

Yao Ning Яо Нін

Teacher of Art at the Institute of Arts, Chongqing University
of Science and Arts (China)викладач, Інститут Мистецтв, Чунцінський університет науки
і мистецтв (КНР)orcid.org/0000-0002-9860-4851

Nataliia Markhaichuk Наталія Мархайчук

Ph.D. in Art Studies, Associate Professor, Head of the Department
of Television of the Kharkiv State Academy of Cultureкандидат мистецтвознавства, доцент, завідувачка кафедри
телебачення Харківської державної академії культуриe-mail: natalkakharkiv@gmail.com | orcid.org/0000-0002-2321-9107

Representation of Taras Shevchenko as an Artist in the Art of China

Репрезентація Шевченка-художника в мистецтвознавстві Китаю

Abstract. The article proves that in China Taras Grygorovych Shevchenko is primarily known as a genius poet. Throughout the entire 20th century, Shevchenko the poet and Shevchenko the revolutionary essentially overshadowed Shevchenko the artist. Shevchenko's artistic legacy attracted attention of Chinese scholars only at the turn of the 21st century, when new socio-political and cultural relations emerged between China and Ukraine. It is noted that in contemporary art criticism of China, T. Shevchenko is interpreted either, by analogy with Soviet science, as a “cultural revolutionary”, or as a collective image of the Ukrainian people, usually unappreciated. Based on the analysis of articles and works of Chinese scholars in varying degrees involved in comprehension of artistic heritage of T. Shevchenko, it is shown that absence of a common understanding of the historical development of Ukrainian art in Chinese art history often prevents Chinese scholars from realizing the role and place of Shevchenko the artist in Ukrainian art. For Chinese scholars, he remains a lyricist and a “poetic” artist (“literary painter”). The portrait genre is recognized as the most “convenient” for analysis by Chinese art critics due to national specifics of creative activity of T. Shevchenko. Within its framework, special attention is paid to self-portrait, which to a certain extent corresponds to Chinese understanding of T. Shevchenko as a “literary artist”. The analysis of female images in artistic heritage of T. Shevchenko is important and corresponds to the primary perception of Kobzar as a “poetic” artist and lyricist.

Keywords: Ukrainian art in art history of China, artistic heritage of T. Shevchenko, portrait and self-portrait in creative activity of T. Shevchenko.

Problem statement. For Ukrainian art and culture, the figure of Taras Shevchenko is important for a number of reasons. These include not only his special role as the pioneer of Ukrainian modern literature and a well-known public figure, but also as a national symbol, because “the figure of T. Shevchenko is undoubtedly equal to the figures of European ‘creators of national-consolidating author’s myth’, such as Dante, Miguel de Cervantes, Goethe, Ibsen, etc.” [7, p. 5].

In China, Shevchenko is mostly known as a great poet of the 19th century. “Chinese acquaintance with poems of Taras Grygorovych started during the 1920s and 1930s thanks to Ukrainian emigrants in Harbin and, later, in Shanghai where about 15 thousand Ukrainians lived. There were Ukrainian schools, gymnasiums, associations, in particular, the Council of the Ukrainian National Community, the Union of Ukrainian Youth, Prosvita and various newspapers where the works of Taras Shevchenko were published.

Ukrainians also had their own radio programs in Harbin and Shanghai. Ukrainian communities regularly held events dedicated to Taras Shevchenko” [3, p. 90]. Around this time, Chinese writer and literary critic Zhou Zuoren made the first translation of Shevchenko’s poems into Chinese (from Russian translations) and published materials about artist’s life and work.

Acquaintance of T. Shevchenko with Chinese culture can be traced in sporadic points of interest in socio-political life in China. Based on the statements of T. Shevchenko in the circle of friends and acquaintances, on the entries in his *Diary*, it may be argued that he was aware of the events of the Taiping Rebellion (1850–1864), which he perceived as a peasant opposition to alien religious and social orders [13, pp. 162, 344]. Chinese scholars emphasize that T. Shevchenko was concerned about this contemporary episode of Chinese history and clearly “loved China” [33]. Probably, for Shevchenko, the reasons for the Taiping

Rebellion had some parallels with the situation of peasants in the Russian Empire—a problem that runs a common thread through the entire work of T. Shevchenko. Modern Chinese researcher Zhao Yunzhong (赵云中) rightly notes that “using poetry as a weapon of struggle, he mercilessly reveals slavery and national coercion under autocratic government, demonstrates the people’s struggle against oppression, struggle for freedom and independence, reveals oppression of the Ukrainian nation by the tsarist government and harsh exploitation of peasants by landowners, expresses conviction that the struggle of the peoples of the Russian Empire must win” [25, p. 240–241].

Since Ukraine gained independence, interest of China in the legacy of Shevchenko has rapidly grown [6]. On August 8, 2008, the first monument to Shevchenko in China (sculptor Yuan Xikun) was opened in Chaoyang Park in Beijing. The peak of interest in the figure of Kobzar happened during the latest decade. In 2009, the Beijing University organized the first in China (and probably in the entire Asia-Pacific region) literary and artistic evening dedicated to T. Shevchenko. This event was timed to coincide with the release of a short popular science edition (booklet in Chinese) containing milestones of Shevchenko’s biography, some poems and reproductions of his artworks. Since then, T. Shevchenko became much more than a poet for China.

In 2016 in Beijing, the T. Shevchenko Museum-Gallery was opened and a large poem collection of Kobzar translated to Chinese from Ukrainian (139 poetic texts) was published (on the basis of memorial complex of the Chinese artist Li Kezhan). It is important to note that leading Chinese Slavists (such as Ge Baoquan, Li Mingbin, and others) admitted that traditional translation of Kobzar from Russian into Chinese did not always make it possible to fully understand the meaning intended by the poet [3, p. 92]. The logical conclusion of this approach to the study of the poet’s literary heritage was the publication of an anthology of his poetry *Father of the Spirit of the Ukrainian People* in Chinese and Ukrainian languages in 2018. Its presentation took place on March 29 at the Tianjin Foreign Studies University (jointly with the Beijing Society for Foreign Studies) [11]. Today, scientists from the Center for the Study of Russia and Ukraine of Wuhan University and the Institute of World Literature of the Academy of Social Sciences of China carry out a number of interesting studies on the creative activity of T. Shevchenko. In addition, some universities in China, within the framework of Ukrainian studies, present training courses that introduce Chinese students to poetic heritage of Kobzar. However, for Chinese scholars, artistic heritage of T. Shevchenko still is generally overshadowed by his poetic talent.

Today, many international researchers interpret T. Shevchenko as a collective image of Ukrainian nation in its political and cultural development. In this context, the story of Shevchenko the artist turns into a kind of background, which is often used as an excuse to study other aspects of his work, or as a motivation for analyzing general problems in the study of Ukrainian national genesis.

The analysis of recent research works and publications of creative and cultural heritage of T. Shevchenko as a whole shows that there are much more studies of his literary heritage than of the artistic one.

Studies on the visual artworks by Shevchenko in the Western European and North American historiography of the second half of the 20th century are fragmentary and sporadic. For example, scientific publications of the 1960s and 1970s mainly emerged in academic environment of the Ukrainian diaspora [34; 35; 39]. Such a “closed nature” (lacunarity) of the topic, of course, determined its peripheral nature for Chinese researchers. Studying T. Shevchenko as an aesthetic phenomenon of his time, who incorporated literature and visual arts into a single system of artistic thinking, is associated with the works of George G. Grabowicz. It should be noted that Grabowicz omits the Chinese studies of the creative activity of T. Shevchenko and concentrates mainly on the literary-centric image of Shevchenko as a poet [36; 37; 38].

In Ukrainian art history, creative work of Kobzar did not always exist as a separate scientific problem. The first studies dedicated specifically to the poet’s artistic heritage appeared a couple of decades after his death. However, the first monographic study on the Shevchenko’s legacy as a painter was published only in 1914. It stated that his artistic creativity was “real vocation and his primary poetic talent could not be suppressed in him” [9, p. 3].

A new stage in the study of T. Shevchenko’s oeuvre started during the 1920s, when the institute named after Taras Shevchenko was established in Kharkiv. Comprehensive study of the poet’s heritage was the central issue on its agenda [8, p. 162]. At the time, the complete collection of Shevchenko’s works, including his artistic heritage, was prepared for publication. The monograph by D. Antonovich, published in Prague in 1937 [2] became an important study of creative activity of Shevchenko as an artist when “after ideological ‘cleansing,’ the glory of T. Shevchenko as a revolutionary practically did not give a chance to see him as an artist and forcibly changed the methodology, affected the scope of research, the point of view on the covered events” [8, p. 169].

Artistic heritage of Taras Shevchenko in the Context of European Artistic Culture by V. Ovsyichuk published in 2008 is one of the most profound studies of artistic work of T. Shevchenko [10]. Ovsyichuk, one of the leading figures of Ukrainian art criticism in many respects, views the well-known facts and issues of creative activity of Kobzar in a new way, deconstructing such prevailing stereotypes as “Shevchenko the peasant’s child,” “Shevchenko the revolutionary,” rethinking his heritage in the mainstream of modern scientific knowledge and considering his creativity in the context of European artistic culture development.

In modern Chinese historiography, the image of Shevchenko the artist is extremely scant. In the 1950s, following the logic of the Soviet presentation of the socio-political and cultural history of the USSR, Shevchenko entered the pantheon of “cultural revolutionaries.” All of the above

determined the fact that the image of the national poet prevailed over seeing Shevchenko as an artist. This lasted until 1991, when an interest to a more holistic image of the Great Kobzar appeared in China. During this period, Gao Wei, San Wei, Zhao Yanfeng, Ge Bao Quan and others expressed some judgments about Shevchenko the artist. In general, Chinese researchers know that while studying painting with the great Karl Bryullov at the St. Petersburg Academy of Arts, T. Shevchenko achieved high results and secured himself a position of a “teacher of painting” at the Kyiv University. However, in modern Chinese historiography, when there is a sufficiently large number of references and evaluations of Shevchenko’s artistic talent, there is no synthetic monographic study on Shevchenko as an artist, which proves the relevance of the chosen research subject. It should be noted that working with the original Chinese sources constitutes a certain methodological difficulty for the researcher of T. Shevchenko. When transliterating a name of foreign origin, translators are free to use different hieroglyphs due to wide homonymy of the Chinese language. In China, the name of T. Shevchenko has at least nine different forms.

Objectives of the study. In this article, it is considered necessary to draw attention to a number of common features that bring Shevchenko the artist closer to the Chinese artistic tradition. While answering the question how contemporary Chinese art criticism understands the history of Ukrainian art, one inevitably faces the “Shevchenko issue.” It has several important aspects.

For Chinese science, the conversation about how Shevchenko the poet relates to Shevchenko the artist *is of paramount importance*, because poetic word and visual space have many points of intersection in Chinese artistic tradition. In some cases, it is practically impossible to separate one from the other, except the aspect of methodological analysis.

The second most important issue for contemporary analysis of the history of art in China is Shevchenko’s self-presentation, primarily through a self-portrait. Shevchenko repeatedly painted self-portraits and, according to Ukrainian researchers, it was not only of everyday importance for him, but also was perceived as an opportunity to express “the spirit,” to comprehend inner self-understanding. Based on the example of artworks of Chinese artists today this feature is noticed by many Chinese researchers of self-portrait as a genre. In our opinion, a comparison of self-portraits by T. Shevchenko with the artworks of Chinese authors will help to reveal those aspects in the discussion that are not considered as paramount by modern researchers.

The third issue which we conceive as the key issue in the analysis of T. Shevchenko as an artist is the problem of female images in his paintings. In modern Chinese science, this topic has been dominant over the last few decades. It is associated not only with an attempt to penetrate the aesthetics of female image expressed by painting, but also to get better understanding of boundaries of gender stereotypes in modern artistic language.

Undoubtedly, outlined aspects do not entirely represent the issue of creative perception of Shevchenko the artist

in modern Chinese scientific dialogue. At the same time, we believe that it is these aspects of art history analysis that most completely portray T. Shevchenko the artist in the field of contemporary scientific interests of Chinese art history.

We consider it necessary to highlight *methodological features* of our analysis. In modern Chinese art research dominates the figurative-stylistic and comparative analysis which makes it possible to understand artistic integrity of a work, its emotional-figurative structure. However, it is important to know that in the Chinese tradition, the analysis is focused on those aspects of artistic process that are not always provable in Ukraine. This also applies to the study of style statements and attempts to penetrate the images of the author’s artistic thinking. The philosophical nature of many statements of Chinese researchers is based on traditions of Chinese culture and deep understanding of national art, its forms, styles, spatial and plastic characteristics, etc. When faced with artistic language of other peoples, simple transfer of traditional methods to new and often unfamiliar goals and objectives does not always become a reliable basis. For example, analysis of the artwork composition is important for the study of Ukrainian painting. And if in the Chinese art research, first of all, this aspect is understood as the study of figurative integrity, in Ukrainian art history different approach prevails. For example, self-portraits by T. Shevchenko are viewed by many authors as a study of the “depth” of artistic space, as a task related not only to the idea of a work, but also to its “craft” structure (technique, material, form).

For both Chinese and Ukrainian art history, the analysis of coloration and color scheme is of great importance. However, in this sense, the tendencies of modern approach to the material have obvious differences. Thus, the Chinese traditional systems for the study of color in painting are based on the national cultural forms that are not always applicable to art in Eastern Europe. For example, the coloristic program of Shevchenko’s artworks, where female images are most vividly used, is spatial. It is directly connected to the artist’s thoughts on form, perspective, and compositional volumes. People depicted in Shevchenko’s artworks always have their own place in the picture. They are interpreted as fragments of real life with its irregularities, darkening and changes in light. Therefore, such an interesting coloring and unusual for Chinese art “color formula” are visible. Thus, our main methodological task is the convergence of the analysis formats of Chinese and Ukrainian researchers, which, in our opinion, will allow us to form a more comprehensive scientific vision of the problem. An analysis of the range of main issues considered by art critics from China will allow us to analyze the main points of contact between two scientific models of art vision.

Presentation of the main research material. The artistic heritage of T. Shevchenko is deeply national in its very spirit. However, defining this “spirit” of Ukrainian art for Chinese researchers becomes possible only after comprehending the specifics of artistic life of in Ukrainian lands, not only by the 18th and during the first half of the 19th century, but also throughout all previous eras: princely (10th–13th centuries),

late medieval or “Polish-Lithuanian” (14th–15th centuries) and the era of “Ukrainian Baroque” (17th–18th centuries) [See: 1].

Today, the main vector of analysis of Chinese art history is aimed at comprehending philosophical and aesthetic content of the artist’s artworks. At the same time, the issues of artistic form, the search for compositional techniques and means of expression are perceived by Chinese scientists as a secondary task. This feature brings together and alienates scientific paradigms of Ukraine and China. Figurativeness, poetry and lyricism, orientation towards literary works are easily comprehended by Chinese scholars, sometimes serving as the only definitions for Ukrainian art. The image of an universal master, a creator in every sense of the word (when artist and a poet are merged together) plays a special role in Chinese art. T. Shevchenko as “The Great Kobzar” is perceived by Chinese researchers as the harmony of two main aspects of his creative activities: literary-poetic and artistic-pictorial. For example, since the 1980s, Chinese art criticism had used the term (“artist-writer”), in the context of which the idea of the “dual world” of the creator, his universal artistic experience was developed [29].

Thus, the contexts in which T. Shevchenko is perceived by the Chinese art science are diverse. The image of a literary genius, in which the traits of Shevchenko as an artist act as supplementary to the image of the creator-poet (“artist-writer”) is of primary importance.

Ukrainian theme entered the Chinese scientific environment not directly but through intermediaries. For example, Kim Suk Won, the Korean researcher and translator of many Shevchenko’s works, defines this path as complex and sophisticated, “In Korea, China and Japan in the 19th and early 20th centuries, Ukrainian literature was considered to be a part of Russian literature. Therefore, in the Japanese *Anthology of World Poetry* in the section ‘Russia’ you one could find translations of the works of T. Shevchenko” [5, p. 244]. Thus, today there are at least two images of Shevchenko as a creator, one of which is based on the original works, while the other, on the contrary, penetrates the Chinese humanitarian environment as a part of Russian scientific program.

It should be noted that this tendency does not leave modern stage of the artistic heritage analysis of T. Shevchenko. In this sense, the position of Gao Wei is somewhat different. In 1987, he noted his special “fundamental” role in the formation of artistic illustration of the book. The author draws special attention to the fact that T. Shevchenko entered the history of art as a “great Ukrainian writer” and “one of the best illustrators.” In particular, the author mentions illustrations to the lyrical epic *Haidamaky*, where the concept of illustration itself is presented in independent watercolor artworks. They cannot be regarded to be simple illustrations to the text [31].

An important aspect in assessing the role of Shevchenko as an artist is how Chinese researchers perceive him to be the bearer of his unique literary and artistic aesthetics. For many researchers of art in China, the idea of figurative and stylistic perception of his poetry is equivalent to the as-

essment of his artistic and pictorial work. In the context of translation practice of Shevchenko’s texts, this feature is illustrated by N. Isaeva, the researcher from Kyiv. She states that “translation inevitably reflects the Chinese-philosophical tradition which dictates the placement of additional conceptual accents to the text of T. Shevchenko” [4, p. 228]. First of all, it is a question of understanding the figurative-symbolic space of T. Shevchenko, his allegorical language (both in poetry and in painting), as well as the author’s aesthetics (both in textual and in pictorial senses). For example, “the Old Slavonic vocabulary and established biblical expressions were the most difficult parts for translation. They vividly illustrate national specificity of analyzed poetry and also play the role of stylistic means of expression of sublimity, holiness of the proclaimed idea. To preserve emotional palette and compensate limited morphological capabilities of the Chinese language, translators use various techniques. One of them includes expansion of the word meaning and enriching emotionality by using a synonymic row” [4, p. 225]. Authors trying to analyze pictorial images in the artworks by T. Shevchenko use a similar technique, trying to show incomprehensible, not too culturally identical as a set of synonyms, side interpretations and parallel developments of the main theme. For example, this resembles the reverse strategies of Ukrainian authors trying to approximate formal-stylistic and compositional properties of the Chinese traditional painting to the terminology existing in the Eastern Europe. We can assume that in this case there is a typical problem of representation of the content associated with the problem of figurative “transliteration”.

One of the most typical examples of transferring the meaning of Shevchenko the poet to Shevchenko the artist is the assessment of his role in the genesis of literature and art. Such an assessment is typical for the position of Ge Bao Quan (戈宝权), the most famous translator of poetry of T. Shevchenko in China. The researcher presents T. Shevchenko as a genius poet, unique figure in the history of Ukrainian literature, determined precisely by his universal influence both on the development of language and on the formation of artistic space. In Ge Bao Quan’s works, T. Shevchenko is “the founder of new Ukrainian literary language” and this feature characterizes his “revolutionary painting” [20]. It should be mentioned that Ge Bao Quan is aware of the fact that he came across the genius of T. Shevchenko during the 1940s studying Russian literature, which in some way determined original nature of his understanding of Kobzar’s creative activity [19, p. 26–27]. By the way, for some Chinese scientists of the older generation, the very fact of the poet’s studies at the St. Petersburg Academy of Arts and his long stay in St. Petersburg is often the key to defining him as a Russian artist. At the same time, they omit the fact that, “Seeing the cause of national disaster in obvious anti-Ukrainian policy of the tsarist government, he fought against it with the power of his creative spirit and cherished awakening of the true beginning of the Ukrainian national soul” [7, p. 6], and therefore, of course, he is the founder of the Ukrainian national art school.

Ge Bao Quan compares the role of Kobzar in Ukrainian culture with the role of Pushkin in Russian culture. However, in such a comparison, he seems to “attach” pictorial problematics to artistic and poetic ones, generalizing Shevchenko’s greatness and merits [18]. Thus, there is no surprise in the fact that modern researchers still consider creative activity of T. Shevchenko as a common artistic product. The Kobzar appears “equally brilliant” both in his literary and artistic image and in his artistic heritage. At the same time, artistic side of Shevchenko’s creativity is not so much analyzed as the subject of an art history conversation, but rather becomes an additional argument for substantiating unique cultural and historical role of Kobzar.

Similar principles of generalization of Shevchenko’s creative activity are typical for the other researchers from China. In particular, for the articles of Sun Wei (孙玮), published in 1961 [16] and Zhao Yanfeng, published in 1983 [32]. In the article by Sun Jian (孙佳文) (2016) T. Shevchenko is “a genius Ukrainian poet”, “the founder of a new literary language”, but at the same time “a symbol of Ukrainian spiritual culture”. It is the latter that determines the author’s attempt to show how the themes of “People” and “Motherland” are embodied in artistic heritage of Kobzar. However, the author argues more about difficult circumstances of the poet’s life than tries to determine actual artistic and aesthetic position of Shevchenko as an artist. In this sense, reasoning of Sun Jian about “Shevchenko the artist beyond the framework of literary creativity” seems interesting [17, p. 40–42].

Self-portraits of T. Shevchenko in China are equally precious along with *Kateryna* and his most recognizable artworks. They are known as publications in books, as well as projects that accompany the anniversary events. For example, in March 2011, as part of the exhibition on the occasion of the poet’s 197th birth anniversary, copperplate works of T. Shevchenko were exhibited in Beijing: *Self-portrait with a candle in hand* and *Self-portrait in a casing* [22].

In the Chinese science of art, the place of a self-portrait in artistic and aesthetic palette of plastic arts is determined not so much by traditional views on this painting genre as by the long evolution of acquaintance with self-portrait in the art of Europe. In this aspect, the study by Yuan Yue (袁悦) is of great interest. The author outlines main features of perception of this genre of painting by Chinese scientists. Yuan Yue argues that self-portrait as a special form of portraiture is somewhat distant from traditional understanding of the painting. It is characterized by the artist’s interaction with external environment, a demonstration of his social and cultural intentions. At the same time, the genre unfolds as a specific art form (“full of life and unique charm”), which is designed to emphasize human nature of creativity [24]. In our opinion, all the mentioned features to varying degrees could be found in the self-portraits (and portraits) of T. Shevchenko.

The typology of self-portrait is offered for consideration by Lin Dawei (林大), the author of a study on the evolution of the “Western” self-portrait. It is interesting to note that the scientist covers all the main stages in the development

of this genre of painting, asserting a certain sequence in each period. Such a linear research structure forms, in a way, a direct causal relationship between each of the stages in general genesis of the self-portrait. Lin Dawei refers self-portrait genre of the 19th century, within which T. Shevchenko worked, to the space of “inspired myths about bohemian rebels and martyrs.” In our opinion, this metaphor correlates with artistic and aesthetic attitudes in the visual art of Kobzar, especially of the 1840s–1850s period. The Chinese scholar notes that a self-portrait is a kind of “spiritual confession of an artist”, a special art, “indicating the inner world of the author.” During this period, self-portrait is always focused on what is not obvious and does not lie on the surface of artistic perception [21]. The other side of self-portrait in European art is noted by Wang Juhui (王羽慧). His attention is focused on stylistic issues, means of expression and the author’s vision and understanding of himself as an object of artistic and plastic analysis. According to the author, any master of the past who experimented with self-portrait genre, faced social, socio-cultural, aesthetic and other challenges. All of that influenced creativity and at the same time demonstrated the artistic growth of a painter, his personal stylistic and artistic evolution. Thus, questions of inspiration and imaginative motivation were always at the forefront of this complex creative introspection, which led the author to the next attempts to “retell” himself [23].

We note a similar evolution of the inner world in the series of self-portraits by T. Shevchenko, which are in many respects unique for their staging. The artist’s attempts to fix elusive line between different states are evident: joy, sadness, detachment, a wise understanding of the essence of things, etc.

Tian Xiaolei (田笑蕾) proposed another important understanding of the development of modern research of the self-portrait genre in Chinese art science. The author explores the issue of aesthetic self-awareness in self-portrait trying to substantiate technical, technological, stylistic and figurative points of contact between Chinese and European art. From his point of view, self-portrait as a genre is the most accessible source for analyzing the relationship between creator and his art. It is the presentation of oneself as a subject of painting that demonstrates full depth of the author’s artistic means and technique, as well as philosophical and aesthetic preferences. Tian Xiaolei considers the problem in two overlapping aspects. Within the first, he explores “spiritual meaning” and social relationships of the artist. Furthermore, in a more specific analysis of art, we are talking about artistic means of expression such as technique, color, composition and stylistic solutions. It is interesting to note that applying this scheme to the analysis of a self-portrait in European art Tan Xiaolei comes to conclusion that there are two creative programs: “positive” and “negative”. Each of the programs depends on the nature of the artist’s creativity, his movement in art, technique and figurative-stylistic task or social vision and understanding of a certain “spiritual”, “inner” meaning of creativity [26]. It is in these aspects that Chinese scientists comprehend and interpret self-portraits of T. Shevchenko known to them.

The study of female images in the heritage of T. Shevchenko has a somewhat different direction in Chinese art research than in the analysis of the self-portrait issue. It is based on a comparative analysis of development of painting in China and Europe, as well as an attempt to determine the nature of European art influence on Chinese art and vice versa. It is especially important to understand that for Chinese scholars the nature of oriental art influence on the models of artistic thinking in Europe in the second half of the 19th and early 20th century, tangibly affects the first half of the 19th century as the era of the classicist canon end and the beginning of romanticism.

For example, Chinese researchers, analyzing the process of mutual influence of Chinese and European painting, investigate the phenomenon of “infiltration and integration” of both forms of artistic thinking. At the same time, attempts to determine stylistic evolution lead scientists to understanding of various semantic interpretations of artistic and stylistic phenomena. Thus, time shift of “impressionism” leads to a different understanding of the “realism” concept. Obvious influence of oriental aesthetics on European impressionists sharpens the question of evolution nature itself [30].

All of the above determines the place of creative activity of T. Shevchenko in general structure of European art genesis—in the form in which it is perceived by the Chinese art studies. It should be noted that since the mid-2000s, Chinese scholars increasingly reconsider the role of “westernization” of painting, which somewhat changes the very essence of analysis in a number of studied problems. For example, Lu Jamin (路家明), back in 2009, suggested that the influence of the Repin Academy of Fine Arts on the development trends of Chinese painting may have a reverse perspective: “The Academy has a long history ... The science of painting has undergone significant evolution during this time. This institution has trained a large number of artists, including famous masters of realistic painting: Surikov, Repin, Serov, Vrubel and others. Many famous Chinese artists studied here in the 1950s and that greatly influenced the Chinese art world. However, a different time has come, and modern Chinese art world is open to change from all over the world, and not just within the framework of the former USSR or ‘Westernization.’ Russian oil (easel) painting now alienates us from our aesthetic (visual) core. In fact, when we talk about Russian painting, as a rule, we think about drawing with ink ‘seu pai’” [27, p. 78]. It should be noted that discussion about the influence on painting always takes place in parallel with rethinking of the art history. In this example, we see not only some incorrect generalization of stylistic evolution (for instance, in understanding of Ukrainian scholar

M. Vrubel as an artist of the modern era, not a representative of realism), but also an attempt to present the degree of difference in understanding of painting as such.

Another important understanding of the role and place of T. Shevchenko in artistic process of the 19th century is provided by the discussion of Chinese art in the European context. For example, Da Shiqi (达世奇) raises several important questions. The author, in particular, asserts that “for the Chinese art of painting and calligraphy, it remains a mystery why famous artists of Western Europe are included in the world artistic process, while Chinese masters of the same time and their masterpieces are left aside? It is generally believed that the so-called world art history is written by Western authors in terms of the dominance of Western aesthetics. However, in this case, the question arose why it is impossible to include great representatives of realistic painting of Eastern Europe in the world evolution of art ... who greatly affected Chinese painting in the 1950s?” [28, p. 60].

Conclusions. Thus, the analyzed material allows to draw the following conclusions.

Firstly, the absence of a synthetic (generalizing) understanding of the development of the history of Ukrainian art significantly affects the understanding of the role and place of personality of Shevchenko in the Ukrainian artistic genesis. For Chinese researchers he is primarily a poet and his peculiar “artistic talent” in the works of the 1950s–1980s determined specificity of the perception of his pictorial language as a “poetic” artist, lyricist, and master of metaphorical expression for several decades.

Secondly, to a significant extent the aforementioned perception trend of Shevchenko’s creativity determined the interest of Chinese researchers in the self-portrait genre. In fact, Chinese scholars, following the traditional path of analysis, have identified the problem of artistic self-presentation as the most common one for answering the question: what role is assigned to Shevchenko the artist in the evolution of Eastern European and Ukrainian art?

Thirdly, attention is drawn to accentuated study of female images in the work of Shevchenko as an artist, which, in our opinion, generally corresponds to the primary perception of the Great Kobzar as a lyrical artist and poet. It should be noted that this aspect requires further research. In our opinion, it is wrong to limit complex and multifaceted creativity of T. Shevchenko to the search for metaphorical statements. At the same time, importance of gender studies should be acknowledged, especially in the context of searching for the common artistic meanings in the mid-19th century visual arts.

References

1. Yao, Ning. (2018) 'The Art of Ukraine in the Art History of China: the Problem of "Vision"'. *Traditsiyyi i novatsiyyi u vischiiy arhitekturno-hudozhniiy osviti*, [online] 3, pp. 96–100 [online]. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1443114> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
2. Antonovych, D. (2004) *Shevchenko-maliar*. Kyiv: Ukraina.
3. Diachenko, O. (2016). 'Rozvytok shevchenkoznavstva v KNR u 20 — na pochatku 21 st.', *Visnyk Dnipropetrovskoho universytetu. Seriya «Istoriia ta arkhelohiia»*, 24, pp. 89–92 [online]. Available at: <http://oaji.net/articles/2017/4767-1494220905.pdf> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
4. Isaieva, N. (2008) 'Tryptykh T. Shevchenka "Dolia", "Muza", "Slava" v kytayskykh perekkladakh: problema retseptsiy', *Shevchenkoznavchi studii*, (10), pp. 221–228.
5. Kim, SukVon (2008) 'Pereklady tvoriv Tarasa Shevchenka v literaturi narodiv Zakhodu i Skhodu', *Shevchenkoznavchi studii*, (11), pp. 241–249.
6. Liu, Du. (1990) 'Ukrainoznavstvo v Kytai', *Suchasnist: Literatura, mystetstov, suspilne zhyttia*, 3, 27–31 [online]. Available at: https://archive.org/stream/suchasnist/1990_N03_347_djvu.txt (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
7. Markhaichuk, N. and Troian, A. (2015) 'Postat Shevchenka', in *Monumentalna shevchenkiana Kharkivshchyny: Za materialamy do Kharkivskoho tomu «Zvid pam'iatok istorii ta kultury Ukrainy»* [online] Kharkiv: Rarytety Ukrainy. Available at: http://www.spadschina.kh.ua/assets/files/Vidannya/Mon_Shev.pdf (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
8. Markhaichuk, N. (2012). Materialy k izucheniyu istorii shevchenkovedeniya v Xarkove (20–30-e gody 20 veka). *Aktualnye problemy mirovoj khudozhestvennoj kultury: sbornik dokladov Mezhdunar. nauchnoj koferencii*. Grodno: GNU imeni Yanka Kupala, pp. 162–169.
9. Novytskyi, O. (1914) *Taras Shevchenko yak maliar*. [online] Lviv; Moskva: Nakladom Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka. Available at: http://uartlib.org/downloads/Novickiy_TarasShevcnenko_uartlib.org.pdf (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
10. Ovsiihuk, V. (2008). *Mystetska spadshchyna Tarasa Shevchenka u konteksti yevropeiskoi khudozhnoi kultury*. Lviv: Instytut narodoznavstva NAN Ukrainy.
11. U tyantszinskomu universiteti Inozemnih mov 29 bereznya vidbulasya prezentatsiya vidannya kitayskoyu ta ukrayinskoyu movami antologiyi poeziyi Tarasa Shevchenka [online]. Available at: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-diaspora/2435497-u-kitajskomu-universiteti-prezentuvali-dvomovnu-antologiu-poezii-sevcenka.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
12. Shevchenko, O. (2017) 'Populyarizacziya ukraïns' koï kul' tury na terenakh Kitayu: literaturnij aspekt'. *Ukraïna–Kitaj*, 1(7) [online]. Available at: <https://sinologist.com.ua/populyarizatsiya-ukrayinskoyi-kulturi/> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
13. Shevchenko, T. (1931) *Dnevnik* [online]. Moskva-Leningrad: Academia. Available at: https://imwerden.de/pdf/shevchenko_dnevnik_academia_1931_text.pdf (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
14. Shylenko, Y. (2014) 'Zhyvopysne polотно Tarasa Shevchenka «Kateryna»: istoriia pobutuvannia, atrybutsiia ta doslidzhennia', *Visnyk LNAM*, 25, pp. 238–246.
15. Yao, N. (2017) 'Ukrainy vtoroj poloviny XVIII—pervoj treti XIX veka v sovremennom iskusstvovedenii Kitaya: problema verifikacii', *Ukraïnska kultura: minule, suchasne, shlyaxi rozvitku*, 24, pp. 175–181. [online]. Available at: http://www.rshu.edu.ua/images/nauka/ukr_kult_min_such_rozv_nm_vip24.pdf (Accessed: 14 June 2020).

References

1. Yao Ning. The Art of Ukraine in the Art History of China: the Problem of "Vision" // *Традиції і новації у вищій архітектурно-художній освіті*. 2018. № 3. С. 96–100. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1443114
2. Антонович Д. Шевченко-маляр: монографія. Київ: Україна, 2004. 272 с.
3. Дяченко О. Розвиток шевченкознавства в КНР у ХХ — на початку ХХІ ст. // *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету. Серія «Історія та археологія»*. 2016. Вип. 24. С. 89–92. URL: <http://oaji.net/articles/2017/4767-1494220905.pdf> (дата звернення: 14.06.2020).
4. Ісаєва Н. Триптих Т. Шевченка «Доля», «Муза», «Слава» в китайських перекладах: проблема рецепції // *Шевченкознавчі студії*. 2008. Вип. 10. С. 221–228.
5. Кім Сук Вон. Переклади творів Тараса Шевченка в літературі народів Заходу і Сходу // *Шевченкознавчі студії*. 2008. Вип. 11. С. 241–249.
6. Лю Дунг. Українознавство в Китаї // *Сучасність: Література, мистецтво, суспільне життя*. 1990. № 3 (березень). Ч. 3 (347). С. 27–31. URL: https://archive.org/stream/suchasnist/1990_N03_347_djvu.txt (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
7. Мархайчук Н., Троян А. Постать Шевченка. Монументальна шевченкіана Харківщини: За матеріалами до Харківського тому «Звід пам'яток історії та культури України». Харків: Раритети України, 2015. С. 5–17. URL: http://www.spadschina.kh.ua/assets/files/Vidannya/Mon_Shev.pdf (дата звернення: 14.06.2020).
8. Мархайчук Н. Матеріали к изучению истории шевченковедения в Харькове (20–30-е годы ХХ века) // *Актуальные проблемы мировой художественной культуры: сборник докладов Междунар. научной коференции*. Гродно: ГНУ имени Янка Купала, 2012. Ч. 2. С. 162–169.
9. Новицкий О. Тарас Шевченко як маляр: монографія. Львів; Москва: Накладом Наукового товариства імені Шевченка, 1914. 173 с. URL: http://uartlib.org/downloads/Novickiy_TarasShevcnenko_uartlib.org.pdf (дата звернення: 14.06.2020).
10. Овсічук В. Мистецька спадщина Тараса Шевченка у контексті європейської художньої культури: монографія. Львів: Інститут народознавства НАН України, 2008. 414 с.
11. У Тяньцзіньському університеті іноземних мов 29 березня відбулася презентація видання китайською та українською мовами антології поезії Тараса Шевченка. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-diaspora/2435497-u-kitajskomu-universiteti-prezentuvali-dvomovnu-antologiu-poezii-sevcenka.html> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
12. Шевченко О. Популяризація української культури на теренах Китаю: літературний аспект // *Україна–Китай*. 2017. № 1 (7). URL: <https://sinologist.com.ua/populyarizatsiya-ukrayinskoyi-kulturi/> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
13. Шевченко Т. Дневник. Москва-Ленинград: Academia, 1931. URL: https://imwerden.de/pdf/shevchenko_dnevnik_academia_1931_text.pdf (дата звернення: 14.06.2020).
14. Шиленко Ю. Живописне полотно Тараса Шевченка «Катерина»: історія побутування, атрибуція та дослідження // *Вісник ЛНАМ*. 2014. Вип. 25. С. 238–246.
15. Яо Нин. Художники Украины второй половины XVIII — первой трети XIX века в современном искусствоведении Китая: проблема верификации. *Українська культура: минуле, сучасне, шляхи*

16. Sūn Wēi (1961) Wūkèlán rénmin shīrén xiè fū qín kē “Shìjiè zhīshì” dì 06 qī [online]. Available at: <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Article/CJFDTotal-SJZS196106009.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
17. Sūn Jiāwén. (2016) “Xiè fū qín kē de mínzú jīngshén zòngshù”, tiānjīn wàiguóyǔ dàxué bīnhǎi wàishi xuéyuàn “Wénxué jiàoyù” 03 qī 40–42 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/88863x/201606/668684410.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
18. Gē Bǎo quán. (1992) Wǒ yì “xiè fū qín kē shījī” “Zhōngguó fānyì” dì 5 qī 39–40 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/92822x/199205/1002953721.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
19. Gē Bǎo quán. (1997) Nánwàng de wūkèlán zhī xíng “huárén shí kǎn” dì 11 qī 26–27 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/87696x/199711/4000995121.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
20. Gē Bǎo quán. (1961) Wēidà de wūkèlán rénmin shīrén xiè fū qín kē yī jiniàn xiè fū qín kē shìshì yībǎi zhōunián “Wénxué pínglùn” dì 1 qī 68–85.
21. Lín Dàzǐ. (2008) Xīfāng zihuàxiàng yìshù shǐ lùn xuéwèi lùn wén: Shuòshì “Zhōngguó měishù xuéyuàn” [online]. Available at: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10355-2008140890.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
22. Máo Jūnyù. (2011) Xièpǔqín kē tóngbǎnhuà zhǎnlǎn liàngxiàng běijīng jīn tái yìshù guǎn “Wénhuà yuèkǎn” dì 5 qī 12 [online]. Available at: URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/86268x/201105/37556850.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
23. Wáng Yǔ huì (2008) Shì xī xīfāng zihuàxiàng de jīngshén nèihán xuéwèi lùn wén: Shuòshì “Qūfù shīfàn dàxué” [online]. Available at: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10446-2008098832.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
24. Yuán Yuè. (2004) Shì xī yìshùjiā de zihuàxiàng xuéwèi lùn wén: Shuòshì “Húnán shīfàn dàxué” [online]. Available at: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10542-2004090312.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
25. Zhào yún Zhōng. (2005) Wūkèlán: Chénzhòng de lìshǐ jiàobù. Shànghǎi: Huádōng shīfàn dàxué chūbǎn shè.
26. Tiánxiàolěi zihuàxiàng zhōng zìwǒ yìshì yǔ chuàngzuò de tàn suǒ xuéwèi lùn wén: Shuòshì “Hǎ’ěrbīn shīfàn dàxué” / 2011 nián [online]. Available at: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10231-1011242702.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
27. Lù Jiā Míng. (2009) Liè bīn měi yuàn yóuhuà jiàoxué de chéng chuán hé fāzhǎn “Běifāng měishù: Tiānjīn měishù xuéyuàn xué bào” dì 2 qī 78–81 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/83026x/200902/31490994.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
28. Dá Shì Qí. (2014) Zhōngguó shūhuà xīn lùn “Shànghǎi yìshùjiā” dì 2 qī 60–65 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/83256x/201402/49511547.html> (access date: 30.07.2020).
29. Lǚ Shū Yuán. (1982) lùn wénxué yìshùjiā de qíngxù jìyì “Shànghǎi wénxué” dì 09 qī [online]. Available at: <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Article/CJFDTotal-SHWE198209001.htm> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
30. Huáng Dān huī. (2011) Lùn zhōngxī yìshù de hù shèn yùgòng róng “zhōngguó měishù guǎn” dì 9 qī 18–27 [online]. Available at: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/89011x/201109/39928957.html> (Accessed: 14 June 2020).
31. Gāo Wēi. (1987) Wūkèlán wénxué: Yìshù chātǔ. Èluósī wénxué yìshù. dì 2.
32. Zhào Yǎnfēng. (1983) Wūkèlán de wēidà shīrén shì Sì Yukinke. Chényáng dàxué xué bào: Shèhuì kēxué. dì 1 qī 79–83.
33. Jī Yǒuzhì. (2014) Wēidà de wūkèlán rénmin shīrén xiè fū qín kē yǔ zhōngguó — jiniàn wūkèlán rénmin shīrén xiè fū qín kē dàncǎn
- розвитку. Рівне: РДГУ, 2017. Вип. 24. С. 175–181. URL: file:///E:/Downloads/ukrkm_2017_24_30.pdf (дата звернення: 14.06.2020).
16. 孙玮 乌克兰 人民诗人谢甫琴柯 《世界知识》。1961年 第06期。URL: <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Article/CJFDTotal-SJZS196106009.htm> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
17. 孙佳文 《谢甫琴柯的民族精神综述》，天津外国语学院滨海外事学院《文学教育》。2016年 第03期 40–42。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/88863x/201606/668684410.html> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
18. 戈宝权 我译《谢甫琴柯诗集》《中国翻译》。1992年 第5期 39–40。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/92822x/199205/1002953721.html> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
19. 戈宝权 难忘的乌克兰之行 《华人时刊》。1997年 第11期 26–27。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/87696x/199711/4000995121.html> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
20. 戈宝权. 伟大的乌克兰人民诗人谢甫琴柯 — 纪念谢甫琴柯逝世一百周年 《文学评论》。1961年 第1期 68–85。
21. 林大梓 西方自画像艺术史论 学位论文: 博士 《中国美术学院》。2008年。URL: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10355-2008140890.htm> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
22. 毛俊玉 谢甫琴柯铜版画展览亮相北京金台艺术馆 《文化月刊》。2011年 第5期 125。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/86268x/201105/37556850.html> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
23. 王羽慧 试析西方自画像的精神内涵 学位论文: 硕士 《曲阜师范大学》。2008年。URL: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10446-2008098832.htm> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
24. 袁悦 试析艺术家的自画像 学位论文: 硕士 《湖南师范大学》。2004年。URL: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10542-2004090312.htm> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
25. 赵云中. 乌克兰: 沉重的历史脚步. 上海: 华东师范大学出版社。2005年。
26. 田笑蕾 自画像中自我意识与创作的探索 学位论文: 硕士 《哈尔滨师范大》 2011年 URL: <http://cdmd.cnki.com.cn/Article/CDMD-10231-1011242702.htm> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
27. 路家明 列宾美术学院油画教学的承传和发展 《北方美术: 天津美术学院学报》。2009年 第2期 78–81。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/83026x/200902/31490994.html> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
28. 达世奇 中国书画新论《上海艺术家》。2014年 第2期 60–65。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/83256x/201402/49511547.html> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
29. 鲁枢元 论文学艺术家的情绪记忆《上海文学》。1982年 第09期。URL: <http://www.cnki.com.cn/Article/CJFDTotal-SHWE198209001.htm> (дата звернення: 30.07.2020).
30. 黄丹麾 论中西艺术的互渗与共融 《中国美术馆》。2011年 第9期 18–27。URL: <http://www.cqvip.com/qk/89011x/201109/39928957.html> (дата звернення: 10.05.2020).
31. 高伟乌克兰文学: 艺术插图. 俄罗斯文学艺术。1987年. 第2。
32. 赵艳凤乌克兰的伟大诗人是Si Yukinke. 沈阳大学学报: 社会科学。1983年第1第79-83页。
33. 纪有志 伟大的乌克兰人民诗人 谢甫琴柯与中国 — 纪念乌克兰人民诗人 谢甫琴柯诞辰200周年。2014年。URL: http://www.zgshifu.com/sub_view.asp?ncode=07230589f353c2da (дата звернення: 10.05.2020)
34. Buyniak V. Shevchenko the artist // Canadian Slavonic Papers. 1965. 7(1). С. 143–158. DOI: 10.1080/00085006.1965.11417897
35. Corbett D. Taras Shevchenko and Ira Aldridge: (The Story of Friendship between the Great Ukrainian Poet and the Great Negro

200 zhōunián [online]. Available at: http://www.zgshifu.com/sub_view.asp?ncode=07230589f353c2da (Accessed: 14 June 2020).

34. Buyniak, V. O. (1965) 'Shevchenko the artist', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 7(1), pp. 143–158. DOI: 10.1080/00085006.1965.11417897
35. Corbett, D. M. (1964). 'Taras Shevchenko and Ira Aldridge: (The Story of Friendship between the Great Ukrainian Poet and the Great Negro Tragedian)', *The Journal of Negro Education*, 33(2), pp. 143–150.
36. Grabowicz, G. G. (1982). *The poet as mythmaker: a study of symbolic meaning in Taras Ševčenk*. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
37. Grabowicz, G. G. (2006) 'Shevchenko in the Critical Essays of Ievhen Malaniuk', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 28(1/4), pp. 441–459.
38. Grabowicz, G. G. (2014) Taras Shevchenko: The Making of the National Poet. *Revue des études slaves*, 85(LXXXV–3), pp. 421–439.
39. Rozumnyj, J. (1977) Byzantinism and Idealism in the Aesthetic Views of Taras Shevchenko', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 19(2), pp. 193–206.

Tragedian) // *The Journal of Negro Education*. 1964. Vol. 33(2). P. 143–150.

36. Grabowicz G. The poet as mythmaker: a study of symbolic meaning in Taras Ševčenko. Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982.
37. Grabowicz G. Shevchenko in the Critical Essays of Ievhen Malaniuk // *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, (2006). Vol. 28(1/4). P. 441–459.
38. Grabowicz G. Taras Shevchenko: The Making of the National Poet // *Revue des études slaves*. 2014. Vol. 85(LXXXV–3). P. 421–439.
39. Rozumnyj J. Byzantinism and Idealism in the Aesthetic Views of Taras Shevchenko // *Canadian Slavonic Papers*. 1977. Vol. 19(2). P. 193–206.

Яо Нін, Мархайчук Н. В.

Репрезентація Шевченка-художника в мистецтвознавстві Китаю

Анотація. Показано, що в Китаї Тарас Григорович Шевченко насамперед відомий як геніальний поет. Протягом усього ХХ століття Шевченко-поет і Шевченко-революціонер значно заступали Шевченка-художника. Його художня спадщина привернула увагу китайський учених лише на межі ХХ–ХХІ століть, коли між Китаєм та Україною почали вибудовуватися нові соціально-політичні та культурні відносини. Відзначено, що в сучасному мистецтвознавстві Китаю постать Т. Шевченка трактують або аналогічно до радянської науки, як «культурного революціонера», або як збірний образ українського народу — зазвичай, так і не зрозумілий до кінця. У такому контексті іпостась Шевченка-художника відходить на другий план. На основі аналізу статей і праць китайських дослідників, які тією чи іншою мірою дотичні до осмислення художньої спадщини Т. Шевченка, показано, що відсутність у китайському мистецтвознавстві загального уявлення про розвиток українського мистецтва часто не дозволяє китайським вченим усвідомити роль і місце, яке посідає Шевченко-художник в українському мистецтві. Для китайських дослідників він лишається ліриком та «поетичним» митцем («художником-літератором»). Унаслідок національної специфіки творчості Т. Шевченка, найбільш «зручним» для аналізу китайськими мистецтвознавцями визнано портретний жанр. У його межах особливе значення приділяють автопортрету, який до певної міри відповідає розумінню Т. Шевченка як «художника-літератора». Не менш важливий і аналіз у художній спадщині Т. Шевченка жіночих образів, що також відповідає первинному сприйняттю Кобзаря як «поетичного» митця і лірика.

Ключові слова: українське мистецтво у мистецтвознавстві Китаю, художня спадщина Т. Шевченка, портрет та автопортрет у спадщині Т. Шевченка.

Яо Нін, Мархайчук Н. В.

Репрезентація Шевченко-художника в искусствоведении Китая

Аннотация. Показано, что в Китае Тарас Григорьевич Шевченко в первую очередь известен как гениальный поэт. На протяжении всего ХХ века Шевченко-поэт и Шевченко-революционер существенно оттесняли на задний план Шевченко-художника. Его художественное наследие привлекло внимание китайских учёных только на рубеже ХХ–ХХІ веков, когда между Китаем и Украиной начали выстраиваться новые социально-политические и культурные отношения. Отмечено, что в современном искусствоведении Китая Т. Шевченко трактуется либо, по аналогии с советской наукой, как «культурный революционер», либо как собирательный образ украинского народа, обычно до конца так и не понятый. В таком контексте ипостась Шевченко-художника уходит на второй план. На основе анализа статей и трудов китайских учёных, которые в той или иной мере причастны к осмыслению художественного наследия Т. Шевченко, показано, что отсутствие в китайском искусствоведении общего представления о развитии истории украинского искусства часто не позволяет китайским ученым осознать роль и место, которое занимает Шевченко-художник в украинском искусстве. Для китайских исследователей он остается лириком и «поэтическим» художником («художником-литератором»). В силу национальной специфики творчества Т. Шевченко, наиболее «удобным» для анализа китайскими искусствоведами признан портретный жанр. В его рамках особое значение уделяется автопортрету, который в определенной мере соответствует их пониманию Т. Шевченко как «художника-литератора». Немаловажное значение имеет и анализ в художественном наследии Т. Шевченко женских образов, что также отвечает первичному восприятию Кобзаря как «поэтического» художника и лирика.

Ключевые слова: украинское искусство в искусствоведении Китая, художественное наследие Т. Шевченко, портрет и автопортрет в творчестве Т. Шевченко.