

Olga Albertivna Bigun

The Typology of Sanctity: the "Kiev-Pechary Patericon" and the "Kobzar" of Taras Shevchenko

Religious and Sacred Poetry : An International Quarterly of Religion, Culture
and Education 1/4, 97-115

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach
dozwolonego użytku.

OL'GA ALBERTIVNA BIGUN (Kiev, Ukraine)
[(ОЛЬГА АЛБЕРТІВНА БИГУН),
OL'GA ALBERTOVNA BIGUN,
(ОЛЬГА АЛБЕРТОВНА БИГУН),
OLGA ALBERTIVNA BIGUN]
e-mail: olgabigun[at]mail.ru

The Typology of Sanctity: the *Kiev-Pechary Patericon* and the *Kobzar* of Taras Shevchenko

The aim of the article is to present the reception of one of the most important records of the Orthodox-Christian literature – the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* (The Patericon of the Kiev Caves Monastery (Lavra) observable in the works of Taras Shevchenko. The religious aspect of the world view of the Ukrainian poet still evokes a constant interest of the contemporary Shevchenko studies¹. The semantic abundance of the biblical elements in Shevchenko's poetics points to the creative role of the sacred writings in his artistic visions. Among the poetic constructs an important place is occupied by the biblical topoi, such as the topos of paradise, crucifixion, ascetics, "God's punishment", sin etc. A special position in the semiotic content of the poet's works is taken up by the topos of sanctity. The investigation of the works of Shevchenko in the context of the Byzantine-Slavic inheritance has not been the subject of a separate study so far, although there have been some scholarly publications dealing with the comparison of the spiritual Old Ukrainian (Old Ruthenian) literature and the works of the poet². We believe that detailed studies of the

¹ Vide: Д. Бучинський, *Християнсько-філософська думка Тараса Шевченка*, Мадрид-Лондон 1962, 256 с. [D. Bučinskij, *Hristiāns'ko-filosofs'ka dumka Tarasa Ševčenko*, Soūz Ukraīnciv u Velikij Britanii, Madrid-London 1962, 256 s. (D. Buchynskiy, *The Christian and Philosophical Conceptions of Taras Shevchenko*, Ukrainian Alliance in the Great Britain, Madrid-London 1962, 256 p.)]; W. Mokry, *Literatura i myśl filozoficzno-religijna ukraińskiego romantyzmu*, Szewczenko, Kostomarov, Szaszkiewicz, Kraków 1996, 211 s. [W. Mokry, *Literature and Philosophical-Religious Thought of Ukrainian Romanticism. Shevchenko, Kostomarov, Shashkievich*, Cracow 1996, 211 p.], Є. Нахлік, *Доля – Los – Судьба: Шевченко і польські та російські романтики*, Львів 2003, 568 с. [Є. Nahlik, *Dolá – Los – Sud'ba: Ševčenko i pol's'ki ta rosij's'ki romantiki*, Svīt, L'viv 2003, 568 s. (Y. Nakhlik, *Fate. Taras Shevchenko and Polish and Russian Romantics*, Svīt, Lviv 2003, 568 p.)].

² Vide: О. Бігун, *Чет'ї-Миней у творчості Тараса Шевченка: рецепція та інтерпретація*, "Мова і культура" (гол. ред. Д. Бурого), Київ 2012, № 15 (т. 3), с. 263-270. [O. Bigun, *Čet'i-Minei u tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenko: recepciā ta interpretaciā*, "Mova i kul'tura" (gol. red. D. Burago), Kiiv 2012, № 15 (t. 3), s. 263-270 (O. Bigun O., *The Synaxary in Taras Shevchenko's Works: Reception and Interpretation*, „Language and Culture”, D. Burago (head editor), Kiev 2012, № 15 (vol. 3), p. 263-

Christian readings of T. Shevchenko will open wider possibilities for the sources and textual analysis of his works. The cultural and historical³ as well as comparative⁴ analysis will demonstrate the usage of the typology of the image of the sacred place in the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* and the *Kobzar* of Taras Shevchenko.

The idea to compare the two most important acquisitions of the Ukrainian literature – *Kobzar* of T. Shevchenko and the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* is not a new one. It belongs to M. Hrushevsky, who wrote that:

“*Patericon* and *Kobzar* were the two most popular Ukrainian books. We may blame our old intelligentsia and leaders of our culture and literature for not putting into the hands of our society the work more useful from the social and intellectual points of view, more vital, more social than that trace of the late Byzantine single combat. But the fact remains. It was not *The Tale of Igor's Campaign*, nor *The Sermon on Law and Grace*, nor *Chronicle*, but the *Patericon* that became the ever renewed, widely

270)]; С. Росовелький, *Агіографія християнська в літературній творчості Тараса Шевченка*, [в:] *Темі і мотиви поезії Тараса Шевченка* (гол. ред. Н. Чамата), Київ 2008, с. 321-342 [S. Rosovetskij, *Agiografija hristianska v literaturnij tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenko*, [v:] *Temi i motivi poezij Tarasa Ševčenko*, (gol. red. N. Čamata), Naukova dumka 2008, Kiiv 2008, s. 321-342 (S. Rosovetskiy, *The Christian Hagiography in Taras Shevchenko's Literary Works*, [in:] *Themes and Motives of Taras Shevchenko's Poetry*, N. Čamata (head editor), Kiev 2008, p. 321-342.)); О. Сліпушко, *Духовна держава Тараса Шевченка у контексті української літературної традиції*, “Шевченкознавчі студії” (гол. ред. Г. Семенюк), Київ 2009, № 12, с. 153-163. [O. Slipuško, *Duhovna deržava Tarasa Ševčenko u kontekstij ukrain'skoj literaturnoj tradicij*, “Ševčenkoznavčij studij” (gol. red. G. Semenjuk), Kiiv 2009, № 12, s. 153-163 (O. Slipushko, *The Spiritual State of Taras Shevchenko in the Context of Ukrainian Literary Tradition*, „Shevchenko's studies”, H. Semenjuk (head editor), Kiev 2009, № 12, p. 153-163.)) et al.

³ С. Аверинцев, *Поэтика ранневизантийской литературы*, Санкт-Петербург 2004, 480 с. [S. Averincev, *Poetika rannevizantijskoj literatury*, Azbuka-klassika, Sankt-Peterburg 2004, 480 s. (S. Averintsev, *The Poetics of the Early Byzantine Culture*, Azbuka-klassika, Saint-Petersburg 2004, 480 p.)); В. Бычков, *2000 лет христианской культуры: sub specie aesthetica*, Т. 1: *Раннее христианство. Византия*, Москва - Санкт-Петербург 1999, 573 с. [V. Byčkov, *2000 let hristianskoj kul'tury: sub specie aesthetica*, T. 1: *Rannee hristianstvo. Vizantiâ*, Universitetskaja kniga, Moskva - Sankt-Peterburg 1999, 573 s. (V. Bychkov, *2000 Years of the Christian Culture: Sub Specie Aesthetica*, V. 1: *The Early Christianity: Byzantine*, Universitetskaya kniga, Moscow - Saint-Petersburg 1999, 573 p.)); І. Огієнко, *Візантійська культура і Україна*, [в:] *Україна: філософський спадок століть*, «Хроніка – 2000» (гол. ред. Ю. Буряк), Київ 2000, № 37-38, с. 117-128. [I. Ogienko, *Vizantijska kul'tura i Ukraïna*, [v:] *Ukraïna: filosof'skij spadok stolit'*, (gol. red. Ū. Burâk), “Hronika – 2000”, Kiiv 2000, s. 117-128. (I. Ohienko, *The Bizantine Culture and Ukraine* [in:] *Ukraine: Philosophical Heritage of the Centuries*, „Khronika 2000”, Yu. Buryak (head editor), Kiev 2000, № 37-38, pp. 117-128.)) et al.

⁴ E. Kasperski, *Kategorie komparatystyki*, Warszawa 2010, 401 s. [E. Kasperski, *Categories of Comparatistics*, Warsaw 2010, 401 p.]; Д. Наливайко, *Теорія літератури й компаративістика*, Видавничий дім “Києво-Могилянська академія”, Київ 2006, 347 с. [D. Nalivajko, *Teoriâ literatury i komparativistika*, Vidavničij dim „Kiëvo-Mogilâns'ka akademiâ”, Kiiv 2006, 347 s. (D. Nalyvayko, *The Literature Theory and Comparative Studies*, Publishing House Kiev-Mohyla Academy, Kiev 2006, 347 p.)).

spread, and with the start of our typography – constantly retyped work of our old literature, ‘the golden book’ of the Ukrainian literate people, the source of its literary satisfaction and moral edification”⁵.

In this way one of the scholars describes the common social and intellectual aspects, the literary importance and the high moral value that unite the works from the point of view of the synchronic approach. From the diachronic point of view, these common features may be interpreted as elements of heritage, as well as constituents of a synthesis within the frame of the successive development of the Ukrainian literature.

As is generally known, the culture and literature of Byzantine Christianity had a great influence on the Old Ukrainian written records, among which the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* occupies an important place (belonging to the first half of the 13th century). It is a collection of the tales about the Kiev Caves Monastery and its first ascetics. Generally it is accepted that the genre of ‘The Lives of Fathers’ comes from the Greek and Byzantine tradition. On the territory of Kievan Rus they are represented by the translations, which are genealogically close to the biographical descriptions of Plutarch and other ancient authors. It is known that the genre includes such texts as *Sinaitic Patericon* (the lives of the Sinaitic monks), the *Egypt Patericon* consisting of the *Tale of the Egyptian Monks* and *Lavsaik* telling of the Egyptian hermits and their fight with demons, *The Rome Patericon*, represented by the novels of the Pope Gregory the Great about the ecclesiastical deeds of the Italian Fathers of the Church etc.

So, the canon of the *Lives of Fathers* was not formed under the conditions of the Old East Slavic realia; its adoption on the territory of Kievan Rus caused certain alterations. Thus, the *Omnibus Patericon*, the *Athos Patericon* were compiled according to the Orthodox tradition, although the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* represents both the world view and the literary context that make it possible to interpret the work as an important record of the medieval Ukrainian philosophical culture. In the center of the stories of the *Patericon* we see the hagiographic ideal embedded in the image of a saint, a martyr or another kind of hermit. Although,

“unlike the hagiographies, the *Patericon* does not reveal all the aspects of the life of a hermit or a stylite, but only its most prominent episodes, it describes the wonders and the visions. The bases of the works are mostly itinerant plots. The *Lives of the Fathers* is characterized by the simplicity and the strict form”⁶.

⁵М.С. Грушевський, *Історія української літератури*, Т. 3, Київ 1993, с.113-114 [M.S. Gruševs'kij, *Īstoriâ ukrains'koï literaturi*, T. 3, Libid', Kiïv 1993, s. 113-114 (M.S. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukrainian Literature*, vol. 3, Lybid, Kiev 1993, p. 113-114)]. Translation of the text from Ukrainian into English – by Ol'ga Bigun.

⁶*Літературна енциклопедія* (автор-укладач Ю. Ковалів), Т. 2: М-Я, Академія, Київ 2007, с. 192. [*Literaturna enciklopediâ* (avtor-ukladač Ū. Kovaliv), T. 2: M-Ä, Akademiiä, Kiïv 2007, s. 192 (*Liter-*

The authors of the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon*, Symon and Policarp, the two figures of the Old East Slavic culture, based their work on the great fund of home sources and of translations, among which there are *The Lives of Theodosius of the Cave*, the *Rostov Manuscript*, the *Cloister Synodicon*, *The Paresnesis* of Ephraem the Syrian, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent* of John Climacus, *The Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschus, *The Synaitic Patericon*, *The Prologue* etc. That is why the texts of the collection reflect the views of the man and the world, characteristic of those times. These views are interwoven with the church dogmas and the postulates of Christian ethics, although the main attention of the authors is focused on the description of the inner world of the person.

The hagiographic texts, devoted to the lives of the saints, the hermits, were addressed to the large masses of the population, as they aimed at the promotion of the Christian values and popularization of the ideological basis of the Orthodox tradition, which would surpass the sources of the East Slavic mythological world view.

“Although – in I. Zhylenko’s opinion – even on the properly Ukrainian lands paganism could not pass away, as it was their ‘own’, ‘native’ religion, whereas Christianity was ‘Greek’. In order to cause old gods to disappear forever, it was necessary to have real Christians among the Ruthenians and other peoples of Kievan Rus – the pious hermits who would represent the sanctity and the piety of Christianity”⁷.

The popularity of the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* among the masses of the Ukrainians is proved by the reception of this source in the works of T. Shevchenko. The poet mentions the *Patericon* and its tales time and again in a direct way (the tales *Twins*, *Captain’s Wife*, *Hireling*) and in an indirect way (the poems *Varnak*, *Witch*, *The Moskal’s Well*, *Monk* etc.). These recollections provide a strong basis for literary research as they suggest a wide spectrum of typological levels: morphological, thematic, intertextual etc. The most prominent aspect of the study of the relations between the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* and the works of Shevchenko is concerned with the similarity of the themes and problems, demonstrated in singular artistic expressions. The notion of “sanctity” is included among these vital conceptions, revealed in the *Patericon* and the *Kobzar*; which show a number of similari-

ary Encyclopedia, Y. Kovaliv (head editor), vol. 2: M-Ya, Akademia, Kiev 2007, p. 192)]. Translation of the text from Ukrainian into English – by Ol’ga Bighun.

⁷ І. Жилєнко, *Джерела та історія тексту Києво-Печерського патерика*, [Електронний ресурс], <https://www.litopys.org.ua/paterikon/patchyt.htm> [доступ 10.01.2013]. {I. Žilenko, *Džerela ta istoriâ tekstu Kiëvo-Pečers’kogo paterika*, [Elektronnij resurs] <https://www.litopys.org.ua/paterikon/patchyt.htm> [dostup 10.01.2013], (I. Zhylenko, *The Issues and the History of the Kiev-Pechery Patericon*, <https://www.litopys.org.ua/paterikon/patchyt.htm> [Access 10.01.2013]}.

ties and differences in their interpretations and therefore constitute proper material for further investigation.

The basic message of the *Patericon* concerns the moral ideal, a special moral state – a life yearning for “God’s Kingdom” – the ideally transformed world Jesus told his disciples about. In the view of medieval patristic tradition, the greatest Christian values are concentrated in the notion of “sanctity”, the basic component of the philosophic tradition of those times. It is a well-known fact the Christian world-view is based on the dualistic picture of the world (the Heaven and the Earth), though its theocentric direction points to God as the greatest good and perfection. God is the center of the Universe, and that is why sanctity is perceived, first of all, as the hope for the other world, for the values “from the other world”. Sanctity belongs to the earthly world, although in its essence it surpasses its limits, representing “the other world” on the Earth. It is believed that the basis of the word “saint” is derived from the Old Slavic root element with Indo-European origins and meaning “growth” or “swelling”⁸. The image of sanctity is filled with moral contents; it represents the “growth” of the spiritual character – the “growth” of the spirit. So, the saint is the person who has followed the path of the spiritual, heaven-sent growth to his sanctity.

The culture of Kievan Rus took the Christian notion of sanctity introducing a certain shift of accents. Thus, in the Christian interpretation the attention is paid not to the yearning for the heavenly world, but to the desire for “the Kingdom of God” on the Earth, available for every believer, which is known from the Gospel. The concretization of the notion “the Kingdom of God is among us” is very typical for Old Ukrainian (Old Ruthenian) literature and therefore the ancient hagiography of our country deals not only with the people, enlightened by the faith, but also focuses on the “sacred places”, the meaningful points of the ideal world. In this context the significance of such a monument as the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* is fundamental: as V. Horsky rightly claims,

“together with the hagiography the sanctity of the location of the cloister and the temple dedicated to the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, the sacral center reflecting the sanctity of the cloister, is substantiated”⁹.

⁸ В. Топоров, *Святость и святые в русской духовной традиции*, Т. 1: *Первый век христианства на Руси*, Москва 1995, с. 7-9 [V. Toporov, *Svâtosť i svâtye v russoj duhovnoj tradicii*, T. 1: *Pervyj vek hristianstva na Rusi*, Gnozis, Źyky russoj kul'tury, Moskva 1995, s. 7-9 (V. Toporov, *The Sanctity and the Saints in the Russian Ecclesial Culture*, V. 1: *The 1st Century of Christianity in Rus*, Gnosis, Languages of Russian Culture, Moscow 1995, p. 7-9)].

⁹ В. С. Горський, *Нариси з історії філософської культури Київської Русі (середина XII – середина XIII ст.)*, Наукова думка, Київ 1993, с. 76 [V. S. Gors'kij, *Narisi z istorii filosof's'koj kul'turi Kiïvs'koï Rusi (seredina XII – seredina XIII st.)*, Naukova dumka, Kiïv 1993, 162 s. (V.S. Horsky, *The Essay on the History of Philosophic Culture of Kievan Rus (from the Middle of 12th until the Middle of 13th Century)*, Naukova dumka, Kiev 1993, p. 76)].

Generally, it corresponds to the symbolic ecclesiastic character of the medieval consciousness in its treatment of the temple as a sanctity.

According to I. Zhylenko,

“the great sanctity of the cloister made an interesting psychological point which should be borne in mind while studying the history of the Lavra till the end of the 18th century. At the end of the 11th c. and the beginning of the 12th c. the professed of the monastery shared a kind of Cave consciousness, generated by the works of Theodosius of the Cave and Nestor the Chronicler. The cloister, which was often called the home of God, was the most sacred, the purest, and the most magnificent place on the Earth. If the place was to stay like that, it had to be served by all the secular and spiritual people, as this was the best way to ‘be closer to God’. For the state, the cloister was like ‘the consciousness of the nation’, which was considered to be the higher force with the right to evaluate and criticize the actions of the statesmen”¹⁰.

That is why the first “Slovo” (word/part/text), opening the *Kievan Patericon* is devoted to the history of the church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. It tells of the Varangian Shymon (called Simon after the baptism) who provided the means to build the temple. The legend is accompanied by numerous wonders, like the appearance of the image of the church during a sea trip to Rus, or pointing the site for building the temple by God, or the sound of the “voice of God” in the church etc. Here we come across the story of the people being healed with Shymon’s miraculous belt; among those healed was a future prince Volodymyr Monomakh.

The Mother of God is also active in her relation to the building of the temple. In the following parts it is said that she comes to the Greek builders with the words:

“I want to build the church on the territory of Rus, in Kiev and I am telling you to do this. Take gold for three years”¹¹.

The Mother of God personally presents the relics of seven martyrs and the icon that is to occupy the central place in the temple and invites icon painters from Constantinople. Both builders and icon painters having finished the work,

“finished their lives in the Caves monastery and they were put in their cave vestibule. Today their peasant’s overcoats are seen on the gallery, and their Greek books are kept to remember that miracle”¹².

¹⁰ І. Жиленко, *Джерела...*, [I. Žilenko, *Džerela...* (I. Zhylenko, *The Issues...*)], op. cit., ibidem.

¹¹ Д. І. Абрамович, *Києво-Печерський патерик*: репринтне видання, Київ 1991, с. 26 [D. I. Abramovič, *Kiëvo-Pečers'kij paterik*: reprintne vidannâ, Čas, Kiïv 1991, 280 s. (D. I. Abramovich, *Kiev-Pechery Patericon*: reprint, Chas, Kiev 1991, 280 p.)].

¹² Ibidem, p. 27.

That is the first sign of the sacred place that is the mark of the personal communication of God Himself and of the Mother of God.

Another sign is the parallel between the Kiev-Caves Monastery and the other famous holy places. In the previous text the point was that the Assumption Cathedral was connected with Constantinople, and the *Legend about the Cave Name of the Monastery* of Nestor tells of the hereditary relations of the monastery and Athos. That emphasizes the connection between the sacred places. Moreover, it turns out that there is a possibility to join holy places not only referring this directly God, but also adopting this right from another other sacred place; in the *Patericon* this place is the Sacred Mount Athos.

Another characteristic of the holy place is special care provided by its founders, the saints - Anthony and Theodosius. It was Anthony who received a blessing on the Athos before the foundation of the monastery. Thanks to the constant protection of the founders of the monastery, both righteous people and even sinners feel the blissful influence of the holy place. Being on this "territory of sanctity" provides its inhabitants with a special privilege- the prayers of the saintly fathers, for instance Saint Theodosius:

"When someone finishes his life in the home of the Holy Virgin and under my care, I shall pray to God for them, though they might have not reached the deeds of saints"¹³.

So, the image of the holy place in the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* corresponds to the notion maintained by the patristics of those days. The sanctity of the place is explained, first of all, by "God's intrusion" and, secondly, by the logical link in the chain of the "territories of sanctity" (Constantinople, Athos, etc.), which demonstrates the inheritance of religious traditions, and, thirdly, by the spiritual experiences and deeds of the inhabitants of the monastery, which is the evidence of the special favor and care of the higher powers. That is the way of argumentation in support of the view that the monastery belongs to the divine world.

Numerous records about the holy places are found in the works of Taras Shevchenko. Sometimes the poet mentions the names of the Ukrainian holy places or gives a description of a certain temple. So, Kiev-Pechery Lavra appears in the poems *Witch*, *Hireling*, *Slave* etc. Holy Assumption Pochayiv Lavra and the Mezhyhirya Savior-Transfiguration Monastery appear in *Slave* and in the poem *Monk*, the Kholodnoyavorivsk Motronynsk monastery is depicted in the poem *The Cold Ravine* and in the lyric verse *On the Holy Sunday*. We come across other records about the Motronynsk convent of the Holy Trinity (*Princess*), the church of Saints Boris and Glib in Vyshgorod (*Monk*), the church in Lebedyn (it has not been decided which church is meant here – it may be either the church of St. Nicholas or the

¹³ Ibidem, p. 35.

church of St. Barbara of the Lebedynsk monastery of St. Nicholas). In Shevchenko's works we see the churches of Chygyryn, among them is the church of the Saviour, which has not been preserved (*Haidamaki*), the church of Bohdan (Illinska church) in Subotiv etc. There is information about cloisters and other sacred places which are still puzzles in the legends and tales:

“А он старе Монастирище, / Колись козацьке село, / Чи те воно тойді було?... / Та все пішло царям на грище: / І Запоріжжя, і село... / І монастир святий, скарбниця, – / Все, все неситі рознесли!...” [*Сон (Гори мої високі!...)*]¹⁴.

This same text in my English translation:

[“And here is the old Monasteryshche / A village of cossacks it was / Was it the same in those days/ It all went to tsars / Zaporizhya and the village... / And the saint monastery, and the treasury, – / All had gone to those insatiable!...”]

[*A Dream (My High Mountains...)*]¹⁵.

It is generally known that T. Shevchenko was not a great admirer of the clergy, that's why the votaries of the church are mentioned in his poetry in a disdainful way. This attitude was caused by the historical development of the Orthodox traditions in Ukraine, since with the growth of the influence of the Moscow patriarchate the Ukrainian lands witnessed an estrangement of the congregation from the clergy. That was caused by the Moscow traditions of the subordination of the priests to the secular authorities and the destruction of the old Ukrainian orders and rules accepted in the life of the church. This will be proved by illustrating the procedure of the appointment of the metropolitans, which in Cossack Ukraine depended upon the will of the community and was an elective position. That tradition gave way to that of Russian Orthodoxy which became a part of the empire project of the neighboring state. In Shevchenko's times, according to Yu. Zemsky,

“the organization of the church life itself and the process of studies in the theological seminary prepared priests to fulfill the mission of the representative of the will and authority of the autocracy: priests declared the highest manifests, announced the news of the autocrat's family life and, for sure, they always remembered the tsar and his close relatives in prayers”¹⁶.

¹⁴ Т. Шевченко, *Кобзар*, Камінь, Львів 2011, с. 445 [T. Ševčenko, *Kobzar*, Kamenîar, L'viv 2011, s. 445 (T. Shevchenko, *Kobzar*, Kameniar, Lviv 2011, p. 445)].

¹⁵ Here and below – the translation from the originals is in the author's version (author: Ol'ga Bigun).

¹⁶ Ю. Земський, *Деградація соціальної ваги православного духовенства в умовах політики Російської імперії впродовж XIX ст.*, [Електронний ресурс:]

https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf, [доступ 3.01.2013]

[Ů. Zemsk'ij, *Degradaciâ social'noi vagi pravoslavnogo duhovenstva v umovah politiki Rosijs'koi imperii vprodovž XIX st.*, [Elektronnij resurs:]

https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf, [dostup 03.01.2013];

Having attended such a kind of liturgy, the poet was influenced by the idea of a constant “commemoration” of the royal persons, but in his works such remembrances were of the opposite kind to that of the ecclesiastical celebrations of the authorities.

T. Shevchenko is merciless in criticizing the clergy of the “alien church”, sometimes using historic parallels:

“А маги, бонзи і жерці
(Неначе наші панотці)
В храмах, в пагодах годувались,
Мов кабани царям на сало
Та на ковбаси”.

(*Саян*)

This same text in my English translation:

[“And magi,
bonzes and ministers
(Just like our priests)
In churches, in pagodas were being fed,
As if boars for tsars for leaf lards
And sausages”.]

(*Saul*)¹⁷

There is no wonder that the church is not treated as a sacred place, although for the poet the monastery is still a special “holy place”. That is seen in the solemn and festive tone of the references to the monasteries in Shevchenko’s works, for instance:

“Дивлюся
Мов на небі висить
Святий Київ наш великий.
Святим дивом сяють
Храми божі, ніби з самим
Богом розмовляють.
Дивлюся я, а сам млію.
Тихо задзвонили
У Києві, мов на небі...”.

(*Варнак*)

(Y. Zemsky, *Degradation of the Social Role of the Orthodox Clergy of Ukraine in the Conditions of the Russian Empire Policy during 19th Century*, (Electronic source:)

https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf, [Access: 03.01.2013]).

¹⁷ Т. Шевченко, *op. cit.*, с. 818 [T. Ševčenko, *op. cit.*, s. 818 (T. Shevchenko, *Kobzar*, *op. cit.*, p. 818)].

And this same text in my English translation:

[“I am looking
As if hanging in the sky
Our saint grand Kiev
The churches are as if
Shining by a miracle
Talking to God himself.
I am looking and I feel I faint
A quiet bell
In Kiev, as if in the sky...”]

(*Varnak*)¹⁸

Such an emotional state can in fact be caused by social and psychological impulses to treat the monastery as a God-blessed place, resembling the Kingdom of God.

The tone of the depiction of the holy place is similar to that of the description in the *Patericon*. That is why, in this respect, the common features of Shevchenko’s works and the Old Kievan collection refer, first of all, to God’s gift of sanctity. Thus, in the *Patericon* the monastery comes into being by means of the active intrusion of God and the Mother of God, who express their wishes concerning the interior and the exterior of the monastery. In Shevchenko’s works the churches have the privilege to talk to God themselves and the privilege is presented to them by God. Secondly, sanctity has a direct relation to a miracle (let’s compare the above cited lines

„as if hanging in the sky
Our saint grand Kiev
The churches are as if
Shining by a miracle” –

(*Varnak*)¹⁹

with the *Patericon*’s legends about the image of the church of the Mother of God which appeared to Varangian Shymon in the sky, where he heard the command of God to build it). The next point referring to the notion of sanctity is the acknowledgement of the miraculous force of the holy place. It is widely known that the *Patericon* boasts of numerous examples of the healing and other miraculous transformations. The characters of Shevchenko’s poems often apply to the force of the holy places in Kiev:

¹⁸ Ibidem, p. 487.

¹⁹ Ibidem, p. 487.

“У Києві великому
Всіх святих благала:
У Межигорського Спаса
Тричі причащалась;
У Почаєві святому
Ридала-молилась,
Щоб Степан той, доля тая,
Йй хоча приснилась”.

(Невольник)

This same text in my English translation:

[“In grand Kiev
Begging all the saints:
In the church of Mezhygiryia Saviour
Received community three times;
In saint Pochaiv
Sobbing and praying
For see Stepan and his faith
At least in a dream”.]

(*A Slaver*)²⁰

„У Київ їздила, молилась,
Аж у Почаєві була”.

(Петрусь)

And this same text in my English translation:

[“Went to Kiev to pray,
Went to Pachaiv”.]

(*Petrus*)²¹

The last point emphasizes the acknowledgement of the gracious influence of the holy place. Shevchenko uses legends about the end of the path of life of a number of Cossacks in monasteries. Such a plot is seen in the poem *Monk*, which uses the legend about the Cossack leader Semen Paliy, who is known to have been buried in Mezhygiryia monastery. Making references to the *Patericon*, in which even the sinner, who got into the monastery, was forgiven his sins, we may assume that Shevchenko’s addressing “saint knights” refers to the professed Cossacks in advanced years.

²⁰ Ibidem, p. 750.

²¹ Ibidem, p. 652.

Now some attention is due to an analysis of the differences in the reception of the holy place in the poet's works. Among these differences the interpretation of the notions of monastery and church should be mentioned first. According to what has been mentioned above, T. Shevchenko prefers monasteries, while the church is for him an embodiment of religious blasphemy:

“Храми, каплиці, і ікони,
І ставники, і мири дим,
І перед образом твоїм
Неутомленнє поклони.
За кражу, за войну, за кров,
Що братню кров пролити, просять
І потім в дар тобі приносять
З пожару вкрадений покров!!”

(Кавказ)

This same text in my English translation:

[„Temples, chapels and icons
Both candlesticks and the smoke of chrism,
In front of your icon
Indefatigable bows.
For theft, for war, for blood,
Asking for bloodshed
And then making it a gift to you
The shroud stolen in fire!!”]

(Caucases)²².

The devaluation of the Christian virtues, particularly justice and mercy, by the church authorities leads to the rejection of the church by the people:

“Виростають нехрещені
Козацькі діти;
Кохаются невінчані;
Без попа ховають;
Запродана жидам віра,
В церкву не пускають!”²³

(Тарасова ніч)

This same text in my English translation:

[“Children of Cossacks
grow unbaptized

²² Ibidem, p. 370-371.

²³ Ibidem, p. 51.

They make love without church wedding
They are buried without a priest
The faith was sold to yids,
They are not allowed to church!"]
(*The Night of Taras*)

Nowhere in Shevchenko's works do we come across a description of a church suggesting some traces of the sacredness comparable to that possessed by the cloisters. It is probable that the poet believes – following the conviction expressed in the *Patericon* that the monastery had not been made by human hands – that miraculous guidance of God leads to the creation of the cloisters, while the churches might be built by “unjust” people:

“А той, щедрий та розкошний,
Все храми мурує,
Та отечество так любить,
Так за ним бідкує,
Так із його сердешного,
Кров, як воду точить!...”²⁴.
[*Сон (У всякого своя доля)*]

And this same text in my English translation:

[“And that generous and luxurious
Is building shrines
And loves his fatherland so much
Condoles with it so much
That from this poor wretch
sheds blood like water”].
[*Dream (Everyone has his own fate...)*]

Thus it can be concluded that the above examination of Shevchenko's poetry in the context of the Byzantine spiritual tradition shows both similarities and differences in the reception of the concept of “sanctity”. First of all, the image of the sacred place is prominent here, as it corresponds to the Christian tradition and has a number of common characteristics, such as the personal intrusion of God, associated with a miracle, the connection of the place with other sacred centers, a special graceful influence of the sacred place on the people around it, ecclesiastical deeds of its inhabitants etc. It is noticeable that all the enumerated features are characteristic of the description of the cloisters in Shevchenko's works. Beside the conception “Kiev – Jerusalem”, the poet develops the idea “Kiev-Pechery Lavra – Athos”, which must have been borrowed from the hagiographies of the *Kiev-Pechery*

²⁴ Ibidem, p. 258.

Patericon. Finally, it has to be stressed that the image of the church in Shevchenko's work is distinguished by its ambivalence.

Summary / Abstract (in English):

This article is a part of the thesis *Ambivalency of the Byzantism in Taras Shevchenko's Works*. The aim of the article is to present the reception of one of the most important records of Orthodox-Christian literature – the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* (The Patericon of the Kiev Caves Monastery (Lavra) reflected in the works of Taras Shevchenko. The cultural, historical and comparative analysis will describe the usage of the typology of the image of the sacred place in the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* and the *Kobzar* of the Ukrainian poet. The examination of Shevchenko's work in the context of the Byzantine spiritual tradition reveals the common and distinctive features (i.e. similarities and differences) in the reception of the concept of "sanctity". First of all, the image of the sacred place or the shrine is particularly important in this context, as it corresponds to the Christian tradition and displays a number of important characteristics such as, for example, a personal intrusion of God, associated with a miracle, the connection of the place with other sacred centers, a special, beneficial influence of the sacred place on the people living in the vicinity, the ecclesiastical deeds of its inhabitants etc. It is noticeable that all the enumerated features are characteristic of the description of the cloisters in Shevchenko's works. In addition of the conception "Kiev – Jerusalem", the poet develops the idea "Kiev-Pechery Lavra – Athos", which must have been borrowed from the hagiographies of the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon*. Moreover, the image of the Church is distinguished by its ambivalence. The results of the research can be used for courses in the History of Ukrainian Literature and in Literary Theory, in textbooks and training aids, in further comparative studies of Shevchenko's works. The results are addressed to philologists and researchers of Ukrainian literature. The academic novelty of this article consists in presenting the typology of the image of the sacred place in the *Kiev-Pechery Patericon* and the *Kobzar* of Taras Shevchenko. For the first time it has become the object of individual research, in the course of which theoretical aspects and comparative levels of this problem have been delineated.

Key words: typology, reception, hagiographic literature, Kiev-Pechery Patericon, Kobzar (Piper), Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861).

The Title in Polish: *Typologia świętości: kijowsko-pieczarski Paterikon i Kobziarz Tarasa Szewczenki*

Streszczenie (Abstrakt) po polsku / Summary (Abstract) in Polish:

Artykuł jest częścią tezy (dysertacji) pt. *Ambiwalencja bizantynizmu w dziełach Tarasa Szewczenki*. Celem artykułu jest przedstawienie recepcji jednego z największych zapisów chrześcijańskiej literatury prawosławnej – *Kijowsko-*

Pieczarskiego Paterikonu (*Paterikonu* monasteru kijowskich pieczar, ławry) oświetlonego w dziełach Tarasa Szewczenki. Analiza kulturowa, historyczna oraz porównawcza opisze zastosowanie typologii do wizji świętego miejsca w *Kijowsko-Pieczarskim Paterikonie* i *Kobziarzu* ukraińskiego poety. Badanie dzieła Szewczenki w kontekście bizantyńskiej tradycji duchowej ujawnia wspólne i dystynktywne cechy (np. podobieństwa i różnice) w recepcji koncepcji „świętości”. Przede wszystkim, wizja świętego miejsca albo miejsca kultu jest szczególnie ważna w tym kontekście, tak jak to odpowiada chrześcijańskiej tradycji i obrazuje wiele ważnych właściwości, takich jak na przykład osobowe wtargnięcie (interwencja) Boga, skojarzone z cudem, złączenie (danego) miejsca z innymi ośrodkami świętymi, szczególny dobroczynny wpływ świętego miejsca na ludzi żyjących w okolicy, na duchowe uczynki jej mieszkańców itd. Godne uwagi jest to, że wszystkie wymienione cechy są charakterystyczne dla klasztorów w dziełach Szewczenki. Dodatkowo z koncepcji „Kijowa - Jerozolimy” poeta rozwija ideę „Kijowsko-Pieczarskiej Ławry – Atosu”, która musi mieć zapożyczenie z hagiografii *Paterikonu Kijowsko-Pieczarskiego*. Co więcej, wizję Kościoła rozpoznaje się (wyróżnia się) przez jego (tę) ambiwalencję. Wyniki badań mogą być zastosowane w kursach historii ukraińskiej literatury i teorii literatury, w podręcznikach i jako środek pomocniczy do ćwiczeń, w dalszych studiach porównawczych nad dziełami Szewczenki. Wyniki są adresowane do filologów i badaczy literatury ukraińskiej. Na nowość naukową artykułu składa się przedstawienie typologii wizji świętego miejsca w *Paterikonie Kijowsko-Pieczarskim* i *Kobziarzu* Tarasa Szewczenki. Po raz pierwszy stało się to obiektem indywidualnego badania, w toku którego zostały określone aspekty teoretyczne i porównawcze poziomu tego problemu.

[polski przekład: Marek Mariusz Tytko]

Słowa kluczowe (po polsku) / Key words (in Polish):

typologia, recepcja, literatura hagiograficzna, Kijowsko-Pieczarski Paterikon, Kobziarz, Taras Szewchenko (1814-1861).

Bibliography:

The Primary Bibliographical Sources:

The Primary Bibliographical Sources in the Cyrillic Alphabet:

Шевченко Т., *Кобзар*, Каменяр, Львів 2011, 871 с.

The Primary Bibliographical Sources Transliterated from the Cyrillic Alphabet into the Latin Alphabet:

Ševčenko T., *Kobzar*, Kameniar, L'viv 2011, 871 s.

The Primary Bibliographical Sources in the English Transcript:

Shevchenko T., *Kobzar*, Kameniar, Lviv 2011, 871 p.

The Secondary Bibliographical Sources:

The Secondary Bibliographical Sources in the Cyrillic Alphabet:

- Абрамович Д. І., *Києво-Печерський патерик*: репринтне видання, Час, Київ 1991, 280 с.
- Аверинцев С., *Поэтика ранневизантийской литературы*, Азбука-классика, Санкт-Петербург 2004, 480 с.
- Бігун О., *Чет'ї-Мінеї у творчості Тараса Шевченка: рецепція та інтерпретація*, "Мова і культура" (гол. ред. Д. Бурого), Київ 2012, № 15 (т. 3), с. 263-70.
- Бучинський Д., *Християнсько-філософська думка Тараса Шевченка*, Союз українців у Великій Британії, Мадрид-Лондон 1962, 256 с.
- Бычков В., *2000 лет христианской культуры: sub specie aesthetica*, Т. 1: Раннее христианство. Византия, Университетская книга, Москва - Санкт-Петербург 1999, 573 с.
- Горський В. С., *Нариси з історії філософської культури Київської Русі (середина XII – середина XIII ст.)*, Наукова думка, Київ 1993, 162 с.
- Грушевський М. С., *Історія української літератури*, Т. 3, Либідь, Київ 1993, 285 с.
- Літературна енциклопедія* (автор-укладач Ю. Ковалів), Т. 2: М-Я, Академія, Київ 2007, 624 с.
- Нахлік Є., *Доля – Los – Судьба: Шевченко і польські та російські романтики*, Світ, Львів 2003, 568 с.
- Наливайко Д., *Теорія літератури й компаративістика*, Видавничий дім "Києво-Могилянська академія", Київ 2006, 347 с.
- Огієнко І. *Візантійська культура і Україна*, [в:] *Україна: філософський спадок століть*, (гол. ред. Ю. Буряк), «Хроніка – 2000», Київ 2000, №37-38, с. 117-128.
- Росовецький С., *Азіографія християнська в літературній творчості Тараса Шевченка*, [в:] *Теми і мотиви поезії Тараса Шевченка* (гол. ред. Н. Чамата), Наукова думка, Київ 2008, с. 321-342.
- Сліпущко О., *Духовна держава Тараса Шевченка у контексті української літературної традиції*, «Шевченкознавчі студії» (гол. ред. Г. Семенюк), Київ 2009, № 12, с. 153-163.
- Топоров В., *Святость и святые в русской духовной традиции*, Т. 1: *Первый век христианства на Руси*, Гнозис, Языки русской культуры, Москва 1995, 870 с.
- Земський Ю., *Деградація соціальної ваги православного духовенства в умовах політики Російської імперії впродовж XIX ст.*, [Електронний ресурс], https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpnmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf, [доступ 03.01.2013].
- Жилієнко І., *Джерела та історія тексту Києво-Печерського патерика*, [Електронний ресурс], <https://www.litopys.org.ua/paterikon/patchyt.htm> [доступ 10.01.2013].

The Secondary Bibliographical Sources in the Latin Alphabet:

- Kasperski E., *Kategorie komparatystyki*, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 2010, 401 s.
- Mokry W., *Literatura i myśl filozoficzno-religijna ukraińskiego romantyzmu: Szewczenko, Kostomarov, Szaszkiewicz*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków 1996, 221 s.

The Secondary Bibliographical Sources Transliterated from the Cyrillic Alphabet into the Latin Alphabet:

- Abramovič D. I., *Kiëvo-Pečers'kij paterik*: reprintne vidannâ, Čas, Kiïv 1991, 280 s.
- Averincev S., *Poëtika rannevizantijskoj literatury*, Azbuka-klassika, Sankt-Peterburg 2004, 480 s.
- Bigun O., *Čet'i-Mineï u tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenko: recepciâ ta interpretaciâ*, "Mova i kul'tura" (gol. red. D. Burago), Kiïv 2012, № 15 (t. 3), s. 263-70.
- Bučins'kij D., *Hristiâns'ko-filosofs'ka dumka Tarasa Ševčenko*, Soûz Ukraïnciv u Velikij Britanii, Madrid-London 1962, 256 s.

- Byčkov V.**, *2000 let hristianskoj kul'tury: sub specie aesthetica*, T. 1: *Rannee hristianstvo. Vizantiâ*, Universitetskaâ kniga, Moskva - Sankt-Peterburg 1999, 573 s.
- Gors'kij V. S.**, *Narisi z istorii filosof's'koï kul'turi Kiïvs'koï Rusi (seredina XII – seredina XIII st.)*, Naukova dumka, Kiïv 1993, 162 s.
- Gruševs'kij M. S.**, *Îstoriâ ukraïns'koï literaturi*, T. 3, Libid', Kiïv 1993, 285 s.
- Literaturna enciklopediâ** (avtor-ukladač Ū. Kovaliv), T. 2: M-Â, Akademiâ, Kiïv 2007, 624 s.
- Nahlik Ê.**, *Dolâ – Los – Sud'ba: Ševčenko i pol's'kâ ta rosij's'kâ romantiki*, Svit, L'viv 2003, 568 s.
- Nalivajko D.**, *Teoriâ literaturi j komparativistika*, Vidavničij dim „Kiêvo-Mogilâns'ka akademiâ”, Kiïv 2006, 347 s.
- Ogîenko Ĭ.**, *Vizantijs'ka kul'tura i Ukraïna*, [v:] *Ukraïna: filosof's'kaj spadok stolit'*, (gol. red. Ū. Burâk), “Hronika – 2000”, Kiïv 2000, s. 117-128.
- Rosovec'kij S.**, *Agiografiâ hristiâns'ka v literaturnij tvorčosti Tarasa Ševčenko*, [v:] *Temî i motivi poezii Tarasa Ševčenko*, (gol. red. N. Čamata), Naukova dumka 2008, Kiïv 2008, s. 321-342.
- Slipuško O.**, *Duhovna deržava Tarasa Ševčenko u konteksti ukraïns'koï literaturnoi tradicii*, “Ševčenkoznâvčî studii” (gol. red. G. Semenîk), Kiïv 2009, № 12, s. 153-163.
- Toporov V.**, *Svâtost' i svâtje v russkoj duhovnoj tradicii*, T. 1: *Pervyj vek hristianstva na Rusi*, Gnozis, Âzyki russkoj kul'tury, Moskva 1995, 870 s.
- Zems'kij Ū.**, *Degradaciâ social'noi vagi pravoslavnogo duhovenstva v umovah politiki Rosij's'koï imperii vprodovž XIX st.*, [Elektronnij resurs], https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpnmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf, [dostup 03.01.2013].
- Žilenko Ĭ.**, *Džerela ta istoriâ tekstu Kiêvo-Pečers'kogo paterika*, [Elektronnij resurs] <https://www.litopys.org.ua/patenikon/patchyt.htm> [dostup 10.01.2013].

The Secondary Bibliographical Sources in the English Transcript:

- Abramovich D.I.**, *Kiev-Pechery Patericon*: reprint, Chas, Kiev 1991, 280 p.
- Averintsev S.**, *The Poetics of the Early Byzantine Culture*, Azbuka-klassika, Saint-Petersburg 2004, 480 p.
- Bigun O.**, *The Synaxary in Taras Shevchenko's Works: Reception and Interpretation*, „Language and Culture”, D. Burago (head editor), Kiev 2012, № 15 (vol. 3), p. 263-270.
- Buchynskiy D.**, *The Christian and Philosophical Conceptions of Taras Shevchenko*, Ukrainian Alliance in the Great Britain, Madrid-London 1962, 256 p.
- Bychkov V.**, *2000 Years of the Christian Culture: Sub Specie Aesthetica*, V. 1: *The Early Christianity: Byzantine*, Universitetskaya kniga, Moscow - Saint-Petersburg 1999, 573 p.
- Horsky V. S.**, *The Essay on the History of Philosophic Culture of Kievan Rus (from the Middle of 12th until the Middle of 13th Century)*, Naukova dumka, Kiev 1993, 162 p.
- Hrushevsky M. S.**, *History of Ukrainian Literature*, vol. 3, Lybid, Kiev 1993, 285 p.
- Literary Encyclopedia**, Yu. Kovaliv (head editor), vol. 2: M-Ya, Akademia, Kiev 2007, 624 p.
- Nakhlik Y.**, *Fate. Taras Shevchenko and Polish and Russian Romantics*, Svit, Lviv 2003, 568 p.
- Nalyvayko D.**, *The Literature Theory and Comparative Studies*, Publishing House Kiev-Mohyla Academy, Kiev 2006, 347 p.
- Ohienko I.**, *The Bizantine Culture and Ukraine* [in:] *Ukraine: Philosophical Heritage of the Centuries*, „Klronika 2000”, Yu. Buryak (head editor), Kiev 2000, № 37-38, pp. 117-128.
- Rosovetskiy S.**, *The Christian Hagiography in Taras Shevchenko's Literary Works*, [in:] *Themes and Motives of Taras Shevchenko's Poetry*, N. Chamata (head editor), Kiev 2008, p. 321-342.
- Slipushko O.**, *The Spiritual State of Taras Shevchenko in the Context of Ukrainian Literary Tradition*, „Shevchenko's studies”, H. Semeniuk (head editor), Kiev 2009, № 12, p. 153-163.
- Toporov V.**, *The Sanctity and the Saints in the Russian Ecclesial Culture*, V. 1: *The 1st Century of Christianity in Rus*, Gnosis, Languages of Russian Culture, Moscow 1995, 870 p.

Zemsky Yu., *Degradation of the Social Role of the Orthodox Clergy of Ukraine in the Conditions of the Russian Empire Policy during 19th Century*; (electronic source:)

https://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/nzzpmv/2009_20/Zemsky.pdf; [Access: 03.01.2013].

Zhylenko I., *The Issues and the History of the Kiev-Pechery Patericon*,

<https://www.litopys.org.ua/paterikon/patchyt.htm> [Access 10.01.2013].

Information about the Author (in English):

Oľga Al'bertivna Bigun (Ольга Альбертівна Бігун), Ph.D. [C.Sci.], graduated from the Faculty of Romance Philology (French language and literature) at the Yuriy Fed'kovych Chernivtsi National University (1998) and has a degree of Candidate of Sciences [PhD] in Comparative Literature. She defended her candidate thesis entitled *The Genre Typology of Poem in Prose (French and Ukrainian Literatures of the Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries)* at the Volodymyr Hnatyuk Temopil' National Pedagogical University in 2009. Since 2012 she has been a doctoral candidate (Comparative Studies) at the Taras Shevchenko Kiev National University (Ukraine) in the Department of Literary Theory, Comparative Studies and Literature.

Her email is olgabigun@mail.ru

Information about the Author (in Polish) / Informacja o autorce (po polsku):

Oľga Al'bertivna Bigun (Ольга Альбертівна Бігун), C.Sci. [Ph.D.], ukończyła Wydział Romanistyki i Germanistyki (język i literatura francuska) na Czerniowieckim Uniwersytecie Narodowym im. Jurija Fedkowycza (1998), kandydat nauk filologicznych w zakresie literaturoznawstwa porównawczego (komparatystyki literaturoznawczej), obroniła pracę kandydacką na temat *Typologia gatunku poezji w prozie (literatura francuska i ukraińska końca XIX i początku XX w.)* w Temopolskim Pedagogicznym Uniwersytecie Narodowym im. Wołodynyra Hnatiuka (2009), od 2012 r. habilitantka – uczestniczka studiów postkandydackich (doktorskich na D.Sci.) z komparatystyki literaturoznawczej (literaturoznawstwo porównawcze) w Kijowskim Narodowym Uniwersytecie im. Tarasa Szewczenki w Kijowie (Ukraina) w Katedrze Teorii Literatury, Studiów Porównawczych i Twórczości Literackiej. E-mail: [olgabigun\[at\]mail.ru](mailto:olgabigun[at]mail.ru)

[polski przekład: Marek Mariusz Tytko]

Information about the Author (in Czech) / Informace o autorce (v češtině):

Olga Albertivna Bigunová (Ольга Альбертівна Бігун), C.Sci. [Ph.D.], vystudovala fakultu románsko-germánské filologie (francouzský jazyk a literaturu) na Černovické národní univerzitě Jurije Fed'koviče (1998), kandidátka filologických věd v oblasti srovnávací literární vědy (literární komparatistiky), obhájila kandidátskou práci na téma *Typologie žánru poezie v próze (francouzská a ukrajinská literatura konce 19. a začátku 20. století)* v Tamopolské národní pedagogické univerzitě Volodymyra Hnatjuka (2009), doktorandka, od r. 2012 je v postkandidátské přípravě na DrSci ze srovnávací literární vědy (literární komparatistiky) v Kyjevské národní univerzitě Tarase Ševčenko v Kyjevě (Ukrajina) na katedře teorie literatury a srovnávacích studií a literární tvorby. E-mail: [olgabigun\[at\]mail.ru](mailto:olgabigun[at]mail.ru)

[český překlad: Libor Martinek]

Information about the Author (in Slovak) / Informácie o autorke (v slovenčine):

Oľga Albertivna Bigunová (Ольга Альбертівна Бігун), C.Sci. [Ph.D.], vyštudovala fakultu románsko-germánskej filológie (francúzsky jazyk a literatúru) na Černovickej národnej univerzite Jurija Fed'koviča (1998). Je kandidátkou filologických vied v oblasti porovnávacej literárnej vedy (literárna komparatistika), dizertačnú prácu obhájila na tému *Typológia žánru poézie v próze (francúzska a ukrajinská literatúra konca 19. a začiatku 20. storočia)* na Tamopolskej národnej pedagogickej

univerzite Volodymyra Hnatjuka (2009). Habilitantka – od r. 2012 je na postkandidátskej príprave na DrSci. z porovnávej literárnej vedy (literárna komparatistika) na Kyjevskej národnej univerzite Tarasa Ševčenko v Kyjeve (Ukrajina) na katedre teórie literatúry a porovnávacích štúdií a literárnej tvorby. E-mail: olgabigun[at]mail.ru

[slovenský preklad: Ivica Hajdučková]

Information about the Author (in Russian) / Информация об авторе (по-русски):

Ольга Альбертовна Бигун, кандидат филологических наук (сравнительное литературоведение). Окончила факультет романо-германской филологии (французский язык и литература) Черновицкого национального университета имени Юрия Федьковича в 1998 году. Защитила кандидатскую диссертацию *Типология жанра стихотворений в прозе (французская и украинская литературы конца XIX – начала XX вв.)* в Тернопольском национальном педагогическом университете имени Владимира Гнатюка (2009). С 2012 года докторант кафедры теории литературы, компаративистики и литературного творчества Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко. E-mail: olgabigun[at]mail.ru

Information about the Author (in Ukrainian)

Інформація про автора / Довідка про автора (українською мовою)

Ольга Альбертівна Бігун, кандидат філологічних наук (порівняльне літературознавство). Закінчила факультет романо-германської філології (французька мова і література) Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича у 1998 році. Захистила кандидатську дисертацію *Типологія жанру поезії в прозі (французька та українська літератури кінця XIX – початку XX ст.)* у Тернопільському національному педагогічному університеті імені Володимира Гнатюка (2009). З 2012 року докторант кафедри теорії літератури, компаративістики і літературної творчості Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. E-mail: olgabigun[at]mail.ru

Information about the Author (in Belarusian) /

Звесткі пра аўтара (па-беларуску):

Вольга Альбертаўна Бігун, кандыдат філалагічных навук (параўнальнае літаратуразнаўства). Скончыла факультэт рамано-германскай філалогіі (французская мова і літаратура) Чарнавіцкага нацыянальнага ўніверсітэта імя Юрыя Федзьковіча ў 1998 годзе. Абараніла кандыдацкую дысертацыю *Тыпалогія жанру вершаў у прозе (французская і ўкраінская літаратуры канца XIX - пачатку XX стст.)* у Цярнопальскім нацыянальным педагагічным універсітэце імя Уладзіміра Гнатюка (2009). З 2012 года дактарант кафедры тэорыі літаратуры, кампаратывістыкі і літаратурнай творчасці Кіеўскага нацыянальнага ўніверсітэта імя Тараса Шаўчэнкі. E-mail: olgabigun[at]mail.ru

[тлумачэнне на беларускую мову: Eugeniusz Pańkow i Olga Pańkowa]