

<http://doi.org/10.31861/pytlit2025.112.140>

УДК 821.161.2-1Фед.07:82.0(437)(092)

MEČISLAV KRHOON AND HIS "POETIC WORK OF YURIY FEDKOVYCH" AS A MULTICULTURAL INTERSECTION

Ivo Pospíšil

orcid.org/0000-0001-8358-0765

Ivo.Pospisil@phil.muni.cz

Prof., PhDr., DrSc.

Institute of Slavonic Studies

Masaryk University

Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Abstract. The present contribution is based on the author's previous texts about the work of the Czech specialist in Slavonic/Russian/Ukrainian/Belarusian studies, Mečislav Krhoun, especially about his extensive monograph "The Poetic Work of Yuriy Fedkovych" (Brno, 1973), and attempts to synthesize the personality of Mečislav Krhoun and to examine in more detail his epochal work, which has so far been known only fragmentarily even in Ukraine. The motivation for the contribution is also connected with the project of the Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, specifically prof. Lidiia Kovalets from the Department of Ukrainian Literature and dr. Taras Kovalets from the Department of History of Ukraine, to translate this work into Ukrainian. The aforementioned colleagues contacted the management of Masaryk University in Brno and asked for help in finding the heirs of Mečislav Krhoun for copyright reasons. I was willing and able to help them in this and look forward to the result of their work. This contribution – unlike my previous ones, which were based on the examination of comparative contexts, personal contacts with M. Krhoun and knowledge of his entire philological work – is focused in more detail on individual chapters and partial aspects of the examination of Yuriy Fedkovych's poetic work as an intersection of multiculturalism, since his purely national work is deeply permeated by the traditions of European culture and literature, and his Ukrainian-German biliterariness includes various stimuli from other national literatures, especially those of the Central European area. This is reflected in the chapters of Krhoun's monograph examining the existing literature on Fedkovych, his German

and Ukrainian origins, the genesis of his poetic work, his genre range, legendary poems, the poetry collections “Am Tscheremus” and “Dyki dumy” and the last poems. Krhoun’s work is historically anchored in his complex life path, in his life story, but also in the time of the book’s publication, to which the then vice-dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Brno, Jaroslav Burian, had great merit. Krhoun’s methodology is based on internal and external thematological and versological comparative studies of a rather positivist nature, but at the same time, partly also in the spirit of formist and formalist schools; he pays considerable attention to the poetics of Fedkovych’s work, its genesis, cultural background, connection with the poet’s life destinies and especially with his biliterariness, which was largely determined by the state organization and cultural influences in which the territory of Bukovina, as a part of the Austro-Hungarian Cisleithania (Cisleithanien), which it shared with the Lands of the Bohemian Crown, was located. Fedkovych used this to create a broadly conceived work that draws on a considerable breadth of European poetry. The tendency towards synthesis, which runs like a red thread through Krhoun’s entire work, forces the author to use various approaches of literary criticism: in addition to the positivist-comparative method, there is also the poetological, biographical, and partly psychological method, which together form an inseparable whole. Krhoun’s monograph is an original and distinctive part of the Brno school of Slavonic literary comparative studies of Frank Wollman and his disciples. This is complemented by historical anchoring, i.e. a cultural-historical approach. Therefore, Krhoun’s monograph should be viewed with a high degree of sensitivity through the prism of Fedkovych’s time with its language and period contexts and not deprive it of this historicity, i.e. not forcibly modernize his poetic heritage, while at the same time respecting the historical background of the author of the monograph and his courage to publish, in a time that was not very favourable, a very open, deep and factually precise work that anticipated contemporary approaches with its multicultural vision and contributed to deepening knowledge of the work of the Ukrainian classic connected to a specific cultural area.

Keywords: Brno Slavonic studies and the slavist Mečislav Krhoun; Yuriy Fedkovych and his poetic work; multiculturalism as a natural feature of the poet’s creations; his Ukrainian and German poetry; the importance of the Bukovyna area.

I have written about the Brno Slavist, but above all a Ukrainian and Russian scholar, and more generally an expert in the East Slavonic cultural area Mečislav Krhoun (1907–1982) several times and in various

contexts, especially about his book *Básnické dílo Jurije Fed'kovyče*, but also about his literary studies activities in general (Pospíšil 1997, 2000, 2001, 2002; Поспишил 2018). Now, in contact with the multicultural context, we will look at Krhoun's monograph in more detail, including in the context of its new update, a translation into Ukrainian, initiated by Lidiia Kovalets and Taras Kovalets, with whom I have recently collaborated in finding the copyright holder. We will also briefly recall the context of Brno Slavonic studies, within which Mečislav Krhoun worked, and we will characterize in more detail the contribution of his work on the Bukovinian poet, its methodology, its strengths and weaknesses in the sense of a certain one-sidedness of the research and perhaps even a lesser comparative contextuality of Ukrainian-Czech or Ukrainian-Slavonic in general.

At the beginning, I will allow myself a small memory of Mečislav Krhoun, who retired during the time of my studies, but often returned to his former office, where he sat with Jaroslav Mandát (1924–1986), an expert in Russian literary classics, Russian and Romance studies, to a set of several carved wooden figures that reminded him of his beloved Ukraine. So I missed him as a teacher: he lectured on medieval literature and sometimes folklore. From his narration, I also know at least a little about his life story. At that time, I was more interested in other topics and approaches, structuralism, comparative studies, the novel, chronicle, American-Slavonic comparison, so I perhaps paid less attention to him – and that was a mistake. Only when I became acquainted with his articles in the faculty literary history collection and later the aforementioned book, did I see behind them a strong personality, a type of researcher who is rare then and especially today: meticulous, with considerable research carefulness, deep philological preparation and the ability to perform detailed textual analysis. He demonstrated this most clearly in the monograph on Yuriy Fedkovych.

At the origins of Brno University Slavonic studies stood Professor Frank Wollman (1888–1969), among other works the author of *The Literature of the Slavs* (1928) and the polemical treatise *On the Methodology of Comparative Slavonic Literature* (1936). Wollman came to Brno – as a graduate from Charles University – from the Comenius University in Bratislava (1928) where he became an associate professor. The Polish literary theorist Edward Kasparski called his contribution to

literary scholarship “the Prague-Brno, or Czech, school of comparative and genre studies” (Kasperski 1999). However, in addition to Frank Wollman, the character of Brno University Slavonic literary studies was also shaped by other individuals, including professor Sergii Vilinsky (born 1876 in Chişinău/Kishinev, died in Prague 1950), former professor and vice-rector of the Novorossiysk University in Odesa, and in the winter semester of 1913, the teacher of the renowned Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975). Vilinsky left revolutionary Russia in 1920; all his books were stolen at the port of Odesa, so that, already in Europe, he was forced to buy his own books from second-hand book dealers. After difficult years in Bulgaria, where he taught primarily in Russian grammar schools and as a bank clerk, he found himself in Brno at the invitation of the Czech professors Stanislav Souček (1870–1935) and Václav Vondrák (1859–1925) from Masaryk University. A medievalist and Byzantine scholar, Vilinsky began to study both modern Russian and Bulgarian literature in Czechoslovakia, including M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin and Petko Todorov. Like his son Valery, he also wrote about the Czech Russian scholar and translator Alois Augustin Vrzal (pseudonym A. G. Stin, 1864–1930), who became a correspondent for famous Russian writers A. P. Chekhov, V. G. Korolenko, M. Gorky, and others (*Litteraria Humanitas...* 1996, Mandát 1986, Pospíšil 1992, 1996, 2006; Поспишил 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; Levý 1966; Levý a Palas 1968; Vilinskij 1928, 1933a, 1933b; Vilinský 1929; Вилинский 1900, 1906, 1911–1913, 1930, 1932; F. Wollman 1928, 1936, 1958, 2003, 2012; S. Wollman 1988, 1989).

Although Ukrainian studies were perceived from the very beginning as a natural component of Brno Slavonic studies, it did not become an independent specialty (later it was even banned), and for a long time there was no one here who could competently study the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian literature. Brno Ukrainian Studies as an independent field is a child of the 1990s. After long years when Ukrainian Studies could only be in Prague, this was a real breakthrough, especially when Olomouc joined Brno over time. However, this does not mean that at Masaryk University, of which Slavonic Studies is a founding field, a more prominent place was not found for Ukrainian Studies in its broad concept. The tradition of Brno Ukrainian Studies is indeed longer and we do not mean only the lecturership, the practical

language, but directly its scientific phase, especially the field of literary studies. The first person to specifically deal with Ukrainian literary studies was Mečislav Krhoun, the author of the monograph on Yuriy Fedkovych (Krhoun 1973). His birthplace already seemed to anticipate the focus of his work. Trembowla, now Ukrainian Terebovlia, is a city in the Ternopil (Tarnopol) region. It was part of Kyivan Rus' in the 11th century, and of the Kingdom of Poland from the 14th century; for many years it was a Polish border fortress that played an important role in the fight against various eastern invaders and the Ottoman Turks. During the period of Poland's weakening, it often changed its rulers; in the years 1772–1918 it was part of Austria-Hungary, later briefly of the West Ukrainian People's Republic (1918–1919), until 1939 it was again part of Poland, later of Soviet Ukraine, and thus the USSR, until 1991, when it became part of independent Ukraine. It is quite easy to imagine how many nations and languages have passed through here over the centuries and who all shaped the history of the city.

Krhoun studied history, geography and Czech at the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University in 1928–1933, was also a student of Arne Novák (1880–1939), later after the war (1946–1947) he also graduated in Polish and Russian, became a doctor of philosophy in 1935, taught at various grammar schools (Nový Bohumín, Spišská Nová Ves, Lučenec, Brno), after 1945 he was a lecturer at the University of Krakow, later worked at the Prague Slavonic Institute and stayed in Poland, Russia and Ukraine several times. At the faculty, he taught Old Russian literature, Russian folklore and methodology, but his scientific interests were mainly related to Belarusian, Ukrainian and Polish literature, although he also became (with Vlasta Vlašínová) a co-author of the *Small Dictionary of Russian Writers*. M. Krhoun knew Russian, Polish, Ukrainian and Belarusian, not to mention the then obvious German. The analyses of the work of the Bukovina native Yuriy Fedkovych, who was not only a Ukrainian but also a German poet, showed Krhoun's interest in the culture of the Central European area, its multilingualism and natural, not artificial, multiculturalism, which later became significantly impoverished as a result of tragic events, and this is what allowed him to explore the vast Central European panorama. The truth is that in difficult times, the Faculty of Arts in Brno managed to publish a publication that surprised Ukrainians themselves even after many years, when after 1991

they rediscovered and still rediscover their hidden authors, whose work was not in the spotlight for various reasons. In his 1973 monograph, Mečislav Krhoun showed a cultural space in which German, Slavonic, Jewish and even Armenian influences intertwined. The work of Yuriy Adalbertovych Fedkovych (1834 Storonet-Putylyiv, 1888 Chernivtsi) is well-known and international conferences are held about it, but Krhoun was one of the first, if not the first, to openly address its interliterary dimension and the internal connections of his Ukrainian and German work. It is a paradox that this book is not known by almost any dictionaries or historical overviews; it has been almost forgotten.

The core of the volume is twelve chapters that deal with the biography and artistic development of the poet and do not neglect his role as a Ukrainian – German biliterary author. Mečislav Krhoun was not a literary theorist, but rather a literary historian, and therefore there is rich material, long examples and comparisons, and fewer theoretical constructions. The first chapter is devoted to an analysis of the literature on Fedkovych, but the author himself openly expressed his concept here, which is Czech and European, placing Fedkovych's work in a broader comparative context. Thanks to the Vice-Dean for Science at that time Jaroslav Burian, a book was published in Brno in the early 1970s that anticipated new trends in the view of the complex literary process of Central, Southeastern and Eastern Europe. The most attractive part of Krhoun's brilliant book is his analysis of Fedkovych's Ukrainian collection *Poezii* and the German collection *Am Tscheremus*, in which Krhoun emphasized the Hutsul-Ukrainian mythical and legendary tradition, but also artificial inspirations from European, especially German romantic literature. We could also mention Krhoun's substantial contribution to the *Small Dictionary of Russian Writers* (2 volumes, Brno, 1970) and the authorship of several studies (Krhoun 1964, 1971), but the monograph on Fedkovych has permanently entered the world of Ukrainian studies and is, in my opinion, a key work of modern Ukrainian literature.

The monograph is divided into 16 chapters, including a bibliography, notes, a Russian summary, and a name and subject index. The core of the volume consists of twelve chapters containing an analysis of the poet's biography and artistic development, taking into account his Ukrainian – German literary heritage. Krhoun was not a

literary theorist; rather, he is a meticulous literary historian – his book contains rich material, extensive excerpts and comparisons, and less speculation and theoretical constructs. The first chapter is devoted almost entirely to an analysis of specialized literature devoted to Fedkovych (I. Franko, O. Makovey, M. Pyvovarov, and others), but the author himself expresses a concept here that is both Czech and European, opening the poet's work to a broad comparative framework. The literary scholar seeks the folklore roots of his poetry but simultaneously evaluates his German education and the influence of German reading and the German Romantic tradition. Krhoun naturally could not know the future trends in the development of the methodology of literary criticism, including comparative studies, among other things, what is now called biliterariness or even multiliterariness and multiculturalism, but he could not help but mention the German – Ukrainian – Polish – Russian context as a natural basis for the imagery of the Hutsul poet and at the same time show how German and Slavonic elements are intertwined in his poetics and how the Ukrainian territory is differentiated from the point of view of culture and mentality (Galicia, Bukovina, the Kyiv center, Eastern Ukraine, etc.). It seems that in the first half of the 1970s, a book appeared in Brno that anticipated the later study of the specifics of the area of Central and Southeastern Europe. Krhoun considers the distinctive features of Fedkovych's poetic work to be a synthesis of romantic and realistic projects and the anticipation of modernist trends. His literary criticism method is reminiscent of traditional *Stoffgeschichte* techniques, but considerable space is also devoted to the study of the metrics and poetics of the works.

Krhoun's monograph shows the values that result from the overall circumstances of the researched material, from the nature of Fedkovych's work, i.e. from the multicultural character of the Bukovina area in the sense of diachronic and partly synchronic, from Fedkovych's Ukrainian – German biliterariness and also from the fact that it belongs to the context of Galicia-Bukovina (then part of Austrian Cisleithania/Cisleithanien), but also has a background of Ukrainian literary classics from the center and east of today's Ukraine (then part of the Russian Empire) and, of course, Polish literature, not to mention the influences that affected Fedkovych during his military service (Italy).

However, there is also the character of the author of the monograph, a native of the territory of today's Ukraine; today's Terebovlia was once part of the Kingdom of Poland, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, a crown land of the Habsburg Empire (Cisleithania/Cisleithanien), briefly (1918–1919) of the West Ukrainian Republic, the Second Polish Republic, for a short time part of the USSR/Soviet Ukraine (1939–1941) based on a secret amendment to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, then occupied by German Nazis (1941–1944), later again became part of the USSR/Soviet Ukraine (1944–1991), after the collapse of the USSR it is part of independent Ukraine. The interpenetration of these circumstances, the ability of linguistic and mental empathy, at the same time the researcher's knowledge of the cultures and literatures of Central Europe with an emphasis on Eastern Europe, the poet's tendency towards the European south and at the same time towards the German poetic tradition (*die deutsche Romantik*) with an overlap with the sentimentalist poetics (*Empfindsamkeit*) of the 18th century formed a whole that created a sensitive, deep and more generally conceived work, but at the same time conservative and cautious in its conclusions.

Already in the introduction to his book, the author states its main goals, to which he includes the effort to create, as he states, a more just image of the poet, who was for many years the object of strict and even negative criticism. I would say that the main result of his research is the shifts in emphasis in understanding Fedkovych's work: emphasis on some collections, especially the Kolomyia collection, and mainly on the separate, scattered poems that did not fit into his first collection; he included carols in the poetic context, from which the poet created lyric-epic poems as material, and legendary songs that he interpreted differently. However, he omitted children's and military songs and fables, which, according to Krhoun, belong more to Fedkovych's educational activity than to his artistic one. He searched for and found a place for German poems in his work, including the early ones, and pointed to their filiation and genetic function in Ukrainian work; German poetry was a natural poetological inspiration. Krhoun emphasizes that part of the poet's work, poems, the importance of which, according to Krhoun, was underestimated. He pays great attention in particular to the genesis of individual poems, their redactions and the interconnectedness of German and Ukrainian work, i.e. to the ways in which Ukrainian and German

work permeate. Similarly, he notes the German and Ukrainian roots of Fedkovych's early work and the late poems, which, according to him, have considerable importance that was not recognized much in the past.

We must also realize that Krhoun's monograph was written in the 1960s and early 1970s and took into account the secondary literature on the subject that had been published up to that time, but at the same time only officially admissible at that time. At the same time, it relied on previously published editions and literature, as well as on the gradually discovered poems of Fedkovych, which had not been precisely identified until then. It is obvious that the author is not so much interested in the poetics of Fedkovych's work in a broader context, but that it occurs gradually from the genesis of the text, the identification of individual poems, their filiations and textual shifts. I am convinced that this publication by Krhoun, although so distant from us in time, cannot be omitted even in today's analyses of Fedkovych's work, even though its results at that time may be surpassed many times over. A true understanding of Krhoun's contribution would probably require an in-depth analysis of his research, especially regarding the genesis of poetic texts.

It seems that in the first half of the 1970s, a book appeared in Brno that anticipated the later study of the specifics of the area of Central and Southeastern Europe. The most engaging part of M. Krhoun's brilliant book is the analysis of the poem cycle *Dyki Dumy* and the German collection *Am Tscheremus*, in which Krhoun emphasizes the Hutsul-Ukrainian tradition of myth-making and legend, alongside European traditions, including German Romanticism. The author meticulously studies both the poet's early lyric poetry and his later work, permeated with religious motifs.

In the first chapter, in which Krhoun comes to terms with the existing literature on Fedkovych, he does not hesitate to argue with Ivan Franko regarding the quality and originality of the poet's work even in Fedkovych's stylization as a folk singer, Krhoun does not see a mere imitation of folk impulses, but their creative development. In this respect, I believe that the author sometimes overestimated the poet's originality, although not by far the majority: the more Fedkovych moved away from his discipleship of early German and Ukrainian poems, the stronger his originality became, perhaps with the exception of the last period of his

work, which Krhoun nevertheless raises from the shadow of oblivion as unjustly neglected. I consider the chapters “German and Ukrainian Beginnings”, “Kolomyia Collection”, “Poems of the Kolomyia Collection Period” (revealing their identification and characterization), “The Collection *Am Tscheremus* and the Cycle *Dyki dumy*”, “Carols” and “Last Poems”, i.e. essentially two thirds of the entire monograph, to be the key to multiculturalism and one of the cores of Krhoun’s research. According to Krhoun, extensive quotations from German poetry of the early period demonstrate the state of the poet’s experiences and their cultivation rather than artistic inspiration, i.e. poetry written in German was not only a workshop, but also a concentration of feelings that led to more mature work. He does not neglect military poems with Italian motifs (“U Veroni”) and also the translation of the Austrian anthem, the writing of which he interprets soberly.

Of course, he pays close attention to Fedkovych’s first mature collection, *Poetry* from 1862. He finds the poems with military themes interesting, in two thematic series (the life of a Hutsul boy in war/his role as a victim of a society that forces him to fight for foreign interests). It already becomes clear here that Krhoun’s method is thematology verified by form analysis, including metrical, and less so poetological (figures, tropes). Given that much has been written and is actually being written about Fedkovych’s first mature collection of poems, and that Krhoun substantiates his analyses with extensive samples of poetic material, I consider the greatest contribution of Krhoun’s monograph to be the chapters mentioned above, although here too the author tries to engage in internal Ukrainian comparative studies, especially with poets from Galicia, but he does not neglect the work of T. H. Shevchenko – as in a number of other chapters.

The chapter “Poems from 1862–1867” forms an important bridge, especially to the analysis of the themes of the poet’s work and its evolution. Another chapter on the Kolomyia collection, perhaps the most revealing part of the monograph, is similar in scope to it. Here, he works, among other things, with the condemnations of contemporary criticism about the weaknesses of this poetry and interestingly compares the gravity of Fedkovych and Shevchenko’s lives, but that would be a separate chapter and perhaps even a topic for a separate study using new materials.

Krhoun's analyses of the verses of some poems, their connection with music and the rhythms of folk poetry are impressive. These parts would deserve a thorough evaluation from the position of contemporary versology. Krhoun also comments here on the thesis of dependence on Shevchenko and believes that even if there is, there is also a certain independence (the poem "Horodenchuk"); Here too, the author returns to Fedkovych's dominant and symbolic motif and emblem of the rose.

The multicultural character of Fedkovych's poetry is particularly strengthened by the chapter on German poems and their connection with Ukrainian work. In 1862, when the collection *Poezii* was published, a volume of poems written in German appeared in the Chernivtsi magazine "Sonntagsblatt der Bukowina", which was edited by the grammar school teacher and Fedkovych's friend Ernst Neubauer, and which have the same context as his Ukrainian work; in the preface "Die Nationalpoesie der Ruthenen", probably due to insufficient philological erudition, Fedkovych makes mistakes ("Illyrian speech") and is strongly pathetic in places, but the oscillation between German and Ukrainian texts indicates the mutual interconnection of poetic inspiration, textual filiations and overall cultural transfer.

While in his early German poems the poet adopted a creative manner under the influence of German, especially romantic poetry, here he transfers motifs of Ukrainian folk poetry and their artistic transformation to German poems. The somewhat neglected period of the 1870s in Fedkovych's poetry is sometimes understood as marginal, but Krhoun does not consider this to be correct either. He particularly notes the influence of Heinrich Heine, and he also sees overlaps of German inspiration in the paraphrases of *The Tale of Igor's Campaign*. The analysis and textual filiation of the collection *Am Tscheremus* and the cycle *Dyki dumy* represent the highlight of the monograph, perhaps also together with the "Carols" and "The Last Poems".

If we were to characterize Krhoun's contribution to the knowledge of Fedkovych's work in detail once again, we would come to the conclusion that it corresponds to older methods typical of the first half of the 20th century. Krhoun prefers thematics, he was not affected by structuralism, Czech family silver, but perhaps also because at the time of the book's publication he was actually excluded from official Czech literary studies as a method; he sometimes connects thematics with

reflections on the biographical method and with a sociological view of poetic work. However, what runs like a red thread through his monograph is what corresponds to the natural multiculturalism of Fedkovych's work, both in content and language as typically biliterary, in which one language clearly dominates, and the other reflects it and forms its background or edge, although this does not mean at all that his German poems would have little importance, quite the opposite: without them and their multiple functions, including poetic tradition, poetic form, adoption of the national mentality embodied in thematic clusters and motifs, Ukrainian poetic work would also be different and less aesthetically impressive.

Krhoun's work with the methods of literary comparative and genre studies is weaker. He clearly prefers internal Ukrainian comparative studies, as already mentioned, confronting especially Galicia, Bukovina and Ukraine as a part of the Russian Empire at that time, essentially the work of Fedkovych, Franko, who is also one of Fedkovych's most important literary critics, who was strict with him, but also appreciative, and Shevchenko. Although Fedkovych also worked with the Slavonic question and slavisms, but these motifs are vague and far from as dominant as in other poets; there is also inter-Slavonic comparative studies, which would strengthen multiculturalism, but there is much less of it. Polish poetry and its filiation are nearby, but at the same time, K. J. Erben flashes here somewhere, albeit marginally, in connection with the German tradition, and the Ukrainian – German comparison and filiation clearly prevail, which organically follows from Fedkovych's biliterary nature. The view on the genre nature of literature is also not particularly pronounced, although the author could not completely avoid these areas, but he does not work with these categories as the basis for his interpretation. Textual analysis prevails, often even textological, when he points to newly identified poems and creates a chain from individual poems, as is the case with the Kolomyia collection or poems from the 1860s and 1870s.

The multicultural reality, created by historical development in a buffer zone where various geopolitical and cultural influences and entire eras intersected, resulted in a strong aesthetic effect of Fedkovych's Ukrainian work, which integrated all this, in some places more successfully, in others less successfully, and created a qualitatively new

whole. This is also the justification for Krhoun's constantly repeated claims about the poet's originality, that even though he adopts motifs and themes from German and other poets, he remains his own, always reworking the stimuli and illuminating them in a new light and setting different edges of their thematic and formal aspects. Perhaps this answer about the multicultural cause of poetic quality is too simplified, that there is a number of other factors, but this one is not insignificant among them, quite the opposite. And Krhoun's monograph, although it does not mention multiculturalism at all, naturally takes it into account and works with it as a matter of course, taking it as the breath of a living poetic organism, which does not need to be explicitly discussed.

- Вилинский, С. (1900). *Византийско-славянские сказания о создании храма св. Софии цареградской*. Одесса : «Экономическая» типография, 109 с.
- Вилинский, С. (1906). *Послания старца Артемия (XVI века)*. Одесса : «Экономическая» типография, 425 с.
- Вилинский, С. (1911–1913). *Житие св. Василия Нового в русской литературе*. Одесса : Типография «Техник», ч. I–II.
- Вилинский, С. (1930). Письма русских писателей чешскому переводчику. Из архива Авг. Врзала. *Центральная Европа*, т. 11, с. 650–657.
- Вилинский, С. (1932). В Болгарии в 1920–1923 гг. Из эмигрантских переживаний. In: *Jubilejní sborník Svazu ruských studentů v Brně*. Brno, s. 40–46.
- Поспишил, И. (2008). Брненская школа литературной компаративистики и генологии/жанрологии и ареальное изучение славистики: ее истоки в контекстуальных связях. In: Станковић, Б. (ур.). *Изучавање словенских језика, књижевности и култура као инословенских и страних*. Београд : Славистичко друштво Србије, с. 278–293.
- Поспишил, И. (2009). К традиции брненского стиховедения и специфике русской поэзии. *Nová rusistika*, vol. II, iss. 1, pp. 55–65.
- Поспишил, И. (2010). Проблема энциклопедий литературоведческой терминологии: брненский проект начала XXI века. *Миргород*, т. 2, с. 19–28.
- Поспишил, И. (2011). К современности и традициям брненской славистики/русистики. In: *Поэтика и риторика диалога*. Гродно : ГрГУ, с. 25–38.
- Поспишил, И. (2018). Концепция творчества Юрия Федьковича в монографии Мечислава Кргоуна в контексте брненской литературоведческой славистики. In: Borkowski, A. i Mnich, R. (red.). *Galicja 1916: plus/minus dziesięć lat (przestrzenie dyskursów: historia, literatury, kultury, język)*. Siedlce : Wydawnictwo Naukowe IKR(i)BL, s. 147–159.

- Kasperski, E. (1999). Przyszłość i zasady genologii. O czeskiej szkole genologicznej z Brna. *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, t. XLII, z. 1–2 (83–84), s. 181–196.
- Krhoun, M. (1964). Češi a počátky běloruského národního a literárního hnutí v prvním desetiletí 20. století. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 13, iss. D11, pp. 49–57.
- Krhoun, M. (1971). Náčrt vývoje běloruské literární vědy. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 19–20, iss. D17–18, pp. 177–186.
- Krhoun, M. (1973). *Básnické dílo Jurije Fed'kovyče*. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 358 s.
- Krhoun, M. a Vlašínová, V. (1970). *Malý slovník ruských spisovatelů I–II*. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně.
- Levý, J. (red.) (1966). *Teorie verše I*. Sborník brněnské versologické konference 13.-16. května 1964. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 271 s.
- Levý, J. a Palas, K. (red.) (1968). *Teorie verše II*. Sborník druhé brněnské versologické konference 18.-20. října 1966. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 195 s.
- Litteraria Humanitas IV. Roman Jakobson* (1996). Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 529 s.
- Mandát, J. (1986). Vzpomínka na S. G. Vilinského. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 35, iss. D33, pp. 125–126.
- Pospíšil, I. (1992). Alois Augustin Vrzal: A Catholic Vision of Slavonic Literatures. *Slovak Review*, no. 2, pp. 166–171.
- Pospíšil, I. (1993). *Srdce literatury. Alois Augustin Vrzal*. Brno : Albert, 43 s.
- Pospíšil, I. (1996). Sergij Vilinskij an der Masaryk-Universität in Brunn: Fakten und Zusammenhänge. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, Bd. 42, S. 223–230.
- Pospíšil, I. (1997). Jubileum slavisty (Mečislav Krhoun, 1907–1982). *Universitas*, č. 1, s. 25–26.
- Pospíšil, I. (2000). Kapitola z dějin brněnské ukrajinistiky: Kniha Mečislava Krhouna o Juriji Fed'kovyčovi. *Univerzitní noviny*, č. 2, s. 14–16.
- Pospíšil, I. (2001). A Chapter from Brno Ukrainian Literary Studies: the Creative Activity of Mečislav Krhoun and His Book on Jurij Fed'kovyč. In: Brogi Bercoff, G. e Siedina, G. (ed.). *Pagine di ucrainistica europea*. Alessandria : Edizioni dell'Orso, p. 83–90.
- Pospíšil, I. (2002). K výročí úmrtí Mečislava Krhouna. *Universitas*, č. 3, s. 22–23.
- Pospíšil, I. (2006). “Slavismy a antislavismy za jara národů“ Franka Wollmana: analýzy a přesahy. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. X, Řada literárněvědné slavistiky*, vol. 55, iss. X9, pp. 85–93.
- Vilinskij, S. (1928). *O literární činnosti M. J. Saltykova-Ščedrina*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 246 s.

- Vilinskij, S. (1933a). Národní prvky v tvorbě I. S. Turgeněva. In: *Sborník družiny literární a umělecké k padesátým narozeninám p. Emanuela Masáka*. Olomouc : D.L.U., s. 119–127.
- Vilinskij, S. (1933b). *Petko Jur. Todorov. Život a dílo*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 151 s.
- Vilinský, V. (1929). Dílo P. Augustina Vrzala. *Archa*, roč. XVII, s. 229–238.
- Wollman, F. (1928). *Slovesnost Slovanů*. Praha : Vesmír, 259 s.
- Wollman, F. (1936). *K metodologii srovnávací slovesnosti slovanské*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 154 s.
- Wollman, F. (1958). *Slovanství v jazykově literárním obrození u Slovanů*. Praha : SPN, 240 s.
- Wollman, F. (2003). *Die Literatur der Slawen*. Herausgegeben von R. Ibler und I. Pospíšil. Aus dem Tschechischen übertragen von Kristina Kallert. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Wien : Peter Lang. 401 S.
- Wollman, F. (2012). *Slovesnost Slovanů*. Eds: I. Pospíšil, M. Zelenka. Brno : Tribun EU, 474 s.
- Wollman, S. (1988). *Porovnávací metoda v literární vědě*. Bratislava : Tatran, 314 s.
- Wollman, S. (1989). *Česká škola literární komparistiky (Tradice, problémy, přínos)*. Praha : Univerzita Karlova, 138 s.

МЕЧИСЛАВ КРГОУН ТА ЙОГО «ПОЕТИЧНА ТВОРЧІСТЬ ЮРІЯ ФЕДЬКОВИЧА» ЯК МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНИЙ ПЕРЕТИН

Ivo Pospíšil

orcid.org/0000-0001-8358-0765

Ivo.Pospisil@phil.muni.cz

Доктор наук, професор

Інститут славістики

Університет Масарика

Arna Nováka 1, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic

Анотація. Ця стаття базується на попередніх дослідженнях автора творчості чеського славіста, русиста, україніста та білорусиста Мечислава Кргоуна, зокрема його розлогої монографії «Поетична творчість Юрія Федьковича» (Брно, 1973), та робить спробу синтезувати особистість Мечислава Кргоуна та детальніше дослідити його епохальну творчість, яка досі була відома в Україні лише фрагментарно. Мотивація для цієї статті також пов'язана з проєктом Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича, зокрема Лідії Ковалець з кафедри української літератури та Тараса Ковальця з кафедри історії України, перекласти цю працю

українською мовою. Згадані колеги звернулися до керівництва Університету Масарика в Брно та попросили допомогти знайти спадкоємців Мечислава Кргоуна з міркувань авторського права. Я мав бажання та можливість допомогти їм у цьому і з нетерпінням чекаю на результат їхньої роботи. Цей внесок – на відміну від моїх попередніх, що базувалися на дослідженні порівняльних контекстів, особистих контактах із М. Кргоуном та знанні всієї його філологічної творчості – детальніше зосереджений на окремих розділах та часткових аспектах дослідження поетичної творчості Юрія Федьковича як перетину мультикультуралізму, оскільки його суто національна творчість глибоко пронизана традиціями європейської культури та літератури, а його українсько-німецька двописьменність включає різні стимули з інших національних літератур, особливо центральноевропейського простору. Це відображено в розділах монографії Кргоуна, що досліджують існуючу літературу про Федьковича, його німецьке та українське походження, генезу його поетичної творчості, його жанровий діапазон, легендарні вірші, поетичні збірки «Am Tscheremus» і «Дикі думи» та останні вірші. Творчість Кргоуна історично пов'язана з його складним життєвим шляхом, із його життєвою історією, а також із часом виходу книги, до чого мав велику заслугу тодішній віцедекан філологічного факультету брненського університету Ярослав Буріан. Методологія Кргоуна базується на внутрішніх та зовнішніх тематологічних і версологічних порівняльних дослідженнях радше позитивістського характеру, але водночас, у дусі формальної та формалістської шкіл, він приділяє значну увагу поетиці поетичної творчості Федьковича, її генезі, культурному фону, зв'язку з життєвими долями поета та, особливо, з його двописьменністю, яка значною мірою визначалася державним устроєм та культурними впливами, в яких знаходилася територія Буковини, як частина Австро-Угорської Цислейтанії (Cisleithanien), яку вона ділила із Землями Чеської Корони. Федькович використав це для створення широко задуманого твору, що спирається на значну широту європейської поезії. Тенденція до синтезу, яка червоною ниткою проходить через усю творчість Кргоуна, спонукає автора використовувати різні літературні підходи: окрім позитивістсько-порівняльного методу, існує також поетологічний, біографічний та частково психологічний метод, які разом утворюють нерозривне ціле. Монографія Кргоуна є оригінальною та самобутньою частиною брненської школи слов'янської літературної компаративістики Франка Волмана та його учнів. Це доповнюється історичною фіксацією, тобто культурно-історичним підходом. Тому монографію Кргоуна слід розглядати з високим ступенем чутливості крізь призму часу Федьковича з його мовним та історичним контекстом і не позбавляти її цієї історичності, тобто не модернізувати в насильницький спосіб його поетичну спадщину, водночас поважаючи історичне походження автора монографії та його сміливість опублікувати в не дуже сприятливий час

дуже відкрито, глибоку та фактографічно точну, порівняльно обґрунтовану працю, яка своїм мультикультурним баченням провістила сучасні підходи та сприяла поглибленню знань про творчість українського класика, пов'язану з певним культурним простором.

Ключові слова: Брненська славістика та славіст Мечислав Кргоун; Юрій Федькович та його поетична творчість; мультикультуралізм як природна риса творчості Федьковича; українська та німецька поезія Федьковича; значення буковинського регіону.

References

- Vilinskij, S. (1900). *Vizantiisko-slavianskie skazaniia o sozdanii khrama sv. Sofii tsaregradskoi* [Byzantine-Slavic Legends on the Creation of St. Sophia Cathedral in Constantinople]. Odesa : "Ekonomicheskaiia" tipografiia, 109 p. (in Russian).
- Vilinskij, S. (1906). *Poslaniia startsa Artemiia (XVI veka)* [Epistles of Elder Artemiy (XVI Century)]. Odesa : "Ekonomicheskaiia" tipografiia, 425 p. (in Russian).
- Vilinskij, S. (1911–1913). *Zhitie sv. Vasiliia Novogo v russkoi literature* [The Life of St. Basil the Yonger in Russian Literature]. Odesa : Tipografiia "Tekhnik", parts I–II. (in Russian).
- Vilinskij, S. (1930). Pis'ma russkikh pisatelei cheshskomu perevodchiku. Iz arkhiva Avg. Vrzala [Russian Writers' Letters to a Czech Translator. From the Archive of Aug. Vrzal]. *Tsentral'naia Evropa*, vol. 11, pp. 650–657. (in Russian).
- Vilinskij, S. (1932). V Bolgarii v 1920–1923 gg. Iz emigrantskikh perezhivaniia [In Bulgaria in 1920–1923. From Emigrant Experience]. In: *Jubilejní sborník Svazu ruských studentů v Brně*. Brno, pp. 40–46. (in Russian).
- Pospíšil, I. (2008). Brnenskaia shkola literaturnoi komparativistiki i genologii/zhanrologii i areal'noe izuchenie slavistiki: ee istoki v kontekstual'nykh svyaziakh [The Brno School of Literary Comparativistics, Genology/Genre Studies, and Ariel Slavic Studies: Origins in Terms of Contextual Connections]. In: Stanković, B. (ed.). *Izučavanje slovenskih jezika, književnosti i kultura kao inoslovenskih i stranih*. Belgrade : Slavističko društvo Srbije, pp. 278–293. (in Russian).
- Pospíšil, I. (2009). K traditsii brnenskogo stikhovedeniia i spetsifike russkoi poezii [On the Tradition of the Brno Theory of Verse and the Specific Features of Russian Poetry]. *Nová rusistika*, vol. II, iss. 1, pp. 55–65. (in Russian).
- Pospíšil, I. (2010). Problema entsiklopedii literaturovedcheskoi terminologii: brnenskii proekt nachala XXI veka [The Issue of Encyclopedias of Literary Terminology: the Brno Project of the Early XXI Century]. *Mirgorod*, vol. 2, pp. 19–28. (in Russian).
- Pospíšil, I. (2011). K sovremennosti i traditsiiam brnenskoi slavistiki/rusistiki [On the Modernity and Traditions of Brno Slavic/Russian Studies]. In: *Poetika i ritorika dialoga*. Grodno : GrGU, pp. 25–38. (in Russian).

- Pospíšil, I. (2018). Kontsepsiia tvorчества Iuriia Fed'kovicha v monografii Mechislava Krgouna v kontekste brnenskoj literaturovedcheskoj slavistiky [The Concept of Yuriy Fedkovych's Creative Work in Mečislav Krhoun's Monograph in Terms of Brno Literary Slavic Studies]. In: Borkowski, A. i Mnich, R. (red.). *Galicja 1916: plus/minus dziesięć lat (przestrzenie dyskursów: historia, literatury, kultury, język)*. Siedlce : Wydawnictwo Naukowe IKR(i)BL, s. 147–159. (in Russian).
- Kasperski, E. (1999). Przyszłość i zasady genologii. O czeskiej szkole genologicznej z Brna. *Zagadnienia rodzajów literackich*, t. XLII, z. 1–2 (83–84), s. 181–196.
- Krhoun, M. (1964). Češi a počátky běloruského národního a literárního hnutí v prvním desetiletí 20. století. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 13, iss. D11, pp. 49–57.
- Krhoun, M. (1971). Náčrt vývoje běloruské literární vědy. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 19–20, iss. D17–18, pp. 177–186.
- Krhoun, M. (1973). *Básnické dílo Jurije Fed'kovyče*. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 358 s.
- Krhoun, M. a Vlašínová, V. (1970). *Malý slovník ruských spisovatelů I–II*. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně.
- Levý, J. (red.) (1966). *Teorie verše I*. Sborník brněnské versologické konference 13.-16. května 1964. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 271 s.
- Levý, J. a Palas, K. (red.) (1968). *Teorie verše II*. Sborník druhé brněnské versologické konference 18.-20. října 1966. Brno : Universita J. E. Purkyně, 195 s.
- Litteraria Humanitas IV. Roman Jakobson* (1996). Brno : Masarykova univerzita, 529 s.
- Mandát, J. (1986). Vzpomínka na S. G. Vilinského. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity. D, Řada literárněvědná*, vol. 35, iss. D33, pp. 125–126.
- Pospíšil, I. (1992). Alois Augustin Vrzal: A Catholic Vision of Slavonic Literatures. *Slovak Review*, no. 2, pp. 166–171.
- Pospíšil, I. (1993). *Srdce literatury. Alois Augustin Vrzal*. Brno : Albert, 43 s.
- Pospíšil, I. (1996). Sergij Vilinskij an der Masaryk-Universität in Brunn: Fakten und Zusammenhänge. *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, Bd. 42, S. 223–230.
- Pospíšil, I. (1997). Jubileum slavisty (Mečislav Krhoun, 1907–1982). *Universitas*, č. 1, s. 25–26.
- Pospíšil, I. (2000). Kapitola z dějin brněnské ukrajinistiky: Kniha Mečislava Krhouna o Juriji Fed'kovyčovi. *Univerzitní noviny*, č. 2, s. 14–16.
- Pospíšil, I. (2001). A Chapter from Brno Ukrainian Literary Studies: the Creative Activity of Mečislav Krhoun and His Book on Jurij Fed'kovyč. In: Brogi Bercoff, G. e Siedina, G. (ed.). *Pagine di ucrainistica europea*. Alessandria : Edizioni dell'Orso, p. 83–90.

- Pospíšil, I. (2002). K výročí úmrtí Mečislava Krhouna. *Universitas*, č. 3, s. 22–23.
- Pospíšil, I. (2006). "Slavismy a antislavismy za jara národů" Franka Wollmana: analýzy a přesahy. *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. X, Řada literárněvědné slavistiky*, vol. 55, iss. X9, pp. 85–93.
- Vilinskij, S. (1928). *O literární činnosti M. J. Saltykova-Ščedrina*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 246 s.
- Vilinskij, S. (1933a). Národní prvky v tvorbě I. S. Turgeněva. In: *Sborník družiny literární a umělecké k padesátým narozeninám p. Emanuela Masáka*. Olomouc : D.L.U., s. 119–127.
- Vilinskij, S. (1933b). *Petko Jur. Todorov. Život a dílo*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 151 s.
- Vilinský, V. (1929). Dílo P. Augustina Vrzala. *Archa*, roč. XVII, s. 229–238.
- Wollman, F. (1928). *Slovesnost Slovanů*. Praha : Vesmír, 259 s.
- Wollman, F. (1936). *K metodologii srovnávací slovesnosti slovanské*. Brno : A. Píša, Filosofická fakulta, 154 s.
- Wollman, F. (1958). *Slovanství v jazykově literárním obrození u Slovanů*. Praha : SPN, 240 s.
- Wollman, F. (2003). *Die Literatur der Slawen*. Herausgegeben von R. Ibler und I. Pospíšil. Aus dem Tschechischen übertragen von Kristina Kallert. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Wien : Peter Lang. 401 S.
- Wollman, F. (2012). *Slovesnost Slovanů*. Eds: I. Pospíšil, M. Zelenka. Brno : Tribun EU, 474 s.
- Wollman, S. (1988). *Porovnávací metoda v literární vědě*. Bratislava : Tatran, 314 s.
- Wollman, S. (1989). *Česká škola literární komparistiky (Tradice, problémy, přínos)*. Praha : Univerzita Karlova, 138 s.

Suggested citation

Pospíšil, I. (2025). Mečislav Krhoun and His "Poetic Work of Yuriy Fedkovych" as a Multicultural Intersection. *Pitannâ literaturoznavstva*, no. 112, pp. 140–158. <http://doi.org/10.31861/pytlit2025.112.140>

Стаття надійшла до редакції 14.10.2025 р.

Стаття прийнята до друку 20.11.2025 р.