

Tetiana Cherkashyna

“With Ukraine in the Heart”: From the History of Ukrainian Autobiography in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

This article is devoted to the study of the history of Ukrainian autobiography. The object of analysis is Ukrainian autobiographies of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, written by well-known Ukrainian writers, ethnographers, and public and cultural figures of that time who contributed to the formation and affirmation of Ukrainian statehood. The article examines the autobiographies of Volodymyr Antonovych, Dmytro Bahalii, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo Drahomanov, Sofiia Rusova, Yevhen Chykalenko, and other well-known Ukrainians who had a clearly defined view of life and were active members of *hromadas* (Ukrainian intelligentsia societies) and of the scholarly and political societies of the time and who were, for this reason, often persecuted by the state. The autobiographies analysed here were among the first examples of classical Ukrainian autobiography to comprehensively reveal the life and creative path of the autobiographers. These texts were structured according to a classical scheme: family history, the birth of the author, the specifics of their family upbringing, school, and university education, their professional and social activities. At the same time, they also contained blocks typical of the description of a person's life at that time related to the social and academic activities of the authors which centred on the Ukrainian national cause. Often, Ukrainian autobiographies of this period functioned as apologias. An important element of these texts was to leave a 'living testimony' to the autobiographer's life, the lives of the people around them, the moods and interests that prevailed in the society of the time, and the socially significant events that the autobiographer witnessed or participated in.

The Ukrainian autobiographical tradition dates back to the twelfth century, with the appearance of the *Tale* [Povchannia] of Volodymyr Monomakh, which was then joined by syncretic texts by Vasyl' Zagozovs'kyi, Matvii Strykovs'kyi, Vasyl' Hryhorovych-Bars'kyi and others – all texts in which one

can trace the interweaving of autobiographical, historical, didactic and other types of literature.¹ Ukrainian autobiography of the twelfth to eighteenth centuries was not yet systematic and mostly consisted of individual autobiographical or autobio-

¹ See Shevchuk 2008.

graphical elements, which, like autobiography of that period globally, lacked the complex critical and self-reflective analysis of the autobiographers' lives typical of classical autobiographies of later periods, after the appearance of Rousseau's *Confessions* [Les Confessions, 1782] and Goethe's *Truth and Poetry* [Dichtung und Wahrheit, 1811].²

The basic rules and norms of Ukrainian autobiography were developed in the second half of the nineteenth century, during a period of the strengthening of the Ukrainophile, nationally oriented movement when the 'most prominent Ukrainians' of the era began to write and publish long, comprehensive autobiographies that exhibit elements characteristic of such texts such as extensive factuality, a chronological structure, retrospectivity, double perspective (contrasting then and now), an interest in psychology, self-analysis, and self-reflexivity.³ The emergence of

classical autobiographies in Ukrainian literature written under the influence of the aforementioned standard examples of this genre can be related in the first instance to the significant shifts then underway in the political, social, and intellectual life of the country. In the second half of the nineteenth century, nationalist ideas gained considerably in strength in Ukraine (which was under the yoke of the Russian Empire, of which it was then a part) as the movement for the establishment of a national identity, which had begun several decades earlier after the Polish uprising of 1830, entered a new phase. The first Ukrainian autobiographers (including Panteleimon Kulish, Mykola Kostomarov, and Hanna Barvinok) were founders of and active members in the first political organisation of the Ukrainian national movement, the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, which was banned by the Russian tsarist government in 1847 because its goal was to liberate Ukrainians from tsarist rule and create a common Slavic

² In this article, when analysing the theory and history of global autobiography, I rely on the theory of the French researcher of autobiographical writing Philippe Lejeune (Lejeune 1971, 1975, 2004, 2005).

³ This is the expression used in by George Luckyj in his 1989 anthology *About Themselves* [Sami pro sebe, 1989] to refer to consciously active Ukrainian public, literary, scientific, and political figures of the turn of the nineteenth

and twentieth centuries who stood at the origins of the Ukrainian national movement of that time and were active in the development of Ukrainian statehood in the early twentieth century.

federation centred in Kyiv.⁴ Experts in the history of Ukraine, especially of the Cossack era, did a great deal of educational work, including through their scholarly, journalistic, and literary texts, to prove that Ukrainians are a separate nation, distinct from Russian, Polish, and other Slavic nations and emphasising Ukraine's long-standing democratic traditions. It was during this period of the Ukrainian national movement that Kulish and Kostomarov wrote their autobiographies.

In the middle of the nineteenth century so-called *hromadas*, non-governmental educational organizations began to operate in various cities in Ukraine organising community schools that promoted Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture and history.⁵ Almost all authors of autobiographies in Ukrainian in

this period were active figures in these communities (Mykhailo Drahomanov, Volodymyr Antonovych, Olena Pchilka, Sofiia Rusova, Yevhen Chykalenko, Oleksandr Barvins'kyi, and others). With the accession of Alexander II to the throne in the early 1860s, political life in the Russian Empire became more liberal. Alexander II carried out a number of reforms, including of the military, the judiciary, and the *zemstvo* (local government). One of the most important of these reforms was the abolition of serfdom. People who had been members of secret organisations and movements in the 1830s and 1850s and who had been imprisoned returned from exile. The reforms were inconsistent, however, and any sign of national movements on the part of non-Russian peoples within Russian Empire (primarily Poles and Ukrainians) was brutally suppressed. In 1863, the Valuev Circular was issued, banning any publications in the Ukrainian language. The Ems Ukaz of Alexander II in 1876 constituted in effect a complete ban on everything Ukrainian – language, culture, the printing of works in Ukrainian and about Ukraine, its history, culture, and traditions – and instituted repressions against Ukrainians using any language. This ban provoked re-

⁴ Panteleimon Kulish (1819-1897) was a Ukrainian writer, folklorist, ethnographer, linguist, critic, editor, translator, active public figure, and member of the Ukrainian national movement. Mykola Kostomarov (1817-1885) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, ethnographer, ethnopsychologist, writer, university professor, and active public figure. Hanna Barvinok (real name Oleksandra Bilozers'ka-Kulish, 1828-1911) was a Ukrainian writer, folklorist, active public figure, member of the feminist movement, and the wife of Panteleimon Kulish.

⁵ See Pobirchenko 2000.

sistance from politically conscious Ukrainians. Some of the older civic activists went into exile. Young Ukrainians, dissatisfied with the passivity of older civic activists, began to join Russian socio-political organisations and participate in revolutionary movements aimed at overthrowing the tsarist government. Many young Ukrainians joined the illegal organisation *Land and Liberty* [Zemlia i volia] and, after that split in 1879, became members of the secret revolutionary organisation *People's Liberty* [Narodna volia].⁶ Drahomanov, one of the leading figures in the Ukrainian national movement of the time, was dismissed from his position as a professor at Kyiv University and forced to leave Ukraine and settle abroad. In exile, he wrote his autobiography. Drahomanov advocated cosmopolitanism and Ukraine's entry into a single European space as part of a broad federation that would include Russia. While his writings were banned in the Russian Empire, which included a large part of Ukraine, they later became widespread in the western lands of Ukraine, which were ruled by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Some of the leaders of the Ukrainian national

movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century moved there from lands controlled by the Russian Empire, including the historian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who later became the head of the Ukrainian People's Republic established in 1917 and centred in Kyiv. It was on these lands that an active political, social, and intellectual Ukrainian life developed at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and it was here that the chronicles of the 'prominent Ukrainians' of the time continued to be published. These were mostly older public figures whose children (such as Sofiia Rusova) were active public figures of the younger generation and participated in secret revolutionary organisations. These autobiographers (in particular, Oleksandr Barvyns'kyi) were members of local societies of the time that were engaged in the study and promotion of Ukrainian history, language, literature, and culture – the Prosvita and the Shevchenko Scientific Society.⁷

The next surge in Ukrainian autobiography occurred in the late 1920s, during the short period of Ukrainianisation after a significant part of Ukraine had been

⁶ See Sarbei 1994, Yanyshyn 2008 for more on these topics.

⁷ See Sarbei 1994, Naumov 2006, Yanyshyn 2008, Procyk 2019 and others.

absorbed into the USSR as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in the wake of the unsuccessful attempt to create a separate state with Kyiv as its capital, the Ukrainian People's Republic. At this time, a significant number of the former leaders of the Ukrainian national movement found themselves in exile, primarily in what was then Czechoslovakia. Later, however, some of them, including Hrushevs'kyi, returned to Soviet Ukraine and became involved in the development of Ukrainian historical, linguistic, and literary studies there. In this same period, specialist periodicals were created to publish research into the history, language, literature, and culture of Ukraine from different periods of its historical development. Hrushevs'kyi launched the publication *In One Hundred Years* [Za sto lit, 1927-1930], which published materials on the social and literary life of Ukraine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. At his request, 'prominent Ukrainians' of the time (including Sofiia Rusova, Vasyli' Chahovets', and Liudmyla Myshchenko) wrote autobiographies for this publication. In this same period, both Hrushevs'kyi and another prominent pro-Ukrainian historian, Dmytro Bahalii, celebrated major anniversaries and used these

occasions to write their autobiographies. Given that these works were published in Soviet Ukraine, the authors cautiously avoid describing their lives during the last decade, ending their stories at the moment when a Ukrainian state independent of other countries is still in preparation. As such, historical events in Ukraine in 1917-1921 did not feature in autobiographical accounts until public figures of subsequent generations came to write their memoirs, mostly in exile. It was abroad that prominent political figures such as Serhii Yefremov, Volodymyr Vynnychenko and others published diaries as well as autobiographies and memoirs.

With their comprehensive description of their own lives in the context of the socio-political and intellectual life of their country, Kulish, Kostomarov, Barvyns'kyi, Chykalenko, Rusova and Hrushevs'kyi had laid the foundations of classical Ukrainian autobiography. The next phase in the evolution of Ukrainian autobiography would not begin until a century later, at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century, when readers were once more able to access foundational texts through anthologies and

new editions.⁸ The same period saw the publication of major autobiographies by Ukrainian public and cultural figures, such as Mykola Rudenko, Ivan Dziuba, Iryna Zhylenko, and others.⁹ The first Ukrainian classical autobiographies have still not been studied in detail. The first brief overview was given by George Luckyj in his preface to the anthology *About Themselves* (Luckyj 1989). In a brief excursion into the history of Ukrainian memoir literature, some texts were mentioned by the authoritative Ukrainian researcher of nonfiction writing, Oleksandr Halych (1991, 2001, 2008). Mariia

⁸ In 1981, Hrushevs'kyi's autobiography was republished abroad (Vynar 1981); in 1989, George Luckyj published the anthology *About Themselves* (Luckyj 1989) in New York, in which he collected excerpts from autobiographies of prominent Ukrainian public figures of the nineteenth century. In 1990 the full text of Kostomarov's autobiography was republished in Kyiv (Kostomarov 1990). The first edition had been published in the late nineteenth century with some fragments removed due to censorship; in 2001, the autobiography of Kulish's wife Hanna Barvinok was reprinted in Kyiv (Barvinok 2001), and four years later Kulish's autobiography was reprinted in Kyiv (Kulish 2005); in 2002, the full text of Bahalii's autobiography was reprinted in Kharkiv (Bahalii 2002); in 2004, the full text of Rusova's memoirs was reprinted in Kyiv (Rusova 2004).

⁹ See Dziuba 2008, 2013, Rudenko 2013, Zhylenko 2011 and others.

Fedun' (2010) has produced a literary analysis of individual autobiographical texts written by western Ukrainian autobiographers at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Valeriia Pustovit has examined the epistolary heritage of the authors under study through the prism of nation-building (Pustovit 2008). However, the overwhelming majority of contemporary researchers into the history of Ukrainian autobiographical literature address texts from later periods, studying mostly contemporary autobiographical texts without referring to the original sources of the Ukrainian autobiographical tradition. Given how little attention has been given to texts from the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, the purpose of our article is to provide a structural and typological analysis of the first Ukrainian autobiographies of the classical type – the texts that laid the foundations of Ukrainian autobiographical writing.

The texts studied in this article are the classic autobiographies of prominent Ukrainian public figures Kulish (2005), Hanna Barvinok (2001), Kostomarov (1990), Barvyns'kyi (1989), Nechui-Levyts'kyi (1989), Drachomanov (1989), Chykalenko (2011), Antonovych (1989),

Rusova (2004), Myshchenko (1929), Hrushevs'kyi (1926), and Bahalii (1927, 2002), all written in the second half of the nineteenth and first decades of the twentieth century. The particular focus of the analysis is a consideration of the structural and typological characteristics of these first classical autobiographies of the Ukrainian tradition, the identification of their main structural and typological blocks, and the specifics of the construction of the image of the self they construct.

Autobiographical texts of every historical era have their own peculiarities, and Ukrainian autobiography of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is no exception, as is evidenced in texts of various structural and typological models. One group consisted of classical comprehensive autobiographies that recounted the author's life and creative path in its entirety. They were constructed according to the classical biographical scheme with the following principal thematic blocks: family history; information about the author's parents; birth and childhood of the protagonist; peculiarities of upbringing; home, school, and education at the gymnasium and then university; professional and social activities; personal and everyday

life and so on. At the same time, they also contained sections particularly characteristic of life in nineteenth-century Ukraine, such as: participation in the formation and running of *hromadas* and the political and scientific societies of the time; references to arrests, imprisonment, and exile related to these activities; information about traveling around Ukraine to collect ethnographic, archaeological, folklore and other material, for cultural and educational purpose; trips to European countries to for further academic training etc. The autobiographies of this group were created mainly in the crucial years of the authors' lives and usually in adulthood. They served as a kind of summary of their scientific, pedagogical, social and political, cultural and educational, literary, and literary-critical activities.

Among the authors of this type of Ukrainian autobiography were Mykhailo Drahomanov, Mykola Kostomarov, and Panteleimon Kulish, who were all active participants in the social, political, and cultural life of nineteenth-century Ukraine, and who could thus not avoid describing their own political, ideological, and spiritual beliefs in their autobiographies. It is, therefore, not surprising that

these works are mostly apologetic and confessional in nature and, in addition to providing basic biographical information, contain detailed explanations of the personal beliefs that the authors expressed in their academic and literary critical publications, and explanations of the motivations behind their actions in certain controversial situations.

Kulish's autobiography *My Life* [Moie zhyttia] was written in August 1867, when the author was in government service in Warsaw. This was a difficult period in Kulish's life, since, on the one hand, in his capacity as tsarist official he participated in the suppression of the Polish national liberation movement, and, on the other hand, he was under constant surveillance by the Russian government, which saw him as unreliable because of his close ties to Ukrainian and Galician *hromadas*. Consequently, the autobiography had to serve as a kind of apologia for the author, justify his sometimes controversial activities. This text was written in Ukrainian and was intended mainly for the Ukrainian reader, with whom the author constantly emphasises a close connection in the pages of the work, stressing that 'his father was of an old Cossack family' (Kulish 2005: 96) and

that 'Kulish's mother was a simple person' (Kulish 2005: 98), who 'knew how to speak only Ukrainian, and what she had in her head, she took it all not from books, but from the living folk speech' (Kulish 2005: 99).¹⁰ The author tried to convey to Ukrainian readers as accurately as possible his experiences of the misunderstandings that occasionally arose between him and the Ukrainian *hromadas* of Kyiv, Lviv, and St Petersburg. However, the work was written in the third person, which helped the author to distance himself from his own text and emphasize the greater objectivity of the narrative. Kulish does not always succeed in this because of the high emotional tone of the narrative and his numerous digressions, remarks, and instances of self-reflection. Kulish's autobiography was first published in 1868 in nine issues of the Lviv weekly *Pravda*, a year after it was written, while the writer was still in Warsaw, and, as Shokalo notes in a note to the 2005 reprint (Kulish 2005: 95), the work was submitted for publication by Bilozers'kyi, a friend of Kulish.

Drahomanov had a somewhat similar motivation for writing

¹⁰ Here and throughout, translations of the autobiographical texts from Ukrainian and Russian are my own.

his own life story, as he turned to writing an autobiographical note while in exile.¹¹ The main text of the autobiography was written in 1883 in Geneva, where the author had settled in 1876 because of the risk of arrest and because he was prohibited from living in Ukraine. In 1889, the text was supplemented with information about Drahomanov's public and literary critical activities in the period 1883-1889. However, the work was first published only in 1896, after the author's death.¹² Just like Kulish before him, Drahomanov was persecuted for his active civic position. As Luckyj notes in the preface to *About Themselves*, 'He was an internationalist and cosmopolitan. In addition to the obstacles of the tsarist government and misunderstanding among his countrymen, he tried to build the "political culture" of the nation' (Luckyj 1989: 11). His ideas were not always supported

by the Ukrainian community, so even in exile far from Ukraine, Drahomanov was forced to engage in polemics with his opponents and provide extended comments on his political, scientific, literary and critical articles in his autobiography, giving his own account of his own social and cultural activities. As Drahomanov admits at the end of the main part of his autobiography:

Throughout my life I have had to argue with many people – with different parties at the same time. Not a week passes without me encountering an arrow directed against me from the national camp: Moscow, Polish, German, conservative as well as revolutionary; I also get hit from the Ukrainophiles (mostly Galician ones) [...]. Before starting a polemic with any group or even an individual, I almost always sought gentle means of repair and took up a printed polemic only when I came across 'mauvaise foi' (bad faith) and insincerity from my opponent. I engage in polemics only as long as I think it is necessary to clarify my opponent's opinion and mine.

¹¹ Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-1895) was a Ukrainian historian, philosopher, publicist, university professor, literary critic, folklorist, active public figure and member of the Ukrainian national movement, advocate of political autonomy and socialist. He was the brother of the writer and active public figure Ole-na Pchilka (Ol'ha Drahomanova-Kosach) and uncle of the famous Ukrainian writer Lesia Ukrainka (Larysa Kosach-Kvitka).

¹² This refers to Pavlyk 1896.

After that, I shut up and endure everything without response, especially personal attacks on me. (Drahomanov 1989: 136)

As Luckyj aptly puts it, Drahomanov's autobiography is, first and foremost, 'an account of an outstanding political figure and thinker', since 'it contains few personal details and is devoted to work and ideology' (Luckyj 1989: 12).

Unlike the works of Kulish and Drahomanov, Kostomarov's autobiography is not confessional or apologetic. It was written in Russian. Kostomarov describes his own life in a balanced and reasonable manner, focusing on his academic, pedagogical, archaeological, ethnographic, and critical activities. As such, his autobiography is mainly focused on professional and social matters. Kostomarov worked on his autobiography in the last years of his life. Due to health problems, he was unable to write the text himself and dictated it to his wife Alina Leontievna in the summer of 1875. In the summers of 1876 and 1877, after travelling to Valaam and Narva, the text was added to, and until 1881 Kostomarov personally edited the text, making certain corrections. The autobiography is well structured, contains fifteen

chapters, and covers a significant period of the author's life – sixty years, ending with the events of 1877. We can conclude from a note by Kostomarov's wife in the final chapter (Kostomarov 1990: 637) that the work remained unfinished, as Kostomarov planned to continue the text and at the same time to change some of the chapters that had already been written, in particular the unfinished title of that final chapter, chapter XV, 'Classes and Trips. Illness. Bereavement. Rest...'. Like Drahomanov's autobiographical notes, Kostomarov's autobiography was first published after the author's death. In 1890, Kostomarov's *Autobiography* [Avtobiografiia] was published in the journal *Literary Heritage* [Literaturnoe nasledie] in abbreviated form (without the sections 'IV. Arrest, Imprisonment, Exile', 'VIII. Student Unrest. Closure of the University', and 'IX. St. Petersburg University in the Early 1860s') and with plentiful notes. In 1910 and 1917, Chapters IV, VIII, and IX, which were not published in the previous edition for reasons of censorship, were first published in Moscow in 1922.

An important role in the autobiographies of the nineteenth century was assigned to the Ukrainian studies of the authors, which

is why, when providing information about their own genealogy, these authors repeatedly focus the readers' attention on their Ukrainian, mostly Cossack, roots. Even Kostomarov, who begins his *Autobiography* by saying that 'the family nickname I bear belongs to the old Great Russian families of nobles or children of the boyars' (Kostomarov 1989: 57) and goes on to describe how his grandfather Petr Kostomarov joined Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi and was promoted to the rank of Cossack (Kostomarov 1990: 11-12). Kulish, whose father 'was of an old Cossack family' (Kulish 2005: 96), and Drahomanov, who notes at the beginning of his autobiography that 'my father and mother belonged to the petty gentry, descended from the Ukrainian Cossack officers' (Drahomanov 1989: 115), also find Cossack roots in their family.

Nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiographies are primarily histories of the formation and development of an individual, so considerable attention is paid to accounts of upbringing in the family home and to education. As a rule, the protagonists of these works received similar educations. For example, Kulish's upbringing was handled by his mother because 'the son was hiding from his father, and the

father did not care about his son' (Kulish 2005: 98), while Kostomarov and Drahomanov's upbringing and education were more the concern of their fathers. As Kostomarov recalls, 'My childhood until the age of ten was spent in my father's house without any tutors, watched over by my father himself. After reading *Emile* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, my father applied the rules he had read to the upbringing of his only son [...]. Constantly forcing me to read, he began to inspire me from my tender years with a Voltairean lack of belief' (Kostomarov 1990: 60). Drahomanov's father was also involved in his son's education: 'I adopted a love of reading and a kind of politics from my father from an early age, and at his urging, while still a student at the Hadiach district school (1849-1853), I read almost all the interesting books from his library – mostly travel and historical works (including Karamzin's *History of the Russian State* [Istoriia gosudarstva rosiiskogo] twice)' (Drahomanov 1989: 115), for which the son was later very grateful to him: 'I must thank my father from the bottom of my heart for developing intellectual interests in me and there was no moral discord or conflict

between us.' (Drahomanov 1989: 116).

Later, the autobiographers studied at local district schools, colleges, or gymnasiums, and then became students of the historical and philological faculties of Kharkiv or Kyiv universities.¹³ Almost all autobiographers of the time mention that 'the science at the school was dry, dead, and abstract' (Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: 233). The subjects taught were mainly Greek, Latin, German, and French, mathematics, geography, history, and literature. As Nechui-Levyts'kyi recalls, 'most of the lectures were in Latin and Greek. We were forced to learn everything by heart, word for word' (Nechui-Levytskyi 1989: 233).¹⁴ University education was not much different.

After graduating from university, these nineteenth-century autobiographers were actively engaged in scientific, pedagogical, socio-political, cultural, educational, literary, and literary critical work. In his autobiography, Kulish recalls how he taught in Kyiv and Luts'k, and eventually,

due to financial problems, became more involved in literary and publishing activities, which brought better income. Due to great need, he also agreed to government service, which did not bring him much pleasure. Kostomarov and Drahomanov began their professional careers as teachers in gymnasiums in Rivne and Kyiv, and later, after defending their dissertations, moved on to teaching at universities, which they would go on to describe in detail in their autobiographies.

Their professional, cultural, and educational activities involved numerous trips to Ukraine and European countries, and thus the description of these trips becomes an integral part of their autobiographies. Kostomarov describes his trips in the most detailed way, devoting several chapters of his autobiography to them. From the pages of Kostomarov's *Autobiography*, a vivid palette of the life of Ukrainian and European cities of the time, their customs, everyday problems, ordinary residents and the most famous people with whom the author met, are described.

The autogeography of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers is quite extensive, as most of them actively travelled to study or explore the

¹³ Today these are V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University and Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University.

¹⁴ Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi (real name Ivan Levyts'kyi, 1838-1918) was a Ukrainian writer, ethnographer, folklorist, educator, and public figure.

world around them. The reader of their autobiographical works is presented with a wide panorama of European and Ukrainian cities of the time including: Berlin, Heidelberg, Vienna, Zurich, Warsaw, Poznan, and Kyiv in the autobiography of the cosmopolitan Drahomanov; Kharkiv, Poltava, Kyiv, Kremenets', Pochaiv, Vyshnivets', Berestechko, Rivne, and others in Kostomarov's autobiography. Among the great variety of European and Ukrainian cities and towns, Kharkiv and Kyiv are mentioned most often in nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography.

Many Ukrainian autobiographers of this period were born in rural areas (on family estates) or in small provincial towns, but their conscious youth and adult lives were spent in large cities such as Kharkiv or Kyiv, where they received higher education at local universities and were engaged in active scientific, pedagogical, social, cultural, and artistic activities. Consequently, the first perception of these cities began with leaving one's native area and describing one's unforgettable first impressions of the city, which did not always coincide with the stories of people who had visited them before. Here is how Nechui-Levyts'kyi

recalls his first trip to Kyiv to study:

From the Bohuslav school I went to the Kyiv Theological Seminary when I was fourteen. The village women told me many amazing things about Kyiv, most of all about the 'Lion' (a fountain in Podil, Kyiv), about big bells and ancient churches, and my father praised the Dnipro River and the Lavra. I had never been to any city before, and I went to Kyiv with a vivid imagination, hoping to see all those wonders. However, I did not like the 'Lion', the bells, the old churches, or the Lavra. The dark old churches with their dark nooks and crannies and tombs made me sad. I was very impressed by the city with its houses and the huge Dnipro River with its green banks. (Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: 234)

Some interesting observations about Kyiv in the mid-nineteenth century were left by Kostomarov, who came here to work after studying at Kharkiv University and was unpleasantly surprised by the way the city looked at that time:

Recalling my survey of Kiev at that time, I cannot but be surprised to note the difference between the city at that time and the appearance it has at the present time. Pechersk was the centre of commercial activity; in the area now included in the fortress were rows of shops, most frequented by the public; the university stood almost in the field, in the midst of hills and sand mounds inconvenient for passage; the Old Town was unpaved, dotted with ugly mud huts and hovels, and besides had large vacant lots. Khreshchatik then had no shops, no benches, no hotels. Most of it was made of wood, there were no pavements at all, and in wet weather it was even more muddy and slushy. There was no embankment along the Dniepr at all; its bank from Podol under the mountain was literally impassable, and I had planned to walk along the bank from Podol with the intention of getting to the Lavra, but was forced to return because it was impossible to walk down

the slope, especially in rainy autumn. The city was poorly lit, so walking at night was a real punishment. For me, who came from Khar'kov, Kiev seemed to be a much worse city than the former. (Kostomarov 1990: 95-96)

The pages of the autobiographies of that time also present a panorama of the cultural and artistic life of the cities. It is perhaps theatrical life that receives the most attention. Kostomarov recalls in his autobiography:

Until 1840, the Khar'kov Theatre was housed in a wooden building on a long square called the Theatre Square [...]. Since 1840, the theatre has been housed in a newly rebuilt stone building at the other end of the same square, and was run by a directorate. Throughout my stay in Khar'kov, I attended performances quite often, and during my service as an assistant inspector, I was even obliged to attend them frequently. The Khar'kov theatre in all the years I knew it was not devoid of more or less gifted actors and actresses ap-

pearing on the stage.
(Kostomarov 1990: 91)

These nineteenth-century autobiographers had a clearly defined position in life and were active members of local communities (Ukrainian communities in Kharkiv, Kyiv, L'viv, St. Petersburg, Geneva, etc.), political and scientific societies (the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius, the Southwestern Division of the Russian Geographical Society). And it was this activity that eventually led to their persecution by the tsarist government. And while Drachomanov mentions the ban on living and working in Ukraine only in passing, Kulish and Kostomarov go into great detail about the details of their arrests, interrogations, and subsequent exile to the provinces of Russia. Kulish served his exile in Tula and this period, according to the author himself, was very difficult for him and his family: 'The life of Kulish and his family in Tula was difficult. Governor Kruzenshtern looked at him in a jingoistic way. Other people in Tula looked at him like fools, as if they had lived not under Tsar Mykolaj but under Tsar Borys. He did not know anyone, only his master, a blacksmith, an Old Believer' (Kulish 2005: 126), but despite this, 'he worked there on

foreign languages and wrote *The Tale of Boris Godunov and the False Dimitrii* [Povest' o Borise Godunove i Dimitrii Samozvantse], the historical novel *Aleksei the Unicorn* [Aleksei Odnorog] and the novel drawn from Ukrainian life *The Seekers of Happiness* [Iskateli schast'ia]' (Kulish 2005: 125-26).¹⁵

Due to his health problems, Kostomarov was offered a choice of four cities in southeastern Russia – Astrakhan, Saratov, Orenburg, or Penza. And as he notes in his autobiography, 'after thinking about it, I chose Saratov because I thought it would be better to swim there' (Kostomarov 1990: 489). Unlike Kulish, who lived in exile separated from other townspeople, Kostomarov immediately became actively involved in the local community, which included many exiled families. At the same time, he continued his historical research, in particular, research on Bohdan Khmelnyts'kyi, and began collecting local ethnographic material. The exile became a difficult test for Kostomarov; due to his arrest, he was forced to cancel his wed-

¹⁵ *The Tale of Boris Godunov and the False Dimitrii*, a historical novel *Aleksei the Unicorn*, and the novel *The Seekers of Happiness* were written by Panteleimon Kulish in Tula, during his exile, in Russian.

ding and break up with his fiancée. At the same time, his numerous ailments began to progress. As the author himself notes:

despite all the activities I was doing at the time, I was very depressed, and the *khandra* affected my nerves: I resumed my former thoughtfulness and tendency to exaggerate my ailments or even create non-existent ones. I began to receive treatment; but because there were no experienced and skilful doctors in Saratov, I found myself in the hands of such Asclepiuses who began to stuff me with works of Latin cuisine, and I, out of fear of diseases that I did not have, acquired real diseases – the inevitable consequences of the poisonous substances with which I was treated. (Kostomarov 1990: 492)

Quite often in their autobiographical works, these authors resort to extensive commentary on their own scientific, pedagogical, literary, and critical activities. For example, Kulish explains in detail the history and publication of his works, gives them a critical description, fo-

cuses on autobiographical elements in his own fiction, and describes the reception of his works by his contemporaries. Kostomarov and Drahomanov also provide a detailed bibliography of their scientific, literary, and critical works.

A typical feature of nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography is their concentration on the authors' professional and public activities with only a passing mention of their personal and everyday lives. When describing their personal life, nineteenth-century autobiographers usually limit themselves to dry factual information. For example, very little information about his wife, Oleksandra Mykhailivna, better known by her pen name Hanna Barvinok, can be found in Kulish's autobiography. The author refers to the fact of their marriage: 'Kulish turned his thoughts about his family, his ideal, to Bilozers'kyi's sister, and in the winter of 1847, having arrived in Ukraine, he married her' (Kulish 2005: 121). He later explains that 'young Kulishykhya [his wife], an enthusiast like himself, gave all her wine (three thousand karbovanets) as a sacrifice for mother-Ukraine' (Kulish 2005: 124). He does not discuss their sometimes very difficult married life, but it is noteworthy that the author, who

speaks of his wife with great love and warmth throughout the work, does not mention her name anywhere, referring to her simply as 'the woman' or 'my mistress'. Drahomanov also provides limited information about the fact of his marriage: 'In 1864, my fiancée's mother died, and I had to get married earlier than I thought. So I immediately became a man with a family' (Drahomanov 1989: 121). Kostomarov left more information about his relationship with his wife. In the third chapter, the happy protagonist is preparing to get married to his former student Angelina Kragel'ska, better known as Alina Leontiivna:

On 13 February, I became engaged to a girl, Alina Leont'evna Kragel'skaya, whom I had known at the boarding school of Madame de Melian, where I had taught since 1845. After she left the boarding school, I saw her and met her mother in Odessa, where I went to bathe in the sea in the summer in 1846, and after returning to Kiev I visited their home for some time, became closer and got to know her better. The wedding was scheduled for after Easter, on Thom-

as Sunday [the name in Orthodoxy for the first Sunday after Easter], 30 March 1847'. (Kostomarov 1990: 112-13)

As the author further notes, however: 'the day of my wedding was approaching, and I was preparing for it, not suspecting that a cloud was gathering over my head, from which I was to be struck' (Kostomarov 1990: 113). As a result, in the fourth chapter, the young people are separated, seemingly forever, due to Kostomarov's arrest, imprisonment, and subsequent exile, but at the end of the autobiography, in the last chapters, he recalls how he decided to meet with Alina Leontiivna, the widowed mother of three children, when he was already elderly and very ill, how he visited her at her estate in Didivtsi, and how on 9 May 1875, after twenty-eight years of separation, they finally got married (Kostomarov 1990: 642).

However, not all the details of the personal and socio-political life of nineteenth-century autobiographers are reflected in their autobiography. The texts mentioned contain certain autobiographical gaps left by the authors, usually for personal reasons or because of censorship. Kostomarov, for example, when

describing the history of his family, ignores the fact that he was born before his parents, the landowner Ivan Kostomarov and the serf Tetiana Melnykova, were married, and that, according to the laws of the time, Kostomarov was his father's serf, and the fact that after his father's tragic death in 1828, he became a serf of his close relatives, the Rovnevs. Kostomarov also does not mention his mother's financial agreement with the Rovnevs, thanks to which he became a free man. However, the topic of serfdom is repeatedly raised in his autobiography. Kulish avoids a detailed description of his government service in Warsaw, briefly noting at the end of the work that 'it is too early to speak about Kulish's life in Warsaw' (Kulish 2005: 137). Similarly, for personal reasons, he does not dwell on his complex relations with some Ukrainian communities, as, in his opinion, 'it is too early to talk about the Moscow Ukrainian community, the Poltava and Kharkiv communities' (Kulish 2005: 134). In this way these autobiographies became the first classical examples of comprehensive Ukrainian autobiographies with a high degree of artistry, comprehensively revealing the authors' life and creative path. They are a valuable source of in-

sights into the life of people of that time who adopted a clear civic position and took an active part in the social, political, cultural and educational life of the country. Thus, the pages of nineteenth-century Ukrainian autobiography primarily portrayed the image of a nationally conscious citizen whose main concern was serving their people. At the same time, the personal faded into the background, giving way to the social. According to Oleksandr Halych, 'interest in memoir genres always arises in crucial epochs, when fundamental changes are underway that affect the interests of the broader society, radically altering the established life' (Halych 1991: 3). Therefore, it is not surprising that the early twentieth century gave rise to a large number of memoirs that performed not only a cognitive and aesthetic function, but also an ideological one. A special place in the Ukrainian autobiography of the time was given to the memoirs of prominent political and public figures who, with a high degree of documentation and varying degrees of artistry, recreated on paper the story of their individual lives in the context of the history of the country and the history of the life of their generation. Given the great significance of these personal

memoirs as sources of information, these works are becoming a subject of interest not only to literary scholars, but also to historians, anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, and others.¹⁶

At the beginning of the twentieth century famous Ukrainian historian and ethnographer Volodymyr Antonovych's socially oriented *Autobiographical Notes* [Avtobiohrafichni zapysky] were published in 1908 in part 43 of the *Literary and Scientific Bulletin* [Literaturno-naukovy visnyk]. In 1911, on the occasion of his election as a full member of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, the famous ethnographer and linguist Kost' Mykhal'chuk wrote his *Autobiographical Note* [Avtobiohrafichna zapyska]. Three years later, in 1914, it was published in issue 121 of the *Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society* [Zapysky NTSh]. In his essay, the scholar fulfils the request of the National Scientific Society to provide basic information about

himself, including bibliographic information, and focuses on explaining his own socio-political and ideological beliefs, describing his social and cultural activities. In 1909-1911, Kulish's wife Oleksandra (née Bilozers'ka), better known by her literary pseudonym Hanna Barvinok, published autobiographical memoirs recounting the story of her first meeting with Kulish, their marriage and the first months of their life together in the magazines *Future* [Buduchnist'] (part 3, 1909) and *Ukrainian Home* [Ukrainska khata] (parts 5/6, 7/8, 1911).

In 1912-1913, the first two parts of the autobiographical memoirs of the Ukrainian historian and educator Oleksandr Barvyns'kyi were published in L'viv. In 1923, while living in exile in Austria, noted Ukrainian public figure Yevhen Chykalenko completed his autobiographical memoirs. As the author himself explained in the preface to the work, in 1907 he had begun keeping a diary, in which, with short breaks, he described in detail not only his private life at the time, but also the social life around him. In order for 'the readers of that diary to get acquainted with at least a brief biography of the person who wrote it' (Chykalenko 2011: 27), Chykalenko reproduced 'his outline memories of

¹⁶ Among the studies devoted to this particular stratum of memoir-autobiographical literature, there are not many scholarly studies (Vynar 1981, Halych 2001, Myronets' 2008, Pustovit 2008), the authors of which analysed mostly individual memoir works without relating them to a specific type of memoir writing characteristic of the period.

45 years of his life (1861-1907)' (2011: 26) as an introduction to the diary, which was to become the 'chief book of my life' for the author. The first fragments of Chykalenko's 'Memoirs' were published in 1924 in the American newspaper *Freedom* [Svoboda], and in 1925-1926 this work was published in Lviv as a separate edition in three parts. In 1925-1927, at the request of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, the celebrated educator and public figure Sofiia Rusova wrote her autobiographical memoirs for the collection *In One Hundred Years* [Za sto lit, 1927-1930], which he edited. In 1928, after lengthy epistolary negotiations between the author and the editor, the first ten chapters of the memoirs were published in the second and third books of the collection on the condition that Rusova would not publish them in other publications, including foreign ones, for the next three years. The full text of the memoirs, completed by 1923, was published in a separate edition in Lviv only in 1937. Between 1928 and 1930, the same collection published the autobiographies of Ukrainian public figures Liudmyla Myshchenko and Vasyl' Chahovets', written specifically for it. Most of these works were written by authors in exile, mostly in

Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Austria, and later published in Kyiv and Lviv. These autobiographies tend to be factual and lack self-reflexivity. They are primarily Ukraine-centric and socially orientated, so the authors' and their acquaintances' socio-political, social, cultural, and educational activities usually come to the fore. Chronologically, they cover the period from the second half of the nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. For example, Myshchenko brings her memoir up to 1889, Chahovets' – to 1891, Chykalenko – to 1907, Rusova in her 1928 edition – to 1916.

Unlike nineteenth-century autobiographies of this type, the main thing of the Ukrainian autobiography of the first decades of the twentieth century is to leave behind a 'living testimonies' about the author's life, the lives of people around him, the moods and interests that prevailed in the society of the time, and the socially significant events that the autobiographer witnessed or participated in. At the same time, the leading theme of the narrative is not so much their own path in life as the life of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the period in which the memoirists live. According to Mariia Fedun', 'the memoirist of modern times understood

that memories are not only history (the cognitive function of memories). He tried to explain the past: to cast his own light on events, facts, and people, trying to preserve their inner nature' (Fedun' 2010: 21), so autobiographers, as true chroniclers of their time, relying on their own memory and documentary sources of the time, wrote down for future generations the activities of Ukrainian *hromadas* in Kyiv, St. Petersburg, Odesa, Kharkiv, L'viv, Ternopil', Poltava, Chernihiv, Katerynoslav, Yelysavethrad, and others. Each community had its own interests, which consisted mainly of a comprehensive study of the history and culture of the Ukrainian people, compiling dictionaries, collecting, further processing and publishing ethnographic materials, and educational activities.

Barvynsk'yi recalls the Ukrainian community in Ternopil' at the time:

Our *hromada* was a real school of the science of the native language, literature, and history, precisely those subjects in which we could learn very little or nothing at all in the gymnasium. At the community meetings, which usually took place every Saturday

evening, and more than once on Sundays and holidays, citizens made speeches on the occasion of some celebration, readings on literary and historical topics, and recitations of works by prominent poets. Sometimes letters written to citizens or sexes from the *Vecherhyts'* or *Meta* were read and reprisals were carried out against them. (Barvynsk'yi 1989: 82)¹⁷

Ethnographic trips were made in order to acquire a better understanding of the history, folklore, language, culture, and life of the Ukrainian people. Antonvych, for example, recounts how:

in the late 1850s, our group thought that it was a shame to live in the region and not know either the region itself or its people, and we decided to spend all our vacations from the beginning of April to the end of August travelling on foot around the region [...]. We travelled on foot, in *svytka* [a traditional Ukrainian folk

¹⁷ Oleksandr Barvynsk'yi (1847-1926) was a Ukrainian historian, educator, and social and political activist.

clothing, a long coat], and everywhere we were mistaken for peasant boys [...]. During three vacations, we travelled all over the right-bank: Volyn', Podolia, Kyiv, Kholm, and most of the Katerynoslav and Kherson regions. It would take a very long time to tell you about our travels, and probably most of them have already faded into memory. We usually spent the night by asking to stay with peasants, and never once did the host agree to charge for the night and dinner. (Antonovych 1989: 148)

According to Rusova's recollections, she and her husband even 'sat down on the land, as they said at the time [...], with purely folklore competitions' (Rusova 2004: 70):

at home I had never been in the kitchen, and here I dared to take on all the difficult work of a cook and a hostess. Ol. Ol. [Oleksandr Oleksandrovych, Sofiia Rusova's husband] had to move from books and intellectual life to agriculture. I will never forget how one morning the women came

to my house on their way back from the market in Borzna, and I was kneading dough for bread. Red-faced and exhausted from all the hard work, I tried not to show my inability in front of the women, but one of them just looked at me for a while, smiling, and then she couldn't stand it any longer and said: 'Lady, let me do it for you in a minute,' and gently pushing me away from the tub, she began to knead the thick dough. I was ashamed, but what could I do? (Rusova 2004: 70)¹⁸

But it was precisely this 'going to the people' that allowed her to better understand the life of her people.¹⁹

¹⁸ The idiomatic expression *to sit down on the land* meant 'to integrate into the people', 'to live among peasants as one of them'

¹⁹ This expression was associated with the activities of the *narodovoltsy*, participants in the revolutionary democratic movement of the Russian Empire that emerged after the peasant reform of 1861. During the period 1873-1875, democratically-minded young people, not only from the Ukrainian lands (primarily Kyiv, Kharkiv, and Chernihiv provinces), but also from the entire Russian Empire, carefully prepared (that is equipped with peasant dress, knowledge of crafts and customs) and

Some autobiographers included detailed ethnographic sketches in their memoirs. For example, Hanna Barvinok describes in detail her wedding and farewell 'hen party' held according to Ukrainian folk traditions (Barvinok 2001: 273-77). Recalling his childhood in the family estate in the Kherson region, Chykalenko does not ignore the rituals and beliefs of the Ukrainian people of that time, which were part of their lives thanks to their servants. Later, according to the author, being fascinated by the ethnographic trend, he recorded and published some of this folklore material in magazines and in separate editions (Chykalenko 2011: 48-49).

However, according to the recollections of the members of these communities, their activities were not always safe, 'because at that time it took a lot of courage and faith in the revival of the Ukrainian nation for people who were in the civil service, burdened by family, to belong to an

went out to villages to get closer to the peasants and conduct revolutionary propaganda among them in the hope of rousing them to armed rebellion against the Russian autocracy. This dangerous activity was accompanied by the risk of arrest. Between 1873 and 1879, more than two thousand people were prosecuted for revolutionary propaganda in the countryside in the Ukrainian provinces of the Russian Empire alone.

"illegal community" that could be threatened with "settlement" in Siberia or in "not so distant places" like Vologda, Perm', etc' (Chykalenko 2011: 201). Their revolutionary activities were often linked to their public Ukraine-centric work, a fact which was also reflected in their autobiographies. As Rusova recalls, 'almost every day, the *narodovoltsy* [members of the People's Will] gathered at my place, discussing plans for uprisings [...]. Quite a few strange individuals visited me with various conspiratorial recommendations' (Rusova 2004: 80-81). As a result, the author was imprisoned several times and, after serving her prison sentence, she was closely supervised by the gendarmerie.

The autobiographers of this period came from progressive-minded wealthy families. They had a good upbringing and a brilliant education in the best local and foreign educational institutions, had a broad outlook, were fluent in several foreign languages, travelled the world, were acquainted with the most famous people of their time, and were well aware of contemporary intellectual trends. They were true patriots of their country, with a strong civic position and active social engagement.

Some typical descriptions which they would use for relatives and acquaintances were expressions such as 'a true Ukrainian' (Chykalenko 2011: 165), or 'a man with a deep democratic conviction' (Antonovych 1989: 147). According to Rusova, Olena Pchilka was a model of the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the time 'who manifested her Ukrainianness not only in patriotic words, but by actively pursuing it in her family life and citizenship. She spoke only Ukrainian, the pure Poltava language. She brought up her children in the family on Ukrainian culture, adding to it as many Western languages as possible' (Rusova 2004: 43). The dramatist Mykhailo Staryts'kyi was highly respected by Ukrainian civic activists; Rusova explains the reasons as follows:

when the Ukrainian theatre began with such success as part of the first truly artistic group (Kropyvnyts'kyi, Sadovs'kyi, Zankovets'ka, Saksahans'kyi, Tobilevych), Mykhailo Petr[ovych] was willing to give all his property for the organisation of this troupe, despite the fact that he had a family – four children and a wife, and despite the fact that he himself was constantly

under the threat of death because all this work with the organisation of the theatre and directing caused a lot of very dangerous worries for him. (Rusova 2004: 40)

Autobiographers of this period created self-images of deeply moral, modest people who, despite their significant professional, intellectual, social and political achievements, avoided personal assessments of their own activities, limiting themselves to simple statements of facts. The self-image of women was that of atypical emancipated, well-educated women of that time, who, like their brothers and husbands, actively participated in the social and political life of the country, travelled extensively, spoke foreign languages fluently, and were familiar with the most progressive ideas of their time.

The years 1926 and 1927 were marked by the anniversaries of two outstanding scholars, prominent historians, academics, and prominent political figures, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi²⁰ and

²⁰ Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866-1934) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, scientist, university lecturer, academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the Czech Academy of Sciences, socio-political figure, chairman

Dmytro Bahalii, and as a result they wrote and published their autobiographies in separate editions.²¹ Hrushevs'kyi wrote his *Autobiography* in 1926 on the occasion of his 60th birthday and 40th anniversary of the beginning of his career as a historian. The solemn celebration of the academician's anniversary took place on 3 October 1926 in the assembly hall of the Kyiv Institute of Public Education. And as Liubomyr Vynar notes in his study, despite the numerous 'differences between Hrushevs'kyi and representatives of the "red science" and the Bolshevik authorities' (Vynar 1981: 38), which were also manifest in their anniversary greetings, 'the celebration of Hrushevs'kyi's anniversary went beyond paying tribute to the most prominent historian of Ukraine and turned into a majestic manifestation of the Ukrainian academic world' (Vynar 1981: 38). The scholar's *Autobiography* was published on the eve of the anniversary in

of the Central Rada of the Ukrainian People's Republic, and active public figure.

²¹ Dmytro Bahalii (1857-1932) was a prominent Ukrainian historian, philosopher, university lecturer, rector of Kharkiv Imperial University, and co-founder and academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

2,000 copies and consisted of 31 pages of text.²² Given the practical orientation of his autobiography, Hrushevs'kyi chose to include only what he believed to be the most fundamental autobiographical information about himself, leaving many autobiographical gaps in the text, mostly concerning the events of the last years of his life, not long before these anniversaries. Thus, in a dry telegraphic style, the author reports that:

having been elected chairman of the Ukrainian Central Rada at its organisation and summoned by its telegrams to Kyiv, Hrushevs'kyi arrived in March [...], for the fourteen months of the Ukrainian Central Rada (March 1917 – April 1918), during which Hrushevs'kyi was always its chairman, he filled his time primarily with political work [...]. After the Hetman's coup, Hrushevs'kyi lived in Kyiv incognito [...]. At the end of March, he left for abroad through Galicia [...]. Elected in late 1923 as a member of the Ukraini-

²² This text is now a bibliographic rarity, as almost the entire edition was withdrawn from library collections and destroyed in the 1930s.

an Academy and having been granted permission to return, in March 1924 he returned to Soviet Ukraine, to Kyiv, hoping to conduct intensive scientific work in the new conditions. (Hrushevs'kyi 1926: 28-30)

Given the time and the conditions in which he had to work at the time of writing his autobiography, Hrushevs'kyi confines himself to stating facts about the events of recent years and does not give any assessment or commentary on his own political activity, nor does he mention the people who worked alongside him. At the same time, having described his socio-political, public, and publishing activities during 1906-1924, the author ignores the events of 1924-1926. Bahalii was familiar with Hrushevs'kyi's autobiographies (1906 and 1926) and, recalling them in his own biography, regretted that the author confined himself to a very brief overview of his own life and professional career. He wrote:

It would seem that historians should be memoirists first and foremost, but we do not notice this among Ukrainian historians. And even the author of the

classical history of Ukraine, the academician M.S. Hrushevs'kyi, whose life and work are a diverse and colourful, so to speak, epic, gave us only a short autobiography, and even that was on the occasion of his two anniversaries. (Bahalii 1927: 16)

However, as Vynar notes, in this case, 'the "spirit of the times" must also be considered' (Vynar 1981: 33).

Bahalii wrote his *Autobiography* in 1927 at the request of the Academy of Sciences on the occasion of its 70th anniversary, which was solemnly celebrated on 7 November 1927 in Kyiv at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The same year, it was published in Kyiv in the *Jubilee Collection in Honour of Academician Dmytro Ivanovych Bahalii on the Occasion of the Seventieth Anniversary of His Life and Fiftieth Anniversary of His Scientific Activity*. In the preface to the re-issue of the academician's autobiography, Yareshchenko notes that

D.I. Bahalii's anniversary was marked by solemn official celebrations and the authorities literally showered the scholar, unlike his colleague [Hrush-

ves'kyi], with their privileges. A decree of the Council of People's Commissars determined that academicians' collected works should be published at public expense, the Kharkiv Research Department of the History of Ukrainian Culture be named after him, D.I. Bahalii be granted a personal pension, and an annual scientific prize to be established in his name (Yareshchenko 2002: 11).

The scholar took seriously to the request of the Academy of Sciences, since, in keeping with the occasion, 'this biography is inevitably needed so that the results of my scholarly work can be summed up with concrete and factual data' and 'I had to start compiling my biography myself, because no one else could have done it' (Bahalii 1927: 15). Bahalii did a lot of research, collecting materials about himself and those events that might be interpreted ambiguously by his descendants. The author himself writes in a note at the beginning of his autobiography: 'My life is to a significant extent my memoirs, so in order to make them factually accurate, I have cited documentary data from archival sources; I consider them espe-

cially necessary where it is actually about me' (Bahalii 1927: 16). This means that the work contains numerous pieces of documentary evidence authored by others alongside Bahalii's text.

Unlike Hrushevs'kyi, who in his autobiography (particularly in the first part) paid considerable attention to explaining his own political beliefs and throughout the work referred to his political activity in one way or another, Bahalii noted at the beginning of the work that 'I stood aside from politics and the active political life of that time' (Bahalii 1927: 16). Later the scholar repeatedly pursues this thesis on the pages of his autobiography, saying, for example: 'Energetically engaged in public education, I resolutely shied away from the political work of the time' (Bahalii 1927: 162). To prove this, he cited documentary evidence from his contemporaries: 'Here is D.I. Doroshenko's recollection of how I was called to the post of prime minister in 1918 and how I resolutely refused this offer' (Bahalii 1927: 163).

Similarly to Hrushevs'kyi's autobiography, Bahalii's autobiography is characterised by self-censorship, caused by concern for his own safety and the safety of his family and friends. That is why the autobiographer speaks quite cautiously and carefully

about the Bolshevik government, his attitude to it, and the conflicts that arose between it and the scholar from time to time. It is noteworthy that, like Hrushevs'kyi, Bahalii paid much more attention to the events of his life before the October Revolution, devoting nine chapters out of eleven to them, while the events of 1917-1927 are contained in only one, the last chapter. As the scholar explains at the beginning of chapter eleven:

This era of my life and activity would require a broad, spacious narrative and my special attention and public assessment in order to illuminate it; however, I think that the time for such a general and comprehensive assessment has not yet come, because the data have not yet been collected, so I will actually be able to confine myself here to a scheme, and even then it is far from complete. (Bahalii 1927: 152)

The autobiographies of Kulish, Hanna Barvinok, Kostomarov, Barvyns'kyi, Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Drahomanov, Chykalenko, Antonovych, Rusova, Myshchenko, Hrushevs'kyi, and Bahalii were the first Ukrainian autobiog-

raphies of the classical type. They laid the foundations of the Ukrainian autobiographical tradition and determined one of the vectors of its development for the next centuries. They became the first examples of Ukrainian autobiographies of an analytical nature; their scale (in terms of the amount of material covered); the detailed description of a large time period of the author's life; the predominance of the memoir component over the autobiographical one; the clear structuring of the narrative with the distribution of autobiographical material into sections and subsections; documentation of the narrative; the indication of precise temporal and spatial reference points; the introduction of actual documentary sources into the textual framework of the work in order to clarify, comment on, and provide additional characteristics; the identity of the author, narrator, and protagonist; an auto-diegetic type of narrative with internal focus; and the construction of a textual plane from authorial and non-authorial texts. If for ancient syncretic Ukrainian autobiographies of the 17th and 18th centuries the idea of serving God was dominant, then the Ukrainian autobiographies of the second half of the 19th century and the first decades of

the 20th century explored above introduce the idea of public service to one's people, whose life was comprehensively studied from an ethnographic point of view; these texts had a nationalist, Ukrainophile character. At the same time, however this type of autobiography still contains features of apologetics inherent to the earliest Ukrainian autobiographies, a feature that was also inherited by autobiographies of this type in subsequent periods of Ukrainian autobiographical writing. Other typological features of Ukrainian autobiographies of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century (features also inherited by later autobiographies of this type) are a certain thoroughness and commitment to balance in thoughts, assessments, and judgements, as well as a reliance on actual documentary evidence to confirm the veracity of the autobiographer's words. As a result, Ukrainian autobiographies of this structural and typological variety became 'living' historical documents that are still studied today. Further study of Ukrainian autobiographies of this type from different periods of their development (from the nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries) will provide valuable information not only on the development of

Ukrainian autobiography in terms of structure and typology, but also on the history of the formation and development of Ukrainian statehood and Ukrainian nationalism, including their interrelationships with other nations in the region.²³

²³ I would like to thank Dr James Rann and Dr Josephine Von Zitzewitz for their invaluable help in translating this paper.

Bibliography

Antonovych 1989: Antonovych, Volodymyr. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafichni zapysky' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 147-56

Bahalii 1927: Bahalii, Dmytro. 1927. *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrainskoi kultury. Yuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Dmytra Ivanovycha Bahalii z nahody simdesiatoi richnytsi zhyttia ta piatdesiatykh rokovyn naukovo diialnosti* (Kyiv: B.V.)

Bahalii 2002: Bahalii, Dmytro Ivanovych. 2002. *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrainskoi kultury* (Kharkiv: Prapor)

Barvinok 2001: Barvinok, Hanna. 2001. 'Spomyny A. M. Kulish (Hanny Barvinok)' in Hanna Barvinok, *Zbirnyk do 170-littia z dnia narodzhennia* (Kyiv: Rada), 255-89

Barvyns'kyi 1989: Barvyns'kyi, Oleksandr. 1989. 'Spomyny z moho zhyttia' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 157-204

Chykalenko 2011: Chykalenko, Yevhen. 2011. *Spohady (1861-1907)* (Kyiv: Tempora)

Drahomanov 1989: Drahomanov, Mykhailo. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafia' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 115-45

Dziuba 2008: Dziuba, Ivan. 2008. *Spohady i rozдумы na finishnii priamii* (Kyiv: Krynytsia)

Dziuba 2013: Dziuba, Ivan. 2013. *Ne okremo vziate zhyttia* (Kyiv: Lybid')

Fedun' 2010: Fedun', Mariia. 2010. *Vitchyzniana memuarystyka v Zakhidnii Ukraini pershoi polovyny XX stolittia: istorychni tendentsii, zhanrova spetsyfika, poetyka* (Ivano-Frankivsk: Prykarpats'kyi natsional'nyi universytet imeni Vasylia Stefanyka)

Halych 1991: Halych, Oleksandr. 1991. *Ukrains'ka pysmennyts'ka memuarystyka: pryroda, evolutsiia, poetyka*. (Kyiv: KDPI imeni O. M. Hor'koho)

Halych 2001: Halych, Oleksandr. 2001. *Ukrains'ka dokumentalistyka na zlami tysiacholit': spetsyfika, geneza, perspektyvy* (Luhans'k: Znan-nia)

Halych 2008: Halych, Oleksandr. 2008. *U vymirakh non fiction: shchodennyky ukrains'kykh pys'mennykiv XX stolittia* (Luhans'k: Znan-nia)

Hrushevs'kyi 1926: Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo. 1926. *Avtobiohra-fii* (Kyiv: B.V.)

Kostomarov 1989: Kostomarov, Mykola. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafii' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh uk-rainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 57-113

Kostomarov 1990: Kostomarov, Nikolai. 1990. *Istoricheskie proizve-deniiia. Avtobiografiia*. (Kyiv: Lybid')

Kulish 2005: Kulish, Panteleimon. 2005. 'Moie zhyttia' in Pante-leimon Kulish, *Povist' pro ukrains'kii narod; Moie zhyttia; Khutirs'ka fi-losofiia i viddalena od svitu poeziia*. (Kyiv: Ukrains'kyi svit), 95-138

Lejeune 1971: Lejeune, Philipe. 1971. *L'autobiographie en France* (Paris: Armand Colin)

Lejeune 1975: Lejeune, Philipe. 1975. *Le pacte autobiogra-phique* (Paris: Seuil)

Lejeune 2004: Lejeune, Philipe. 2004. *L'autobiographie en France*, 2nd edn (Paris: Armand Colin)

Lejeune 2005: Lejeune, Philipe. 2005. *Signes de vie: le pacte auto-biographique 2* (Paris: Seuil)

Luckyj 1989: Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohra-fii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA)

Mykhal'chuk 1989: Mykhal'chuk, Kost'. 1989. 'Avtobiohrafichna zapyska' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vy-datnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolittia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 219-24

Myronets' 2008: Myronets', Nadiia. 2008. *Dzherelaistorychnoi pa-miati* (Kyiv: Instytut ukrains'koi arkheohrafii ta dzhereloznavstva imeni Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho NAN Ukrainy)

Myshchenko 1929: Myshchenko, Liudmyla. 1929. 'Z mynuloho sto-littia. Spomyny' in *Za sto lit.* (Kyiv : DVU), vol. 4, 106-60

Naumov 2006: Naumov, Serhii. 2006. *Ukrains'kyi politychnyi rukh na Livoberezhzhi (90-ti roky XIX stolittia – liutyi 1917 roku)* (Kharkiv: KhNU imeni V. N. Karazina)

Nechui-Levyts'kyi 1989: Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Ivan. 1989. 'Zhyttiepys Ivana Levyts'koho (Nechuia), napysanyi nym samym' in Luckyj, George (ed.). 1989. *Sami pro sebe: Avtobiohrafii vydatnykh ukrainsiv XIX stolit-tia* (New-York: UVAN u SShA), 229-38

Pavlyk 1896: Pavlyk, Mykhailo (ed.). 1896. *Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841-1895). Yoho yubilei, smert', avtobiohrafia i spys tvoriv* (Lviv: V. Manets'ky's printing house)

Pobirchenko 2000: Pobirchenko, Nataliia. 2000. *Pedahohichna i politychna diialnist' ukrains'kykh hromad u druhii polovyni XIX – na pochatku XX stolittia* (Kyiv: Naukovyi Dim)

Procyk 2019: Procyk, Anna. 2019. *Giuseppe Mazzini's Young Europe and the Birth of Modern Nationalism in the Slavic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

Pustovit 2008: Pustovit, Valeriia. 2008. *Problemy natsiietvorennia v memuarному dyskursi vitchyznianykh pys'mennykiv XIX stolittia* (Luhans'k: Znannia)

Rudenko 2013: Rudenko, Mykola. 2013. *Naibilshe dyvo – zhyttia* (Kyiv: Klio)

Rusova 2004: Rusova, Sofiia. 2004. 'Memuary' in Sofiia Rusova, *Memuary. Shchodennyk* (Kyiv: Polihrafknyha), 9-242

Sarbei 1994: Sarbei, Volodymyr (ed.). 1994. *Narysy z istorii ukrain'skoho natsional'noho rukhu* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy)

Shevchuk 2008: Shevchuk, Velerii (ed.). 2008. *Koreni ta parosti: ukrains'kyi genealogikon: pamiatky ukrains'koi biohrafichnoi literatury XI – XVIII stolit'* (Kyiv: Lybid')

Vynar 1981: Vynar, Liubomyr. 1981. 'Avtobiohrafia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho z 1926 roku' in Vynar, Liubomyr (ed). 1981. *Avtobiohrafia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho z 1926 roku*. (NewYork; Munich; Toronto: Vydavnytstvo ukrains'koho istorychnoho tovarystva)

Yanyshyn 2008: Yanyshyn, Borys. 2008. *Ukrains'ka mis'ka politychna elita v Halychyni ta narodovs'kyi rukh ostannioi tretyny XIX stolittia: stanovlennia ta instytutsiinyi rozvytok* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy)

Yareshchenko 2002: Yareshchenko, Artur. 2002. 'Spovid', napysana kroviiu sertsia... Dmytro Bahalii ta yoho Avtobiohrafia in Dmytro Bahalii, *Avtobiohrafia. 50 lit na storoni ukrains'koi kultury* (Kharkiv: Prapor), 3-12

Zhylenko 2011: Zhylenko, Iryna. 2011. *Homo feriens* (Kyiv: Smoloskyp)