

SHEVCHENKO'S ARCHETYPES

GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ

I. Introductory

REFERENCES TO ARCHETYPES, or more likely the simple use of the terms “архетип/-и” or “архетипальний/-е,” did appear now and then in Soviet Shevchenko scholarship, or in the para-scholarly Shevchenko discourse, in the period before Ukrainian independence, but given the ideological strictures and general isolation from western theories that obtained in the Soviet Union, they had neither real currency nor any programmatic conceptualization.¹ The pre-Soviet period remains outside our purview since it predates the Jungian theory that will serve as our basic frame of reference here. In post-independence Ukraine (1991 and after) the terminological and conceptual reliance on “archetypes,” and with it a broad array of western theoretical formulations, becomes ever more pronounced, but its use was and remains largely superficial, eclectic and dilettantish – both within Shevchenko studies and in the broader frame of the humanities and the social science.² Given the burgeoning popular interest in myth, folklore, occultism, and so on, and in the absence of quality control in the academic establishment, writings on Shevchenko’s archetypes have now become a staple on the internet – but mainly in a para-literary or pseudo-scholarly mode (cf. sec. 4, below).

For its part, Shevchenko scholarship outside of Ukraine did address the question of archetypes, but only in a preliminary way; cf. below. Apart from these and a few other recent, though largely cursory studies, a complex investigation of the role and functions of archetypes in Shevchenko’s creative legacy has not been attempted, and the question, in principle, remains open. To the extent that it is a central question,

¹ The Ukrainian version of this study appeared as “Arkhetypy Shevchenka” in Hryhori Hrabovych, *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaємо* (Kyiv, 2014); cf. also the shorter Ukrainian version in *Shevchenkivs'ka entsyklopediia*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 2012), 253-71. The notion of the archetype was used in both pre-Soviet and in Soviet literary scholarship in a purely philological or largely textual frame, in the sense of a primal (and subsequently lost) text; cf. e.g., M. Hrushevs'kyi's *Istoriia ukraїns'koї literatury*, vol. 3 (Kyiv, 1993), 77 and 79. This does not directly relate to our use of the term.

² See, for example, Olena Donchenko and Iurii Romanenko, *Arkhetypy sotsial'noho zhyttia i polityka* (Kyiv, 2001); and Natalia Slukhai, “Arkhetypy,” *Shevchenkivs'ka entsyklopediia, Robochyi zoshyt A* (Kyiv, 2004), 207-17.

one which models the basic structures and the psychological, compositional and narrative levels of Shevchenko's writings and art, and particularly his poetry, this state of affairs reminds us yet again of the basic gaps that exist in contemporary Shevchenko studies, especially with respect to the psychological.

1.

The theory of archetypes has its origins in the work of the psychoanalyst Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) and was developed by him over the course of many years, beginning with a preliminary formulation in his dissertation "On the Psychology and Pathology of So-called Occult Phenomena," in 1902, and later in his 1919 article on "Instinct and the Unconscious," and then in "The Concept of the Collective Unconscious" (1936-1937) and more specifically in such later works as "The Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype," "On the Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious," "On the Archetype with special reference to the Concept of the Anima" and other works.³ Although the term "archetype" existed long before Jung's usage, and was most often compared, even by Jung himself, to Platonic "ideas," and the term itself borrowed by him, as he says, from Dionysius the Aeropagite, its conceptualization and theoretical as well as clinical application is closely linked with Jungian and post-Jungian psychoanalysis and is still broadly discussed and continually refined in analytical (Jungian) psychoanalysis.⁴ For Jung, it was a theory that underwent significant evolution, from discussions of "primordial images" to that of the ontological status of the archetype, and to its application to various forms of human activity.⁵ At the same time, beginning with the 1930s, first in Anglo-American criticism and then more broadly, the idea of the archetype and so-called archetypal criticism becomes an established form of literary criticism and exegesis.⁶

³ See "Zur Psychologie des Kind-Archetypus" (1951), "Die psychologischen Aspekte des Mutter-Archetypus" (1954), "Über die Archetypen des kollektiven Unbewussten" (1954), "Über den Archetypus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Animabegriffes" (1954). Cf. C. G. Jung, *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, trans. R. F. C. Hull, vol. 9, pt. 1 of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Bollingen Series 20 (New York, 1959).

⁴ Cf. Jung, *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. See also Jolande Jacobi, *Komplex/Archetypus/Symbol in der Psychologie C.G. Jungs*; Eng. trans.: *Complex/Archetype/Symbol in the Psychology of C. G. Jung*, trans. Ralph Manheim, Bollingen Series 57 (Zurich, 1957), 34.

⁵ Cf. Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 33-35 and passim.

⁶ See esp. Maud Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* (London, 1934), and also John

The basic theses of the Jungian conception of the archetype are relatively well known. According to Jung, "Archetypes may be considered the fundamental elements of the conscious mind, hidden in the depths of the psyche... They are systems of readiness for action, and at the same time images and emotions. They are inherited with the brain structure – indeed they are its psychic aspect."⁷ Archetypes, in a word, model our psychic life, our instincts, emotions and perceptions. Characteristically they exist both in the individual and the collective unconscious: "archetypes are not disseminated only by tradition, but ...can rearise spontaneously at any time, at any place, and without any outside influence"; they are thus "living dispositions, ideas in the Platonic sense, that preform and continually influence our thoughts, feelings and actions."⁸

The notion of the "collective unconscious" (*das kollektive Unbewusste*) through which Jung significantly expanded the psychoanalytic doxa of his day, and which precipitated his split with Freud, and won him lasting skepticism from the scientistically inclined scholarly establishment, also opened the way to a multifaceted and fruitful investigation of a range of cultural phenomena, especially in ethnology, in folklore (particularly fables), ritual and above all myth. By reaffirming the universality of the human imagination and of symbolism it continues to generate new typological and comparative research. Archetypes, which function as a *sui generis* index of basic and continually renewed motifs, topoi and images, become the locus for or the modality in which the collective unconscious echoes and works with the individual, personal unconscious. For Shevchenko, both the mythical dimension (as code, as mode of thinking and symbolism) and the psychological dimension (again as code, as symbolic mode, but also as a strategy of daily thought and action and as essential introspection) are remarkably strong, deep and fraught with meaning. They are also remarkably unexamined in the voluminous criticism devoted to him. Thus, the concept and especially the textually given presence of archetypes become a means through which one can productively and systematically examine the symbolism and the structuring – and the interaction – of both codes, the mythical and the personal-psychological.⁹

Celli, *The Uses of the Term "Archetype" in Contemporary Literary Criticism*, Ph.D. thesis, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, 1974.

⁷ Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 37.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁹ Cf. George G. Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), 16.

2.

According to Jung, archetypes are in principle universal and omnipresent – they are, after all, the products of human experience from the dawn of the species. The most basic, most often noted and most frequently discussed archetypes pose only a finite series, to be sure: the mother (which Jung himself analyzed¹⁰), the father (which melds into the concept and image of God), the child (which like the other two has various ramifications, including the “holy child,” the “child of nature,” the orphan and so on), and various others which continue on into a series of specific, but still universal archetypes, for example, the teacher, the priest/holy man, the king or tsar, the holy fool, the trickster, and so on. All of them find different manifestations in different cultures and smoothly meld into a broad gamut of literary characters or types. Commenting on Jung’s theory, Jolande Jacobi notes that archetypes basically constitute a hierarchical order, from the most essential and primordial which illustrate “the fundamental characteristics of human kind” to those that are more specific, for example the European, or then the Nordic, and then the specifically national, and ethnically based, and on further to the local, for example those relating to, say, the city of London. With greater specificity or localization the charge of psychic energy and the depth of significance and of numinosity contained in the archetypes decreases proportionally.¹¹ In principle, the number of possible archetypes is endless: given the multiple and multifarious nature of human cultures, and especially the human tendency to create and reformulate symbols, any important moment or type has the potential to become an archetype. Moreover, and most importantly, the archetype is immanently bi-polar, reflecting as it does “the general contradictory and contrapuntal nature of psychic life.”¹² As Jung puts it, “all archetypes have their positive, attractive, bright side which tends upwards, but at the same time they have a side that tends downwards, which is particularly negative and repellent, and partially chthonic.”¹³ It is altogether natural and inevitable, therefore, that in Shevchenko the “mother” can be transformed into a “witch.”

This hardly exhausts the protean nature of the archetype. Such key Jungian structures of the psyche as the self (*das Selbst*, also “the soul,”

¹⁰ See Jung, “Psychological Aspects of the Mother Archetype,” in *Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, 75-101, and Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 33.

¹¹ See Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 56-57. Regarding “numinosity” see Part II, below.

¹² Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 65.

¹³ *Ibid.*

which is so central to Shevchenko), the “anima” and “animus,” the “shadow” (which also plays a crucial role in his poetry) are all essentially archetypal. In addition, a wide range of events on the individual or collective level, or on both at once, also manifest archetypal form and meaning: birth, death, marriage, divorce, the creation of the world, the end of the world/apocalypse, and so on. This greatly expands the range of subsumed material, of course, but it also shows how productive these structures can be. Most importantly – and archetypal criticism has repeatedly demonstrated this – archetypes are not static moments or topoi, and even more so they are not mere illustrative material. As Jung has argued, archetypes organize the work of the psyche, establish its basic motifs and patterns of development, determine its narrative strategies and symbolic values, and ultimately decide its essential meaning and Gestalt.¹⁴ The very list of “archetypal patterns” examined by Maud Bodkin in her path-breaking book – rebirth (in the poetry of Coleridge), heaven and hell and the descent into hell (in Virgil, Dante and Milton), the image of woman (in Milton, Dante and Goethe) and various others – indicate both their depth, that is, their psycho-cultural rootedness in the collective imagination and at the same time their broad dissemination in various cultures and periods.¹⁵ For Northrop Frye, archetypes and archetypal patterns, along with myth and mythopoesis, determine the essential modalities, and particularly the genres, of literature itself.¹⁶

3.

In Shevchenko's works archetypes can be seen as a basic symbolic and narrative presence, a code guiding his poetry. Indeed, this is specific to the poetry, for his prose and his painting are not ruled by the same condensation of symbolic means, the same compression of psychic energy and intensity of introspection, or the same reliance on mythical thought, and with that the key emphasis on prophecy (which itself is also an archetype) that characterizes the poetry. One can and one should examine both the prose and his painting for echoes of that archetypal code of the poetry, but this may be deferred for another occasion.

¹⁴ See *ibid.*, 31-73, and *passim*.

¹⁵ See Bodkin, *Archetypal Patterns*, *passim*.

¹⁶ See Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, 1957).

II. Collective Archetypes: The Mythopoetic Code

1.

One can contextualize matters by briefly reviewing the moments, characters and topoi (all but exclusively drawn from Shevchenko's poetry) which the earlier critical literature has discussed precisely as archetypes. Almost invariably they were perceived nominally (not functionally or structurally) and statically, in effect, as attributes of Shevchenko's poetic world, as a set of topoi, albeit important ones. One of the first attempts to address the question of archetypes in Shevchenko's poetry, and specifically in the context of both Jungian theory and with reference to archetypal criticism, was George S. N. Luckyj's "The Archetype of the Bastard in Ševčenko's Poetry," which traces the presence of this archetype in Shevchenko's poetry (addressing particularly such long poems as "Kateryna" and "Mariia"), briefly discusses the connection of the archetype of the bastard with that of the mother (which is partially obscured by the unconvincing thesis about the existence of a primal matriarchy), broaches the broad topic or complex of illegitimacy in Shevchenko, particularly the topos of the *pokrytka*, the unwed mother (without, however, noting that it, too, is an archetype), and arrives at the conclusion that a pair of "cosmic proportions" is implied here.¹⁷ Despite its somewhat limited textual base (Luckyj does not mention such poems as "Tytarivna," "Petrus" and especially "Vo Iudeï vo dni ony," where in one of the poem's variants the poet refers three times to Christ as "байстрюче праведний" [righteous bastard] and adds for himself "Прости / Мене, неправедного" [forgive me, an unrighteous one]), and despite the fact that the role and function of this archetype is not really developed with respect to the question of illegitimacy/marginality as such, and especially the key juxtaposition of the worlds of the father and the mother, and so on, there are at least two major moments that are addressed by this study – apart from the basic fact that it examines the Shevchenkian archetype for the first time in a systematic way. On the one hand, in the spirit of the archetypal criticism then flourishing in the West, Luckyj postulates (for the most part implicitly) that the archetype here is not a static "thing," but something of a process; he stresses the narrative basis of this archetype, the fact that the fate of the bastard projects a plot and symbolic movement. (To be sure, the

¹⁷ See George S. N. Luckyj, "The Archetype of the Bastard in Ševčenko's Poetry," *Slavic and East European Journal* 14, no. 3 (1970).

structure behind this movement is not identified, and the hypothesis that “Mariia” resolves its dichotomies does not in fact hold true; cf. below.) The second, perhaps even more basic insight stems from Luckyj’s observation that the topic has its “pre-history,” in effect, that the early attempts to consider Shevchenko’s “national character” (*narodnist*) as well as his underlying “themes and motifs” which serve as his “primordial images” (M. Sumtsov) constituted a kind of “pre-theoretical” or “pre-Jungian” formulation of the question, postulating a kind of archetype *avant la lettre*, or archetype-without-an-archetype, in effect, an archetype-without-psychoanalysis.¹⁸ This has special relevance for contemporary Shevchenko studies for it shows that traditionalism and rudimentary empiricism, and an attendant resistance to theory, have their roots not only in the Soviet period but are indeed already in place in the pre-Soviet period – and now continue apace into the post-Soviet one.¹⁹ Many of the contemporary Shevchenko studies that allude to or circle around this topic are characterized by a similar descriptive empiricism, by an absence of hierarchy or structuring in the treatment of the phenomenon, and above all by a marked avoidance of the pertinent theoretical frame – and in all this echo the style and legacy inherited from Soviet literary scholarship.²⁰ For both a prehistory and a clearer situating of the notion of archetype in present-day Shevchenko studies, the raw terminological material found in many of these studies may be instructive, and the mix of the traditional and ad hoc, for example,

¹⁸ Cf. Kostomarov re. “narodnist”; also cf. N. F. Sumtsov, “Glavnye motyvy poezii T. G. Shevchenko,” *Iz ukrainskoi stariny* (Kharkiv, 1905), first published in *Kievskaiia starina* 60, no. 2 (1898).

¹⁹ An exceptionally solid scholarly work – albeit largely empirical in its method – is Filaret Kolessa’s “Folk’ornyi element v poezii T. Shevchenka” in his *Studii nad poetychnoiu tvorchistiu T. Shevchenka* (Lviv, 1939); cf. also Teofil Komarynets’, *Shevchenko i narodna tvorchist’* (Kyiv, 1963) (also mentioned by Luckyj). Cf. also Volodymyr Krekoten’s article “Mifolohichni siuzhety, motyvy ta obrazy u tvorchosti T. H. Shevchenka” in the *Shevchenkiv’skyi slovnyk*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 1976), 407-8; Stepan Myshanych’s article “Mifolohiia u tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka,” *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, vol. 230, *Pratsi Sektsii ethnohrafii ta fol’klorystyky* (Lviv, 1995), 234-50; and the most recent works of the Institute of Literature of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, i.e., the collective *Temy i motyvy poezii Tarasa Shevchenka* (Kyiv, 2008) as well as Lesia Heneraliuk’s monograph, *Universalizm Shevchenka: vzaïmodiia literatury i mystetstva* (Kyiv, 2008).

²⁰ Folkloristic studies, such as the excellent work by Filaret Kolessa noted above, are hard pressed to avoid this empiricism; at any rate, that work reflected the state of ethnography at that time. But when it remains fixed in place for decades and is then applied to literary studies (cf. Stepan Myshanych’s study noted above) it reflects an isolated and dated scholarship. For its part, the work of Lesia Heneraliuk (also noted above) draws on (or seems to draw on) the latest critical innovations, but their application is less than persuasive – or indeed coherent.

“key-images,” “images-symbols,” “words-mythologems,” “words-symbols,” “mythological allusions,” or “images-concepts,” not to say the altogether general “themes” and “motifs,” clearly suggests certain conceptual difficulties in grasping this topic.²¹

2.

Various direct treatments of Shevchenko’s archetypes are hardly more rigorous, and seldom if ever address the most basic issue – the psychological dimension as such and within that the interrelation between the individual and the collective unconscious.

One can find, for example, broad and general claims that there is an “archetype of the heart” in Shevchenko and that it articulates “the way to the ideal and to harmony with nature”; along with that one also hears that Shevchenko’s writing is animated by the “archetype of the word.”²² In the newest academic edition of Shevchenko’s Complete Works, in the commentary to the poem “Son” (relating to the phrase “i niodnisiin’koï khaty” [and not a single peasant house – i.e. to be found in St. Petersburg]) we are told that “the archetype of the peasant house (khata), contains a profound humanitarian charge. The peasant house is a haven of human warmth and peace” and thereupon come various examples that purport to illustrate that “this archetype is intended to counter the concept of ‘palace.’”²³ Other poems that deal with this topos such as “L.” (“Postavliu khatu i kimnatu...”) and especially “My-nuly lita molodii,” are not mentioned, however, nor is it noted that Shevchenko also regularly projects a totally different, “cold” and in-

²¹ Cf. Myshanych, “Mifolohiia u tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka,” *passim*; and Heneraliuk, *Universalizm Shevchenka*, *passim*. The “themes” and “motifs” from the above-noted collective volume (*Temy i motyvy poezii Shevchenka*) also generally tend to address the topic and issue of archetypes; for example, the “motif” of the “road” (which would perhaps be better phrased as that of a “quest”) would clearly qualify as an archetype; the same can be said of such topoi as “fate,” or “freedom,” or “death,” and so on. Throughout, a clear perspective on these matters and the requisite critical tools seem to be lacking.

²² Cf. Uliana Maraieva, “Arkhetypy ukrains’koï mental’nosti” on the site of the “Ukrainoznavstvo Institute,” <http://rius.kiev.ua/do/ment2>. [as of 2011; no longer active, July 26, 2013]; however, the notion of Shevchenko’s “archetype of the word” [arkhetyp slova] easily resurfaces in another online archetype i.e., as “mentalitet”: cf. “Ukrains’ka mental’nist’ u konteksti natsional’no-patriotichnoho dyskursu” (http://www.library.univ.kiev.ua/ukr/elcat/new/detail.php3?doc_id=1429859).

²³ See Taras Shevchenko, *Povne zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 2001), 703 (hereafter *PZTDT*). Regarding the “profound humanitarian charge,” see my “Shevchenko i psevdomorfozy humanizmu,” *Krytyka / Krumuka*, 2007, no. 3, 12-18.

hospitable peasant house (cf. especially the ending of the long poem “Sotnyk”). This, of course, is also an archetype – but in its negative, fearsome cast (the above-noted polarity).

A prominent locus, or bazaar, for discussing Shevchenko's archetypes is the internet, particularly in the guise of the ready-made essays (*referaty* or papers) on Ukrainian literature, and on Shevchenko as well, which are either sold or distributed freely there.²⁴ What characterizes both the *referaty*, and the dissertations (and their *avtoreferaty*), is that they have the same static and declarative and “empirical” tone and are quite innocent not only of any textual subtlety, but of a sense of the textual whole of the corpus they are dealing with, in effect, of the system of Shevchenko's poetry. As such they become a powerful if indirect indictment of the discourse of the Ukrainian establishment, specifically the school criticism relating to Shevchenko.

Both the scholarly and the journalistic discourses show a persistent tendency to relate the archetypes to the Ukrainian ethno-national sphere, to the Ukrainian world-view, and to the “national mentality” as such.²⁵ As understandable as this may be in today's political context, and the anxieties it generates, this tends to introduce a certain distortion (if not subversion) of the basic notion of the archetype by substituting a particular, ethnic coloring for something that is essentially universal. In the broader psychological, and cultural, and theoretical frame archetypes are not measured or defined solely by the collective ethnic or national experience. By their nature, they reach the deepest, universal level of human experience – although they may also draw on the collective memory of smaller, national and ethnic collectives; as such, they should need not be sought on one level of meaning to the

²⁴ This para-scholarly (and in light of its underlying plagiarism – anti-scholarly) production can largely be ignored. At times, however, as with the Wikipedia, it can be useful – not truly scholarly, but to some extent informative. Cf. e.g., “Referat na temu: Vyvchennia mifiv. Istoriiia rozvytku mifokrytyky,” www.ukrlib.com.ua/referats-zl/printout.php?id=184. This shadow industry is a product of the curriculum, i.e., the obligation to study literature; Shevchenko and discussions of his archetypes are particularly steeped in this para-scholarly humus.

²⁵ Illustrative of the hyperbole that surrounds this is the fact that such politicians as the Speaker of the Parliament of Ukraine, and even the President, are ready to comment on the subject of Shevchenko's archetypes; cf. e.g.: “Poeziia Kobzaria – vichna knyha ukraïntsviv,” on the site of the former www.golos.com.ua/article/1227094211.html [active 2009; not available now] and “Taras Shevchenko: prochyttannia mizh urochystostiamy” on the site of the latter: www.yuschenko.com.ua/ukr/Past/175/447 [also not available now]. The Yushchenko site even claimed [ca. 2009] that Shevchenko anticipated Jung: “Шевченкові ‘діді високочолі,’ протиставлення, боротьба чоловічої стихії вогню і жіночої стихії води є взагалі зверненням до найглибшої символіки образів, які набагато пізніше Юнг назвав архетипами”.

exclusion of a possibly deeper and more essential one.²⁶ A tension in a particular reading is ultimately resolved through the interplay of the textually given and the broader patterns of the work.

3.

A certain preliminary contextualization of the role of Shevchenko's archetypes was suggested in my earlier study, *The Poet as Mythmaker*, which in a departure from the Shevchenko studies pattern of the time, focused its inquiry both on the structures of Shevchenko's thought, his mythopoetic code and his mythical view of Ukraine, her fate, and beyond that of human fatedness itself, and on the means and signposts of his self-projection as a carrier of the myth.²⁷ The study itself did not set out to examine Shevchenko's archetypes in their full range and complexity – especially since its focus was programmatically focused on the collective and mythical level and the question of the author's psychological code was left as a task for the future. An examination of myth and mythical thought, however, is impossible without reference to archetypes – they are, after all, the building blocks of this modality – and thus archetypes and archetypal moments and contexts were discussed there in various forms, be it as archetypal events, or archetypal figures – for example, the *kobzar* (the carrier of the myth), or Iarema Halaida (a figure in the long poem *Haidamaky* who appears as an emblematic representative of *communitas*), or Jan Hus (from the poem by the same name, an archetypal martyr), Nero (the archetypal tyrant) and Christ (the archetypal savior). Throughout, Shevchenko's mythopoesis was discussed as the language of archetypes and universal symbols.²⁸ Both explicitly and implicitly I stressed that any moment, particularly one that possessed collective weight or validation, and was anchored in collective memory, could become a symbol, and this, according to the theory of archetypes, is the objective, visible basis for an archetype.²⁹ This connection can now

²⁶ Jacobi speaks directly (and somewhat schematically, perhaps) of the hierarchy that obtains here: "Such a hierarchical chain might, for example, be formed of those archetypes which manifest the basic traits of the entire human family, of the feminine sex alone, of the white race, of Europeans, of Nordics, of the citizens of London, of the Brown family, etc. ... The basic structure is laid down, but its individual spatiotemporal concretizations are imprinted by the time and environmental constellations in which they appear." *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 57.

²⁷ See Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*.

²⁸ See chap. 3, "The Myth: Structures and Paradigmatic Relations," esp. 44-57.

²⁹ Cf. C. G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation*, vol. 5 of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, (London, 1977), 232, and Jacobi, *Complex/Archetype/Symbol*, 74 and *passim*.

be put unequivocally: given the basic mythical code of Shevchenko's poetry, and the role of archetypes as the basic building blocks of myth, its mythologems, the whole fabric of Shevchenko's poetry can be said to be focused on archetypes, on their essential articulation. A careful rereading of the poetry will confirm this directly.

One should also note that the basic structural oppositions discussed in *The Poet as Mythmaker*, especially the opposition between the "world of the father" or that of social structure and the "world of the mother," or broadly speaking *communitas*, is that foundation or indeed spring or mechanism that generates a series of archetypal situations, narratives, themes, and so on and defines the basic values and symbolic tasks of Shevchenko's poetry.

By this same token, by considering the gamut of psychological archetypes and archetypal patterns one can begin discussing the interrelation of the mythical and the personal-psychological codes of Shevchenko's poetry.³⁰ This also opens up the possibility of looking at Shevchenko's works from the perspective of archetypal patterns and archetypal criticism.

4.

The nominal and "empirical" approaches mentioned earlier see the archetypal primarily in figures that appear in the various narratives of Shevchenko, figures like the woman (i.e., the mother, and particularly the unwed mother, the *pokrytka*; and her antipode, the witch), the Cossack, the minstrel (*kobzar*), the bastard child, the Russian soldier, the convict, the military officer (or "general"), the "Tsar" (who can be either a generally loathed tyrant, like Nero [in "Neofity"] or the contemporary "satrap" Nicholas I [in "Iurodyvyi"], or an autocrat who had managed to become a saint for the Russian [and also the Ukrainian] Orthodox Church, like Volodymyr/Vladimir, or like the biblical David ["Tsari"]), the people's avenger (like Iarema Halaida in *Haidamaky*) or the righteous man (the eponymous Jan Hus, Maksym in the long poem "Moskaleva krynytsia" [both the 1847 and the 1857 versions]), and many others like them. All of them are central to Shevchenko's poetry and serve to focus its plot lines and its visible surface. But essentially they are just that, the surface, an epiphenomenon, not least of all because the list is always partial and always open to textual continuation or variation – although it is finite. More important, therefore, are the

³⁰ Cf. Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, 16.

dynamics behind them, the hierarchy they imply, the transformations they enter into and the patterns they produce.

In the context of Shevchenko's mythical code the basic generating matrix or mechanism for these figures is the already mentioned opposition between social structure and ideal humanity or *communitas*. In its most archetypal, i.e., primordial and universal sense this devolves precisely on the opposition between the world of the father and the world of the mother. In the "real," manifest or "historical" world it also expresses itself in the opposition between the rulers and the ruled, between despotic, imperial power on the one hand and small nations, or simply the people, on the other. Paradigmatic in this sense is the poem "Kavkaz" (The Caucasus) with its juxtaposition of the Russian Empire and the various small nations of the Caucasus; the same is evident in the poem "The Heretic" (Ieretyk) where the Catholic Church (The Holy Roman Empire) and "the Germans" (*nimota*) are counterposed to the Slavs, the Czechs, and indeed the common folk, whom the poet repeatedly calls "ordinary people" (*prosti liudy*) and once simply "people" (*liudy*) and even "orphans" (*syroty*). For his part, the Pope of Rome and his cardinals are counterposed not only to Jan Hus, the martyr for truth, but to Christ himself. Similarly archetypal – and couched in a fundamental juxtaposition of the "human" and the "inhuman" – is the relationship of Russia to Ukraine, in effect the Empire to ordinary people, the *narod* as such, to the world of widows and orphans revealed in such "political" (in effect, proto-political) poems as "Son" (The Dream), "Velyky l'okh" (The Great Crypt), "Poslaniie" (The Epistle) and others – almost all of them written in the period 1843-1845. Both antipodes – of the Empire and the ordinary people, of the human and the non-human – are clearly archetypes. But one must note that not only the poles but the opposition itself is archetypal, in effect the actualization of the binary opposition of good and evil, the human and the monstrous, and, secondly, that it is a structure of the mythical code, but also the personal, psychological one, and as such a structure and binary opposition – of good and evil, truth and falsehood – it can generate a multitude of derivative structures, narrative themes, motifs, and so on.³¹

³¹ In recent Ukrainian Shevchenko scholarship the structured nature of Shevchenko's poetry, its coding, is still largely ignored – and what often substitutes for it is an ever baggier eclecticism; cf. e.g., Vasyli' Pakharenko's article on "Good and Evil" in the above-mentioned *Temy i motyvy poezii Shevchenka*, 52-75. The archetypal nature of this opposition, its multifaceted reliance on archetypes, is not perceived.

What is also noteworthy – and this appears across a broad range of narrative poems, from “Kateryna” (1838) to “Mariia” (1858), but is also not confined only to them – is that this opposition between *communitas* and social structure is not static, but constantly articulates movements and transformations between these two worlds. In essence, this movement – above all of the hero – and the transformations that are symbolically coded in them continually stress the “righteousness” or “superiority” of *communitas* with respect to that of social structure, i.e., the world of authority, property, privilege, rank – and the state itself.³² In the usual, “normal” run of things, and in the life of society, in effect, in various rituals and narratives, in literary plots, and so on, this movement (directly in the *peripetia* of the hero) goes from the world of social structure to that of *communitas* whereupon, in the manner of a rite of passage, having been cleansed and renewed, the hero returns to the world of social structure and resumes his “normal” life. In Shevchenko this process works in exactly an opposite way: what is stressed and apotheized is only the world of *communitas*. In his poetry (the prose presents a more complicated picture) there is no acceptance of, no “legitimization,” or “validation” of the world of social structure. It is precisely this deep pattern – in effect, the general structuring sense of his poetry – that underlies and provides meaning for what traditional Shevchenko criticism has called his “revolutionism” or “rebelliousness” (*buntarstvo*). This, in fact, is the essential mythical component of Shevchenko’s world. The “solution” to this continually stressed state of marginalization and oppression comes only from a millenarian vision of the future – and also from the poet’s basic role of foretelling, projecting and “realizing” this coming salvation.³³

Since myth is articulated through archetypes, and since, as noted, they constitute its core mythologems, this movement or pattern of continually validating *communitas* can be seen as the most basic, “root” archetype of Shevchenko’s poetry. In short, *communitas*, the vision of ideal humanity and everything associated with it – of marginalization and social oppression, of victimization, but also of partaking in, and a special empowerment from the attendant state of truth-justice (*pravda*), of human authenticity and salvation, and finally of the sacrum – is at the core of Shevchenko’s world. Speaking semiotically, it is its default mode and it expresses itself in a master narrative that generates a host of symbols and plots, the narratives about the *pokrytka* (beginning with “Kateryna” and ending with “Mariia”), the bastard child, the orphan, the soldier, the convict, the *kobzar*, and so on. These are also the *visible* archetypes not-

³² See Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, chaps. 3 and 4, esp. pp. 97-106 and passim.

³³ *Ibid.*, chap. 4.

ed before which so dominate the present state of analysis. The totality of these relations (and narratives) and particularly the cathexis of their telling is also the foundation for the general, but still largely murky notion of Shevchenko's national character, his *narodnist'*. From this primordial pattern, or Ur-Archetype will later come both the final millenarian vision of a redeemed world (“а буде син, і буде мати, і будуть люде на землі” / “there will be a son, and a mother, and there will be people on this earth”) and the sublime role of the poet himself – as carrier of the myth, and as a liberating force – a bodhisattva, a prophet.

5.

The latter moment needs to be emphasized: both the myth and the archetypes that are its components can be seen in their full dimension, or “fully expanded,” only when one sees the poetry as a synchronic totality, in effect, when one duly considers its culminating millenarian message (which by virtue of the structures of the myth is implicit in the early poetry as well, but is fully articulated only in the later poetry, and particularly in its culminating phase).³⁴ Thus while the topos and archetype of the son is evident across the whole diachronic reach of Shevchenko's poetry, it is largely, and in terms of the affective and cathectic thrust of the poetry, indeed entirely subordinated to or melded with the archetype of the orphan or bastard son. There are various illustrations of this, but the paradigmatic case is presented in the poem “Petrus” where a village boy-child initially described as “погане мале байстря” (an ugly small bastard child) is raised in status, indeed adopted by the gentry family, and allowed to become a full member of the world of social structure:

Петра на волю одпустили,
Зимою в Київ одвезли,
І там у школу оддали.
І там чимало поповчили.
Вернувся з Києва Петрусь
Уже Петром і паничем...
(94-99)

³⁴ See Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, chap. 5. One should note that by reason both of crypto-Marxist ideology and of populist traditionalism such a holistic perception of the poetry was resisted and largely blocked in Ukrainian Shevchenko criticism. What emerged instead was an emphasis, as noted above, on Shevchenko's rebelliousness (*buntarstvo*) and revolutionism as his putatively defining and essential features. Such core issues as salvation, and especially the sacred itself were systematically ignored. A similarly blinkered perspective animated various polemical responses to *Poet as Mythmaker*.

(Petro was freed. / By Winter he was sent to Kyiv, / And put in school.
/ And there they taught him many things. / And when Petrus' returned
from Kyiv / He came as Peter – and a young lord.)

But this elevation in status, or “upward mobility,” which is entirely normal in human affairs and is a core pattern in various narratives and literary genres, especially, the *Bildungsroman*, simply cannot be made to fit – as a normal, sanctioned, self-standing component – into Shevchenko's poetic world: Petrus's “mother” (i.e., the young lady who had him adopted, and who is also a victim in the story, and at the same time a variant of the sinful/dark mother) poisons her husband, the general (a variant of the Shevchenkian archetype of the father/old husband/rapist) and in a pattern to be repeated in “Moskaleva krynytsia” (The Soldier's Well), and echoed in “Iurodyvyi” (The Holy Fool) and “Jakby tobi dovelosia” (If you were ever to...), Petrus' takes the sin upon himself and confesses to the crime. As a righteous sufferer he accepts his penance and drags his chains to deepest Siberia: “...і поволік Петрусь кайдани / Аж у Сибір...”

This fate or karma is encoded into various archetypes and articulates the workings of the overarching core or macro-archetype noted earlier, i.e., the split of Ukraine between the worlds of the father and the mother, between social structure and *communitas*, which then project the existing, day-to-day Ukraine as ever-liminal, a world of the abused, oppressed and exploited, a world not of justice (*pravda*) but of injustice (*kryvda*). In such a world the universal archetypes of father, mother, son, and so on consistently “shift” into a state of deformation that defines society precisely by its continual oppression. Here, instead of a son there will always be a bastard-son, instead of a mother, an unwed mother (*pokrytka*), or widow, instead of a father – a “general,” i.e., an abuser and rapist. And only the vision of a redeemed future (another core archetype in Shevchenko's poetry), in effect, a vision of a millenarian paradise, as in the concluding lines of “Isaiia 35” (see below) or the already cited conclusion of “I Arkhimed i Halilei” (Both Archimedes and Galileo),

І на оновленій землі
Врага не буде супостата,
А буде син, і буде мати,
І будуть люде на землі
(11-14)

(And on the renewed earth/ There'll be no enemy, no foe/ But there'll
be a son, and a mother,/ And there'll be people on this earth.)

holds forth the promise of a return to a human existence that is not deformed, and not oppressed, and couched precisely in universal and archetypal terms: of son, mother, earth.

6.

The tendency to stress the archetype, or indeed the archetypal, is not confined to Shevchenko's late poetry. In fact, this facility or need to express oneself through archetypes and the condensation they provide is a defining feature of Shevchenko's poetry, and stems from the mythical thought that underlies it; it appears as a predictable code, programmatically stressing the essential, forcing us to look at "the root of things." Once the poet bares, as the formalists would put it, his device, it becomes visible even to the innocent eye, and the only thing strange here is not the regularity or predictability of the pattern as the fact that Shevchenko criticism has ignored it for so long. In truth, however, what is at issue is not a "device," a formal, thematic or compositional feature (although these are also projected) but a deep need for self-expression, for stressing the message itself, that is, both the content and the code, the "idea" and the poet's sense of it. Most telling in this regard is the triptych "Muza" (The Muse), "Dolia" (Fate), "Slava" (Fame) (all written in 1857), where each poem bares both the central archetype which resonates in every culture and the poet's individual perception of it – which is conveyed by seemingly absolute intimization, a total psychological anchoring of the archetype in his own biography. To this we shall return. There are, however, many such "bared" or "thematized" archetypes in Shevchenko's poetry, many more, in fact, than conventional logic would suggest. One often has the sense that every poem bares an archetype. Thus the early poem "Perebendia" (1839) represents not some concrete *kobzar*, or even a typical *kobzar* – although the moment of typicality is not excluded here – but the *kobzar* as such, the archetypal *kobzar*. This is argued both by the programmatic comparison that is drawn between his word – an echo of nature itself – and the word of God, and by his own designation as a seer "who knows all" and "who sees all" – and the fact that for this very reason people do not accept him ("Його на сім світі ніхто не прийма. / Один він між ними як сонце високе" – [No one in this world can really accept him / He's as lonely among them as the sun that's above]). The categorical cast of this polarized reality ultimately suggests a universal, not an individual, concrete *kobzar*). Perebendia's depiction, moreover, is couched entirely in the key of the sublime and the sacred; and finally the fact that the poet (in effect, the voice of the

represented author) turns to Perebendia – now the *kobzar*-as-such – as to his “father” (*bat'ko*), as to an Ur-model (in fact, the archetype) and that in confirmation of this his image and voice meld with the image and voice of the poet – as we see in the lines that can serve as a basic leitmotif of the author's self-depiction, particularly in the early poetry of Shevchenko, but in some measure in all of his poetry:

А якби почули, що він, одинокий,
Співа на могилі, з морем розмовля, –
На Божее слово вони б насміялись,
Дурним би назвали, од себе б прогнали.
(75-78)

(And if they would hear that he sits there alone, /And sings on the mound, and talks to the sea –/ They would laugh at God's word/ And call him a fool, and drive him away.)

In a still earlier poem, “Prychynna” (The Bewitched Girl, 1837?), which is generally considered Shevchenko's earliest poem, everything – both the unnamed, lovelorn girl, and the unnamed lovelorn Cossack, and the mermaids, and nature (and the Dnieper that “groans and moans”) and the village girls and young men who gather to bury the two dead lovers, and every detail it would seem, from the cuckoo bird that comes to coo over their grave, and the nightingale who comes to sing – “виспівує та щебече / Поки місяць зійде, / Поки тії русалоньки / З Дніпра грітись вийдуть” (who sings and warbles / Until the moon will rise / Until the mermaids / Will emerge from the Dnieper to warm themselves) – all partake of an archetypal aura, are part of a great overarching archetype, a *sui generis* symphony of archetypes. (And from its workings, from that unswervingly accurate resonance that it establishes with generations of readers emerges the no less archetypal reception of Shevchenko. The one models the other: an integral part of Shevchenko's myth is his participation in it, his role as myth-carrier – which in turn forms and confirms the appropriate reception.³⁵)

The catalogue of poems that bare or thematize various Shevchenkian archetypes can easily be continued. Thus, such poems as “Iurodyvyi” (The Holy Fool, 1857) or “Neofity” (The Neophytes, also 1857) do not depict any concrete or “typical” figures or events, but project, indeed apotheize, the archetype in question. In the process, the moment of apotheization, the way the poet's attention is brought to bear

³⁵ See Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, 159 and passim.

(Not in our land, beloved by God, / Not during the Hetmans and the Tsars, / But in the Roman, idolatrous land / Did this infamy take place. / Perhaps in the reign of the Tsar Decius? / Or maybe during Nero's tenure? / I cannot, really, say for sure. / Let's say, then, Nero. / Russia / Didn't even exist then, / When in Italy / A little girl was growing up...)

In "Moskaleva krynytsia" (the 1847 version) the localization of the archetypal village in which the action is to take place is given as if in passing, as something *faute de mieux*, and in what is characteristic for this work, as a dialogue between the work's two narrative voices – which is also a key archetype (cf. below): "Пиши отак" (write it down like this) says the illiterate villager/*kobzar* to his literate alter ego, the nobleman (*panych*) who is transcribing the story:

було
Село.
Та щоб не лізти на чужину,
Пиши: у нас на Україні.
А в тім селі вдова жила...

(there was / a village / And so as not to wander off into foreign lands / write – here, in our Ukraine, / And in this village lived a widow...)

In "Kniazhna" (The Princess) another such introduction of the archetypal village is conducted in the guise of a long quasi-sentimental passage, from the opening lines "Село! І серце одпочине, / Село на нашій Україні" to the final "Сам Бог витає над селом":

Село! І серце одпочине:
Село на нашій Україні –
Неначе писанка, село.
Зеленим гаєм поросло.
Цвінуть сади, біліють хати,
А на горі стоять палати,
Неначе диво. А кругом
Широколисті тополі,
А там і ліс, і ліс, і поле,
І сині гори за Дніпром.
Сам Бог витає над селом.

(33-43)

(A village! And your heart is stirred: / A village, right in our Ukraine – / As perfect as an Easter egg. / All overgrown with verdant groves / With blooming orchards and white huts / And on the hill – a manor house. /

Magnificent! And all around / The broad leafed-poplars and the forest
/ And then more forest and the fields / And bluish mountains by the
Dnieper. / It seems that God, Himself, stands watch.)

In the popular perception, and especially in the school canon, both Soviet and non-Soviet, this brief passage depicting the village as a transcendent Easter egg (*pysanka*) had become an important archetype, indeed an all-but-official icon.³⁶ Most tellingly, however, in this same poem, indeed in the very next lines, this “bright” archetype, seemingly blessed by God himself, is replaced by its opposite, a “dark” and “demonic” hypostasis which totally rewrites the image of the village-as-paradise and village-as-Easter-egg as the narrator continues first with mockery and then curses:

Село! Село! Веселі хати!
Веселі здалека палати,
Бодай ви терном поросли!

(A village! A village! The joyful peasant houses! / The joyful palace from afar, / May you be overgrown with thorns!)

And all of the subsequent narrative shows the village in its archetypal-deformed form – as a village of oppression and exploitation, of rape and of incest.³⁷

A paradigmatic example of the thematization of the archetype, its universalization and its baring, is provided by the poem “Saul” (1860) where the opening lines bare the omnipresence of the phenomenon to be discussed:

В непробудимому Китаї,
В Єгипті темному, у нас,
І понад Індом і Євфратом
Свої ягнята і телята
На полі вольнім вольно пас
Чабан, було, в своєму паї.

³⁶ Ibid., 53-54.

³⁷ It should also be noted that while the rape and incest take place specifically in the manor house (*palaty*) – it is also emphatically placed within the context of the village itself, as something that fundamentally defiles it. The village, in turn, is archetypal and iconic of all of Ukraine (“Село на нашій Україні – / Неначе писанка село”). And this in turn also casts light on the reception – i.e., its selectivity. The insistence on seeing only the “bright” side of the archetype (as in the discussion of *xata* above) also reveals an “ideological” bias here, in effect a pedagogic reductiveness and overall simplification of Shevchenko’s world.

(In China ever fast asleep, / In darkest Egypt, and in our lands, / And by the Indus and Euphrates / The shepherd in his bit of eden / Would freely graze his calves and sheep / In open fields.)

The universality of place is augmented by a universality of action, and in the following lines comes a description of how this primal paradise was “captured” (*zainialy*), “destroyed” (*roztyly*), and “defiled” (*oskvernyly*) by the Tsar and his minions brought by the power of the Evil one:

Аж ось лихий царя несе
З законами, з мечем, з катами,
З князями, темними рабами.
(10-12)

(And lo, the Tempter, brings the Tsar / With laws, and swords, and executioners, / With princes, and with ignorant slaves.)

A structurally more concise description of this archetype – of the archetype of authority that destroys (defiles) everything that is immanently human – can hardly be imagined.

Not least of all, Shevchenko is at pains to ironically stress the frequency, the very “obsessiveness” of his key themes – which in the telling are then concretized as archetypes. Emblematic of this is the following passage from the poem “Tsari” (The Tsars) (i.e., Staren’ka sestro Apollona [O, Aged sister of Apollo]) where the poet seems to “consult” with the Muse (which one is not clear – it depends whether the tale that follows is epic, tragic or erotic – and it could be either and all), but in reality confesses his need to vary his by now stale repertoire:

Бо як по правді вам сказать,
То дуже вже й мені самому
Обридли тії мужики,
Та паничі, та покритки.
Хотілося б зогнать оскому
На коронованих главах,
На тих помазаниках Божих...

(For to tell the truth / I too have had enough / Of these muzhiks, / And all these youthful gentlemen and unwed mothers. / It’s time, perhaps, to vent our spleen / At royal folks, / At God’s anointed ...)

7.

The typology of these thematizations can already be addressed in a preliminary way (a full account may be left for later). Most basically they divide into collective and mythical projections on the one hand, and the psychological on the other. The mythical level is complicated, as noted earlier, by the fact that archetypes are a component of mythical thinking and mythical narrative, and will continually produce the multiplicity of *topoi*, motifs and movements that we encounter. These articulations require further attention.

A frequent and obvious case is the archetype of the origins or the emergence of various phenomena. (Etiological tales in general are considered variants of the mythical tale.) In Shevchenko's poetry this appears in such works as "Topolia" (The Poplar), "Lileia" (The Lily), "Utoplēna" (The Drowned Girl), and the already discussed "Saul." The first three are strictly etiological tales, which focus on natural phenomena. They also reflect various Romantic features and conventions and, as some have argued, a balladic form – although I find this generic designation neither accurate, nor persuasive; it is hardly made more persuasive by the fact that Shevchenko himself uses this term (cf. below).³⁸ In such works as "Saul," the already mentioned "Iurodyvnyi," "Neofity," and "U Boha za dvermy lezhala sokyra," as well as such poems as "Prorok" (The Prophet) and "Kosar" (The Reaper), and some others, we see the emergence or "birth" of various human or metaphysical qualities – evil and violence, punishment and the avenger, apostles of the new order, God's gift of the Prophet (whom the people reject at their peril), death, and so on. In "Tytarivna" (The Sexton's Daughter, 1848) the story tells of the origins, the creation as it were, of the seducer – although this becomes apparent only at the very end of the poem. At the beginning *Мукута* – "Найкращий хлопець, та байстриук / Байстриук собі та ще й убогий" (The best boy [in the village], but a bastard son, / A bastard son and poor to boot) – courts the eponymous heroine, but she rejects and mocks him. Later he seduces her and kills their illegitimate child and places the blame on her, and the community (and here Shevchenko, with utter irony, uses the intimate diminutive: "громадонька" – the "dear little community") condemns the basically innocent Tytarivna (in effect she is guilty – but only of falling in love and giving herself to a scoundrel, a true bastard) and punishes her by burying her alive thus actualizing the dark side of the archetypes of

³⁸ For a recent reiteration see Mykola Bondar, "Balada," *Shevchenkivs'ka entsyklopediia, Robochyi zoshyt B* (Kyiv, 2005), 23-32. Cf. fn. 54 below.

both the bastard son and the community.³⁹ After committing his sin, Mykyta becomes a gentlemen (*panych*), and Satan incarnate (*satanacholovik*). The final cautionary message in which this is conveyed is full of irony – for the narrator knows that all his effort is for naught, for the girls (*divchatochka*) will continue to fall in love with and be seduced by such gentlemen:

Покарав
Його Господь за гріх великий
Не смертю – він буде жить,
І сатаною-чоловіком
Він буде по світу ходить
І вас, дівчаточка, дурить
Вовіки.
(221-27)

(God punished him / for this great sin / Not by death – he will keep on living / And as Satan-man / He will walk this earth / And fool you girls / Forever.)

A number of thematized archetypes appear in works which turn to history, in effect, works which on the one hand have traditionally been perceived as “historical” and which resonate with the literary-historical conventions of the time, but which also essentially fit the meta-historical and the general mythical code of Shevchenko’s poetry.⁴⁰ A number of these works have been discussed in various ways, particularly by non- and post-Soviet critics (who have always had more leeway in examining the national and proto-political character of Shevchenko’s writing), but an exploration of these works, their themes and topoi, *precisely as archetypes*, has been notably lacking.⁴¹ Such works as “Rozryta mohyla” (The Open Grave), “Chyhryne, Chyhryne,” “Velykyi l’okh” and its pendant “Stoїť v seli Subotovi” (In the Village of Subot-

³⁹ As noted earlier, all archetypes are binary. Apart from that one should also remember that for Shevchenko the notion of “bastard” does not at all connote only the positive. Depending on the context, it can also have a “dark” meaning; cf. in “Стоїть в селі Суботіві” the reference to “Байстрюки Єкатери́ни / Сарано́ю сі́ли,” lines 27-28.

⁴⁰ Cf. Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, chap. 2, “History and Metahistory.”

⁴¹ A revealing substitute has been the search for political allegory in the criticism of Stepan Smal'-Stots'kyi; see his *T. Shevchenko. Interpretatsii* (Warsaw, 1934; 2nd ed., New York-Paris-Toronto, 1965). Soviet critics, even perspicacious ones like Iurii Ivakin, were basically hemmed in by their obligatory ideological perspective and prevented from duly considering archetypes or even symbols as such; cf. Iu. Ivakin, *Komentar do “Kobzaria” Shevchenka*, 2 vols. (Kyiv, 1964-1968).

iv) written a few days later,⁴² “Kholodnyi iar” (The Cold Ravine) (all of them from the “Try lita” [Three years] period), as well as such poems as “Irzhavets’,” “Poliakam (Shche iak buly my kozakamy)” (To the Poles [When we were still Cossacks]), “Chernets” (The Monk), and then “Oi choho ty pochornilo” (Why Have You Turned Black), “U nedilen’ku u sviatuiu” (On Holy Sunday), “Zastupyla chorna khmara” (A Black Cloud Covered the Sky) and others⁴³ – all develop and thematize archetypal nexuses of the collective past and of collective memory. The objects that arouse and focus the poet’s memory are various, and more or less canonical: an unearthed burial mound, the village church where Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi was buried, a miraculous icon in the village of Rzhavets, the fields around Berestechko where thousands of Cossacks died. Sometimes they are quite subjective – as a reconstruction in memory of a view of the Dnieper from its high shore and a peasant house from which, as he says in “Son (Hory moi vysokii)” (The Dream [My high mountains]) “видно Україну / І всю Гетьманщину кругом” (one can see Ukraine and all of the Hetman state) – but they are all imbued by a deep sense of the past and of a living, immediate contact with it; they all become variants of a powerful, complex archetype of memory which is at once protean and pantopic, all-encompassing as it were, where everything that the eye and memory can see in Ukraine – be it the Podil district in Kyiv, the Cossack Sich, the village of Subotiv – can become a correlative for profound, collective introspection – which then can provide an intimation of the very essence of Ukraine.⁴⁴ In the earlier of these works, basically from the collection “Try lita” (1845), this archetype of memory (which on the surface seems akin to “historical memory,” but which continually shifts into myth and not into history as such) also projects a profound and deeply emotional, and also archetypal, sense of collective identity – which will later become the basis of a new Ukrainian national consciousness, indeed a new political consciousness. The process by which this awareness was created was drawn-out and complex and in various ways coterminous with the very

⁴² In the most recent *Collected Works (PZTDT)* [Kyiv, 2001] as well as in the earlier *PZTDT* (Kyiv, 1989-1991) that stopped with the 3rd volume, the poem has been absorbed into “Velykyi l’okh”; cf. my *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo* (Kyiv, 2014), 171-74.

⁴³ Among these other works one should also include indirect, but important meditations on the past; cf. e.g., “Son (Hory moi vysokii)” (The Dream [My high mountains]) where the “historical” moment is noted almost as if in passing – but where the meditation on the past, and its connection to the present, is altogether central. The very fact of the “marginality” of the concretely historical moment here only reminds us that the core is the mythical message and not the “history as such.”

⁴⁴ Cf. also the discussion on the centrality of memory in my *Shevchenkovi “Haidamaky”: poema i krytyka* (Kyiv, 2013), 189-239 and passim.

reception of Shevchenko. At times this reception was self-reflexive – as in the writings of Mykhailo Drahomanov⁴⁵; at times, especially in the past century and in the gristmills of totalitarian and authoritarian ideology, this reception contributed to a reductive limitation of Shevchenko's vision to suit such or other ideological premises and goals – even while claiming to stress the universal or transcendent.⁴⁶

8.

Characteristically, the dominant ideologies affecting Ukrainian life in the twentieth century, i.e., both the Soviet and the nationalist, and the scholarship they projected and nurtured (which in the Soviet case specifically claimed to espouse secular and positivist values), consistently ignored what is central to Shevchenko's vision of Ukraine – in its past, as well as in its present and future – namely the realm of the sacred. Shevchenko's openness to the sacred, and to what Rudolph Otto called the “numinous,” to that which is fundamentally other and which stands beyond and above the normal and earthly and can in no way be reduced to it,⁴⁷ is a basic, indeed defining, feature of his poetic world. It undergoes an important evolution over the course of the various stages of his poetry, but it is present from the beginning: it is immanent. One can hardly speak about the feeling and the experience of the holy, of numinosity as Otto calls it, as an archetype for it is a quality that informs and gives a special sense to all archetypes and archetypal patterns, it is a dimension and a modality of an archetype rather than an archetype itself, but it plays an essential role in their functioning. It has a special and no less essential role in the poetry of Shevchenko.

Studies of the phenomenon of the sacred (*das Heilige*), its socio-cultural workings and its artistic representation, from the sociolog-

⁴⁵ See esp. his groundbreaking *Shevchenko, ukraïnofily i sotsializm* (Geneva, 1879).

⁴⁶ Thus the Soviet Shevchenko canon basically ignored the issue of national identity and channeled the inquiry into “Shevchenko's historical (or social, or economic) views” – which invariably were cast as “progressive” or socialist *avant la lettre*. The nationalist perspective, beginning in the 1920s with Dontsov and Malaniuk (which in the case of the latter would undergo certain nuances over time) stressed above all the national, and implicitly political and nationalist character of Shevchenko's vision and was prepared to dress it up with preposterous lucubrations on his “leadership principle” (“провідництво”), cf. e.g., Leonid Bilets'kyi's introduction to vol. 2 of Shevchenko's *Kobzar* (Winnipeg, 1952), esp. sec. 6, “Shevchenko i ideia providnytstva,” 31-33.

⁴⁷ See Rudolph Otto, *Das Heilige: Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen* (1917).

ical contextualization of religious thought in Durkheim and the theological conceptualizations of Otto to contemporary analyses usually differentiate several key features, particularly a) a direct connection with the sphere of religion and the religious, b) projections of transcendence and c) defining that which is fundamentally set apart.⁴⁸ The latter plays a particularly important role in Shevchenko.

As a sense of fundamental otherness, of non-earthliness or transcendence of the represented world, such numinosity is evident already in his earliest poetic works, beginning with “Prychynna,” where, as already noted, the entire represented Ukrainian world, in its entire gamut of natural and trans-natural features, but also in its common details, resonates as a kind of symphony of archetypes, and in this fashion, at the very beginning of his creativity, promises a special status to Ukraine. In its unique totality and emotional concentration (or “validity”) it is still only background here – but it already has the aura of the numinous. And although “Prychynna” has traditionally and in formal terms been perceived as a ballad, and even though Shevchenko himself calls it thus, this balladic mode, while masterful, is not defined or animated by its literary and conventional features; the structurally defining moments here, instead, are the special nature, the uniqueness and numinosity of Ukraine, which so manifestly distinguish this work from that of such contemporaries as Zhukovsky, Mickiewicz, Metlyns’kyi, Kostomarov and others.⁴⁹ In none of these other works does that which is generally (and here altogether misleadingly) called “the background” of the action, i.e., the natural setting, have anything like the concentration and power that is exhibited in “Prychynna”; in none of these works (all of them, supposedly, “ballads”) does it transform itself into the very substance of the work.

The direct, semantic (and in time ever more programmatic) articulation of numinosity asserts itself quite rapidly, in effect, already in “Perebendia” (1839) which becomes part of the first *Kobzar* of 1840. What distinguishes the figure of Perebendia from all others, and in this

⁴⁸ The scholarship on the notion of the sacred is rich and ongoing. See Matthew T. Evans, “The Sacred: Differentiating, Clarifying and Extending Concepts,” *Review of Religious Research* 45, no. 1 (Sept. 2003): 32-47; cf. also Roy A. Rappaport, “The Sacred in Human Evolution,” *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 2 (1971), 23-44.

⁴⁹ As he writes in his “Autobiography”: “...из многочисленных попыток он [i.e., he, Shevchenko] впоследствии напечатал только одну балладу ‘Причинна’”. See his *PZTDT*, 5:192 and 1:595. The fact that he uses this term, however, hardly makes such or other poems fit or approximate this genre, or specifically resemble the ballads written by his contemporaries and immediate predecessors. A more detailed investigation is clearly called for.

fashion makes him also the carrier of the Word, in essence a prophet in the making or *in statu nascendi*, is that he is the carrier of God's truth, he speaks with God and his word is also God's word, and through it he expresses His glory (which "the people," of course, are unwilling or incapable of perceiving):

Старий заховавсь
В степу на могилі, щоб ніхто не бачив,
Щоб вітер по полю слова розмахав,
Щоб люде не чули, бо то Боже слово,
То серце по волі з Богом розмовля,
То серце щебече Господню славу...
(55-60)

(...The old man hid himself / In the steppe, on the burial mound, so that no one would see, / So that the wind would disperse his words over the field, / So that people would not hear – for it was God's word, / It was the heart that was speaking with God in freedom, / It was the heart that was warbling God's glory...)

Perebendia clearly foretells the model of the poet as a carrier of the Holy Word, and with it also the self-projection of Shevchenko – and the basic teleology of his poetry.⁵⁰ This search for the Word, which by reason of its semantic weight and centrality also emerges as a basic Shevchenkian archetype already appears in fully thematized form in the early poem "Na vichnu pam'iat' Kotliarevs'komu" (In Eternal Memory of Kotliarevs'kyi, 1838):

Праведная душе...
Прилини до мене хоть на одно слово,
Та про Україну мені заспівай.
Нехай усміхнеться серце на чужині,
Хоть раз усміхнеться, дивлячись, як ти
Всю славу козацьку за словом єдиним
Переніс в убогу хату сироти.
(85-93)

(O righteous soul... / Return to me if but for one word, / And sing to me of Ukraine. / So that the heart might smile in a foreign country, / To smile but once, as it sees how you / With one solitary word brought all of Cossack fame / Into the poor peasant house of an orphan...)

⁵⁰ Cf. Hrabovych, *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo*, 111-13 and *passim*.

And in a work which became iconic for our understanding of the early Shevchenko, i.e., “Dumy moï, dumy moï” (My Thought, My Songs), where he says “А я... а я [...] Тільки сльози за Україну... / А слова – немає...” (lines 66-69) (But I... I only have tears for Ukraine – but no word...) ⁵¹ The programmatic cast is unmistakable here: the word that will have to be found will be about Ukraine, and for Ukraine.

Another milestone in this respect is the long poem *Haidamaky* (1841) where the haidamak uprising is repeatedly cast in the key of the sacred: see, for example, the section “Sviato v Chyhyrynï” (The Feast in Chyhyryn) and especially the words of the prior of the monastery “Кругом святого Чигирина / Сторожа стане з того світу, / Не дасть святого розпинать...” (lines 1115-17) (Around holy Chyhyryn / A guard from the other world will stand / It will not allow the holy one to be crucified...), as well as the symbolic blessing of the knives, with its echoes of the uprising of the Maccabees, and so on. This does not, however, project the numinous: it is more a naming, a literary echo, than an evocation, and the inner light, the numen itself is absent. ⁵² And the images of bloodshed which color and cloud these events become problematic for the author himself, and not only for his various critics over the years, ⁵³ and they shift this work into the general aura of the shadow (see below).

A key continuation and a new conceptualization of the task facing the poet is provided by the Russian-language poem “Trizna” (The Wake, 1843) in which the search for the Word develops into the author’s psychodrama, of which indeed he speaks: “Вот драма страшная, святая!...” (Here is a fearful, a holy drama). ⁵⁴ The aura of the numi-

⁵¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 112.

⁵² The issue, as my more recent study argues, is perhaps more complex: what begins as a divinely sanctioned punishment (“кара” or indeed the prototypical “ban/herem”) turns progressively more demonic; see my *Shevchenkovi “Haidamaky,”* 251-69 and *passim*.

⁵³ I.e., from Belinskii to the present anti-Shevchenko publicists in Ukraine like O. Buzyrna, A. Karevin or N. A. Grekov et al. of the tract *Taras Shevchenko – krestnyi otets ukrainskogo natsionalizma* (Luhansk, 2005). (http://royallib.ru/read/grekov_n/taras_shevchenko_krestniy_otets_ukrainskogo_natsionalizma.html#20480). See also Ivan Dziuba’s *Shevchenkofobiia v suchasniï Ukraïni* (Kyiv, 2006).

⁵⁴ See my “The Nexus of the Wake: Ševčenko’s Trizna,” in “Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students,” ed. Ihor Ševčenko and Frank E. Sysyn, special issue, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 3/4, pt. 1 (1979/1980): 320-47; see also “Perekhrestia ‘Tryzny,’” in my *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo*, 17-51.

nous in this poem applies not only to the object of his quest, the Fatherland he is preternaturally tasked with serving (thus “О святая! / Святая родина моя! / Чем помогу тебе рыдая? / И ты закована, и я...” [246-49] [O holy Fatherland! / How will I help you with my tears? / You are in chains, and so am I]), but also its manner of articulation, i.e., the Word – which at this stage the projected author is more apt to long for and anticipate than to articulate. The apparent aporia of this quest – a search for the Word, and the prophetic aura that comes with it, the “power over men’s souls,” as Mickiewicz had defined it a decade earlier,⁵⁵ that ends with failure, not just the death of the would-be poet and prophet (continually called a “страдалецъ” [sufferer] and “несчастный” [unfortunate] in the poem), but also the dying out of his cult in the small circle of his admirers – is rooted in the fact that the presumably more rational and distanced perception of his calling and task, made available here by the Russian *métier* and medium, i.e., the language of the poem and its implicit discourse, also constricts the author’s voice with an inevitable anxiety of influence: the Ryleevan-Decembrist diction, pathos and rhetoric (with clear echoes of Pushkin as well) which animates and molds the poem and by its very canonicity acts to prevent the poet from articulating his “narrower fatherland” (“родина”), from even naming it. Ukraine, in fact, is not mentioned – even though she is the very subject of the poem.⁵⁶ Thus a poem about one’s dedication to an all-important cause turns into a requiem for that cause. Still, the aporia is confined only to this poem, and to the all-Russian discourse that it draws on. Parallel to it, and indeed a few weeks earlier, Shevchenko initiates a totally different discourse about Ukraine – now in his own, powerful and totally unprecedented voice. At issue is the poem “Rozryta mohyla” (The Open Grave), and all that it contains.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Cf. his “Great Improvisation” in *Dziady*, pt. III.

⁵⁶ Which differs strikingly from, say, Ryleev’s *Voinarovskii* (1825) where Ukraine, its cause, its prime spokesmen and champions – Mazepa and Voinarovskii – are mentioned directly and prominently.

⁵⁷ While animated primarily by its symbolic context (the poem refers to the metaphoric grave that has become Ukraine; cf. below), in the context of the real world it also alludes to the burial mounds in Ukraine that were being excavated at that time, and in which Shevchenko himself was to take part as a member of the digs. As such it casts some light on the ongoing disjunction, or aporia, in his poetry between the visible and the numinous worlds. Both of them are real, but as the poetry argues, the latter is more real. Interestingly, the date of the poem also reveals an aporia, or simply a mistake, in the conventional (Soviet and now post-Soviet) chronology of his texts. In effect, while written earlier than “Trizna” (which is now dated as Nov. 11-27, 1843), “Rozryta mohyla,” despite the strictly chronological principle of Soviet/post-Soviet Shevchenko textology, is

“Rozryta mohyla,” which Shevchenko wrote on October 9, 1843 (this is the date it bears in his manuscript collection “Try lita”), reflects the profound changes in his world view caused, as the critical consensus now holds, by his first trip – now, as an adult – to Ukraine, in 1843-1844. In principle, this is the first illicit, unpublishable poem of his corpus and it ushers in a long sequence of other such illicit works which conceptualize Ukraine and its ordeal in a radically new way. With formal features of a lament, and cast as a dialogue with Ukraine herself, the metaphors and pathos of this poetry are conceptually totalizing – *all* of Ukraine becomes an open grave, with *no* historical or social qualification or intellectual nuance. At the same time it becomes an artistic watershed: the work bares the modality and vision of the new Shevchenkian Word, of the poet as a new Jeremiah, a prophet-madman (*iurodyvyi*, or holy-fool), fated to see what others do not see, and to speak not so much to a living audience as to otherworldly forces – and to the reader of the future. Clearly, this very stance, and everything that flows from it, resonates with numinosity. And the moment of such communication, of finding oneself at the edge of such an open grave, is also quintessentially archetypal, which attests to one’s descent into the unconscious (individual but especially the collective) and in a broader sense actualizes the commitment/dedication to the task at hand (cf. below).

Subsequent works, especially those from the “Try lita” collection, develop this moment (cf. “Chyhryne, Chyhryne,” “Velykyi l’okh,” “Stoït v seli Subotovi” and “Kholodnyi iar”) in which Ukraine and the collective memory associated with her, and which in time will become the new national memory itself, is consistently associated with the sacred: it is the “church-sepulchre” (“церков-домовина”) and “the world of truth” (“світ правди” of “Stoït v seli Subotovi”; it echoes with references to “holy justice-freedom” (“святая правда-воля”) in the poem “Kholodnyi iar” and the weeping of the Virgin Mary in the icon that hangs in the village of Rzhavets (cf. also the poem “Irzhavets”) after the death of Hetman Polubotok tortured to death in St. Petersburg by Peter I (“Velykyi l’okh”). In “Poslaniie” (The Epistle), Ukraine is directly depicted as holy – especially through her martyrdom – even while fated to be defiled by her errant sons. In “Kavkaz” (The Caucasus), the connection of this setting with Ukraine is given implicitly through the

now still being published as a work that comes after “Trizna.” When advised of this the editors (Valeriia Smilians’ka and Nina Chamata) conceded the point, but proposed that this point not be made in the “Arkhetypy Shevchenka” article (cf. n. 1, above). It falls upon the revived *Zapysky* to make the point now.

death of Iakov de Balmen, who was killed in the Caucasus while serving in the Russian army and to whose memory it is dedicated,⁵⁸ and through the fact that freedom must be won in a struggle, at the cost of blood and suffering, first in the Caucasus and then in Ukraine itself, and that it is one seamless and universal continuum. That this freedom is then blessed by the Divinity is also unquestionable: “Борітеся – поборете,” the poet declares, “Вам Бог помагає! / За вас правда, за вас слава. / І воля святая!” (Fight on – and you will win, God is on your side! / Justice and glory and holy freedom are with you!).

9.

If for Jung the archetype of the holy is incarnate in God, for Shevchenko it is incarnate in Ukraine. Through her immanent numinosity she also gives meaning to his life – and endows it with a clear sense of mission. In essence, the ontological status of Ukraine, her self-realization as a *sacrum* is effected in several mutually connected functions or features.

Firstly, on the semantic and ideal plane, that is, *as something not degraded or defiled*, Ukraine is represented primarily by her past. In the present she can also exist as something undefiled (cf. here her already noted “natural state,” i.e., her trans-temporal, numinous and archetypal nature in “Prychynna”). But as a conscious and thematized

⁵⁸ Cf. these eloquent lines at the end of the poem:

І тебе загнали, мій друже єдиний,
Мій Якове добрий! Не за Україну,
А за її ката довелось пролити
Кров добру, не чорну. Довелось запить
З московської чаші московську отруту!
О друже мій добрий! друже незабутий!
Живою душею в Україні витай,
Літай з козаками понад берегами,
Розкриті могили в степу назирай.
Заплач з козаками дрібними сльозами
І мене з неволі в степу виглядай. (156-66)

(And you, too, my one and only friend, / My good Iakov, were sent there to die, / Not for Ukraine, but for her tormentor, / and spill good, not black blood. To drink to the dregs / From a muscovite cup the muscovite poison. / O good and dear friend, a friend I'll always remember / Hover with your living soul over Ukraine, / Fly with the Cossacks over her shores / Keep watch over the open graves dotting her steppe, / Shed your tears along with the Cossacks, / And in the steppe await my return from bondage.)

presence, and even more so as an object of programmatic interest, she is defined by her past existence, her ancient ethos and those heroes who once represented her. In the present, in the real and concrete time-and-space of, say, the summer of 1843, formally and objectively there exists only Little Russia (Malorosiiia). The Ukraine that exists then is only a shadow, an echo of herself; she is in a state of anabiosis and she is, moreover, totally degraded. Thus in “Chyhryne, Chyhryne”: “заснула Вкраїна, / Бур’яном укрилась, цвіллю зацвіла, / В калюжі, в болоті серце прогноїла. / І в дупло холодне гадюк напустила...” (Ukraine is fast asleep./ She’s covered herself with weeds and mold;/ She has rotted her heart in the muck and mire/ And opened her cold, hollow core to the snakes); she is, in effect, a great ruin, one great cemetery. But, paradoxically, this only stresses her numinosity. Her space, as that of every necropolis, is the space of ancestors and glory; paradigmatically this is the church where Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi was buried (“Stoït’ v seli Subotovi”), or the village of Rzhavets (“Irzhavets”), or the high banks of the Dnieper (“Son [Hory moï vysokii]”), or the battlefield of Berestechko, and so on. This numinosity of places and objects of antiquity is seemingly everpresent, and resonates, as already noted, with the overall mythic coding of Shevchenko’s poetry. Its defining trait is that of the set apart – where everything that is in a profound way identified with Ukraine, above all her semiotically charged, “iconic” places or topoi are unique, even transcendent. They are not of this world, and thus the poet can say directly in “Poslaniie”: “Нема на світі України, / Немає другого Дніпра...” (There is no [other] Ukraine in the world / There is no other Dnipro).⁵⁹

Secondly, Ukraine is sanctified by her subjugation and suffering, by her very marginality which reaches down to the lowest social levels, all those unwed mothers, orphans and widows, beggars and cripples that populate Shevchenko’s poetry and are his special charges, but also reaches out to the most general and encompassing level, in effect, to the whole country, occupied and oppressed by an evil empire. In the present, therefore, Ukraine is defined by her marginality, and this state of being, which is coterminous with the state of *communitas*, also sanctifies her – not least of all also in the spirit of the Gospel’s dicta that “the last shall be first” and that “the meek shall inherit the earth.”⁶⁰ This ontological “claim” to sanctity is rooted in the

⁵⁹ Cf. Matthew T. Evans, “The Sacred: Differentiating, Clarifying and Extending Concepts,” and before him Emile Durkheim’s *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (London, 1912, 1915), 47 and passim.

⁶⁰ Cf. Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process* (Chicago, 1969).

very notion of *communitas* – and it grounds the deep universalism of Shevchenko's poetry.⁶¹

Thirdly, insofar as Shevchenko's vision is also focused on the future, on the ideal resolution of things, it projects a millenarian view of a redeemed order, a renewed paradise on earth; cf. e.g., "Isaiia. Hlava 35" (Isaiah 35):

Оживуть степи, озера,
 І не верстовії,
 А вольнії, широкії,
 Скрізь шляхи святії
 Простеляться; і не найдуть
 Шляхів тих владики,
 А раби тими шляхами
 Без гвалту і крику
 Позіходяться до купи,
 Раді та веселі.
 І пустиню опанують
 Веселії села.
 (39-50)

(The steppe and lakes will live again / And roads – with not one toll – / But broad and free and holy / Will spread to the horizon, / And princes will not find them / But slaves will walk those roads / and come together without shout or clamor / And in joy and mirth / The joyful villages / Will master the desert.)

Or in "I tut i vsiudy – skriz' pohano" (Both here and there – it's bad all over, 1860):

...Сонце йде
 І за собою день веде.
 І вже тії хребетносили,
 Уже ворущаться царі...
 І буде правда на землі.
 (10-14)

(...The sun is coming / And leading day behind it. / And stiff-necked Tsars are waking with a start... / And there'll be justice on this earth.)

Or most succinctly in the above cited conclusion of "I Arkhimed, i Halilei."

⁶¹ Cf. Grabowicz, *Poet as Mythmaker*, passim.

This millenarian vision of a redeemed order also articulates the powerful totalizing force of Shevchenko's poetry – for it projects a change that is radical, undifferentiated, and complete. No less importantly, it is projected on all subsequent generations. In a word, this Shevchenkian archetype of Ukraine's sacred nature – which fuses the issues of Shevchenko's subsequent reception and the emergence of the Ukrainian idea – will become in the course of the following decades a variant of a new secular religion, or religion tout court, and the basis for a future Ukrainian collective identity.

The fourth and last moment concerns the actualization of this state of affairs, its transformation into value and behavior. For characteristically Shevchenko's Ukraine is not an abstraction, or just an idea, but a dynamic force field, and concretely – a mission which shapes his self-perception and his understanding of his task, and which inspires and forms his creativity. At the same time it has a distinct collective resonance as it is articulated as an imperative of sacrifice for an ideal, an imperative of love – precisely in the spirit of a higher stage of the new secular religion just noted. That this love can effect an inner revelation, an elevation of the spirit that then reaches a state of holyness, as if drawing on the general numinosity of this force field, is something that is implicitly given – even while it requires further investigation in the context of Shevchenko's psychology. In its “latent” form this quality infuses all of Shevchenko's poetry (and flows from the ubiquity of the mythical code and its basic components – the level of archetypes), but at times it is also clearly bared, thematized, as in “Poslaniie” where the poet turns to his addressees – who are here the entire nation in its holistic and transcendent time-and-space – and enjoins them to “love with a true heart / The great ruin” or in the penultimate poem of the cycle “V kazemati” (In Prison) “Чи ми ще зійдемося знову?” (Will we still meet again, you think?), which he addresses to his fellow prisoners, the “brothers” of the Society of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, “Свою Україну любіть. / Любіть її... Во время люте, / В останню тажку минуту / За неї Господа моліть” (Love your Ukraine. / Love her... in this the worst of times / And even / With your final, dying breath / Pray to the Lord for her).

As for himself, this imperative – again in the spirit of a totalizing poetry and the sacred and prophetic role of the poet – is absolutized and expressed, as in the poem “Son (Hory moï vysokiï),” not even as something uttered by a porte parole, a represented character, but by the poet himself, dispensing even with the narrative “mask” of the “lyri-

cal hero.” (This putatively universal trope, or necessarily mediating ontological step, of an implied voice or speaker who stands between the actual author and the poetic locution⁶² is still often repeated by various critics as an automatic, necessary given, but clearly needs correction and further elucidation when applied to Shevchenko. While he, like many other strong poets before and after him, is projecting a powerful poetic voice, and a powerful persona, that quality can hardly be reduced to merely a formal, “lyrical,” or ontological/ narrative, i.e., a fictional, *als ob* function. It is informed and still more powerfully determined by the mythical/archetypal mode, and over time by an ever stronger, transcendent, indeed millenarian message. Prophecy is not commensurate with a “lyrical hero”; to the extent that it is authentic it transcends the fictive [*als ob*] and narrative [lyrical] modality which the formal vehicle of poetry links it to – and which the formalist mindset is so focused on.) It requires no mediation and the categorical nature and the totalizing (and for some even blasphemous) cast of this re-vision of the ultimately sacred is proffered with utter directness, as in the oft-cited:

Я так її, я так люблю
 Мою Україну убогу,
 Що проклену святого Бога,
 За неї душу погублю!
 (57-60)

(I'm so..., I do so love/ My poor Ukraine / That I would curse the holy Lord/ I'd lose my soul for her!)

For this statement to be intelligible and authentic it cannot be uttered by a mere “lyrical hero.”

III. Individual Archetypes: The Psychological Code

As postulated by Jung's theory and evidenced by Shevchenko's poetry, archetypes are rooted not only in the collective unconscious but in the individual as well; the interrelation and interaction between them is fundamental and aspects of this have already been noted. Myth and mythical thinking intersect above all with the collective unconscious;

⁶² First called the “lyrical hero” by Iurii Tynianov; see his article “Blok,” in *Ob Aleksandre Bloke*, (St. Petersburg, 1921), 237-64; also <http://philologos.narod.ru/tynyanov/pilk/ist8.htm>.

the personal unconscious is expressed in all of human psychic life and reveals itself directly in creativity and psychoanalysis. In our context this also points to a basic aporia: the question of Shevchenko's individual unconscious, the key moment of his overall psychological code – which in this case is expressed not only in his poetry but in other forms of his creativity, above all his prose – still remains the least examined aspect of his creativity, and of Shevchenko studies as a whole. The reasons for this are various, mainly historical, and in large measure ideological: Soviet scholarship which was blind to the presence of archetypes also preferred to close its eyes to the psychology of Shevchenko (as it did to the psychology of any writer);⁶³ *mutatis mutandis* this also applies both to the anti-Soviet, nationalist perspective and the pre-Soviet, populist one. Whatever the differences in ideological position or dogma, the reluctance of all these perspectives to open themselves, in effect, to open Shevchenko studies to the psychoanalytic content and method was rooted not only in their respective biases, simplifications, complexes, and so on, but also in their shared belief in the totalizing discourse of the national poet, and his (and the discourse's) iconic status. In essence, like the para-scholarly and the cultic treatments of Shevchenko, the earlier scholarly approaches (or those that passed for scholarship) were also thickly interlarded with various thematic and methodological taboos. This was compounded by the decades-long isolation of Soviet Ukrainian scholarship, especially in the humanities, from new developments as well as from the old standards in scholarship. An examination of this complex of factors – both the psychology of Shevchenko and its treatment (or rather its denial) in Shevchenko studies – is a high priority for the discipline. What is proposed here is only a preliminary formulation of the problem.

1.

For Jung, the structure of the human psyche is composed of several interconnected functions and their contents (the material on which they build); each of them is also an archetype: the ego, the persona, the anima (or the soul), the shadow, and the transcendent core of the human psyche, the self (*das Selbst*). Some of these functions are familiar from earlier psychological research; some stem from Jung's conceptualizations and work. For us, as before, the most complex and interesting

⁶³ Thus in the *Shevchenkivs'kyi slovnyk*, vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1977), there is no "Psykhohohiia Shevchenka," there is only "Psykhohohizm Shevchenka" – which is not the same thing.

task is the conceptualization of these structures precisely in the concrete given of Shevchenko's works – for not everything that appears here is precisely as in the theory. Still, all of these structures are clearly marked out, and in general Shevchenko's writing, particularly his poetry, but the prose as well, emphasizes in an unprecedented way its psychological coding. As none of his contemporaries, and overtaking, it seems, even such later writers as Dostoevsky and anticipating Kafka, Shevchenko reveals directly, and especially symbolically, the very process of his own creativity and his own psychological content and transforms the creative act into various forms of meditation, confession, self-reflection and self-revelation. One is hard pressed to find another writer – certainly not in Ukrainian literature – who would so intensely reveal and thematize not only his psychic path, his "history" and karma, but the very architectonics of his psyche.

The core concept here for Jung is the archetype of the ego, by which he means the basic integrative function of the human psyche which rests on "the total field of consciousness" as well as on "the sum total of unconscious content"; at the same time "the ego is a conscious factor par excellence. It is even acquired, empirically speaking, during the individual's lifetime."⁶⁴ It is not, however, identical with the entire human psyche: outside of it exist the other functions (the "anima," the "shadow," and above all the self) with which the ego as the center of consciousness interacts in various ways, but is not fully conscious of them. Characteristic of the undeveloped, the not "individuated" ego (cf. below) is its vulnerability to "inflation," i.e., to such or another delusional sense of its own importance.⁶⁵ A special projection of the ego, its external aspect, and also an archetype for Jung, is the "persona," literally, from the Latin, a "mask," in effect the "I," for the most part idealized and largely based on one's official role or status (the "cardinal," "judge," "professor," etc.) which we present to the outside world and by which we cover up a range of internal vulnerabilities, complexes, feelings, and in general our psychic essence.

Even on a very preliminary level, in terms of general thematics, it is clear that Shevchenko places remarkable emphasis on his psychic life and pointedly uncovers both the conscious and unconscious dimen-

⁶⁴ C. G. Jung, *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*, ed. and trans. Gerhard Adler and R. F. C. Hull, vol. 9, pt. 2, of *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, Bollingen Series 20 (New York, 1959), 4-5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 23-24 and *passim*.

sions of his psyche. The presence of the latter, the unconscious, had already focused the attention of various early critics who – even in the absence of a theoretical apparatus – could not but see, for example, the centrality and insistent presence of dreams in Shevchenko, or of visions, or a whole range of the otherworldly, the fantastic, and so on.⁶⁶ A mere enumeration of these moments would take up considerable space, and an analysis even more so (and the issue is compounded by various conventions, above all, the Romantic, that stress or prioritize these moments).

No less obvious, and consistently thematized and narrativized, are Shevchenko's depictions of himself: as a figure, and as a persona, above all as an artist. This is revealed in a great range – remarkable even in the context of comparative art history – of self-portraits, to which one could add a series of symbolic self-portraits, particularly the series of sepia drawings of the exile period, *Prytcha pro bludnoho syna* (The Parable of the Prodigal Son). They all merit a separate investigation. What is striking, however, is that depictions of one's persona, above all of oneself-as-artist, especially in the context of "normal," multi-dimensional social life, with its hierarchies, conventions, codes of behaviour and etiquette, and generally within a broad gamut of society and social situations, and so on, appear all but exclusively in the context of his prose, in short, in a world where the laws and modality of his "adjusted" personality hold full sway. In the poetry this gamut, in principle, i.e., in accordance with the structures of his "unadjusted" world, is almost entirely absent, and it is much more difficult to speak about his presentation of his persona in the poetry since the world in which this persona functions is basically and consistently elided here. In the novellas, however, where his autobiographical mode is present and stressed, for example in *Khudozhnik* (The Artist) and even more in his most complex and symbolically condensed work, *Progulka s udovol'stviam i ne bez morali* (A Journey With Pleasure and not Without a Moral), the question of the persona is put with remarkable directness. In great measure this self-reflection – on one's role in the world and how the world, in its various settings, sees you and how one should project oneself for this same world – becomes the basic theme and subject of these works. This is continued in large measure in the diary, although with a more rationalistic emploi (and without the basic component of fictionality). To what degree these prose depictions and projections of the persona, and the ego as well, articulate the archetype and the archetypical think-

⁶⁶ Cf. Sumtsov, "Glavnye motivy poezii T.G. Shevchenko."

ing that inspires the poetry is an open question and requires further analysis. A certain continuity cannot but exist, however, although it is subject to rationalistic modulations.

2.

The psyche of the author and all aspects of his psychic life are reflected in Shevchenko's poetry with extraordinary dynamism. This flows above all from the fact that reflexivity or auto-thematism is a basic modality for him and recurs in constant variations of self-reflection, meditation and prayer. Many works, particularly from the exile period, but beginning already with the earliest, for example "Dumy moï, dumy moï" (My Songs, My Thoughts; 1839) present this process of thinking and reflecting on the self, frequently in the form of a dialogue. A paradigmatic instance of such a dialogue with oneself is the exile poem "Khiba samomu napysat'" (I Guess It Must Be Up to Me), and generally the whole series of poems of the exile period which deal with the problem of writing.⁶⁷ An iconically bared version of this is the first (1847) variant of "Moskaleva krynytsia," where the work swims into focus, as it were, during a long opening dialogue between two narrators, or rather an author and a narrator, the former literate and a gentleman, a "panych," and the other from "the people," the narod, and thus illiterate, as to how to tell/write the tale (оцю бувальщину), i.e., the poem we are about to hear/read. In turn, this illustrates another basic trait: this poetry depicts not so much psychic states or emotions, as their crystallization, the way they come into being. In a sense, they are always in *statu nascendi*, and they remind us that we are dealing not with static or finished things, but with the force fields of emotion, and symbolic action itself – the performance. Thus in "Muza" (Muse, 1857) the poet turns to the muse/anima with the plea "Учи неложними устами / Сказати правду. Помози / Молитву діяти до краю; 33-35; Teach me, with truthful lips, / To tell the truth. Help me / Perform the prayer to the end). In effect: not prayer as such, but the act of praying. Characteristically, the poem that is called "Molytva" (Prayer, 1860) consists, in fact, of three variants (four if we

⁶⁷ Cf. my "Self-Definition and Decentering: Ševčenko's 'Xiba samomu napysat' and the Question of Writing," in "Adelphotos: A Tribute to Omeljan Pritsak by his Students," ed. Frank E. Sysyn, with the assistance of Kathryn Dodgson Taylor, special issue, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, no. 3/4 (December 1990): 313-42. Ukrainian translation, "Samovyznachennia i vidoseredzhennia: 'Khiba samomu napysat'...': Shevchenko i problema pysannia," in Hrabovych, *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo*.

consider the accompanying “Tym nesyтым ocham” (To Those Greedy Eyes) which vary the “theses,” “postulates,” and “requests” of this prayer. Again: not one prayer, but praying itself, or prayer as a force field.

Movement, dynamism and the ontology of becoming thus become the hallmarks of Shevchenko’s style. In the Introduction to *Haidamaky* (lines 1-268), for example, the poet uses three times the trope “заспіваю” (I shall sing; lines 107, 109 and 113).⁶⁸ The first time it is as an already traditional for him topos (in this poem, after all, he continues to speak in the voice of the minstrel, the *kobzar* whom he had introduced a year earlier in his first collection by that very name) of localizing the forthcoming action: “...один собі / У моїй хатині / Заспіваю, заридаю, / Як мала дитина” (alone / In my hut / I shall sing, I shall weep / Like a small child, 105-8). The second time this signals the content of that song, establishing an equation between song and representation: “Заспіваю – море грає, / Вітер повіває, / Степ чорніє, і могила / З вітром розмовляє” (I shall sing – the sea swells, / The wind blows, / The steppe goes dark and the burial mound / Speaks with the wind, 109-12). The third use of the trope “заспіваю,” however, goes beyond equation of song and representation and as it moves from the iterative (*грає... повіває... чорніє... розмовляє*) to the completed action (*розвернулась* [from *розвернутись* – to open up, or to heave up]) and effects a full actualization of the depicted as the narrative shifts from description to the unfolding of the action itself:

Заспіваю – розвернулась
Висока могила,
Аж до моря запорожці
Степ широкий вкрили.
(113-16)

(I shall sing – the tall burial mound has opened up / The Zaporozhians cover the steppe to the very sea.)

The effect of the movement here and the dynamism in general is far reaching. From this prime principle, as it were, the Cossacks and Hetmans that subsequently appear in the poem are no longer “represented” or “depicted, but made concretely present, actual, as in dramatic discourse:

⁶⁸ I.e., in the first edition. See Oles’ Fedoruk, *Pershe vydannia Shevchenkovykh “Haidamakiv”: istoriia knyzhky* (Kyiv, 2013), 52.

...Сотники з панами
 І гетьмани – всі в золоті,
 У мою хатину
 Прийшли, сіли коло мене
 І про Україну
 Розмовляють, розказують
 Як Січ будували...

(The commanders and the gentlemen / And the Hetmans, all in gold,
 / Came into my cabin / And sat down around me, / And they speak of
 Ukraine, / And tell how they built the Sich...)

Then the *haidamaks* themselves appear. They are not presented, however, as a product of fancy, as a midsummer night's dream, so to speak. Night passes, the sun rises, and they still remain – and they speak with the author:

Отак сидя в кінці стола
 Міркую, гадаю:
 Кого просить? хто поведе?
 Надворі світає;
 Погас місяць, горить сонце.
 Гайдамаки встали,
 Помолились, одяглися,
 Кругом мене стали.
 Сумно, сумно, як сироти,
 Мовчки похилились.
 “Благослови, – кажуть, – батьку,
 Поки маєм силу;
 Благослови шукать долю
 На широкім світі.”
 (197-210)

(Thus sitting at the end of the table / I think and ponder: / Whom
 should I ask? Who will lead? / Outside it's dawning; / The moon goes
 down, the sun is shining. / The haidamaks got up, / Prayed, got dressed,
 / Stood around me in a circle. / Sadly, sadly, like orphans, / Stooping
 in silence. / “Bless us, father, they say, / While we still have strength; /
 Bless us to seek our fate/ In this wide world.”)

Such examples are many. What is at issue is the fundamental tendency of the Shevchenkian poetic text not only to dramatize the represented world, but also to project an inner, psychic world onto the external one, and to shift and blur the boundaries between them. This ability to project one's own psychodrama onto the narrated world, and

then further onto the social and even the historical and ideological backgrounds, makes Shevchenko a strikingly modern writer, considerably closer to the twentieth century than the nineteenth. In the given context it also allows us a much more concrete sense of his psychological structures, and especially of the defining role of archetypes in his psychic life.

3.

One of the main structures in the Jungian analysis of the human psyche is the self (*das Selbst*), which lies at the core of the psyche, but which in the conscious mode cannot be grasped, or “known”: it is transcendent, and in principle, an archetype of wholeness; as such it reaches out beyond the dimensions of one’s own “I” and links us with the center of the sacred, with God; it can be approached intuitively and symbolically, and, characteristically – depending on the culture – it is symbolized by the Deity, by Christ or Buddha. For the Christian world – and this is the matrix for both Shevchenko and the great bulk of his audience – Christ as an archetype of the Savior is also an archetype of the self, the Christ within us. This is discussed at some length by Jung:

Our discourse necessarily brings us to Christ, because he is the still living myth of our culture. He is our culture hero, who, regardless of his historical existence, embodies the myth of the divine Primordial Man, the mystic Adam. It is he who occupies the centre of the Christian mandala... He is in us and we in him. His kingdom is the pearl of great price, the treasure buried in the field... As Christ in us, so also is his heavenly kingdom.

These few, familiar references should be sufficient to make the psychological position of the Christ symbol quite clear. *Christ exemplifies the archetype of the self*. He represents a totality of a divine or heavenly kind, a glorified man, a son of God *sine macula peccati*, unspotted by sin...⁶⁹

For Shevchenko this approach to the self, to that core which unites the conscious and the unconscious and which emanates a special sense of wholeness and harmony, is projected by several more or less distinct moments. Above all, it emerges in that process which Jung calls individuation and which is distinctly marked in Shevchenko’s poetry and becomes the basic component of his sense of task or “mission” (cf. below). The self is also projected (at times only implicitly) in a range of moments, indeed in a kind of projected semiotic field, where the basic and unifying issue

⁶⁹ Jung, *Aion*, 36-37; from chap. 5, “Christ, a Symbol of the Self,” 36-71.

is the true meaning of Christ, his central, holistic and redeeming message for mankind, a message unspoiled by power, lust for control and triumphalism. The delineation of this ideal of Christ (in such works as “Kavkaz” or “Son (Hory moi vysokii),” and the fact that it is often transformed by man into its very opposite (precisely as a craving for authority and as triumphalism) is often couched by Shevchenko as a polemic or a form of struggle with God, the Father – which, as Chyzhevs’kyi was one of the first to argue, hardly suggests a-religious or anti-religious views, but rather a profound depth to his religious feelings.⁷⁰ We are speaking here, however, on the level of conscious approach or stance, i.e., that which has so often been examined precisely in the context of Shevchenko’s “attitudes” or “views” (which when subjected to ideological reasoning, or its simulacrum, could not but come out looking schematic and superficial).⁷¹ This conscious, conceptual, and at times even programmatic cast also includes the Christological views of the Brotherhood of Sts. Cyril and Methodius as reflected in its basic text, the “Zakon Bozhyi” (Law of God), more often referred to (following the Mickiewiczian prototype), as “Knyhy buttia ukrains’koho narodu” (The Books of Genesis of the Ukrainian People) which clearly could not but have had an impact on Shevchenko, and also the fact that he twice wrote to Varvara Repnina from exile (on February 28, 1848, and January 1, 1850) asking her to send him the Russian translation of Thomas à Kempis’s *Imitation of Christ*, and which, according to the eyewitness account of K. I. Gern, Shevchenko did read.⁷² But apart from these conscious and programmatic moments – which could be, and indeed were, impacted by exigencies and pragmatic considerations and the need to project one’s persona, or even curry favor – there is a range of deeper, symbolically charged ones.

A key and frequent element here is a symbolic projection of oneself in the role of Christ, his mission and his martyrdom for the sake of the oppressed, the poor, and the weak. This is a defining component in Shevchenko’s self-portrayal which follows a path from “Trizna” (1843) through “Prorok” (The Prophet, 1848?) and “Iurodovyi” (The Holy Fool, 1857) to the later works where the millenarian vision of a new and redeemed life attains full force. This “Christ within” – especially when

⁷⁰ See Dmytro Chyzhevs’kyi’s “Shevchenko i relihiia,” in *Povne vydannia tvoriv Tarasa Shevchenka*, vol. 9 (Chicago, 1960), 329-47.

⁷¹ Cf. my “Shevchenkivs’ka entsyklopediia,” in *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo*, passim.

⁷² See Shevchenko’s letters to Varvara Repnina of Feb. 25-29, 1848, and Jan. 1, 1850; see Taras Shevchenko, *Povne zibrania tvoriv u shesty tomakh*, vol. 6 (Kyiv, 1964), 50 and 61. Regarding Gern, see his letter to M.M. Lazarevs’kyi, in *Spohady pro Shevchenka*, ed. A.I. Kostenko (Kyiv, 1958), 244. Cf. also Chyzhevs’kyi, 341.

it stresses not the power of authority, the “Бог Савоѳ” (God of the Savaoth, The Lord of Hosts), but mercy and self-sacrifice – is the very heart of the archetype of the self.

At the same time there is another, more earthy, so to speak, locus of selfhood – which inheres in the people themselves, in the *narod* – and gives voice to the collective, to simplicity and the natural. As we see from the already noted “Khiba samomu napysat” and the opening dialogue of “Moskaleva krynytsia” I, this is also where one finds the source of wholeness and life-assertion and the essential antipode to doubt, confusion, and the despair that the ego and the persona suffer from. Here, too, the self is reasserted as a centering structure.⁷³

4.

In terms of thematic content and cathectic intensity, however, the next two psychic structures and core archetypes – the anima and the shadow – are much more prominent in Shevchenko. For Jung, the anima incarnates for each man his archetypal feminine “I” and projects itself on various feminine hypostases, beginning with the mother (for women, according to the law of gender-coded symmetry-in-opposition, which Jung calls “syzygy,” the counterpart to the anima is the “animus” – the masculine “I”).⁷⁴ Even in a purely quantitative, narrative sense, references to the anima, their articulation, clearly assume prominence in Shevchenko; for him she is the “soul,” and “angel,” and “star,” and, also, fate (*dolia*) and the muse (*muza*); one could also add *slava* (fame or glory), since under this title she appears in his triptych (“Dolia,” “Muza,” “Slava”) in a crypto-pejorative way – as a whore, who gives herself to all comers, but remains attractive and lovable nonetheless. The poet’s dialogue with each of these projections – with the anima as such – furnishes him with the basic tools for self-recognition and self-definition; the power of her presence, and the poet’s identification with her, reveal basic features, and the dominant profile, of his psychology – its emotiveness, sensitivity and compassion – while also reveal-

⁷³ Two short poems written in 1845, “Ne zavydуй bahatomu” (Don’t Envy the Rich Man) and “Ne zhenysia na bahatii” (Don’t Marry a Rich Woman) also illustrate this structure, in effect, through a dialogue with the self and a search within for support and guidance – which anticipates the dialogicity of “Khiba samomu napysat” and “Moskaleva krynytsia” I of a few years later.

⁷⁴ See Jung, “The Relations Between the Ego and the Unconscious,” in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, 2nd ed., vol. 7 (Princeton, 1966).

ing the breadth and character of his mission, and the mechanisms of its projection.

A key compositional device and at the same time a basic psychological ritual of text formation is the introduction or invocation that prefaces virtually every longer poem and progressively develops into a highly concentrated articulation of the anima and her role. In his first long poem, "Kateryna" (usually dated as 1838) such an invocation is missing, although in the spirit of the *kobzar's* performance, which animates the whole eponymous collection, the poem does begin with a characteristic moralizing injunction: "Кохайтесь чорнобриві, / Та не з москалями" (Make love, village beauties, / But not with Russian soldiers). In *Haidamaky* (1841), it does appear in the introduction, although still in an embryonic form: the anima is not yet a defined addressee, but she is already implied as an object of discourse – she is the poet's "soul" to whom he turns, or rather speaks of in the third person (cf. lines 20-36). Her presence provides for a doubling of the psychic source of the poem: it is now both the masculine author-narrator and his feminine soul (*dusha*), i.e., "Вона вас любила, рожеві квіти / І про вашу долю любила співать" (She loved you, pink flowers / And loved to sing of your fate, 33-34). In a peculiar way this also resonates with the doubled voice of the author-narrator – which projects both the *kobzar* and the poet.

In "Mar'iana-chernytsia" (Maryana the Nun, also written in 1841), the introductory invocation is addressed to a real person, to "Oksana," that is Oksana K[ovalenko], a childhood friend mentioned in the dedication. Here, too, the form is rather embryonic, but functionally the addressee is already the anima: "ти без мови, без слова навчила / Очима, душею, серцем розмовлять" (without language, without words, / With eyes, the soul, the heart, you taught me to speak, 19-20) and "На тебе дивлюся, за тебе молюсь" (I look at you, I pray for you, 26). In "Trizna" (1843) which is a milestone in his poetry – even though written in Russian – the search for the Word and for his mission is prefaced by an invocation which is also addressed to a concrete person, Varvara Repnina, but her depiction – in the form of elevated and rather exalted diction that conforms to the nature of Shevchenko's relationship with her – again reflects the characteristic features of the anima: she is the "soul," an "angel," and implicitly the "muse" (cf. "Ваш добрый ангел осенил / Меня безсмертными крылами / И тихостройными речами / Мечты о рае пробудил" [Your good angel protected me / With his immortal wings / And with his serene speech

/ Gave birth to dreams of Paradise] 10-13]; cf. below). The quote from St. Paul's first letter which follows yet again stresses the holiness of the word which will be born here.

The poem "Slipyi" (The Blind Man, 1845), later reworked as "Nevol'nyk" (The Captive, 1859) has an invocation where the anima is projected in fully developed form: she is the star that guides the poet; she is his "heart" and "paradise" (*rai*) and his sanctuary even when all have abandoned him, including his inspiration (cf. lines 1-20; one should note that while feelings of loneliness and abandonment will become core topoi of his exile poetry, Shevchenko wrote the first version of this poem well before exile). It also introduces the rudiments of a dialogue, by citing the words of the anima (cf. "Slipyi", 31-33, and "Nevol'nyk", 33-35). As a premonition of things to come, the notion of the anima is widened as the invocation blends into a prefatory meditation on "dolia" (fate) and man's quest for it; and the workings of the anima-dolia are cast as mysterious, unpredictable and transcendent (cf. lines 39-66).

A sublime and intense image of the anima is projected by the invocation to "Kniazhna" (The Princess, 1847). It echoes the earlier image of the anima as a basic source of knowledge, succor and inspiration, but also stresses, particularly in its conclusion, that communing with her – in effect, writing poetry – is a meditative process, a communication both with the sacred, the "paradise" noted earlier, and with the demonic, the hell-on earth that the poem will go on to anatomize. The intermediary role of the anima is particularly stressed here:

Зоре моя!
Мій друже єдиний!
І хто знає, що діється
У нас на Україні?
А я знаю. І розкажу
Тобі; й спать не ляжу.
А ти завтра тихесенько
Богові розкажеш.
(25-32)

(My star! / My one and only friend! / Who knows what is happening in our Ukraine? / But I know. And I will tell / You; and not go to sleep. / And tomorrow, quietly / You will tell God.)

In essence this begins a shift of the invocation into a dialogue with the anima, something that will continue and develop in all such later

projections, i.e., in the introduction to the poem "Tsari" (The Tsars, 1848), in the introduction to "Neofity" (The Neophytes, 1857), and especially in the triptych "Dolia," "Muza," "Slava" (1858) and in the powerful culmination of this series in the introduction-invocation to "Maria" (1859), and finally in his very last, farewell poem, "Chy ne pokynut' nam, neboho" (Should We Not Leave, Dear Friend, 1861). "Kniazhna" – which is also the first narrative, long poem of exile, antedating "Moskaleva krynytsia" (the first, 1847, variant) – also introduces the identification of poetry, that is, of writing poetry, with confession, with an essential communion with God, but with a no less essential mediation of the anima. What was thus an invocation turns now into prayer.

The identification of poetry and prayer was already voiced earlier, to be sure, that is, in the poem "Osyka" (The Aspen Tree, first half of 1847) later reworked in exile as "Vid'ma" (The Witch, 1849-1850), which was the last long poem Shevchenko wrote before his arrest and exile; thus: "Молюся, знову уповаю, / І знову сльози виливаю, / І думу тяжкую мою / Німим стінам передаю" (I pray, I hope again, / And again I shed tears / And give over my heavy thought / To the mute walls, 1-4). Although no invocation proper is addressed to the anima here, "Osyka"/"Vid'ma" is particularly important in that it demonstrates the characteristic duality of the archetype, in effect revealing the anima here with her pained and demonic visage. Early in the poem, before the tale of sexual exploitation and human cruelty and madness is yet recounted by the heroine turned "witch," the poet interrupts the tale and directs, as it were, above the heads of the depicted listeners, the gypsies around a fire, to us, the readers, his universal, archetypal formulation:

Що ж се таке? Се не мара.
 Моя се мати і сестра.
 Моя се відьма, щоб ви знали.
 (65-68)

(What is this then? It's not a phantom / It is my mother and my sister.
 / It is my witch, I'll have you know.)

There are, of course, further basic variants in Shevchenko's treatment of the anima. One is the shift of the invocation into dialogue, in effect, crypto-dialogue, consciously exaggerated and with elements of parody in the style of *kotliarevshchyna*, in the introduction to "Tsari," which is conducted here as an ironic (and one sided) "consultation" of the poet with the muse (we do not hear her words, but can infer her dicta from the poetry that ensues) as to how exactly to depict these

“Tsars,” supposedly “anointed by God,” with “hairdos coiffed with holy myrrh” (святопомазані чуприни). What is characteristic here is the playful, but also psychologically telling familiarity with the muse: it establishes a new level of confidence and control – which also resonates with his baring, in effect re-thematization, of the archetype of the Tsars itself (cf. II, 5, above) and the ideological radicalism of this poem, its revolutionary revision and debunking of the canon of “holy Tsars,” of David, Volodymyr, and so on. It also provides one of several essential entries, in the poetry itself, to what is primarily rooted in Shevchenko’s prose, and partially also in his art – i.e., his cynical mode. This, of course, deserves special attention.

A further step in this direction – not so much of familiarity, as of profound intimization, and with it further self-knowledge and self-assertion – is the masterful triptych “Dolia,” “Muza,” “Slava,” which was written basically in one breath (February 9, 1858), already in freedom (in Nizhnyi Novgorod), but still before the “dizziness from success” that was to come with his return to the capital, St. Petersburg, some six weeks later. All three poems are undoubtedly about the anima, with all the functions and features – succor, care, inspiration, and so on – that were noted earlier, although the first two (“Dolia” and “Muza”) present this (and her) in an “elevated” mode, while “Slava” does so in a “low” or “burlesque” one. This continuity or selfsameness of the object, i.e., the anima, in all three poems, emerges from the general semantics and imagery of the triptych (and before that was suggested by the poem “Slipyi”; cf. above). It is also alluded to in the conclusion of “Dolia,” in the intertwining of “fate” and “fame”: “Ходімо дальше, дальше слава, / А слава заповідь моя” (Let us go forward, before us is fame, / And fame is my destiny). The intimization itself is conveyed by a range of devices, above all diminutives, and the perspective of a child (in both “Dolia” and “Muza,” and partially even in “Slava”); it is most concentrated in the ending of “Muza” where the poetry changes – in diction and in its thesis – into the prayer of a child:

Учи неложними устами
Сказати правду. Поможи
Молитву діяти до краю.
А як умру, моя святая!
Моя ти мамо! Положи
Свого ти сина в домовину
І хоть єдиную сльозину
В очах безсмертних покажи.

(33-40)

(Teach me, with truthful lips / To tell the truth. Help me / Perform the prayer to the end. / And when I die, my holy one! / Lay out, my mother, / Your son in his coffin / And let fall at least one tear / From your immortal eyes.)

The basic function of the triptych, however, is performed by the polyphony itself as the three poetic texts project the anima through several hypostases – indeed more than just the eponymous three inasmuch as in “Slava” she is also a tavern keeper and trollop. The indirection and decentering allows the poet to speak of the most intimate things – his sense of self, his road from childhood to death, his task and his achievements, his mission – concretely and directly while at the same time avoiding the constant pitfalls of ego inflation and pride. Ultimately, his “stereoscopic” illumination of the anima integrates it more fully in his psyche – and propels his individuation (cf. below).

Almost from the beginning, even for such rationalistic critics as Drahomanov and Franko,⁷⁵ the introduction and invocation of “Mariia” was seen as an apotheosis of Shevchenko’s spiritual self-revelation – in the key of the central Christian myth and cultural frame. It is also, undoubtedly, his next and even more powerful projection of the anima, above all as the mother, but now made universal, as a broadly human topos of hope for renewal and salvation. The crux of the matter, however, is that continuing the insights of “Dolia,” “Muza,” and “Slava,” the whole work now, not just the invocation, is about the anima – and along with that is also a meditation on how she functions for mankind. As such it deserves a separate investigation. Perhaps the key moment that requires attention is the conclusion of the poem, firstly the fact that Mariia, while she is the mother of Christ-the-Saviour, and the one who in this story reassembles the weak and fearful apostles after his death and inspires them to new efforts, dies at the end in what can only be seen as an apotheosis of social marginalization and contempt: “Ти ж під тиним, / Сумуючи, у бур’яні / Умерла з голоду” (As for you, you died by a fence, / Grieving among the weeds, / Of

⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. Drahomanov’s publication of the poem in Latin script in Geneva, *Marija maty Isusowa. Wirszy Tarasa Szevczenka z uwahamy M. Drahomanova* (Geneva, 1882) and in his *Shevchenko, ukraïnofily i sotsializm*. Cf. also Ivan Franko’s, “Shevchenko-va ‘Mariia,’” *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 119-120 (1913): 348-56 (cf. also Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u p’iatdesiaty tomakh [ZTP]*, vol. 39 [Kyiv, 1984], 300-309) and his “[Pro ievanhel’s’ki osnovy poemy Shevchenka ‘Mariia,’” *ZTP* 39:310-23.

hunger, 744-46). In a sense, the archetype of the unwed mother (of which “Mariia” is clearly an apotheosis; cf. above) takes over the plot and the narrative focus, and demonstrates the priority of the collective archetypal over the individual. But this is only half of the formulation, for in the concluding ten lines (747-56) the poet continues the story and gives it a remarkably powerful coda, precisely in terms of his evolving millenarian vision – which after “Mariia” receives ever more focused articulation. On the one hand the social and canonic version of Mary turns into a triumphalist mockery of her (and it could not be otherwise – after all, this comes from the patriarchal world of the “holy Tsars”); on the other hand – in the transcendent mode, in the human soul, of each of us, not only that of the poet – she, like the anima she is, comes to be perpetually reborn:

...а ти?
 Мов золото в тому горнілі,
 В людській душі возобновилаь,
 В душі невольничій малій,
 В душі скорбящей і убогій.
 (752-56)⁷⁶

(And you? / Like gold in that crucible, / Were renewed in the human soul, / In the little soul of slaves, / In the soul in pain and want.)

And finally Shevchenko’s last poetic work, “Chy ne pokynut’ nam neboho” ([Should We Not Leave, My Dear Friend] written February 15, 1861, about ten days before his death) is also wholly devoted to the anima, that is the poet’s dialogue with the soul on the very eve of his death as his last articulation of his farewell to the world. Its nuances of voice, intimization and self-projection – especially in this most existential of moments, as the person takes leave of life – make this work a cornerstone for a fuller understanding of Shevchenko’s psychology. In the context of his archetypes and especially Jungian psychoanalysis the work is especially interesting as a forerunner of that process of soul formation examined by such researchers and therapists as James Hillman.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ One can only regret that because of textological formalism these lines were elided from the poem in the last two academic editions and put into the “variants” section; cf. my “Mizh slovom i skhemoiu,” in *Shevchenko, iakoho ne znaiemo*, 172-74.

⁷⁷ Cf. James Hillman, *The Soul’s Code: In Search of Character and Calling* (New York, 1996).

5.

If in terms of the sheer quantity of references and depictions the anima occupies first place in the range of Shevchenko's psychical self-projections and in his view of the world, the Shadow is a close second – although in terms of its importance for his psychodrama, and the evolution of his worldview it is hardly secondary. And yet by the logic of the iconic image of Shevchenko, the Shadow is not perceived – in fact it is actively blocked or ignored, made taboo, and in the discourse of Shevchenko studies (especially in its popular and cultic emanations) it is for all practical purposes invisible; it is a massive structured absence.⁷⁸

For Jung the Shadow (der Schatten) is all that which is darkened or repressed in our psyche and personality, all that which is considered “ugly,” “bad” and “evil,” and which the conscious “I” – modeling itself first on our parents, our teachers, then on society, and finally on all authority – rejects and conceals. The Shadow defines, in short, the destructive as well as the “low” aspects of the psyche.⁷⁹ It is the polar opposite of the persona, everything which denies its idealized version – even while its psychic power, all its strength, comes from the self.⁸⁰ Central in Jung's theory and praxis, and in the work of his followers is the conviction that understanding and then integrating one's own Shadow into the psyche in the course of individuation is a decisive and highly desirable achievement in the individual's psychic life. For the Shadow is also the seat of psychic energy and creativity, and having access to it, “possessing it,” is indispensable for full psychic existence.⁸¹

For Shevchenko the ability to see and to project what is dangerous and dark, decried and made taboo, that which society denies, rejects and demonizes, is a remarkable strength, and a source of his insightful perception of reality. At the same time, this ability to reveal the con-

⁷⁸ Arguably, blocking any awareness of the Shadow from the iconic perceptions of Shevchenko is what leads to its hypertrophied and malicious resurfacing (or recrudescence) in the writings of various shevchenkophobes (Buzyna, Karevin et al.) where the absence is overblown and essentialized, i.e., where Shevchenko appears as “all-Shadow,” as “vurdalak,” etc. Consistently with the workings of the archetype, the taboo merely quickens the negative side to greater prominence.

⁷⁹ Cf. Joseph L. Henderson, *Shadow and Self* (Wilmette, IL, 1990), 65-66 and passim; cf. also Anthony Stevens, *Archetype Revisited: An Updated Natural History of the Self* (London, 2002), esp. chap. 12, “Shadow: the Archetypal enemy.”

⁸⁰ Cf. Henderson, 66 and passim.

⁸¹ Cf. esp. the influential book by Robert Bly, *A Little Book on the Human Shadow* (San Francisco, 1988).

cealed, to see the other, repressed side of the human soul is applied to himself in the difficult and all-important layer of his confessional poetry – and it becomes a powerful means of self-recognition and self-cleansing.

The archetype of the Shadow – in its personalized, objectified form – appears particularly clearly in several narrative poems, especially in “Ty-tarivna” (The Sexton’s Daughter, 1848), in both version of “Moskaleva krynytsia” (1847 and 1857), in “Varnak” (The Convict, 1848) – as well as in more concealed or programmatically less emphasized forms in various other works. But one should note that in Jungian analysis the Shadow devolves not only on the objectified features or traits (as in given characters) – it is also projected by the given state of repression and oppression, and generally by feelings of helplessness, despair and such psycho-social states as guilt and shame.⁸² In Shevchenko’s world this becomes nearly all-encompassing: it sweepingly applies to all Ukraine in her actual subjected and oppressed status, and in light of his immanent identification with her in his poetry, it comes as no surprise that all around him, and especially within himself, the poet so often sees a “desert” (*pustka*), and “ruin,” and “hell.”⁸³ Where others see only the visible, i.e., the beauty of nature and a “picturesque” Ukraine, а живописна Україна, he sees the Shadow, which, instead of a hovering God (Сам Бог витає над селом), looms over the archetypal village, and indeed over all Ukraine.⁸⁴

A thematization of this paradigm shift, of perceiving the Shadow as the very essence of the social order, is the poem “Iakby vy znaly, panychi” (If You Young Gentlemen But Knew, 1850). Along with the

⁸² Cf. B. Wharton, “The Hidden Face of Shame: The Shadow, Shame and Separation,” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 35 (1990): 279-99.

⁸³ The question of Shevchenko’s identifications – with Ukraine, with Christ, with various represented characters – is also a marked component of what I have been calling his symbolic autobiography; cf. my *Poet as Mythmaker* 120, 145, 159; “Nexus of the Wake,” 332-33, and *Shevchenkovyi “Haidamaky,”* passim.

⁸⁴ *Zhivopisnaia Ukraina* is what in fact Shevchenko chose to call his collection of etchings which he published in the first part in 1844. The degree to which he sensed an aporia there constitutes the very essence, and test case, of the divide he feels between his “adjusted/unadjusted” modes and personalities. The core of the question is also its chronology, the timing of these realizations. At the very least, we see that in “Kniazna,” his first long poem written in exile (usually dated as written in 1847-1848; cf. *PZTDT*, vol. 2 [2003], 571), Shevchenko already parodies this “picturequeness”: i.e., “Село на нашій Україні / Неначе писанка село” (A village in our Ukraine / A village like an Easter egg) – and with it God’s complicity in it. This in turn also directly connects to the highly charged issue of Shevchenko’s cynicism; cf. my forthcoming *Taras Shevchenko: A Portrait in Four Sitzings*.

immanent power of its radical social critique, where the institution of serfdom is shown as transforming everything that is beautiful and good in village life, its “paradise,” into a living hell, and doing so, presumably, with God’s full blessing, the force of this poem also comes from its avowed autobiographic cast, and the fact that it so sharply juxtaposes the worlds of the oppressors – the gentlemen, the gentry, precisely those to whom the poem is addressed – and those who are oppressed, among them the poet himself, who is clearly part of the *narod* here (NB the use of “our” in line 5).⁸⁵ Thus its opening lines:

Якби ви знали, паничі,
 Де люде плачуть живучи,
 То ви б елегій не творили
 Та марне Бога б не хвалили,
 На наші сльози сміючись.
 За що, не знаю, називають
 Хатину в гаї тихим раєм.
 Я в хаті мучився колись,
 Мої там сльози пролились,
 Найперші сльози.
 Я не знаю,
 Чи єсть у Бога люте зло!
 Що б у тій хаті не жило?
 А хату раєм називають!
 (1-13)

(If you, young gentlemen, but knew / How people weep their life away / You would not spin your elegies / And praise God’s name in vain / While laughing at our tears. / I cannot fathom why you’d call / A peasant hut God’s paradise. / I suffered once in such a hut, / My tears were shed there, my first tears, / And I don’t know one vicious thing / In this God’s world that didn’t nest there – / Yet you still call it paradise.)

⁸⁵ Turgenev’s *Zapiski okhotnika* (Hunter’s Album) was published in 1852; the first of its stories, “Khor and Kalinich,” in which the humanity and “concreteness” of the peasants was programmatically noted, appeared in early 1847, in *Sovremennik*. (The subsequent stories went on to directly address the question of serfdom and its cruelty.) Whether Shevchenko read the first story then is not clear. (Later in exile his access to various publications was severely restricted.) The need to argue an “influence” on him is hardly in play here. What is quite clear, however, is that there is a world of difference between the perspectives here: Turgenev’s is that of a gentlemen hunter, who sympathizes with the peasants and abhors the cruelty, but takes no part in the action, and often merely eavesdrops, and projects his judgment obliquely; for his part, Shevchenko actually speaks for the mute *narod*, directly – but in a language, and with an artistry, no less sophisticated than the elegies he so easily brushes off here. The intersection of these forces and even identities is the core of his dilemma and requires further examination.

Most strikingly, it is God Himself, who seems to be colluding with this order, as the poet says again in the middle of the poem,

А може й те ще... ні, не знаю,
 А так здається... сам єси...
 (Бо без Твоєї, Боже, волі
 Ми б не нудились в раї голі).
 А може, й Сам на небесі
 Смієшся, батечку, над нами
 Та, може, радишся з панами,
 Як править миром!
 (53-60)

(And maybe... no, I can't be sure / But it does seem that Thou... / (For t'is Thine will, O Lord, that we / Are stranded naked in this paradise) / Perhaps, there in your heaven, Lord, / You're laughing just a bit at us / And taking counsel with the gentry / On how to rule this earth!)

And then concludes with it even more pointedly:

Правда, рай?
 А подивися та спитай!
 Що там твориться, у тім раї!
 Звичайне, радість та хвала!
 Тобі, єдиному, святому,
 За дивнії Твої діла?
 Отим-бо й ба! Хвали нікому,
 А кров, та сльози, та хула,
 Хула всьому! Ні, ні, нічого
 Нема святого на землі...
 Мені здається, що й самого
 Тебе вже люди прокляли!
 (66-77)

(Sheer paradise – not so? / But look more closely then and ask: / What's going on in paradise? / Of course – just happiness and praise! / All for Thy Holy Sacred Self / And all Thy wondrous deeds? / But there's the rub – there is no praise / Just blood and tears and blasphemy. / A curse on everything! No, no, / There's nothing sacred on this earth... / I even think that people now / Have put a curse on Thee!)

In effect, the Shadow, as the world of rancor, of curses and blasphemy (*khula*), and as a natural reaction to seemingly total and seemingly divinely sanctioned injustice, would appear to be everpre-

sent. In terms of Shevchenko's biography (the above poem focuses it on his childhood) the truly condensed space and time of the Shadow for him is the period of exile, where in numerous works and with an unprecedented intensity he depicts the Shadow in its deep psycho-dynamics.

The earliest work which reveals the Shadow – the world of violence, killing, blood and cruelty – is, of course, *Haidamaky*. Its intensity, however, is mitigated by at least two factors. First, by Romantic, and specifically Byronic, conventions, the main intermediary for which was the contemporary Polish literature on the *koliivshchyna* (the *haidamak* uprising of 1768), especially perhaps Seweryn Goszczyński's poem *Zamek kaniowski* (The Castle of Kaniv, 1828).⁸⁶ Secondly, and more importantly, through a conscious intellectual (indeed "ideological") filter which are the slavophile concepts that underlie the work (cf. especially the "Postscript" to the poem, which he ironically calls "Peredmova," i.e., Preface). For all that, a number of elements, especially the figure of Gonta, the main leader of the *haidamak* uprising, his depicted (but fictional) killing of his own sons because they were baptized as Catholics, and the horrific death the Polish side prepared for him (which is not depicted in the work, but is implicit) point to the archetype of the Shadow, above all in a demonic key.⁸⁷ (An echo of this apotheosis of "righteous massacre" is the poem "Hamaliia" (1842) with its triumphalist bloodletting for reasons of revenge and the Cossack ethos, i.e., freeing fellow Cossack captives. Here, too, literary conventions and stylization in the spirit of a *duma* tend to lessen and even conceal the Shadow as a functional archetype – as something both terrible and numinous.) What is characteristic, however, is that Shevchenko, as the poet-narrator, distances himself from this apotheosis of violence – most directly in the "Preface" (*Peredmova*) to *Haidamaky*.⁸⁸ In later works, beginning with "Neofity," he will voice direct opposition to such violence.

The archetype of the Shadow as an image of the demonic and unnatural in the family and in society will continue to appear in Shevchenko's poetry (cf. e.g., "Utoplenu" [The Drowned Girl, 1841]), "Kniiazhna," and other works that depict the killing of children by parents, or parents by

⁸⁶ Cf. Hrabovych, *Shevchenkovi "Haidamaky"*, 148-61 and passim.

⁸⁷ For an extensive examination of this within the larger symbolic meaning of the poem cf. *ibid.*, passim.

⁸⁸ There are, however, numerous others forms of distancing; cf. *ibid.*, passim.

children, of rape, incest, and so on.⁸⁹ At the same time, beginning with the collection “Try lita,” and especially in the poetry of exile, there is a marked increase in the projection of the Shadow as something internal, individual. In “Osyka”/“Vid’ma,” as mentioned, the author/narrator clearly identifies himself with the demonic and suffering witch, and melds, as it were, the archetypes of anima and Shadow. Somewhat earlier, in the poem by the same name, he symbolically enters the “great crypt” (*velykyi l'okh*) which is Ukraine and by this descent into the underworld (as Dante, Virgil and Orpheus before him) performs his deepest and most mysterious task (cf. below). Somewhat later, in “Za bairakom, bairak” (Beyond the Ravine another Ravine, 1847), and then in the poem “Buvaie, v nevoli inodi zhadaiu” (Sometimes in Captivity I Remember, 1850) he unfolds the eerie narrative of his dream of how as a child he is brought, in the arms of a Cossack, down into the burial mound that is the common grave of the Cossacks – which becomes his emblematic immersion in and fusion with the collective unconscious. In his highly complex and insightful, and yet still confused and contradictory obituary article on Shevchenko “Vospominanie o dvukh maliarakh” (A Remembrance of Two Painters, 1861) Mykola Kostomarov, his first researcher and scholar, aptly recognizes and develops the metaphor, indeed archetype of the descent into the underworld where a deep truth is hidden, where the roots of reality lie: “Taras’s muse,” he writes, “broke through into some underground crypt, sealed for centuries by many seals, covered with earth, intentionally plowed and seeded over so that the descendants would not even have an inkling of where that underground cavern lies.”⁹⁰

The articulation of the archetype of the Shadow, activated here by memories of childhood and of trauma, is transformed into the very act of creativity – in effect revealing the psychodynamics of the poet, his deep system of associations. In that same poem, “Buvaie, v nevoli inodi zhadaiu,” he remembers the dream and the burial mound he sees in the dream; and as we see from the tale of the Cossack, it immediately becomes an archetypal common grave:

⁸⁹ Cf., the sections “Unfortunate Lovers” and “The Family” in chap. 3 of *Poet as Myth-maker*, 57-76.

⁹⁰ “Тарасова муза прорвала какой-то подземный заклеп, уже несколько веков запертый многими замками, запечатанный многими печатями, засыпанный землей, нарочно вспаханною и засеянною, чтобы скрыть для потомства даже память о месте, где находится подземная пустота”. Cf. his “Vospominanie o dvukh maliarakh”; cf. also my “Insight and Blindness in the Reception of Ševčenko: The Case of Kostomarov,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 17, no. 3/4 (1993): 279-340.

– Дивися, дитино, оце козаки, –
 Ніби мені каже, – на всій Україні
 Високі могили. Дивися, дитино,
 Усі ті могили – усі отакі.
 Начинені нашим благородним трупом,
 Начинені туго. Оце воля спить!
 (26-29)

(– Look child, these are Cossacks. – / He seems to be telling me, – all over Ukraine / Are these tall burial mounds. So look then child, / All these mounds – they're all just like this. / Packed with our noble corpses, / Filled to the brim. That's freedom sleeping!)

The remembrance of the dream reactivates it, that is, the experience of it, regardless of whether it was real (*naspravdi*) or a phantasy (*mara*):

І досі болить,
 Як сон той згадаю. А як нагадаю
 Козака в могилі, то й досі не знаю,
 Чи то було насправді, чи то було так,
 яка-небудь. Мені той козак
 Розказував ось що...
 (44-49)

(It still pains me / When I think back on that dream. And when I remember / That Cossack in the grave, I still do not know / Whether it was real, or some kind / Of dream. And the tale that he told me...)

And here the Cossack's tale merges with the poem, becomes the poem we are reading. As in various other works, memories, reminiscences, dreams are transformed into poetry – and we become witnesses to the process, we become part of its dramaturgy. Central to it all is the functioning of the archetype, and the poem thus becomes not a historiographic meditation on the reasons for Ukraine's loss of independence,⁹¹ not an explanation of why “freedom sleeps,” but an epiphany, a numinous revelation – and another symbolization of the author's mission.

The most focused projection of the Shadow occurs when it is objectified in narrative. In “Tytarivna” (The Sexton's Daughter, 1848), this is provided by Mykyta, the hero who becomes an anti-hero and who at

⁹¹ As argued by Valeriia Smilians'ka in her reading of “Buvaie, v nevoli inodi zhadaiu,” in *Shevchenkivs'ka entsyklopediia, Robochyi zoshyt B* (Kyiv, 2005), 234-6. See also the same in *Shevchenkivs'ka entsyklopediia*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 2012), 516-18.

the outset provides the poem's psychological perspective, its cathetic locus: he is the village's "best boy" (*naikrashchyi khlopets*'), and one with whom the narrator identifies, but also an illegitimate son, someone not equal in status to the sexton's daughter, and when he is shamed by her (an archetypal locus of the Shadow) the narrator sees in it her future downfall and punishment. But through his devilish revenge (Mykyta returns some years later as a successful character and seduces the sexton's daughter, kills their illegitimate child and then frames her for the murder), he turns into an archetypal "gentleman-seducer," and the devil incarnate (*satana-cholovik*); his karmic task – which also becomes part of the archetype of punishment and eternal return – is to eternally seduce gullible girls, as the moralizing narrator concludes:

Покарав
Його Господь за гріх великий
Не смертю – він буде жить,
І сатаною-чоловіком
Він буде по світу ходить
І вас, дівчаточка, дурить
Вовіки.

(221-27)

(The Lord punished him for this great sin / Not by death – he will live on / And as Satan-man / he'll walk the earth / And fool you girls / Forever.)

What is present in "Tytarivna" as a cathetic backdrop and as only an implicit identification with the hero/anti-hero, is subsequently developed in "Moskaleva krynytsia" with different nuances in each version, and then in the poem "Varnak," as the projection of the Shadow in the form of the double. The theme of the double is central in modern literature, especially in Romanticism and later movements, above all symbolism, and is particularly open to dramatizing psychic processes; it is often activated by psychic upheaval and ordeal – as in rites of passage.⁹² For Shevchenko, broadly speaking, the entire exile period is such a passage, a process of personal re-formulation. In both poems this process is recapitulated as a direct confrontation with one's double and with a transcription, so to speak, of his confession (which is the ostensible plot of "Varnak" itself) – which then becomes a form of expiation and release. The mechanisms of this process deserve separate and detailed analysis.

⁹² See Ann Casement, "Encountering the Shadow in Rites of Passage: A Study in Activations," *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 48 (2003): 29-46.

Along with a realization of the centrality of the Shadow – which is also the core of a creativity that is always pained and vulnerable – comes the realization that it is precisely this concealed, dark, suffering content that provides the means for self-cleansing and the rethinking of one's essential sinfulness. As in confession, the prerequisite is an actualization, the very articulation of the content – however terrible it may be. As we see in various works by Shevchenko which focus on the actions/deeds of the Shadow, this moment of identifying and retelling the content is fundamental. Thus in “Kniazhna,” it is the already cited “But I know. And will tell / You; and not go to sleep. / And tomorrow, quietly / You will tell God.” Or in thematized and intellectualized form in the “Postscript” to *Haidamaky*: “Серце болить, а розказувать треба: нехай бачать сини і внуки, що батьки їх помилялись, нехай братаються знову з своїми ворогами” (The heart aches, but one must tell the story: so the sons and grandsons can see that their fathers were wrong, so they can again become brothers of their enemies),⁹³ or in “Buvaie, v nevoli inodi zhadaiu” the injunction of the Cossack who takes the boy into the grave:

Дивися ж, дитино,
 Та добре дивися – а я розкажу,
 За що Україна наша стала гинуть,
 За що й я меж ними в могилі лежу.
 Ти ж людям розкажеш, як виростеш, сину.
 Слухай же, дитино.
 (36-41)

(Look child / And look well – and I will tell you / For what our Ukraine started to perish, / For what I too lie among them in the grave. / You will tell it to the people, when you grow up, son. / Listen then, child.)

Or the words of the convict in the second version of “Moskaleva krynytsia”:

Слухай, сину,
 Мій друже єдиний!
 Слухай добре, та записуй,
 Та на Україні,
 Як Бог тебе допровадить,
 То розкажи, сину,
 Що ти бачив диявола
 Своїми очима...
 (64-71)

⁹³ Cf. *PZTDT*, 1:512.

(Listen son / My dear and only friend! / Listen well and write it down / And in Ukraine / When God returns you there / Tell them then, son, that you saw the devil / With your own eyes...)

6.

The imperative to tell the truth of what happened, of being its carrier, of performing in this fashion a basic calling is thus spelled out as a fundamental component of Shevchenko's personality – but now not as part of a given psychic subset (persona, ego, anima, Shadow, and so on) but as a central, totalizing and self-defining function. By virtue of its programmatic articulation it exists more on the conscious than on the unconscious level, but it is also imbued with archetypal content and is expressed in patterns which exist and draw on the unconscious level. As a process, a value and a mission it has the symbolic intensity and numinosity of an archetype. In essence it conforms to the archetype of the quest, which is one of the most broadly disseminated narrative archetypes in Western culture and literature, and at the same time one that fully resonates with the Jungian model of psychodynamics, in effect with the process of individuation.

A full discussion of the archetype of Shevchenko's mission, his karma-fate or *заво́дъ*, as he called it,⁹⁴ and the way he conceives it and articulates it would require a separate investigation. Here it can be summarized in several key stages which trace his psychic journey and which recapitulate in large measure the various stages of his life and the key phases of his creativity. In large measure these have been noted by traditional Shevchenko studies, but they also have a symbolic and holistic cast which has not been recognized or analyzed. The stages of this journey, this great rite of passage, are the following:

1. The first, which corresponds to Shevchenko's earliest poetry, from "Perebendia" to "Trizna," reflects the stage of realizing his chosenness, his calling, and depicts it in the key of fatedness and alienation from people (precisely as in the figure of Perebendia), or in the karma-fate of "the unfortunate one" (*neshchastnyi*) of "Trizna," and not with any reference to authority, fame, and so on. It deals, above all, with the task of discovering the Word, and preparing himself for the task of disseminating it.⁹⁵ Char-

⁹⁴ Cf.: "Ходімо дальше, дальше слава, / А слава – заповідь моя" ("Dolia," lines 17-18).

⁹⁵ Cf. Grabowicz, "Nexus of the Wake."

acteristic of this phase is Shevchenko's direct and strikingly self-confident self-inscription into the canon of the new Ukrainian literature, his projection of his central role in that process. Here he exhibits remarkable insight and intuition – which is quite analogous to that of such poets as Pushkin and Mickiewicz, who also at the opening stages of their creativity exhibit or indeed “proclaim” their readiness, their “programming,” to occupy the role of national poet.⁹⁶ This “self-inscription” into the canon of what will become Ukrainian literature as “equal among equals” is performed by such early poems as “Na vichnu pam'iat' Kotliarevs'komu” and “Do Osnovianenka” (To Osnovianenko, 1839), and in the next stage, the “Try lita” period, also with the poem “Hoholiu” (To Hohol', 1844), and in the formal plane, or in the modal key (which, of course, also resonates with Romantic poetics), with his readiness to address the historical theme, in effect, the defining moments of national history. With *Haidamaky*, Shevchenko, like Pushkin with *Boris Godunov*, and Mickiewicz with *Dziady, część III* and then *Pan Tadeusz*, inscribes himself not only into the canon of Ukrainian literature, but also into the national canon, and into the history of the nation – and the parallel that he draws between his own fate and that of the nation confirms, so to speak, his self-assessment and guarantees, in the guise of a self-fulfilling prophecy, the coming reception.

2. The following stage which includes, as is traditionally argued, the poetry of the “Try lita” collection, but also his later works up to the time of the arrest in 1847 of the members of the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood, continues and develops this sense of mission. Like the first stage, this one is also essentially liminal, but his understanding of his mission and the context he is working in are considerably expanded: he now casts himself all but openly as a myth carrier and his role now places him in the midst of national history, in essence he now sees himself – in a pre-political and basically symbolic, mythical key – as activating a national dimension to collective identity; the basic new component he introduces is precisely the numinous nature of Ukraine discussed above. His personal sense of mission, however, is consistently, that is intuitively, or rather archetypically, presented precisely in a manner that will guard against ego inflation – pride, triumphalism, and so on. His self-presentation as a prophet, as a carrier of a deep truth, is constructed around the topos of the holy fool (*iurodyvyi*), and his chosenness for this task is cast more as

⁹⁶ Cf. my “National Poets and National Mystifications,” in *Literární mystifikace, etnické mýty a jejich úloha při formování národního vědomí* [Ethnic Myths and their Role in the Formation of National Consciousness], *Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 20-21.10.2001* (Uherské Hradiště, 2001), 7-24.

curse than as elevation or triumph. And this leads to the basic paradox in this and the previous stage, and serves as a key to his entire quest: the ordeal that comes with his arrest and decade-long loss of freedom is in large measure, that is, on a deeper, transrational level, neither a surprise nor a shock for him. As we see from various sources (reminiscences of fellow arrestees, official trial proceedings, and so on) and the texture of his poetry in the period just after his arrest, that arrest and conviction were hardly terrifying since the freedom that he then had was not unequivocal, not truly authentic: the *narod* with which he so identified and by which he measured himself was not free.

At the same time there is an entirely personal and individual sense of self and mission, and while this will be the substance of the following stage, already in the period before exile one can see the crystallization and thematization of the autobiographical principle that will determine the tonality of his total corpus, not just the poetry. Here, too, we first see – in a highly prescient form – the topos-archetype of descending into a deep underground cavern, into a grave, in effect, the collective and individual unconscious, the paradigmatic Great Crypt.

3. From the perspective of the total phenomenon that is Shevchenko the period of exile remains central and defining. This is true not just from the biographical perspective, i.e., the way that exile focuses the trajectory of his life and career, and not even from the perspective of the output of his entire oeuvre, where the prose is almost entirely written in exile, and the poetry that is written there, even though in a circumscribed time frame, i.e., 1847-1850, is still, arguably, the core of his poetic corpus. What seems decisive here is that exile determines, to be sure in a somewhat preliminary and metaphorical way, the archetype of his reception, both immediately after his return and in the years to come: the poet-exile, the poet-martyr, the un-repentant, *neskorenyi*, *kobzar*. What is no less important is the fact that this period determines the overall trajectory of Shevchenko, it becomes emblematic for the whole archetype of his quest. Without it one could not imagine Shevchenko: he would not be what he is; he would be different, less sharply focused, and all but certainly less monumental. Shevchenko himself profoundly absorbs the experience and integrates the ordeal into his creativity.

The period of exile, of imprisonment and punishment, of humiliation in the eyes of the authorities and the social order becomes, in short, a time of forced and extended existence in the realm of the Shadow – as a convict, as a criminal. And while the status of a political pris-

oner (and the respect this generated in some sectors of society) and the support of many well-wishers during the exile period were mitigating factors, the weight of suffering should not be underestimated. Moreover, its deeper component is not so much the suffering and isolation as doubt, that which in mystical literature is often called the dark night of despair. And this is what Shevchenko transforms into poetry, into the very act of writing, both poetry and prose, and into an extended process of self-therapy. He begins, in a word, that which Jung calls the process of individuation, of discovering within himself and opening himself up to both the anima and the Shadow, of seeking release and reintegration, and of overcoming oppression and humiliation by discovering his true self.

4. This process does not conclude with exile, but it does begin there, especially in terms of confronting one's own Shadow. Its essential continuation, beginning with news of his forthcoming release (of which he learns on April 7, 1857) occasions the creativity of the next few months and continues in the work of the last several years of life. Along with this great resurgence of creative energy, his return to writing poetry, reworking and editing earlier works, writing his diary (June 12, 1857, to July 13, 1858), various new works and so on, there is also the fundamental process of freeing oneself from negativity, from anger and despondency. As before, all of this, including the doubts and the interpenetration of anger and forgiveness is also retranslated into poetry (cf. especially the poem "Neofity" as a kind of "tipping point") which then goes on to articulate his millenarian vision of redeemed mankind.

7.

The individuation that Shevchenko begins in exile is not sudden and does not have an unequivocal conclusion; it continues on to his last works; it introduces new accents and enables a new universal perspective and with it a new humaneness. In many respects it is a continuation of his life's path, but it also marks out a new essence – quite distinct from other motifs in his earlier poetry. What traditional Shevchenko studies seldom saw was that he is one of the very first writers, certainly in the context of Ukrainian literature, to show with such scrupulous detail this process of growth and maturation, of overcoming the exigencies of life's predicament, of self-reformation despite one's fatedness, and, what is surely more difficult, in spite of collective expectations that purport and demand conventional or triumphalist scenarios. At its core

is the healing process of soul making to which contemporary Jungian analysis attaches so much importance. Shevchenko's contribution to it's articulation is still to be fully discovered.

* * *

Shevchenko's last archetype is a meta-archetype, which formally does not belong to our topic, but which ultimately shapes it as well. For in fact, Shevchenko himself becomes an archetype, the archetype of the poet-prophet, the national poet, in effect, the national icon and the cathetic locus of national self-identification. This is the culminating product of a long process of reception, but, as with other archetypes, it appears as something trans-temporal: it begins when Shevchenko is still alive, and is already powerfully at work when he is buried in St. Petersburg and then re-interred in Kaniv, in Ukraine. Already during his lifetime he comes to fill an important and archetypal niche – that of a representative and key spokesman for his society, of the classical poet-tribune. After his death he becomes a prophetic voice for the collective, and the annual commemorations of his memory continually re-confirm this in ritual form. Within this discourse, his archetype is clearly a product of his self-inscription onto the collective consciousness. But it continues to exist through the workings of the collective – and is also a product of the forces within its depths.