

R. Radyshevskiy,
doctor of philological sciences,
International School of Ukrainian Studies of NAS of Ukraine

PAVLO ZAITSEV – SHEVCHENKO SCHOLAR

*In March 1961 there will be a century of Taras' death.
Do we have to place him into the pantheon of world
literature, and the way he was:
"live" and "real" Shevchenko?
The point is clear, it is our duty.
From P. Zaitsev's a letter to V. Doroshenko
dated August 10, 1956*

The works of Pavlo Ivanovich Zaitsev (1886–1965) – the beginning of a new era in Shevchenko studies, the era of impartial, professional, scientific understanding of life and works of Taras Shevchenko. His book *The Life of Taras Shevchenko* was to be the first volume, a kind of an introduction to 16-volume *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko Works*, which from 1934 was published (on the initiative of Director O. Lototskyi) Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, founded in 1929. P. Zaitsev's study was invited to the new academic reading of Shevchenko's biography, the protest against a "'canonical" icon of a singer a peasant's misfortune", one of the first attempts of depoliticization of Shevchenko's figure, to remove an official cover from it, to show an internal living fire of the poet.

From the planned publication only thirteen Shevchenko's volumes saw the world. Instead, volume I (where, in addition to P. Zaitsev's study – a detailed literary biography of the poet – was supposed to be the preface from the publisher), volume V (*Poems of 1857–1861*) and volume XIII (*Shevchenko and the Poles*) did not appear in its time due to a number of political events and the beginning of World War II and the arrival of Soviet troops in the city in particular. However, Zaitsev's biography of Shevchenko was published later in small editions in Lviv, because it is known, for example, that M. Shaginian while writing her book about Shevchenko had a copy of P. Zaitsev's work.

Let us also remind that the above-mentioned *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko* was published under general editorship of P. Zaitsev, he was already the author of most of the notes and articles, to volume II in particular (*Gamalia, Gendarme's Evaluation of Political Significance of the First Kobzar, Ivan Pidkova, Mariana, the Nun, Ode on the Death Kotliarevskiy, Perebendia, The First Three Kobzars, The Message to M. Markewych, The Message to Osnovianenko, Editing the Text Shevchenko's Poetry, Taras's night, The Text of Shevchenko's Early Poems*), to volume III (*The Text of Shevchenko's Poems from 1843 to Exile*), to volume IV (*The Texts of Poems Written by Shevchenko in Exile*) to volume VI (*Shevchenko's Albums, Two Autobiographies of Shevchenko*) to volume VII (*Shevchenko's Prose*, to volume VIII (story "Princess", story "Kaptain's Wife", story "Music") to volume IX (*Twins and in co-authorship with D. Doroshenko – Story "The Journey with Pleasure and With Good Morals"*), to volume X (*The previous edition of the "Journal"*) to volume XII (*Shevchenko's Craftsmanship, Shevchenko's Architectural Projects*), to volume XIV (*The Polish translations of Shevchenko*), to volume XV (*Shevchenko in Russian Translations*).

As rightly noted V. Miiakovskiy, a friend of P. Zaitsev, the *Warsaw Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko* “could be a triumph of Pavlo Ivanovich’s editorial and commentatorial work, but the fact that the first volume with a biographical sketch, the fifth – with poetry of recent years, and another one, less important were not printed, all that created the sense of imperfection” [5, 112].

But even the appearance of the book *The Life of Taras Shevchenko* could not give “the sense of perfection” because numerous P. Zaitsev’s Shevchenko studies were scattered in various journals and magazines, and his Shevchenko projects remained unrealized. So it is actual to continue representing the figure of V. Zaitsev as Shevchenko scholar in a comprehensive and the most complete way, having presented his works in three areas, in which the scientist focused his research and creative efforts. The first one – the study of Shevchenko’s biography to “to place him into the pantheon of world literature as he was “alive” and “real”; the second – the study of his poetry; the third – disclosure of Shevchenko as a person. Let us remind that P. Zaitsev’s Shevchenko study priorities were formed quite early, during his student years (in 1909 he graduated from the Law School, and in 1913 – historical and philological department of St. Petersburg University). In his comments to the second volume of the *Warsaw Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko* P. Zaitsev noted that he did textual study of the works of the poet as early as in 1909, and that for that purpose for four years he could accumulate a large number of new materials that were not used B. Domanytskyi in the first complete edition of *Kobzar* in 1907. At that time the young scientist had collected nearly complete collection of Shevchenko’s autographs. In 1913 a scientific study of P. Zaitsev *Shevchenko’s Russian Poems* was published in the *Journal of Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society*, which showed that he was a serious textual scholar. The article is based on the study of Russian autographs of Shevchenko poems. It should also be noted that P. Zaitsev in his scientific work wanted to use his own findings. As mentioned B. Miiakovskiy, he led a vigorous correspondence, traveled, looking for Shevchenko monuments and often came across unknown to science materials. For example, in 1912 in Nizhniy Novgorod, he found the collection of Shevchenko paintings, including eight paintings from *The Parable of the Prodigal Son* series, and in St. Petersburg – the remains of Shevchenko’s album of sketches and folk recordings that were made by the poet while traveling to Ukraine in 1859. P. Zaitsev bought eight drawings from this album for Kiev History Museum and used for its publication in the *Russian bibliophile journal* (1914). By the one hundredth anniversary of Taras Shevchenko’s birthday P. Zaitsev published (in Russian magazines *Herald of Europe*, *Russian Gazette*, *The New*, newspapers *Speech* (St. Petersburg), *Morning* (Kharkiv), Ukrainian publications *ZNTSH* and *For One Hundred Years*) a series of publications on various issues of Shevchenko study. At the same time the scientist, who gained experience as Shevchenko’s poetry textual scholar, started working on the publication on “scientific principles of the processed text of all Shevchenko’ poems, using all his findings, and the copy of *Kobzar* edition of 1860, on which the poet personally made numerous amendments, the so-called Yu. Tsvitkovskiy copy” [5, 109]. V. Miiakovskiy reasonably believed that it could be a new version of the canonical text of the poems by Shevchenko that was established by V. Domanytskyiy on the basis of autographs. However, the events of World War I prevented

this project from being carried out, having stopped it at the very beginning. Only the first issue was published, which included a sensational publication – the full text of the poem *Mariana, the Nun* that in 1842 Shevchenko sent A. Korsun, the publisher of the literary miscellany *Snip*, but at that time the poem was not published because of the problems of the literary miscellany itself. The autograph remained in Korsun's archive, and all attempts to get the text for another publication were unsuccessful. So only a part of the poem was famous, the one that was published by P. Kulish in *Osnova*. P. Zaitsev was lucky to take a picture of the copy that was kept by the descendants of the poetess Glafira Psyol, Shevchenko's acquaintance from Repnin's Yagotyń environment. However, he concluded that poetry *The Wind in the Grove Bends a Willow and a Poplar...* was actually an epigraph to the poem *Mariana, the Nun* dedicated to Oksana – Shevchenko's puppy love. The publication of this discovery first appeared in Russian *Bulletin of Europe* magazine in 1914, and four years later it was published in Kyiv as a small booklet in Ukrainian with Narbut's cover.

During the turbulent times of the Revolution P. Zaitsev was known as a social and political activist (more details on this page of life and work of P. Zaitsev filed Bilokin [2, 20–34], the most comprehensive to date biography and bibliography works of the scientist also belong to him). Despite being very busy, P. Zaitsev used the slightest opportunity for research in the field of Shevchenko study. For example, among the cases of the so-called Third Department of His Imperial Majesty's Personal Chancellery, the archive of which at that time was transferred from the Police Department to the Academy of Sciences, the scientist discovered an original manuscript of the Ukrainian language *Genesis of the Ukrainian people*. Having copied it, he published the document together with his article *Kostomarov's Genesis... as a document and work* in the newly established historical magazine *Nashe Mynule* (1919). In that magazine he also published materials for the Shevchenko's biography, unknown places from the diary and correspondence, and in the magazine *Knyhar* – the articles about the poet and reviews of the publication of his works.

In March 1920 in Kiev, P. Zaitsev organized an exhibition dedicated to Shevchenko. According to V. Miiakovskyyi, from G. Narbut's apartment a large birchwood couch was brought and the same old table, and Shevchenko's canvas summer dress, borrowed from the museum, was exposed above the sofa. In several windows Zaitsev placed his photo collections of autographs and rare editions of Shevchenko's poetry. Unfortunately, at that time it was the last tribute to the great poet in his native land. Together with the Ukrainian government (after seizure of Kyiv by the Bolsheviks) P. Zaitsev turned out to be in Warsaw. Although being in exile demanded constant struggle for survival, yet in a foreign land he managed not only to work creatively, but also to continue the cause of his whole life – spiritual ascent to Shevchenko.

In 1934–1939 the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, headed by A. Lototskyi, prepared *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko's Works* in 16 volumes. P. Zaitsev, who headed the Commission on Shevchenko Study affiliated at by NTSH, was the editor of the publication. In Warsaw he did not have his collection of autographs, but gained a huge textual experience of work on Shevchenko's poetry, basing himself on the works of V. Domanytskyi, S. Yefremov, M. Novytskyi, A. Doroshkevych while establishing the texts of

the poetry. It is known that Shevchenko authorized his early poetry in the following way: *Chygyryn Kobzar* of 1844 the poet personally corrected and supplemented after the exile in 1858, and in *Kobzar* of 1860 (the so-called Yu. Tsvitkovskiy copy) Shevchenko made corrections on the margins that were specially glued. S. Yefremov, M. Novytskyi for their publication took as the main text the copy of Yu. Tsvitkovskiy, and A. Doroshkevych, though acknowledging the principle of later author's edition, considered more authentic the text of 1858, motivating this fact that the authentic text in the 1860 edition was broken Kulish's amendments, in the printing house of whom this *Kobzar* was printed.

According to V. Miiakovskiy, in Warsaw edition P. Zaitsev followed S. Yefremov, M. Novytskyi. "For him the dispute had been settled in as early as 1914 when he published the first edition of *Kobzar* that had not been completed due to the war events. Pavlo Ivanovych generally considered the text amended by the poet in 1860 objectively better, and as to Kulish's amendments, he expressed the view that while working on the 1858 edition someone else could give Shevchenko some advice" [5, 109].

It is worth mentioning that in the four-volume *Kobzar* (1952–1955) during the editorial processing by the diaspora Shevchenko scholar L. Biletskyi, Shevchenko's works are submitted in the first author's edition. No later revision – insisted L. Biletskyi – will not replace those first creative dreams and thoughts, of which the work arose. So for me the first work of the author is infinitely better because it is the document of poet's being [1, 105]. Scientific Shevchenko study took academic tradition of teamwork on the publication, of which P. Zaitsev is an outstanding representative, rather than completely individual project of L. Biletskyi [8, 41–44].

Instead, we can see, in particular, P. Zaitsev's reasonable textual work represented by V. Miiakovskiy, how difficult it was for the research textual scholar to choose this or that version of Shevchenko's poetry. For example, we know that *Kobzar* of 1860 included Kulish's amendment in the message *To Osnovianenko*. Instead Shevchenko's

Наш завзятий Головатий
Не вмере, не загине...

in all later editions the Kulish's version remained:

Наша дума, наша пісня
Не вмере, не загине.

Although in Tsvitkovskiy's copy Shevchenko did not restore the original text, but P. Zaitsev for the Warsaw edition of *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko's Works* rejected Kulish's amendment as inauthentic. In the *Explanatory article* to this work he outlined in detail the role that the figure of Anton Golovaty, ataman of the last Cossack Sech, played in the mind of Shevchenko and in the whole concept of the message *To Osnovianenko* that he wrote after reading Kvitka's essay on Golovaty in *Otechestvennyie zapiski* in 1839. That is why the editor of the corresponding volumes of the Warsaw edition, – said V. Miiakovskiy, – had to critically assess the differences in authoritative texts and choose a particular reading of an autograph. All those cases Zaitsev discusses in the notes to the text, and each reader, as he puts it, is free to choose the text that is more convincing for them [5, 109].

As we have already mentioned, in 1939 the main work of P. Zaitsev – *Zhyttya Tarasa Shevchenko* was published in Lviv that had to be the first volume of 16-volume Warsaw *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko Works*, but only in 1955 it was reissued thanks to the efforts of NTSH (New York – Paris – Munich). It is the largest and most thorough monograph of emigration Shevchenko studies. Attention is drawn to P. Zaitsev's source materials that is to his desire to reasonably verify all their findings – all the quotations in the text of the monograph correspond to the original. The researcher turned to both archival sources and historical commentary to introduce to readers the image of Taras Shevchenko in the most complete way, which once again confirms author's scientific approach to the research of the life and works of the Ukrainian prophet. In the book, P. Zaitsev in extremely detailed way, sometimes resorting to literary presentation of material, gave a biography of Taras Shevchenko – a unique combination of scientific character and factuality with lyrical and epic digressions and personal commentaries, which does not harm the monograph and gives it a special appeal and expands the range of its potential readers. We can come across some episodes from the biography of Shevchenko only in this monograph; however, P. Zaitsev sometimes indicated sources (e.g., the description of the Warsaw Uprising, as it was seen by small Taras, was quoted from F. Vovk's article in *Gromada* in 1876, although, however, he doubted whether that was author's conjecture); he often referred to his previous articles and studies (for example, the Russian-language works of the writer); quoted little-known versions of works. All this is a shining example of the fact that the researcher had done a tremendous research and source study in order to write his monograph, filling it with the facts from the life of Taras Shevchenko, that later became canonical.

Taras Shevchenko's epistolary served an important source for the biography, which P. Zaitsev widely used to confirm his observations. He quoted both the private correspondence of the poet and his formal appeals to various government agencies (e.g., the story of Shevchenko's last love, that is his relationship with Lukera Polusmakova the researcher gave only from such sources, which, of course, could not be neglected: Shevchenko's letters, memoirs of contemporaries and participants in the events, correspondence of the third parties, etc.).

In general, P. Zaitsev's book can be called an academic biography of Shevchenko, which was later used by the next generation Shevchenko scholars, unfortunately, without the reference to the primary source. Because of such a number of factuality, the attention to fine details, the variety of archival sources, the ability to analyze and highlight the most important things P. Zaitsev's monograph occupies a prominent place not only among the best Shevchenko diaspora studies.

It is worth mentioning that P. Zaitsev's work, according to M. Hlobenko, remained to lie loose at the warehouse of T. Shevchenko Society in Lviv, and after the release in 1955 of the monograph in Munich, V. Doroshenko in his review [3, 207–209] indicated that proof-correction copies of the book in that very 1939 managed to get in the hands of literary critics, and some even miraculously appeared in academic libraries in Kyiv, Moscow and Leningrad. Thus, some experts could acquaint themselves with the monograph, which is

mentioned, in particular, by Marietta Shahinian in the first edition of her book on Shevchenko.

Thus, P. Zaitsev's book *The Life of Taras Shevchenko* was published forty years after the first serious Shevchenko study work of A. Konyskyi *Taras Shevchenko-Hrushivskyi. The chronicle of His Life*, published in 1898–1901 by Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, having witnessed profound changes that have taken place in Shevchenko studies. P. Zaitsev faced such a task: to give a biography of Shevchenko and not to assess his literary, artistic and political activity, but he did assess it, because trying to submit the details of the main events of Shevchenko's life as accurately as possible, he reproduced that living poet's spirit, the seal of which is clearly reflected in the spirituality of Ukraine.

Not in the least deviating from the scientific truth, – wrote in his review V. Doroshenko, – he gave us extraordinary living and plastic, covered with genuine love and piety to the great poet and sufferer story rather than a dry academic study. It differs from the known to the world novels about the life of prominent people because there is nothing fictional in it [3, 208]. This is truly the most detailed depiction of Shevchenko's life among known similar works of that time. As a result, – wrote V. Doroshenko, – in P. Zaitsev's book we have critically tested, not distorted by any party journalism biography of Shevchenko that stands at the proper height and corresponds to materials that we have known so far [3, 208]. P. Zaitsev's book marked the transition from amateur journalism to professional scientific study of the life and works of Taras Shevchenko, fighting the traditions of the populist cult of Kobzar when it was repeated after S. Yefremov about Shevchenko's democratism, Shevchenko was defined as a “fighter against serfdom”, Shevchenko's peasant character was emphasized as well as his serf essence.

Instead, in P. Zaitsev's monograph, as it was written by N. Polonska-Vasylenko, “on a broad background of the life in Ukraine in the middle of the XIXth century the figure of Shevchenko was shown not only as a national poet with a lambskin cap on, but as a brilliant, educated and charming European as well who admired both illiterate peasants and Ukrainian aristocrats and excited lulled patriotic feelings in everyone [7]. It is this basic trend of development in Shevchenko studies – from cultic to scientific – probably for the first time pointed out V. Petrov himself in his work in 1947 [6, 1–37], which, in fact, was a review of the first volume of P. Zaitsev that at that time remained virtually not easily accessible (V. Petrov, as he indicated himself, used the author's proof copy of 1939).

“It can be seen from the books of P. Zaitsev and M. Shaginyan that the break with the populist concepts that were artificially kept in the literature about Shevchenko by the representatives epigonous and populist pseudoorthodoxy has ripened” [6, 18] (the reviewer meant the book of Marietta Shahinian *Shevchenko* (Moscow, 1941)). However, Petrov is not quite sure as to whether Shaginyan went to the break with epigonous and populist scheme of Shevchenko's biography quite independently, or she did so under the influence of P. Zaitsev's work. But, as noted the critic, the fact remains the fact: a distinct change has taken shape in Shevchenko studies. And if, for example, in S. Yefremov's work Shevchenko appeared “buried alive for as much as 10 years in a dead steppe beyond the Caspian Sea in the sand and saline soil”, victimized by drill, then P. Zaitsev, armed with facts went against the concept – and saw not only the drill, but, beyond the drill, the “life full of

content", "raving creative energy", a "huge explosion" of an artistic creative work. "It was enough to turn to the facts, – the reviewer said, – to immediately discard those empty phrases about unborn works, about the man destroyed by soldiering. Neither before nor after that did Shevchenko write as much as during the winter in Kos-Aral, Shahinian noted. During one winter in Kos-Aral Shevchenko wrote almost as much as for the previous 6 years at liberty, maintains Zaitsev. Captivity did not kill the man but tempered the creative power of the poet [6, 23]. Indeed, P. Zaitsev considered a historical fact that participation in the Aral expedition was for Shevchenko the period of meeting prominent individuals, the period of stay in a highly cultured society. "And if, summarizes V. Petrov, Shevchenko was traditionally interpreted either as an "ignoramus" or he was made a "fighter" and a "victim", carefully erasing all that did not meet this concept, not wanting to see in the poet the nature of "Goethe's sort", then after Zaitsev and Shahinian's works we begin to expand and reconstruct our understanding of Shevchenko" [6, 28].

However, Yu. Shereh responded to Petrov's work in a very peculiar way [10, 5–6], maintaining that the new concept of Shevchenko (as opposed to the populist-yefremov's one) which Petrov allegedly attributes to Zaitsev and Shahinian, mostly belongs personally to him. Positively assessing V. Petrov's attempt of debunking a sentimental and populist image of Shevchenko, Yu. Shereh does not accept the denied by him Shevchenko's "peasant character". In that still debatable "peasant character" critic prefers to see the main reason for "life fragility" (after all, known for a long time from Shevchenko's words like "Tormenting myself, suffering, but not repenting..."). "There is no reason to look for Goethe's traits in Shevchenko, and there is no need for that, – says the critic. – Being the personality of an entirely different temperament and outlook, Shevchenko infinitely far from very many Goethe's traits and especially from those (let us call a spade a spade) philistine and adaptive ones that certainly characterized a great Weimar Olympian. It is impossible to imagine Shevchenko as a minister of neither Nicholas I, nor some Charles Augustus even for a moment. Goethe was able to quickly rein his youthful rebelliousness, and Shevchenko's rebelliousness only grew over the years. Goethe took the world, Shevchenko – rebelled against the world. Goethe adjusted himself, Shevchenko – adjusted (circumstances), Shevchenko was Shevchenko, and not Goethe or anyone else, and he is great just as Shevchenko. There is no need to tint him to anyone... Nevertheless, Shevchenko remains Shevchenko. With his "peasant" stubbornness he does not even now, after his death, yield to any masquerades and facings" [10, 6].

The views expressed here obviously require more detailed study, whereas both in P. Zaitsev's book and in V. Petrov's review to it the basic idea is aimed at the dethronement of sentimental and populist image of Shevchenko, so there is no point in denying that P. Zaitsev's work – is building new roads in Shevchenko studies.

The monograph could not do without some inaccuracies, and some of them were pointed out by V. Shevchuk in the preface to the edition of 1994 ("Pavlo Zaitsev and his Shevchenko study work"): "Yes, P. Zaitsev could not arranged the chronology and sequence of Taras Shevchenko's stay in different areas – it was done by Shevchenko scholars of our time in Ukraine. Nicholas Kostomarov's father was not a tyrant landlord, as P. Zaitsev writes, and died from a usual gangster robbery, but his world outlook was rather

liberal. Also, the author takes for granted a poetic imagination of T. Shevchenko about Oksana Kovalenko what allegedly was tormented by a Muscovite; the facts indicate that everything was more prosaic: the girl quietly married a serf K. Soroka from the village of Pedynivka. The author does not know that *Nazar Stodolia* was staged by an amateur society of Medical and Surgical Academy in St. Petersburg (1844–1845) after all” [9, 9]. We could make more such criticisms because while in Warsaw and without his photograph library at hand, P. Zaitsev had really some difficulties because he had to rely on reading autographs by other editors. However, we can agree with V. Doroshenko’s opinion that despite some inaccuracies, P. Zaitsev’s book will always be a guide for every further researcher [3, 209] of Taras Shevchenko’s creative work.

The weight P. Zaitsev’s work is confirmed by the fact that in 1988 the monograph was published in English in Toronto as translation and with a foreword by Yu. Lutskyi, stating that the work “remains to be the most assiduous and balanced biography of Shevchenko” [11, 9]. The original idea and structure of P. Zaitsev’s work remained almost unchanged, only for a better perception of the text by English readers sixteen chapters of the book were grouped into five parts: *Childhood and Youth*, *Formation of an Author*, *Ukrainian Travels*, *Arrest and Exile*, and *Liberation*. It is also worth while giving an assessment of P. Zaitsev’s work that gave Yu. Lutskyi in the final lines of the foreword to this publication: “The life story of Shevchenko is not just a background for his work, but also a shining example of a human weakness that was overcome by will and creative efforts. The life story is reasonably detailed because it is the details that reveal the poet’s weakness and his will. For those who studies Ukrainian and Russian history, the book will be useful with regard to Russia of the XIXth century. Despite the fact that this story tells us about the oppression of people, serfdom, injustice and censorship (the tsar’s attempt to forbid Shevchenko from writing and drawing), the poet’s biography also shows commitment, humanity and cordiality, which his friends showed who were also oppressed. The conditions of his arrest and exile could be equated to the GULAG. The fact that so many details of his hard life were saved for progeny is an evidence of that, despite the strict regime, people in Russia and Ukraine realized that Shevchenko – an extraordinary figure, whose biography will be always remembered. Of course, it is not only the life story of Shevchenko, but also a symbolic history of Ukraine.

After completion of the biography P. Zaitsev continued to print materials related to the creative work of Shevchenko. As if guided by the biography of Kobzar, in the Warsaw edition of *My* (1939) he published an article *How Shevchenko, the Poet Worked* [4, Book 1, 60–72; Book 2, 61–79] that showed great interest of the scholar in the problems of psychology of Shevchenko. It is here and not in the monograph that the author gave a poetic description of the so-called “inspiration” – that mental state, which runs an artist at the time of work writing, emphasizing the fact that this process is linked to nervous tension and is an intuitive one. P. Zaitsev separately dealt with the “creative laboratory” of Shevchenko, which did not depend on the location and conditions of creation (either it was a small Shyriaiev’s workshop or a bench of the Summer Garden). Only aesthetic experience affected Shevchenko so “to pray” and “to create” were synonymous for him, because of that certain visual, imaginary and acoustic images, etc. impelled him to creation most of all.

Instead, a combination of musical accompaniment and description of nature or some other phenomena gave T. Shevchenko's works brilliant perfection and excellence. P. Zaitsev believed the poet heard a melody while writing his poetry.

P. Zaitsev gave these thoughts in his essay *The Psychological Portrait of Shevchenko*, read in Krakow, April 9, 1941 on the Ukrainian publishing house premises. Newspaper *Krakow News* (1941. – № 80. – April 13. – P. 3) informed about this event that "during one-hour professor Zaitsev's presentation the description of a psychological portrait of Shevchenko in vivid pictures was so plastic that it gave a lot to understand Shevchenko and his creative work. Therefore, this statement of a definitely the best among us expert on Shevchenko was awarded abundant applause by those who gathered".

The researcher also paid attention to several features of Shevchenko's creative process. It is primarily the enormous power of the poet's imagination, sometimes even no boundaries between the real and imaginary; compassion for his heroes and spontaneity of creation of images. On this last verge P. Zaitsev went into detail in order to confirm his opinion, resorting to lengthy quotation of both literary works and correspondence of the poet. In the above-mentioned article P. Zaitsev continued his textual experiments that was demonstrated in the Warsaw *Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko*, because he carefully analyzed various text versions and Kobzar's work on the text improvement and refinement. The researcher did not overlook the facts of the poet's collaboration with P. Kulish on the text editing. "There is no doubt, – V. Miiakovskiy wrote in his memoirs, – this essay is the top of scientific creativity of Zaitsev as a Shevchenko scholar: after that he did not give anything deeper or anything as equal" [5, 112]. It should be also reminded that in Ukrainian and Polish periodicals of 30's – 40's of the XXth century P. Zaitsev often published articles with important content, such as *Shevchenko and the Poles* (1934. – № 10), *Two Polish Characters in Taras Shevchenko's Novellas* (1935. – № 8) (*The Polish-Ukrainian Bulletin*), *Shevchenko as a Painter and Graphic Artist* (*Pion*, 1936. – № 4), *Shevchenko's Redemption from Slavery* (*Nazustrich*, 1934), *Shevchenko's Unforgettable Teacher* (*Nazustrich*, 1934), *Shevchenko In Cartoon and Shevchenko as a Cartoonist* (*Nazustrich*, 1935) *Unforgettable Briullov* (*Nazustrich*, 1935), *When Shevchenko Began Writing Poetry* (*Nazustrich*, 1938), *A Woman In Shevchenko's Course of Life* (*Woman*, 1935); in the publication *Siogoshasne I Mynule* (1939. – № 3–4) he published the articles *Shevchenko's Last Two Autographs, Unknown Materials On Shevchenko and Other Ukrainian Writers*, and a review of the Russian edition of the poem *Gaidamaky* (Moscow, 1939) and *Nazar Stodolia* (Moscow, 1939). Later he wrote articles *How Shevchenko Is Being Robbed In Our Land That Is Not Ours* (*Meta*. – 1961. – № 1) and *Shevchenko and Religion* (*Ukrainske Pravoslavne Slovo*. – 1964. – № 3), which were published in emigration.

In 1948 UVAN in Europe chose P. Zaitsev a director of the Shevchenko Study Institute. Soon most of its staff moved to Canada, and P. Zaitsev could not emigrate for health reasons. However, he actively joined in the work and nurtured new plans and projects: for example, on 15 March of that year he sent to UVAN his project of publication of all Shevchenko's works in six volumes and informed that he had ready texts for them. P. Zaitsev did not abandon the hope of publishing his brochure written in Polish, *Shevchenko and the Poles* (1934) in the expanded form of 107 pages (it was supposed to

be volume XIII of the *Complete Edition of Works*), because the “material there was extraordinary and unique from the Rapersvil museum, destroyed during the war in Warsaw. In the letters of 1947 to V. Miyakovskiy Pavlo Ivanovych repeatedly mentioned the intention to republish his article *How Shevchenko, the Poet Worked* (1939) advancing with that a wider project – the publication of all his articles and essays about Shevchenko, which had been collected, in his opinion, at least up to 250 pages (and if to add the articles from the Warsaw edition of Shevchenko – even up to 350 pages). At the same time, P. Zaitsev took a comprehensive work for UVAN – to prepare for publication the long primer of memoirs about Shevchenko with corresponding comments.

“From all the projects, – V. Miiakovskiy wrote, – only the edition of the biography of Shevchenko was realized in 1954 prepared earlier for the first volume of the *Complete Edition of the Works*. He wrote to me about that biography as early as in April of 1947: “The biography of Shevchenko is with me, but not all (480 pages only): the last thirty pages (in columns) I ruined. Ruined and I am crying”. In several letters he mentions the difficulties in this regard and the need to give the bibliography of the works about Shevchenko for the book. We know that Zaitsev failed to do this latest dead. The bibliography for the book was put together by M. Hlobenko [5, 112].

As it was mentioned in obituaries, the death caught P. Zaitsev when he was completing three works: *Ethics and Aesthetics of Shevchenko*, *Comments on the Memoirs about Shevchenko of His Contemporaries*, and *Shevchenko’s Creative Work* – they were all remained unfinished.

P. Zaitsev’s Shevchenko study legacy, an experienced textual scholar, belongs to the outstanding events of this branch of science. However, in the two-volume bibliography of the Shevchenko of 1963 it is not represented, as were not represented some other authors of the suppressed at that time Shevchenko study works, especially those who wrote solid articles before the *Warsaw Complete Edition of Taras Shevchenko*, and we should mention Dmitro Antonovych, Leonid Biletskyi, Pavlo Bogatskyi, Osyp Hermaize, Sviatoslav Hordynskiy, Mykhailo Hrushevskiy, Volodymyr Doroshenko Dmytro Doroshenko, Serhii Yefremov, Bohdan Lepkyi, Olexander Lototskyi, Yevgen Malaniuk, Volodymyr Miyakovskiy, Andrii Nikovskiy, Roman Smal-Stotskyi, Stepan Smal-Stotskyi and many others among them. However, the current edition of the *Encyclopedia of Shevchenko* is gradually filling these scientific gaps.

We still do not have neither vocabulary nor a publication entitled *Diaspora Shevchenko Studies*. Therefore, trying to comprehend Shevchenko’s biography, we are only halfway to living Shevchenko. Instead, let us not forget that P. Zaitsev began this way with dignity in 1939 with his book *The Life of Taras Shevchenko*.

Література

1. Білецький Л. Мої засади / Л. Білецький // Тарас Шевченко. Кобзар. – Вінніпег, 1952. – Т. 1. – С. 105.
2. Білокінь С. “Сполучив легкість і літературну вправність викладу із вдумливою аналізою...” / С. Білокінь // Слово і час. – 2010. – № 6. – С. 20–34.
3. Дорошенко В. Нові праці про Шевченка : літературна біографія Тараса Шевченка / В. Дорошенко // Зарубіжне шевченкознавство. – Річник 5. – 1956. – С. 207–209.

4. Зайцев П. Як творив Шевченко-поет / П. Зайцев // Ми (Варшава). – 1939. – Кн. 1. – С. 60–72 ; – Кн. 2. – С. 61–79.
5. Міяковський В. Спогади і спостереження / В. Міяковський // Сучасність. – Мюнхен, 1968. – Ч. 3 (березень). – С. 100–118.
6. Петров В. Провідні етапи розвитку сучасного шевченкознавства / В. Петров // Шевченко та його доба. – Авґсбург, 1947. – Зб. 1. – С. 1–37. – Рец. на кн. : Зайцев П. Життя Тараса Шевченка / П. Зайцев. – Нью-Йорк ; Париж ; Мюнхен, 1955. – 399 с.
7. Полонська-Василенко Н. Професор Павло Іванович Зайцев (1886–1965) / Н. Полонська-Василенко // Український вільний університет. Наукові записки. – Мюнхен, 1965–1966. – С. 225–228.
8. Шевченко : Річник 5 / [ред. Д. Горняткевич]. – Нью-Йорк : Українська Вільна Академія наук у США, 1956. – 56 с.
9. Шевчук В. Павло Зайцев та його шевченкознавча праця / В. Шевчук // Зайцев П. Життя Тараса Шевченка. – К. : Мистецтво, 1994. – С. 9.
10. Шерех Ю. А все таки Шевченко був Шевченком! / Ю. Шерех // Час (газ.). – 1947. – № 19 (84). – 14 травня. – С. 5–6.
11. Zaitsev P. Taras Shevchenko : A Life / P. Zaitsev. – Toronto ; Buffalo ; London : University of Toronto Press, 1988. – 284 p.