. They have to take care of its philosophical content as well. The author's unique world view, which underlies the structure of their works, can raise national problems to the world level. It turns a book or a poem into a message to humanity. Philosophy is a conversation about the eternal. So is literature.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Барабаш Ю.Я. *Вибрані студії. Сковорода. Гоголь. Шевченко*. Вид. дiм "Києво-Могилянська академiя", Київ, 2006.  
 [Barabash Yu.Ia. *Vybrani studii. Skovoroda. Hohol. Shevchenko*. Vyd. dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia", Kyiv, 2006.]
- [2] *Вогненне слово Кобзаря. Літературно-критичні статті про Шевченка*. Рад. письменник, Київ, 1984.  
 [Vohnenne slovo Kobzaria. Literaturno-krytychni statti pro Shevchenka. Rad. pysmennyk, Kyiv, 1984.]

- [3] Гончар Олесь. Вічне слово. *Вогненне слово Кобзаря. Літературно-критичні статті про Шевченка*, (1984), 244-252.  
[Honchar Oles. Vichne slovo. *Vohnenne slovo Kobzaria. Literaturno-krytychni statti pro Shevchenka*, (1984), 244-252.]
- [4] Грабович Г. *Поет як міфотворець. Семантика символів у творчості Тараса Шевченка. Пер. з англ. Соломії Павличко. Основи*, Київ, 1998.  
[Hrabovych H. *Poet yak mifotvorets. Semantyka symboliv u tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka. Per. z anhl. Solomii Pavlychko. Osnovy*, Kyiv, 1998.]
- [5] Грабович Г. *Шевченко як міфотворець*. Рад. письменник, Київ, 1991.  
[Hrabovych H. *Shevchenko yak mifotvorets. Rad. pysmennyk*, Kyiv, 1991.]
- [6] Грабович Г. Шевченко, якого не знаємо. *Сучасність*, 11 (1992), 102-110.  
[Hrabovych H. *Shevchenko, yakoho ne znaiemo. Suchasnist*, 11 (1992), 102-110.]
- [7] Дзюба І.М. *Тарас Шевченко: Життя і творчість*. Вид. дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", Київ, 2008.  
[Dziuba I.M. *Taras Shevchenko: Zhyttia i tvorchist. Vyd. dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia"*, Kyiv, 2008.]
- [8] Коцюбинська М. *Етюди про поезику Шевченка*. Рад. письменник, Київ, 1990.  
[Kotsiubynska M. *Etiudy pro poetyku Shevchenka. Rad. pysmennyk*, Kyiv, 1990.]
- [9] Франко І.Я. *Зібрання творів: у 50-ти т. Наукова думка*, Київ, 1984.  
[Franko I.Ia. *Zibrannia tvoriv: u 50-ty t. Naukova dumka*, Kyiv, 1984.]
- [10] Шевченко Т. Письмо к В.И. Репниной от 14 ноября 1849г. *Шевченко Т. Собрание сочинений в пяти томах*, 5 (1965).  
[Shevchenko T. *Pysmo k V.Y. Repnynoi ot 14 noiabria 1849h. Shevchenko T. Sobranie sochynenyi v piaty tomakh*, 5 (1965).]

**Address:** Stepan Khorob, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57, Shevchenko Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025, Ukraine.

**E-mail:** kaf.lit@ukr.net.

**Received:** 13.11.2014; **revised:** 04.12.2014.

---

Хороб Степан. Поетичний світ Тараса Шевченка: засоби художнього мислення (до 200-річчя від дня народження Кобзаря). *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 1 (4) (2014), 9–20.

У статті досліджено особливості художнього мислення Тараса Шевченка, пов'язаного із дуалістичною природою його світовідчуття, а також із поезикою його образотворення. Доведено, що таке поєднання ідейно – філософського та ідейно – естетичного в поетовому світовідтворенні лежить у психологічній площині його авторської свідомості.

На широкому матеріалі поетичних творів Тараса Шевченка, передовсім тих, що вміщені в його «Кобзарі», спостережено процес акумуляції «Я – автора» з «Я – соціум», показано, як на перших порах творчого шляху ці два складники зароджувались периферійно (одне із зовнішнього макросвіту, інше – з внутрішнього мікросвіту), а згодом, визрівши як повноцінне явище, органічно синтезувались і витворили Шевченка-поета. Водночас автор дослідження на прикладі багатьох поезій письменника, поеми «Гайдамаки» доводить, що такий синтез дуалістичних «Я» також вивершує його поетичне мислення: «Я – соціум» презентовано міфологічною свідомістю, тоді як «Власне – Я» (у силу життєвих обставин) – екзистенціальністю.

Такий здійснений аналіз творчості Тараса Шевченка, зосібна його художнього мислення, крізь призму філософсько – міфологічних, екзистенційних, ідейно – естетичних концепцій дав можливість автору дослідження виявити неповторний й оригінальний світ поезій Тараса Шевченка. Поезії, у яких світовідчуття і світовідтворення, національне і загальнолюдське мають непроминуше значення як для народу України, так і для всього світу.

**Ключові слова:** художнє мислення, дуалістична природа світовідчуття, поезія, образи, Тарас Шевченко.