# Introduction

## I. Why this book?

This book describes the lives, works and aspirations of more than 150 women and men who were active in, or part of, women's movements and feminisms in 22 countries in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe. In doing so, it challenges the widely held belief that there was no feminism in this part of Europe. Taken together, the biographical portraits not only show that feminists (we will come back to this term) existed here, but also that they were widespread and diverse, and included Romanian princesses, Serbian philosophers and peasants, Latvian and Slovakian novelists, Albanian teachers, Hungarian Christian social workers and activists of the Catholic women's movement, Austrian factory workers, Bulgarian feminist scientists and socialist feminists, Russian radicals, philanthropists, militant suffragists and Bolshevik activists, prominent writers and philosophers of the Ottoman era, as well as Turkish republican leftist political activists and nationalists, internationally recognized Greek feminist leaders, an Estonian pharmacologist and science historian, a Slovenian 'literary feminist,' a Czech avant-garde painter, a Ukrainian feminist scholar and Polish and Czech Senate Members. There were feminists of liberal persuasion, Social Democrats, communists, partisans, Catholics, Jews, Protestants, members of the Orthodox Church and atheists; in sum women, and some men, from all walks of life. Their stories together constitute a rich tapestry of feminist activity.

The belief that there was no feminism in this part of Europe (probably with the exception of Russia, where the history of women's movements has been well documented)[1] is not limited to 'ordinary people,' but is shared by academics as well. Such a fine historian as Eric Hobsbawm wrote only a few years ago with respect to the period around 1900 that "In the condition of the great majority of the world's women, those who lived in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the peasant societies of southern and eastern Europe, or indeed in most agrarian societies, there was as yet no change whatever."[2] It is true that supporters of women's movements and feminist causes in those regions formed a relatively small part of the population in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries–perhaps smaller than in some of the (more industrialized) countries of Western Europe in the same period. Yet, rather than *a priori* assuming that there was no change, it may be more constructive for historians to pay close attention to the undoubted presence and influence of women's activities and protests,

trying to understand in which contexts they developed and how. Women's activities in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe (CESEE) produced (as in 'the West') "a small but unprecedented number of women who were active" and "distinguished, in fields previously confined entirely to men"[3]: dynamic personalities such as Callirhoe Parren (Greece), Elena Ghica/Dora d'Istria (a Romanian of Albanian descent), Fatma Aliye and Halide Edib Adıvar (Turkey), Milica Ninković (Serbia), Vela Blagoeva and Anna Karima (Bulgaria), the Croatian Dragojla Jarnević, Bosnians Stoja Kašiković and Staka Skenderova, and many, many others.

Western feminist historians may not have been so blunt as Hobsbawm, but until recently their work has been generally limited to the Western European continent (or even to a limited number of countries there: namely England, Germany and France). Karen Offen, in her important book *European Feminisms 1700-1950* (2000), has clearly made all possible efforts to include data about Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, but was restricted by the piecemeal and limited information available for most countries of these regions.[4] The history of women's movements in this part of Europe by and large has either not been researched or published only in local languages (the books in Romanian by Ştefania Mihăilescu and Ghizela Cosma are good examples of the latter),[5] without a bridge to the mainly Anglophone world of international scholarship. Of course there are differences in this respect between the various countries, and projects are underway, but it is safe to say that the history of women's movements and feminisms is largely unwritten and that most recent publications deal with the contemporary history of women's movements/feminisms after 1989.[6] The recent (2004) volume *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective*, edited by Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker, does include some countries from the Eastern half of the European continent, but only a handful (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Russia, and Greece);[7] our book, with its focus on 22 countries, aims (through biographical accounts) to give a broader overview of the social-economic-cultural-political factors shaping women's movements and feminisms across the diverse countries of this part of Europe.[8] Therefore the first goal of this *Biographical Dictionary* is to provide reliable information—in principle based on primary research—about women and men who were involved in women's movements and feminisms in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe. We hope to initiate cross national discussions of the history and meaning of feminism(s) in CESEE, and thus to contribute to the expanding field of international and comparative historical research of women's movements and feminisms, as well as contributing in a more general sense to building women's and gender history as an academic field of teaching and research in CESEE.

By uncovering and making accessible this wealth of information, we also hope to challenge the above-mentioned view that there was no feminism in CESEE, as well as the commonly accepted notion that feminism in the region was 'imported' from 'the West' and alien to 'local traditions.' These two (related) assertions are clearly not

innocent. They have been and still are used in many countries around the world to discredit local women's movements and feminisms. Yet "in every society, in every generation, women protest gender injustice,"[9] and any suggestion to the contrary is a denial of the intelligence and human agency of countless women and men, including those featured in this *Biographical Dictionary*. As Judit Ascady has recently put it with respect to Hungary, "If attention is not drawn to this historical background of ... feminism, all the efforts of those who once devoted their energies to this cause will be wasted, and modern-day feminism will be seen as alien and unconnected."[10] The biographies here not only provide a window onto that historical background (thus giving present-day women's movements the 'historical support' that they need and are entitled to), in some cases they demonstrate explicitly the historical continuities between feminisms past and present (as in the case of Veselinka Malinska from Macedonia).

Finally, writing the histories of women's movements and feminisms in CESEE will hopefully increase tolerance and understanding of women's movements and feminisms today, if only by showing the many historical connections between them—particularly before 1940.

# II. Choices and Methodology

## Biographies

We have chosen to reconstruct the history of women's movements and feminisms in CESEE in the form of biographical portraits. One of the main reasons for doing so is our belief that—within all the structural limitations that have existed and continue to exist—human history is made by human beings. In the context of fundamental social changes taking place everywhere in Europe in the nineteenth century (urbanization, industrialization, literacy and education programs, technological changes, 'modernization'), women and men were moved and inspired—by religious beliefs, the struggle for national liberation, socialism and/or feminism—to reject women's secondary status, their poverty and/or illiteracy, discriminating laws, women's exclusion from the realms of culture, higher education, science and politics, age-old traditions presented as unchangeable as well as, for that matter, modern forms of patriarchy promoted by the new 'inclusive' social and political movements such as nationalism and socialism. In order to understand why some women and men opted for change, or even devoted their lives to the struggle for social justice (including gender equality), we have to situate their personalities and personal histories in the broader social-economic-cultural-political context, which is what the entries generally do.

Moreover, the biographical perspective not only clarifies why some individuals opted for change, but also explains the fields in which they became active, usually (as many entries show) connected to their own specific aspirations and the problems and

barriers they encountered—yet another example of the feminist insight that the so-called 'public' and 'private' spheres are intimately connected. A focus on individual life stories in the context of wider social-economic-cultural-political structures brings out these connections: women such as Hermin Beniczky (1815–1895), Eliška Krásnohorská (1847–1926), and Terézia Vansová (1857–1942), who personally suffered from not having had a thorough and structured education and then went on to become pioneers of women's education; Bulgarian women lawyers prevented from practicing their profession such as Dimitrana Ivanova (1881–1960) and Vera Zlatareva (1905–1977), whose life stories merged with the interwar Bulgarian feminist movement to form a personal and political history of struggle with the male legal (and other) professions; or women such as the Turkish Nurser Öztunalı (1947–1999) who, on the basis of her own experience with marital violence, initiated a huge campaign against violence against women as a social/structural rather than individual phenomenon. The biographical/individual level also enables readers to trace which persons (e.g. family members or others) and literature most influenced the ways our subjects/protagonists thought and acted, and in which formal and informal networks they operated—locally, nationally and internationally.

A third reason for choosing the form of biographical entries is the sheer pleasure or inspiration that we derive from reading about other people's lives, a pleasure we hope our readers will share.

## Women's Movements and Feminisms

One of the reasons why feminism is often seen as a 'Western' phenomenon is that (Western) feminists themselves have conveyed that perspective—often with the concomitant notion of superiority and the belief in having *the* right perspective, if not the duty to impose that on others. Indeed historically, as has been documented extensively over the last ten to fifteen years, many Western feminists have shared the imperialist perspective of their governments and co-nationals[11] (and with respect to CESEE, some would argue, similar missionary/imperialist tendencies have become prevalent after 1989 as well).[12]

In order to avoid reproducing such tendencies, and in line with our belief that 1) women's movements and feminisms always have to be contextualized and 2) historically have taken many forms, we have not pre-defined what we understand by 'women's movements and feminisms.' Instead we have asked local experts—the Advisory Board members or Country Coordinators (see page xiii)—to put together lists of names of those subjects they felt should be included in this *Dictionary*. Similarly, in drawing a distinction between 'women's movements' and 'feminisms,' we sought to keep an open mind in order not to exclude *a priori* writings and activities that aimed to improve women's status and position (as part of a 'women's movement'), yet did not

necessarily aim for women's equality with men and/or to challenge patriarchal structures (as 'feminism' is generally defined as doing).[13]

Indeed, we provided only two 'hard' criteria regarding the inclusion of subjects: that they were active in the nineteenth or twentieth century, and that the subject no longer be alive (which is the reason why the *Biographical Dictionary* contains very few entries about contemporary activists/feminists). We informed the Country Coordinators that, considering the state of the research, we were interested in women and men who had established women's organizations and journals, as well as in all kinds of international connections. Of course, the choices that the Country Coordinators made were shaped not only by the state of women's history in their respective countries (which varies widely), but also by their own disciplinary backgrounds and interests. That is why for some countries we have more 'literary feminists' than 'feminist activists' affiliated to women's organizations.

### The Countries

The question of which countries to include in a biographical dictionary of this nature is a difficult one. There is no such thing as a simple definition of 'Europe' nor any simple division of Europe into 'East' and 'West,' as many authors have shown. The labels 'East' and 'West' are relative, historically changing, mutually constitutive and politically laden. In addition, these labels suggest homogenous entities that do not exist.[14] We have decided to include countries in the Eastern half of the European continent generally perceived to be 'outside' the 'core,' yet nevertheless part of Europe. Most of them have shared histories as parts of the Russian, Prussian, Habsburg and Ottoman empires. This includes Turkey which, through the Ottoman Empire, has a shared history with the South Eastern European peninsula—'European Turkey' seen by some as part of the Balkans. Of course many of these countries also share a history of state socialism.

On the basis of the current map of this part of Europe, the countries included in the *Biographical Dictionary* therefore are: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and Ukraine.

## III. What have we found?

Altogether, if we consider the differences between all these 22 countries (of which there are many—too complex and varied to address here), the similarities from a gender perspective are overriding. All countries reveal male domination at both the sym-

bolic and the material level, which is to say that despite the differences, common oppressive gender principles and hierarchies were at work in the historical period covered by the *Dictionary*. Women were subordinated to the 'first sex' and this was reflected in the many common features of their status—devalued motherhood, moral (but not legal or financial) responsibility for family life, vulnerability to violence, high levels of illiteracy and high mortality rates (e.g. in childbirth) etc.—that were a consequence of their being regarded as the 'second sex.' All the same, gender is not the only category of social organization that affects women's lives. The similarities and differences between women's conditions are not only a question of the degree to which 'the masculine principle' is dominant, but also of how this principle intersects with other social demarcations.

What we have found striking is that there does not seem to have been an ideological position or party line, faith, political modernization program or cultural/religious national movement that was exempt from the burning issues of the day raised by what was known across all spectrums of intellectual endeavor as 'the woman question.' All the same, two ideologies stand out in their involvement with 'the woman question': nationalism and socialism. These two ideologies in particular brought men and women together to fight for what many perceived as a 'common cause.' 'The woman question' was set within a wider 'national question' or a wider 'social question' and thus the issues and problems raised—touching among other things on increased opportunities and rights for women in the fields of education, employment and the civil law—were seen to be of relevance to the whole of society. Socialist and nationalist organizations, often in alliance with one another, produced intellectuals and ideologues of both sexes who criticized the subordinated position of women under imperial despotism, capitalism and/or patriarchy as a sign of a 'deeper' problem (that it would later be the job of state-socialist or republican models of government to address). In these contexts, individual women, feminists and organized women's movements often (but by no means always) saw alliance and even compliance with male-dominated organizations, parties and structures as necessary to the realization of their own goals. This kind of approach to women's and feminist issues and causes may be seen in (Romanian) Eugenia de Reuss Ianculescu's philosophy that "both men and women were engaged in a common struggle for the country's social and economic progress,"[15] or the decision, in the 1920s, of the Greek *Syndesmos gia ta Dikaiomata tis Gynaikas* (League for Woman's Rights) to work with men "for strategic reasons."[16]

While this close relation between nationalism and socialism and 'the woman question' is not a new finding in itself, the entries show that women's involvement in nationalism and socialism not only allowed them to articulate certain demands (mostly for women's education, sometimes for the vote), but also to challenge the limits of those ideologies or to criticize them from within. These findings support an alternative feminist reading that does not reduce the histories of nationalism or socialism to male-dominated rhetorical exercises in gender equality. Instead, the attention of read-

ers is drawn to the manifest ways in which women saw nationalist and socialist projects as necessary to their own emancipation as women,[17] while many at the same time recognized gendered exclusionary practices as problematic features of those projects. The Polish Narcyza Żmichowska and Hungarian Mária Gárdos are examples. In 1895 the Ukrainian Natalia Kobrynska wrote: "It would be more realistic for women workers, while admitting that the victory of the workers will also be their victory, to ensure their own rights and not become dependent upon the grace of men." Similarly, the well-known Russian Bolshevik Alexandra Kollontai was by the 1920s already expressing doubts that economic conditions under communism would lead "automatically to harmonious relations between the sexes."[18] In this respect, the lives and work of women such as Żmichowska, Gárdos, Kobrynska and Kollontai reflect debates and questions regarding gender policies that have been present throughout the history of modern nationalism and socialism in CESEE [for the postwar period see for example the work of critical intellectuals such as Croatian philosopher Blaženka Despot (1930–2001)].[19]

Another important finding is that, although women's organizations in CESEE were urban phenomena, women's movements and feminisms here often addressed a wide, agrarian social base in ways that would seem to contradict Hobsbawm's assumption (previously mentioned) that social change was not a factor in "the peasant societies of southern and eastern Europe." Liberal newspapers in Lithuania edited by women in the early twentieth century targeted a large Lithuanian population (85 percent) living in the countryside, as well as providing women's supplements addressed to women of both the towns and the countryside. In late nineteenth-century Ukraine, women activists competed with national 'populist' or socialist women's organizations that appealed to a primarily agrarian base, Belarussian nationalist feminists wrote poems "to peasant women," Romanian feminists opened schools for peasant girls and Russian feminists protested land reforms (1906) that they feared would threaten the existing rights of peasant women. Feminist and women's activities were thus part of radical changes in the lives of both urban and rural populations, and raise questions about dichotomies such as native/foreign, urban/peasant and traditional/modern.

Three other similarities between the 22 countries are also worth mentioning here. Firstly, there is the importance of education in the history of European women's movements and feminisms. In almost all cases, this is what the first initiatives to improve women's lives focused on. Suffrage, as in most Western countries, only became an issue later. To a certain extent, this finding is evidence of the dramatic impact Enlightenment and liberal thought had on the subjects from all 22 countries, many of whom were influenced by core Enlightenment theories of citizenship and education by men such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, and many of whom reacted negatively to the lack of attention paid to women's education and their accompanying lack of civil and civic status. The overwhelmingly positive reception across the region of John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869) suggests that

in Eastern as well as Western Europe, women and men had been growing increasingly frustrated with male-centered views on the functions of education, politics and social roles. It also demonstrates the relevance of Mill's (and other key feminist thinkers') works for CESEE—works that were often translated into local languages. Secondly, it is remarkable how many of our biographical subjects expressed an interest in women's history and the history of women's movements in their own countries and beyond.[20] This is true of Fatma Aliye (Turkey), Callirhoe Parren (Greece), Zinaida Mirovich, Inessa Armand and Ekaterina Nikolaevna Shchepkina (Russia), Lydia Sklevicky (Croatia), Eliza Orzeszkowa (Poland) and Milica Ninković (Serbia) to name but a few. Thirdly, many of our subjects were activists who expressed a powerful belief in the force of internationalism. This belief often (but not always) remained unshaken even in the aftermath of the devastation caused by the two World Wars. Perhaps (as the Hungarian Ilona Stetina seemed to suggest) the extent of the devastation wreaked upon Europe in the first half of the twentieth century strengthened the commitment of activists to the international women's movement, seeing international connections and contacts as vital to the success of their own particular, local struggles.

In addition to these specific results, the entries taken together raise questions about the categories that we use in writing the history of women's movements and feminisms. Thus, we have noticed a certain hesitancy among scholars about including socialist or communist feminists, indeed, some would argue that a 'communist feminist' is in itself a *contradictio in terminis*, "no matter how many specific examples of [communist] policies in favor of women we may find."[21] Arguments against 'communist feminists' have pointed to the fact that first socialists and later communists have denounced and attacked the women's movement as 'bourgeois,' and made explicit their aversion to 'feminism.' This approach has seen gender policies, especially for the communist era in Eastern Europe, as 'state directed' (i.e. motivated by the economic interests of the party or state), rather than reflecting women's 'own aspirations.'

However, for many socialist and communist women at the time, socialism was not just the only political stream that advocated women's equality (and therefore attractive), but they themselves were deeply convinced that the only way to social justice, including gender equality, was through socialism (as for instance the Macedonian entries demonstrate). Secondly, some women, such as the Austrian Social Democrat Käthe Leichter, did not consider themselves part of the women's movement, yet through their writings and activities they contributed significantly to knowledge about women's, especially working women's situation. In the case of Leichter it is clear that no matter how we categorize her, neither this categorization nor Leichter's own self-identification (*Selbstzuordnung*) encompass all aspects of her individual and political biography.[22] Thirdly, there were women, probably quite a few, who identified with, and remained active within the socialist movement, even though they disagreed with its patriarchal practices and sidelining of 'women's issues' in the name of socialism (as

discussed above). Fourthly, and conversely, there were many women—as the Bulgarian and Polish entries in particular show—who seemingly identified as *both* feminists and socialists without much effort. Lastly, and specifically relating to the period of state socialism, there were women such as the Slovenian Vida Tomšič (1913–1998), with a high-ranking position in the communist state hierarchy, who contributed significantly to improving women's status and situation. Tomšič truly believed that private property had to be dismantled in order for patriarchal relations to 'wither away.' She participated in the twentieth Triennial Plenary Conference of the International Council of Women (Vienna, 1973) and in three of the major UN Women's Conferences (1975, 1980, 1985), at which she, as the author writes, "represented the 'official' Yugoslav position ... [Vida Tomšič] contributed a great deal to the new legislation issued during the socialist period of 1945 to 1990 as a specialist on gender questions, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the policies she advocated [such as freedom of reproductive choice] combined both official ideology and [her] own ideas." At the same time, she was part of a government that had declared feminism "an unnecessary, even harmful, 'bourgeois' phenomenon" and which had abolished "all women's civil organizations from 'pre-communist' times—the *Jugoslovanska ženska zveza* (Yugoslav Women's Union), the *Splošno slovensko žensko društvo* (General Slovene Women's Association) and the *Krščanska ženska zveza* (Christian Women's Union)."[23] So, how is one to categorize someone like Tomšič? Was she a communist feminist? Karmen Klavžar, the author of one of our entries on Slovenian feminist Angela Vode, explicitly refers to Tomšič as "feminist."[24] Clearly, the last word about this complex issue has not yet been said, and we hope that the material offered here will initiate further debate.

Secondly, similar questions can be asked about philanthropic and/or religious organizations with a focus on women (and children): were these charity organizations—which sought to provide material relief/assistance, to give girls and women opportunities in a modern environment that seemed by and large hostile to their needs [such as the *Pesti Izraelita Nőegylet* (Pest Israelite Women's Association), Hungary's largest Jewish women's association], and which often emphasized 'conservative' family values and shied away from the political voice of feminism—were these organizations part of the women's movement?[25] Taking a broad definition of women's movements to include those initiatives that aimed at improving women's lives, we believe that they were. Moreover, contextualization is again crucial. Under tsarist law in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia, explicitly political organization/agitation was dangerous for women as well as for men. 'Conservative' Shabanova (1848–1932), the founder and Chairwoman of the *Russkoe Zhenskoe Vzaimno-Blagotvoritel'noe Obshchestvo* (Russian Women's Mutual Philanthropic Society) was imprisoned in her early career for anti-tsarist/revolutionary activities; Filosofova (1837–1912), her colleague, was exiled for the same. These women did not refrain from voicing opposition to existing structures because of religious, pious or other kinds of conservatism. Similarly, women in Republican, interwar Turkey worked within the 'harmless' framework

of philanthropy—often refusing to compromise their political agendas. As Serpil Çakır writes: "Official authorization of the *Kadınlar Halk Fırkası* [Women's People's Party] was refused on the grounds that women did not yet have political rights and members were advised to set up a women's association, suggesting the extent to which the perimeters for the granting of social and political rights for women were largely set by men as founders of Republican Turkey. The *Kadınlar Halk Fırkası* became an association: the *Türk Kadınlar Birliği* (Turkish Women's Association), but its founding principles were in fact similar to the proposed program of the political party."[26] In our view, the question therefore is not "what were these women?" but "what forums did they have and what did they do with them?"

Lastly, some of the entries here also challenge the way in which we think about the history of the international women's movement. There is consensus that the three major international organizations, the International Council of Women (ICW), the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, later International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship (IWSA/IAWSEC) and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) occupied a political 'scale'—from moderate/conservative (ICW) to (liberal) feminist to leftish/progressive feminist.[27] Yet interestingly, many Polish socialist feminists who were involved in the IAWSEC and the Polish *Związek Pracy Obywatelskiej Kobiet* (Women's Association for Civil Labor), affiliated to the IAWSEC from 1929, challenge this scheme. So does someone like Angela Vode, co-founder in 1920 of the Communist Party in Slovenia, a member of that party until 1939, and simultaneously involved in the ICW and IAWSEC.[28] It is worth bearing in mind that if our biographical subjects were able to bridge the contradictions between feminism, nationalism, socialism, communism, philanthropy and revolution in their own lives—then surely historians, including women's historians, must adopt similarly open approaches to their own research and methodologies, rather than creating forms of closure through the use of predefined and potentially limited categories.

## IV. Further research and wishes

While the process of compiling this book has brought together a wealth of information, it also highlights areas for further research of women's movements and feminisms in Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe. Many authors of entries included in this *Biographical Dictionary* note that in their respective countries, there continues to be little academic interest in the "rich and colorful" and "fully-fledged" feminist movements that may have existed and have been subjected to "collective amnesia" in the historiography of the twentieth century.[29] Potential areas of further research include more full-scale biographies of women's leaders and activists; the complex interrelation between religion and women's movements; different forms of

women's organizing across the CESEE countries, with a focus on various class, ethnic and minority groups; the connections between liberal feminism and socialism (both before and after 1945) and interregional, international and transnational connections based on joint research projects of scholars from different parts of Europe.

Several of the research areas mentioned here will undoubtedly help shed light on life 'under communism,' including personal experiences of confronting, contesting and interpreting official Party narratives, and raising questions about the meaning of 'socialist emancipation' (i.e. of women) and 'state feminism.' It is also hoped that further attention to these research areas will contribute to the creation of more comparative and integrative perspectives on the history of CESEE, possibly by those involved in the network formed through the making of this *Dictionary*.

# V. Practical and Technical Issues

## Women's names

As a rule, this book has taken to using the family (i.e. surname) of each individual subject in order to convey that person's *adult* status—be it a woman or a man. (This rule may be waived when describing the subject's childhood or early years). However the business of naming, especially women, is particularly complex. For feminists, the issue of a woman's family name, generally that of her father's and changing upon marriage (in some women's lives this means several changes of name), may be troubling in and of itself as a patriarchal practice. Even though it is historically accurate to refer to a Hungarian woman by her husband's full name, as "Mrs Artur Meller" (possibly then followed by her full maiden name), it may not always 'feel right' to do so. The problem is practical as well as ideological, at least in so far as writing women's history is concerned. For the case of Turkey, Fatmagül Berktay has pointed out to us that in the Ottoman era there were no surnames or official birth records. Sometimes the 'pater familias' would record names of newborns on the family Quoran, but not always and not usually of the females. Likewise, former slave girls bought or given to the Palace and often married off to 'pashas' were 'given' names, with the result that accurate information about women's 'real names' is obscured. Across the 22 countries (as elsewhere in Europe), a woman, whether married or single, may have chosen a pseudonym for herself—as many of our *Dictionary* subjects did—to avoid political persecution for her beliefs or (especially in the case of writers) to avoid the bias of male critics towards her as a 'woman writer.' In such cases, it 'feels right' to name the subject at times as she named herself. Many women adopted several pen-names and pseudonyms over the course of their lives, not only in their literary activities, but also in public and political life. The Latvian writer and politician Ivande Kaija (1876–1941), whose name (meaning 'Seagull' in Latvian) she chose for herself, is a case in

point. These examples draw attention not only to the patriarchal practice of denying women their own names and the historical dilemmas of reproducing those practices, but also to the alternative naming practices that women devised for themselves.

The names that appear italized and in bold refer to the names of subjects included in this *Biographical Dictionary*, in order to highlight the connections between some of the subjects.

### Names of organizations

Where possible, we have used the original names of organizations followed by the English translation the first time the organization appears in the text, rather than using translated names of organizations. There are three reasons for this approach: one, to avoid linguistic insensitivity; two, to convey a sense of the worlds in which these organizations operated and three, to facilitate the further research of scholars interested in the histories of organizations and/or their members.

### Sources

Each entry ends with an overview of the sources used for that piece. For the system employed in the organization of sources, see page xiv with Often Used Abbreviations and Symbols Used in the Lists of Sources.

The *Biographical Dictionary* does not give, or aim to give complete bibliographies of subjects at the end of each entry. The bibliographies provided are lists of sources from which the information contained in each entry has been drawn, and may be treated as preliminary bibliographies for those interested in carrying out further research.

## Notes to the Introduction

1 See among other publications, Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Bolshevism and Nihilism, 1860-1930*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978; reprint 1991; Linda Harriet Edmondson, *Feminism in Russia, 1900-17*, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1984; Marina Ledkovsky, Charlotte Rosenthal and Mary Zirin, eds., *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1994; Norma Corigliano Noonan and Carol Nechemias, eds., *Encyclopedia of Russian Women's Movements*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2001; *Adam i Eva: Al'manakh gender'noi istorii* (Adam and Eve. An almanac of gender history), Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, Institut vseobshchei istorii, 2002.

2 E. J. Hobsbawn, *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*, New York: Vintage Books, 1989, 193.

3 *Ibid.,* 192.

4 Important exceptions are Russia (see note 1) and Ukraine. See M. Bohachevsky-Chomiak, *Feminists Despite Themselves. Women in Ukrainian Community Life: 1884–1939*, University of Alberta: CIUS Press, 1988. Susan Zimmermann's monograph about the Hungarian women's movement only appeared in 1999. See Susan Zimmermann, *Die bessere Hälfte? Frauenbewegungen und Frauenbestrebungen im Ungarn der Habsburgermonarchie 1848 bis 1918* (The better half? Women's movements and women's aspirations in Hungary in the Habsburg Monarchy 1848 to 1918), Vienna/Budapest: Promedia Verlag/Napvilág Kiadó, 1999.

5 Ştefania Mihăilescu, *Emanciparea femeii române: Antologie de texte. Vol. I 1815–1918* (The emancipation of Romanian women: an anthology of texts. Vol. 1 1815–1918), Bucharest: Editura Ecumenica, 2001; Ghizela Cosma, *Femeile şi politica în România. Evoluţia dreptului de vot în perioada interbelică* (Women and politics in Romania. The evolution of suffrage rights in the interwar period), Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2002.

6 See e.g. Sabine Lang, "Women's Movements in Eastern and Central Europe," Eva Maleck-Lewy, "The East German Women's Movement After Unification," Malgozata Fuszara, "Women's Movements in Poland" and Krassimira Daskalova, "The Women's Movements in Bulgaria After Communism," all in the book *Transitions, Environments, Translations: Feminisms in International Politics*, Joan W. Scott, Cora Kaplan and Debra Keates, eds., New York: Routledge, 1997; Laura Grunberg, "Women's NGOs in Romania," in Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, eds., *Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000, 307–335; various pieces in Gabriele Jaehnert, Jana Gohrisch et. al., eds., *Gender in Transition in Eastern and Central Europe. Proceedings*, Berlin: Trafo Verlag, 2001.

7 Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker eds., *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: a European Perspective*, Stanford CA.: Stanford University Press, 2004.

8 Other English-language anthologies with some articles about the historical women's movement in CESEE include Tanya Renne, ed., *Ana's Land. Sisterhood in Eastern Europe,* Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press, 1997, and Gabriela Griffin and Rosi Braidotti (ATHENA), eds., *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*, London and New York: Zed Books, 2002.

9 Shawn Megan Burn, *Women Across Cultures. A Global Perspective*, London and Toronto: Mountain View 2000, 220.

10 Judit Ascady, "The Construction of Women's Case. Turn-of-the Century Hungarian Feminism," in Tanya Renne, ed., *Ana's Land. Sisterhood in Eastern Europe*, Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press, 1997, 106. It may also be worthwhile to repeat the observation made before that 'feminism' is no more or less 'foreign to the region' than socialism, about which no such accusations are made. Finally, women in Western countries, such as the Dutch feminist Anna Maria Storm-Van der Chijs in the 1860s, were *also* inspired by what happened elsewhere and consciously brought that to bear upon their activities at home. For connections between feminists in mostly Western countries, see M. McFadden, *Golden Cables of Sympathy: the Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-century Feminism*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucy, 1999.

11 See among many others, Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian*

*Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994; Mineke Bosch, "Colonial Dimensions of Dutch Women's Suffrage: Aletta Jacob's Travel Letters from Africa and Asia, 1911–1912," *Journal of Women's History* 11, no. 2 (1999): 8–34.

12 See e.g. various pieces in Tanya Renne, ed., *Ana's Land. Sisterhood in Eastern Europe,* Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press, 1997, and Barbara Einhorn and Charlotte Sever, "Gender and Civil Society in Central and Eastern Europe," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5, no. 2 (2003): 163–190.

13 For this distinction see e.g. A. van Drenth and F. de Haan, *The Rise of Caring Power. Elizabeth Fry and Josephine Butler in Britain and the Netherlands*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999, 46. A useful definition of feminism is given by Kumari Jayawardena in her *The White Woman's Other Burden. Western Women and South Asia During British Rule*, New York and London: Routledge, 1995, 9: "Feminism can be defined as a consciousness of injustices based on gender hierarchy, and a commitment to change."

14 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, London etc.: Penguin Books, 1995; first published by Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978. For Europe see Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe. The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994; for South Eastern Europe/the Balkans see Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

15 See the entry by Raluca Maria Popa about Eugenia de Reuss Ianculescu.

16 See the entry by Aleka Boutzouvi about Avra Theodoropoulou.

17 As Katherine David has pointed out with respect to Czech feminism: "The national cause and the feminist cause seemed to them to be complementary and indeed interrelated aspects of a common challenge ...." See her "Czech Feminists and Nationalism in the Late Habsburg Monarchy: 'The First in Austria'," *Journal of Women's History* 3 no.2 (1991): 26–45; here 26. For socialism see also Richard Stites, "The Socialist Women's Movement" in *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia. Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism 1860–1930*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978; reprint 1991, 233–277.

18 See the entries about Żmichowska by Grażyna Borkowska**,** about Gárdos by Susan Zimmermann, about Kobrynska by Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, and about Kollontai by Natalia Gafizova.

19 See the entry about Despot by Gordana Bosanac.

20 See on this point also Francisca de Haan, "A 'Truly International' Archive for the Women's Movement (IAV, now IIAV): From its Foundation in Amsterdam in 1935 to the Return of its Looted Archives in 2003," *Journal of Women's History* 16 no.4 (2004): 148–172; here 149.

21 This argument is made by Mihaela Miroiu in her *Drumul Către Autonomie. Teorii politice feministe* (The road to autonomy. Political feminist theories), Iaşi: Polirom, 2004, 185, where she asks, "Există un feminism comunist?"

22 Edith Saurer in an e-mail, 3 July 2004.

23 See the entry by Mateja Jeraj about Vida Tomšič.

24 See the entry by Karmen Klavžar about Angela Vode.

25 The same question might be asked about one particular entry, Sarolta Geőcze from Hungary, who, while dedicating her life to women's causes, combined an overt right-wing nationalism with an explicit anti-feminist stance.

26 See the entry by Serpil Çakır about Nezihe Muhittin.
27 See in particular the important book by Leila Rupp, *Worlds of Women: the Making of an International Women's Movement*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.
28 For a similar comment, see Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker, eds, *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: a European Perspective*, Stanford CA.: Stanford University Press, 2004, 326.
29 See Judith Szapor, "Sisters or Foes: The Shifting Front Lines of the Hungarian Women's Movement, 1896–1918," in Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker, eds, *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: a European Perspective*, Stanford CA.: Stanford University Press, 2004, 189–205; here 190.

# Subjects per Country*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Albania**: | Shaqe Çoba (1875–1954) |
| | Elena Gjika (Dora d'Istria) (1828?–1888?) |
| | Sevasti (1870–1949) and Parashqevi (1880–1970) Qiriazi |
| | Urani Rumbo (1895–1936) |
| **Austria**: | Ingeborg Bachmann (1926–1973) |
| | Auguste Fickert (1855–1910) |
| | Marianne Hainisch (1839–1936) |
| | Käthe Leichter (1895–1942) |
| | Rosa Mayreder (1858–1938) |
| | Karoline von Perin-Gradenstein (1806–1888) |
| | Adelheid Popp (1869–1939) |
| | Therese Schlesinger (1863–1940) |
| **Belarus**: | Esther Frumkin (1880–1943) |
| | Vera Matejczuk (1896–1981) |
| | Alaiza Pashkevich ('Tsiotka') (1876–1916) |
| | Nadzeja Sznarkiewicz (1897–1974) |
| **Bosnia and Herzegovina**: | Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska (1870–1946) |
| | Stoja Kašiković (c. 1865–?) |
| | Staka Skenderova (1831–1891) |
| **Bulgaria**: | Vela Blagoeva (1858–1921) |
| | Dimitrana Ivanova (1881–1960) |
| | Elissaveta Karamichailova (1897–1968) |
| | Lyuben Karavelov (1834–1879) |

* This list is only intended to provide a guideline to readers wishing to locate the current nation states where the subjects listed above were active, or to identify the nationalizing/nationalist contexts in which their feminist and women's organizations operated.

Ekaterina Karavelova (1860–1947)
Anna Karima (1871–1949)
Kina Konova (1872–1952)
Julia Malinova (1869–1953)
Vera Zlatareva (1905–1977)
Ekaterina Zlatoustova (1881–1952)

**Croatia**:
Blaženka Despot (1930–2001)
Dragojla Jarnević (1812–1875)
Marija Jurić (1873–1957)
Adela Milčinović (1878–1968)
Kata Pejnović (1899–1966)
Lydia Sklevicky (1952–1990)

**Czech Republic**:
Milada Horáková (1901–1950)
Milena Jesenská (1896–1944)
Eliška Krásnohorská (1847–1926)
Charlotta Garrigue Masaryková (1850–1923)
Božena Němcová (1820?–1862)
Teréza Nováková (1853–1912)
Františka Plamínková (1875–1942)
Karolína Světlá (1830–1899)
Toyen (Marie Čermínová) (1902–1980)
Božena Viková-Kunětická (1862–1934)

**Estonia**:
Elise Käer-Kingisepp (1901–1989)
Vera Poska-Grünthal (1898–1986)
Lilli (Caroline) Suburg (1841–1923)

**Greece**:
Callirhoe Parren (1859–1940)
Maria Svolou (1892?–1976)
Avra Theodoropoulou (1880–1963)

**Hungary**:
Countess Apponyi (1867–1942)
Hermin Beniczky (Mrs Pál Veres) (1815–1895)
Johanna Bischitz (1827–1898)
Mariska Gárdos (1885–1973)
Sarolta Geőcze (1862–1928)
Vilma Glücklich (1872–1927)
Emilia Kánya (1830–1905)
Teréz Karacs (1808–1892)

Eugénia Miskolczy Meller (Mrs Artur Meller) (1872–1944)
Róza Schwimmer (1877–1948)
Margit Slachta (1884–1974)
Szeréna Stern (Mrs Pollák) (1894–1966)
Ilona Stetina (1855–1932)

**Latvia**:
Aspazija (1865–1943)
Regina Ezera (1930–2002)
Ivande Kaija (1876–1941)
Klāra Kalniņa (1874–1964)
Karolīne Kronvalde (1836–1913)
Berta Pīpiņa (1883–1942)

**Lithuania**:
Felicija Bortkevičienė (1873–1945)
Magdalena Galdikienė (1891–1979)
Ona Mašiotienė (1883–1949)
Gabrielė Petkevičaitė (1861–1943)

**Macedonia**:
Kostadina Bojadjieva Nasteva-Rusinska (1880–1932)
Veselinka Malinska (1917–1988)
Estreya Haim Ovadya (1922–1944)
Rosa Plaveva (1878–1970)
Kočo Racin (1908–1943)

**Moldova**:
Elena Djionat (1888–?)

**Poland**:
Justyna Budzińska-Tylicka (1867–1936)
Kazimiera Bujwidowa (1867–1932)
Zofia Daszyńska-Golińska (1866–1934)
Paulina Kuczalska-Reinschmit (1859–1921)
Teodora Męczkowska (1870–1954)
Zofia Moraczewska (1873–1958)
Iza Moszczeńska (1864–1941)
Eliza Orzeszkowa (1841–1910)
Anna Szelągowska (1880–1962)
Maria Szeliga (1854–1927)
Tadeusz Żeleński (Boy) (1874–1941)
Narcyza Żmichowska (1819–1876)

**Romania**:
Maria Baiulescu (1860–1941)
Calypso Botez (1880–?)
Princess Alexandrina Cantacuzino (1876–1944)

Elena Meissner (1867–1940)
Sofia Nădejde (1856–1946)
Ella Negruzzi (1876–1948)
Eugenia de Reuss Ianculescu (1866–1938)
Alice Voinescu (1885–1961)
Adela Xenopol (1861–1939)

**Russia**:

Praskov'ia Arian (1864/5–1949)
Inessa Armand (1874–1920)
Mariia Chekhova (1866–1934)
Anna Engelgardt (1838–1903)
Anna Filosofova (1837–1912)
Liubov' Gurevich (1866–1940)
Anna Kal'manovich (?–?)
Alexandra Kollontai (1872–1952)
Nadezhda Krupskaia (1869–1939)
Ekaterina Kuskova (1869–1958)
Zinaida Mirovich (1865–1913)
Serafima Panteleeva (1846–1918)
Anna Shabanova (1848–1932)
Ol'ga Shapir (1850–1916)
Ekaterina Shchepkina (1854–1938)
Poliksena Shishkina-Iavein (1875–1947)
Nadezhda Stasova (1822–1895)
Mariia Trubnikova (1835–1897)
Ariadna Tyrkova-Williams (1869–1962)

**Serbia**:

Ksenija Atanasijević (1894–1981)
Draga Dejanović (Dejanovich) (1840–1871)
Biljana Jovanović (1953–1996)
Draga Ljočić (Ljotchich)-Milošević (1855–1926)
Milica Ninković (Ninkovich) (1854–1881)
Žarana Papić (1949–2002)
Isidora Sekulić (1877–1958)

**Slovakia**:

Hana Gregorová (1885–1958)
Elena Maróthy-Šoltésová (1855–1939)
L'udmila Podjavorinská (1872–1951)
Barbora Rezlerová-Švarcová (1890–1941)
Terézia Vansová (1857–1942)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Slovenia**: | Zofka Kveder (1878–1926) |
| | Pavlina Pajk (1854–1901) |
| | Alojzija Štebi (1883–1956) |
| | Vida Tomšič (1913–1998) |
| | Angela Vode (1892–1985) |
| **Turkey**: | Fatma Aliye (1862–1936) |
| | Suat Derviş (1905–1972) |
| | Halide Edib Adıvar (1884–1964) |
| | Ulviye Mevlan Civelek (1893–1964) |
| | Nezihe Muhittin (1889–1958) |
| | Nurser Öztunalı (1947–1999) |
| | Sabiha Sertel (1895–1968) |
| **Ukraine**: | Natalia Kobrynska (1851–1920) |
| | Olha Kobylianska (1863–1942) |
| | Solom'iya Pavlychko (1958–1999) |
| | Olena Pchilka (1849–1930) |
| | Milena Rudnytska (1892–1979) |
| | Lesia Ukrainka (1871–1913) |

# **KOBRYNSKA,** Natalia (born Ozarkevych) (1851–1920)

Ukrainian feminist writer, publicist and social/political activist, founder in 1884 of the *Tovarystvo Rus'kykh Zhinok* (Association of Ukrainian women).

Natalia Ozarkevych was born on 8 June 1851 in Beleluia, in the Halychyna Province of the Habsburg Monarchy (Galicia), to the Reverend Ivan Ozarkevych (1826–1903) and Teofilia Okunevska. She was the eldest of five children. At her death, the territory of her birth was being contested among Poles, Ukrainians and Russians. Kobrynska identified with Ukrainians, who sometimes still used the older name Rusyn or (in the Latinized version) Ruthenians. Galician Ukrainians recognized a kinship with Ukrainians then living in the Russian Empire but denied being Russian and bitterly resisted Polonization. Ukrainian democratic forces in Halychyna were trying to wrest political power from the Polish nobility, which controlled local government there.

Natalia Ozarkevych was educated at home, benefiting from close interaction with her four university-educated brothers. (Although they too were active in Ukrainian community life, none of her four brothers was as prominent as Kobrynska.) Her father, a social and political activist who lobbied the Austrian Parliament in Vienna for higher education for women, encouraged the participation of his daughter in public life. He, like his forebears, was a priest of the Greek Ukrainian Catholic Church (which had special relations with the Papal See) and could marry. Many of these priests actively promoted educational and social progress as leaders of a western Ukrainian upper-middle class that possessed intellectual aspirations and a social conscience. In 1871, Natalia married Teofil Kobrynsky (1852–1882), who also became a priest. Kobrynsky was very supportive of his wife's views on women's liberation, to which cause the couple dedicated themselves: they decided not to have children and worked jointly on a Ukrainian translation of J. S. Mill's *On the Subjection of Women* (never published). After Kobrynsky's death, Natalia did not remarry. Both her family and married life were marked by close and happy relationships. The family home served as a center for social life, in particular as a meeting place for democratic- and socialist-minded youth. With the exception of a short period in Lviv, travels in West-

ern Europe and a trip to the Ukrainian lands in the Russian Empire, Kobrynska spent her life in the picturesque low Carpathian towns of Beleluia, Bolekhiv and Sniatyn. She lived modestly, and what little she had she channeled into publishing on women's issues.

Physically, Kobrynska was attractive: relatively tall, with dark abundant hair and a stately bearing. She was eloquent and seemed aloof. Her rejections of marriage proposals from her socialist colleagues were considered a sign of her class superiority. Although she paid *de riguer* intellectual respect to contemporaries such as writer Ivan Franko (1856–1916), like many women of her generation who were largely self-taught and who grew up surrounded by strong women, Kobrynska insisted that she had arrived at her own ideas by her own efforts, through her own life and experiences "without the help of men" (Kobrynska 1980, 402).

While her social and political views were formed under the direct impact of socialism, both directly through the works of Marx, Engels and Lassalle and through their Ukrainian interpreters, Kobrynska was a practitioner of democratic liberalism. She remained firmly committed to persuasion and gradualism as guarantors of genuine systemic change. Kobrynska felt that social and civic consciousness would be best promoted through literature, and for that reason she channeled her energy into journals that addressed a primarily middle-class female readership, in contrast to the socialists who agitated for direct action in the villages. Kobrynska thought of middle-class women as transmission belts of new ideas and as the most effective agents of change in the villages. Her refusal to see the family as purely an object of oppression and her arguments against 'free love,' seeing in the practice merely new ways of exploiting women, made her relations with socialists difficult. Moreover, she maintained that women should articulate their own philosophical space, since all existing philosophical theories had hitherto overlooked women. "It is a pity that the age-old slavery of women is etched like a scar in the way men think. Since that is the case, women must struggle not only against the social order, which keeps them in slavery, but against concepts articulated by men" (Kobrynska 1895, 10). Yet her belief in the power of 'human will' remained undaunted: "Weakness and despair are the worst enemies of humanity, be they called pessimism or religion or resignation" (Kobrynska 1893, 69).

Kobrynska saw that economic necessity had already pushed women into the labor market, yet for her the roots of women's inequality lay not in the economic, but in the social sphere. Among Ukrainian women, she introduced the notion of the 'double burden,' refusing to assume that paternalism would automatically vanish in a socialist society. "It would be more realistic for women workers, while admitting that the victory of the workers will also be their victory, to ensure their own rights and not become dependent upon the grace of men" (Kobrynska 1895, 16–17). Steady pressure mounted by women on public life was, for Kobrynska, essential for the progress of society as a whole. She championed the cause of women within the socialist commu-

nity, promoted higher education and self-help societies, as well as attentively studying American and British women's social work and working tirelessly for the establishment of day-care centers and educational outreach at home. The older clergy supported her day-care plans, while the younger sons of clerical families opposed them as frivolous.

Kobrynska began her intellectual journey in the classic fashion of male members of the Eastern European intelligentsia. Under the direct influence of the works of Henry T. Buckle, Ludwig Buchner, Charles Darwin, and Herbert Spencer, as well as of Russian radicals Nikolai Dobroliubov (1836–1861) and Nikolai Chernyshevskii (1828–1889), she went through a reorientation of values and for a time denied the existence of a spiritual realm. Like the men of her milieu who had undergone similar crises, Kobrynska—after further study of the works of Nikolai Gogol (1809–1852), Ivan Turgenev (1818–1883), Ernst Renan and eventually Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle—reconciled philosophical modernism and social radicalism with a very liberally interpreted Catholicism. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic (Uniate) Church was largely self-administrated and all the works Kobrynska read, she either owned or had borrowed from other clerical families who paid no attention to the recently proclaimed Vatican *Index of Forbidden Books*.

Kobrynska came to feminism through socialist theory and positivist philosophy. She presented her views through two forums: fiction and articles. Her short stories poignantly described the difficult life of middle-class women in Halychyna. Her writing impressed the leaders of the Ukrainian democratic movement and Kobrynska became something of a celebrity, participating in the first Ukrainian openly political rally for free elections and universal suffrage held in August 1884. Having witnessed the impact of the rally, she decided to organize a women's society that could also become a major political force. She pioneered the first secular women's organization in western Ukraine and forged closer relations between Ukrainian and other women (though unable to reach a consensus with the Poles). Since she wrote in Ukrainian however, she did not reach too broad an audience and, because she was critical of the tactics of the socialists, she received bad local press and did not gain the support of young people.

On 8 December 1884—several months after the rally—Kobrynska assembled 96 women from across the territory of Halychyna to create the *Tovarystvo Rus'kykh Zhinok* (Association of Ukrainian women). The founding meeting was held in Stanislaviv (currently Ivano-Frankivsk) and the goal of the society was to encourage women to pursue public interests unrelated to church activities (thus breaking with the conventions of earlier Ukrainian women's organizations). She met with opposition from the left for not being radical enough, and from the right for not cooperating with the Church. Nor could she obtain the support of like-minded Polish women, who would not admit to the separate existence of Ukrainians. There were other difficulties too. The initial funds collected for the proposed women's journal were used for a church

donation and the flare-up of terrorist activity in the Russian Empire made Ukrainian women wary of open politics as a possible incentive to violence. The original idea of a journal was replaced by a women's Almanac, the *Pershyi Vinok* (First wreath, 1887), edited by Kobrynska and ***Olena Pchilka***. It was both the first almanac in Ukrainian that represented Ukrainian authors from both the Russian and Austrian Empire, and the first Ukrainian women's almanac. Ivan Franko, a leading Ukrainian socialist, supported this endeavor. Nevertheless, as the political situation among Ukrainians grew increasingly complex, Kobrynska was unable to pursue journalistic activities. She did however, edit three volumes of women's writing without any organized support: *Nasha Dolia* (Our fate) appeared in 1893, 1895 and 1896. In its pages, Kobrynska elaborated on social and feminist theory, promoted cooperation with Jewish women in Halychyna, published original short stories and the poetry of women writers (as well as translations), and shared with readers her special interest in the practical achievements of women in the United States and Great Britain.

At the turn of the century, Kobrynska tried to draw young women in Lviv to feminism but the new generation rejected her political moderation in favor of their own radical organizations. World War I, fought literally in her 'back yard,' and the subsequent Ukrainian and Polish wars made her last years difficult. She died alone on 22 January 1920 and was buried in Bolekhiv. Immediately upon her death, she became an icon for newly organized Ukrainian women, though her ideas (with the exception of those promoting general equality for women) were neither studied nor implemented.

**Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak**
Director, Fulbright Office in Ukraine

## SOURCES

(B) Almanac *Pershy Vinok* (First wreath), facsimile edition. New York: The Ukrainian National Women's League of America, 1988.
(C) Kobrynska, Natalia. Articles published in *Nasha Dolia* (Our fate) (1893, 1895, 1896).
(C) Kobrynska, Natalia. *Vybrani tvory* (Selected works). O. Moroz, ed. Kiev: Dnipro Publishing, 1958.
(C) Kobrynska, Natalia. *Vybrani tvory* (Selected works). I. O. Denysiuk and K. A. Kril, eds. Kiev: Dnipro Publishing, 1980.
(D) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. "Natalia Kobrynska: A Formulator of Feminism." In Andrei S. Markovits & Frank E. Sysyn, eds. *Nation Building and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1982, 196–219.
(E) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. *Feminists Despite Themselves: Women in Ukrainian Community Life, 1884–1939*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988, 71–102.
(E) Sonia Morris, ed. *Women's Voices in Ukrainian Literature*. Vol. I. Saskatchewan: Language Lanterns Publications, Inc., 1998.

# **KOBYLIANSKA,** Olha (Kobylians'ka, Ol'ha) (1863–1942)

Activist in the Ukrainian women's movement in Bukovyna (present day southwest Ukraine); writer; leader of the fin-de-siècle Ukrainian modernist movement.

Olha Kobylianska was born on 25 November 1863 in the town of Gura-Gumora in southern Bukovyna, a beautiful, mountainous and ethnically diverse region, then part of the Austro-Hungarian (Habsburg) Empire. Today, Bukovyna is located in Ukraine proper: it shares international borders with Romania and Moldova to the south and east, is bounded regionally to the west and north by Carpathian Ukraine and Galicia (western Ukraine) and by central Ukraine in the east—all lands formerly under Russian, Polish, or Austrian rule. Her mother, Maria Kobylianska (1837–1906), and her father, Iulian Kobyliansky (1827–1912), had seven children: Maksymilian (1858–1922), Iulian (1859–1922), Evhenia (1861–1917), Olha, Stepan (1866–1940), Oleksandr (1875–1933) and Volodymyr (1877–1909). Olha spent her childhood and youth in Gura-Gumora, but when her father, a minor Austrian civil servant, became a pensioner, the family moved to the village of Dymka in northern Bukovyna. In 1891, she moved to the city of Chernivtsi in the heart of Bukovyna, where she lived until her death.

Although Olha Kobylianska now holds a prominent place in the Ukrainian literary canon as the leader of a new modernist school at the turn of the century, her path to writing was fraught with difficulties. She received a limited formal education and the four years of primary schooling that she did receive were exclusively in the German language. It is known that her family spoke German among themselves—Kobylianska's mother was of German-Polish background—but little is known about the extent to which Ukrainian was used at home. After her schooling had ended, she continued to read hungrily and through the influence of German positivist classics, became concerned with the causes of the day, especially the peasantry. Not surprisingly, Kobylianska's first works were written in German; she submitted these to German-language newspapers and journals in Berlin and Vienna.

In 1894, Kobylianska's first work in Ukrainian, a story "Liudyna" (A person), appeared in the magazine *Zoria* (Dawn) and in 1896 a novel, *Tsarivna* (The princess),

appeared in *Narod* (The people), the leading Ukrainian journal of the day. The first drafts of both of these works had been written in German in 1886 and 1888–1893 respectively and the Ukrainian versions reflect the influence of German Romanticism, particularly the ideas of Friedrich Nietzsche. Kobylianska was also inspired by George Sand. While many critics disparaged her use of German technique, the writer and feminist ***Lesia Ukrainka*** praised its influence on Kobylianska's writing: "It led you to recognize *world* literature, it transported you out into the broader world of ideas and art—this simply leaps out at one, when one compares your writing with that of the majority of Galicians" (Pavlychko 1996, 88). Kobylianska's temperament was indeed modernist, inclined towards the burgeoning neo-romantic and symbolist currents of the day rather than the realist and populist.

Kobylianska's decision to write in Ukrainian was greatly influenced by her acquaintance with three feminist writers: Sofiia Okunevska, ***Natalia Kobrynska*** and Ukrainka. In general, her contemporaries among the Ukrainian literati—important writers, poets, critics and editors like Ivan Franko, Osyp Makovey and Ukrainka—gave impetus to Kobylianska's development and helped popularize her work. Most likely Kobylianska's conscious embrace of feminism was linked to Kobrynska's request, in 1890, that she collect signatures in Chernivtsi for a petition in favor of women's higher education and make contact with various Romanian and German women's organizations. In 1894, having met up with other Ukrainian women keen to form a secular women's organization, Kobylianska helped found the *Obshchestvo ruskykh zhenshchyn* (Society of Ruthenian women), hoping that it would draw in Ukrainians from Bukovyna. For several years, she worked to expand the role of the society in the community and to attract younger women to its membership, but these attempts were largely unsuccessful; young and politically-aware women were drawn to the progressive left-wing socialist intelligentsia, which rejected feminist issues in favor of radical, anti-church and revolutionary concerns, and united girls in a *Hromada* (Women's Community) in support of these agendas.

In 1897, Kobylianska's story "Valse melancolique" was published in Ukrainian (the French title is its original one). "Valse" provoked debates over whether the intelligentsia was an appropriate subject for Ukrainian literature and, more importantly, whether the three heroines were Ukrainian at all, being "creations of purely European culture" (Pavlychko 1996, 88). Whatever view Kobylianska's contemporaries took of her "Valse," it was at least apparent that her heroines transcended traditional boundaries, especially in their romantic relationships: one character recalls her relationship with a man with hatred; another sees only humiliation for women in their relationships with men; all benefit from the empathy born of genuine emotional understanding among women.

In 1899, Kobylianska first met, and subsequently became close friends with ***Lesia Ukrainka,*** through whom she came to know more about the Ukrainian people. They shared much in common: both had a love of knowledge and were very well-read. Fur-

ther more, both felt a painful lack of formal education; both were harsh critics of their own works; both regretted that Ukrainian literary criticism was in its infancy, which they saw as the reason for their both being misunderstood (their literary acclaim based on lesser works); both suffered from ill health and unhappy personal lives and both challenged social norms in life and in literature (after a prolonged love affair with Osyp Makovey—who felt threatened by Kobylianska's talent and ideas and finally married a more 'traditional' woman—Kobylianska never married). Artistically the temperaments of Kobylianska and Ukrainka were modernist and complemented one another: both valued technique and aestheticism, cosmopolitanism and intellectualism, artistry above the dominant populist credo of realism, the depiction and glorification of folk life, cultural isolationism and patriotism. Their correspondence, begun in 1899, reveals all these aspects of their spiritual closeness and mutual sympathy and, as their professional and personal friendship grew, a loving tone clearly enters their letters: for example, the repeated avowals that "someone loves someone" (Pavlychko 1996, 98). While such declarations were a common feature of the European avant-guard movement, they were highly atypical in the very traditional and conservative climate of late nineteenth-century Ukrainian cultural life.

In the late 1890s, about a decade after the appearance of the first female literary almanac, *Pershyi vinok* (First wreath), both Kobylianska and Ukrainka voiced a concern that such endeavors supported an artificial artistic separation of feminism and poetry. This was not a denial of feminism, rather recognition that literature was broader than any given ideology, and in spite of Kobylianska's reservations about serving 'two masters,' her portrayal of profound gender conflicts in Ukrainian society throughout the half-century of her creative work was unflinching. In fact, her *Tsarivna* has been called "the first and most consistently feminist novel in Ukraine literature" (Bohachevsky-Chomiak 1988, 105).

Kobylianska's feminism was founded on the sanctity of individual autonomy. The middle-class heroines of *Tsarivna* and "Liudyna," stifled by their milieu, proclaim feminist ideas and fight for their rights; the heroine in "Liudyna" is unsuccessful but in *Tsarivna*, the heroine marries for love and becomes a writer. Although *Tsarivna* is about a woman's search for autonomy and was, at least initially, viewed as being about female liberation, it has subsequently been critically read as "a model for the attainment of personal autonomy" (Bohachevsky-Chomiak 1988, 109). Kobylianska abandoned exclusively feminist themes after *Tsarivna*, turning to explore the human condition in more general terms, but the attainment of individual autonomy by her heroines remained paramount even as she continued to search for new forms of expression.

Because of her interest in the lives of the Ukrainian peasantry, she was in tune with the connection between people, nature and the land. Two of Kobylianska's important novels *Zemlia* (The land, 1902) and *V nediliu rano zillia kopala* (She gathered herbs on Sunday morn, 1909) treat the forces of nature sympathetically. Predestination, magic and the irrational are central to both novels. Moreover, nature and music are both

symbols of the erotic. Kobylianska was the first Ukrainian writer to deal with sexuality "as an experience and as a problem" (Pavlychko 1996, 95); her heroines are aware of their bodies, their sensuality and their physical needs, which sometimes conflict with their spiritual or intellectual needs. In *V nedilie rano zillia kopala*, Tetiana poisons her lover who has left her for another, and the reader is shown that nature does not always ennoble or promote individual autonomy. Despite its rural setting and peasant protagonists, *Zemlia* was an unveiled attack on a number of myths about the peasantry that underlay the prevalent populist view of country life as a harmonious, organic and patriarchal existence. Just as Kobylianska demythologized the Ukrainian village as an ideal social system, she showed that the idealized Ukrainian peasant woman, unchecked by education or culture, revealed little of the purity of the populist view; in Kobylianska's work, village life was crude, cruel and controlled by raw human instincts.

A solemn, austere woman with serious dark eyes, hair pulled back in a bun, and always dressed in black, Kobylianska introduced strong, self-sufficient female protagonists into a Ukrainian literature that lacked any corresponding male counterparts. She became one of the most popular writers of her time, mentored several important young modernists and incurred the wrath of literary critics who considered her elitist, inaccessible and feminist (Ukrainian cultural populists thought modernism elitist and inaccessible, thus it was but a small step to dismiss 'non-Ukrainian' feminism with the same refrain). Yet Kobylianska rarely engaged in argument; she almost always let her works speak for themselves, and by the turn of the century was at her creative zenith, becoming an icon of her time in spite of her solitary nature. She was a unifying figure for *Moloda muza* (Young Muse), an umbrella group of new Ukrainian poets and by 1910, had become a figurehead for the next generation of Ukrainian modernists. She continued to publish and these later works were by no means her most insignificant: the short stories *Iuda* (Judas, 1915), *Nazustrich doli* (Meeting one's fate, 1915) and *Ziishov z rozumu* (He went mad, 1923) reflect her horror at the violence of World War I. She was quite sympathetic to the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, particularly since the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy in 1918 had placed Bukovyna under Romanian rule, worsening the cultural, political and economic hardships of the Ukrainians in that region. Under these circumstances, her moral indignation continued to grow and she felt that Soviet rule in eastern Ukraine was a positive force for Ukrainians there. When western Ukraine was annexed by the Soviet Union in September 1939, Kobylianska wrote an article entitled "Tsvit kul'tury rozvyvaiet'sia" (The fruit of culture is developing), which welcomed the event; in the summer of 1940, Bukovyna was also annexed. From the late 1920s, her writing—mainly of a publicist nature—was increasingly celebrated for its social criticism and she became a member of the Writers Union of the USSR. In June 1941, when German Nazi and Romanian fascist troops entered Bukovyna (now part of the Soviet Union), Kobylianska's reputation caused her to be singled out; the occupiers viewed her as a dangerous communist writer and

she was scheduled to be tried by court martial. Her death on 21 March 1942 intervened.

In 1944, a literary and memorial museum dedicated to Kobylianska was opened in Chernivtsi in the building in which she lived from 1938 to 1942. Another museum to her legacy is to be found in the village of Dymka, where she spent a number of years during her youth.

**Teresa Polowy**
Department of Russian and Slavic Studies,
University of Arizona

## SOURCES

(C) Kobylianska, Olha. *Tvory* (Works). Five vols. Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnoi literatury, 1962–1963.

(C) Kobylianska, Olha. *Slova zvorushenoho serdtsia* (Words of a passionate soul: diaries, autobiographies, letters, reminiscences). F. Pohrebennyk, ed. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo khudozhnoi literatury "Dnipro," 1982.

(D) *Olha Kobylianska v krytytsi ta spohadakh* (Olha Kobylianska: criticism and reminiscences). Kiev: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnoi literatury, 1963.

(D) Haag, John. "Kobylianska, Olha." In Anne Commire, ed. *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*. 17 vols. Waterford, CT: Yorkin Publications, 2001, 8: 742–743.

(E) Shabliovsky, Yevhen. *Ukrainian Literature through the Ages*. Abraham Mistetsky, et. al., trans. Anatole Bilenko, ed. Kiev: Mistetsvo Publishers, 1970.

(E) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Marta. *Feminists Despite Themselves: Women in Ukrainian Community Life, 1884–1939*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988, 103–110.

(E) Luckyj, George S. N. *Ukrainian Literature in the Twentieth Century: A Reader's Guide*. Toronto: Shevchenko Scientific Society, University of Toronto Press, 1992.

(E) Pavlychko, Solomea. "Modernism vs. Populism in Fin de Siecle Ukrainian Literature." In Pamela Chester and Sibelan Forrester, eds. *Engendering Slavic Literatures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996, 83–103.

# **PAVLYCHKO (PAVL'YCHKO),** Solom'iya (Solom'ea, Solom'iia) Dm'ytrivna (1958–1999)

Ukrainian scholar and central figure in the late twentieth-century Ukrainian feminist movement; Senior Research Associate at the Institute of Literature, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; Doctor of Philology/ professor at the National University ('Kyiv-Mohyla Academy'), Kiev.

Solom'iya Pavlychko was born in Lviv (Ukraine). Her parents were Dmytro Pavlychko (b. 1929), Ukrainian poet and influential figure in the Ukrainian movement for independence, and Bohdana Pavlychko, a doctor. Pavlychko spent most of her adult life in Kiev, where she studied English and French at the Taras Shevchenko Kiev State University from 1975 to 1985. After the completion of her doctoral studies, she began her professional career as a literary translator at the Institute of Literature, Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Kiev. The range of Pavlychko's activities and initiatives make her a significant public figure in Ukraine: the translator of English and American writers (such as M. Twain, E. Hemingway, D. H. Lawrence and W. Golding); author of the important monograph, *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrażns'kii literaturi* (Modernist discourse in Ukrainian literature, 1997); key figure in Ukrainian literary circles of the late 1980s and 1990s and provocative feminist critic of long-established dogmas in Ukrainian society, culture and academic scholarship.

After 1986, the personal and the political became intrinsically connected in the lives of many Ukrainians, who were surviving deep trauma under the shadow of Chernobyl. In 1989, Pavlychko supported the *Narodnyi Rukh Ukraïny* (People's Movement of Ukraine), a new political party founded by members of the Writers' Union of Ukraine. As a political opposition movement, the *Rukh* united many groups: those who demanded the restoration of the Ukrainian language and political independence for Ukraine; those campaigning for the democratic freedoms of former political prisoners; religious and ethnic minorities (such as Ukrainian Catholics and Crimean Tatars), as well as anti-militarist and ecological activists (e.g. the Association of Mothers of Soldiers in Ukraine). *Rukh* was successful in the election campaign of 1990 and eventually formed a political fraction–the *Narodna Rada* (People's Council)–within

the *Verkhovna Rada Ukraïny* (Supreme Council of Ukraine), emerging as a reformist opposition movement by early 1990. As a founding member of the *Zhinocha Hromada* (Women's Community), Pavlychko was instrumental in giving a voice to the women's wing of *Rukh*, establishing *Zhinocha Hromada* as an independent national organization in 1991. In her first book in English, *Letters from Kiev* (subsequently published in Ukrainian), Pavlychko captured the spirit of that turbulent time: the collapse of Soviet power accompanied by political and economic upheaval. Written to her Canadian friend Dr Bohdan Krawchenko, *Letters from Kiev* covers the period from 12 May 1990 to 25 March 1991.

Increasing discrimination against women at work and shifting women's status in Ukrainian society marked the 1990s. After a Soviet period in which feminism was thought of as 'bourgeois' ideology, Pavlychko revitalized the concept of feminism in Ukraine, organizing the first feminist seminar in Ukraine at the archconservative Institute of Literature (Kiev) in 1990. Together with Oksana Zabuzhko and Vira Aheyeva, Pavlychko laid the foundations for a revitalized Ukrainian feminist critique, embedded in two trends in contemporary Ukrainian society: the revival of nationalism in the 1990s (rooted in Ukrainian romantic nationalism of the early nineteenth century) and the rediscovery of 1960s and 1970s feminist literary criticism. In her article "Between Feminism and Nationalism: New Women's Groups in the Ukraine" (1992), Pavlychko criticized an illusory vision of womanhood imposed by those unwilling to accept new roles for women in post-Soviet Ukraine. In "Feminism in Post-Communist Ukrainian Society" (1996), she examined the backlash against women's emancipation in Ukraine during the early 1990s, concluding on a pessimistic note that revival of a Ukrainian matriarchal cultural myth: *Berehinya* (hearth mother) favored the relegation of women to the domestic sphere. Through her interviews and appearances in the media, Pavlychko helped bring feminism and modernism to the fore of public discussion. In her essay "Modernism vs. Populism" (1996), Pavlychko broke new ground, interrogating gender and feminist issues in Ukrainian literary texts and revealing deep connections between literary production and identity construction in contemporary Ukraine. Presenting an anthology *From Three Worlds: New Ukrainian Writing*, a collection of writing from sixteen young Ukrainian writers translated into English, Pavlychko concluded that it was the inner freedom felt by national writers and the intelligentsia that had led to Ukrainian independence; that the sign of that freedom was the rediscovery of the mother tongue. Pavlychko's introduction to this volume is emblematic of her efforts to support young writers (such as V. Dibrova, Yev. Pashkovsky and O. Zabuzhko) who transcended historical limitations and explored their cultural roots. The national priorities of the Ukrainian women's movement of the 'first wave' (1989 to the mid-1990s), when feminism was perceived as the only ideological alternative to communism, were inseparably tied to the process of collective identity formation in contemporary Ukraine.

In her most noted monograph, *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrażns'kii literaturi*

(Modernist discourse in Ukrainian literature), Pavlychko called for a rethinking of twentieth-century Ukrainian literary history. Paradigms in Ukrainian modernism (from 1898–1970) were indicative, in Pavlychko's view, of a conflict between modernism and folklorism. Applying contemporary theoretical standards to a discussion of literary works by ***Lesia Ukrainka***, ***Olha Kobylianska***, Hnat Khotkevych, Mykhailo Iatskov and *Moloda Muza* (Young Muse, a New York-based creative group), Pavlychko demonstrated that a 'Ukrainian feminist consciousness' had developed during the extremely complex twentieth century, under the powerful influence of women writers whose passion for beauty over social problematics, suppressed by the mainstream national critics, had been interpreted as a dangerous and pathological phenomenon in Ukrainian literature. Pavlychko's work was critical in bringing national cultural discourse into contact with broader debates on issues of sexuality and gender in literature and art. In 1998, Pavlychko co-edited an anthology of short fiction by contemporary Ukrainian and Canadian Ukrainian writers, *Two Lands, New Visions: Stories from Canada and Ukraine*, in collaboration with Canadian writer Janice Kulyk Keefer. Pavlychko's "Women's Discordant Voices in the Context of the 1998 Parliamentary Elections in Ukraine" (published in an edited volume of essays entitled *Feminisms and Women's Movements in Contemporary Europe*, 2000) explored changes in the political participation of Ukrainian feminists, who had made repeated efforts to organize themselves into a united electoral bloc, hoping to acquire greater power at the institutional level and to combat the deep cultural conservatism of Ukrainian women (especially in rural regions). Pavlychko suggested a possible convergence of identities between democratic political groups and women's organizations, capable of overcoming the archaic discourses reproduced by national male demagogues. Since Pavlychko rejected the idea of a single 'women's identity,' she also rejected the idea of a single political choice for Ukrainian women; nevertheless, she believed that a quick transition to democracy was central to the future of the Ukrainian feminist movement. An internationally recognized literary scholar, she taught courses in Ukrainian and American literature and literary theory at the Taras Shevchenko Kiev State University and the National University ('Kyiv-Mohyla Academy') in Kiev. She was also invited (as a Visiting Professor) to teach at Harvard University and the University of Alberta. For young Ukrainian writers and artists she was a unique role model, exerting a tremendous influence on their creative activities. As founder and editor-in-chief of *Osnovy* (Foundations), a publishing house in Kiev established in 1992, Pavlychko provided Ukrainian readers with translations of significant contributions to Western culture and thought, including popular feminist texts such as *The Second Sex* by Simone de Beauvoir and *Sexual Politics* by Kate Millet. Pavlychko's untimely death in Kiev on 31 December 1999, a result of an accident in her home, plunged the country into deep sorrow. She was survived by her parents, her daughter Bohdana (b. 1986), her younger sister Roxolana and her life partner Dr Bohdan Krawchenko (b. 1946,

currently Vice-Rector of the Ukrainian Academy of Public Administration in Kiev). Pavlychko was buried in Baikove cemetery in Kiev on 4 January 2000.

Pavlychko generated new discussions on modernism and feminism, opening up the field of late nineteenth and twentieth-century Ukrainian literature for future research in these areas. The Solomea Pavlychko Stipend (established by George Luckyj, Slavic Department, University of Toronto) is now an award available to Ukrainian literary scholars or creative writers. The annual Solomea Pavlychko Prize in Literary Criticism, awarded by AGNI Magazine, honors a critic whose work has enlarged America's literary horizons. The Solomea Pavlychko Publishing House (*Osnovy*) has born her name since the year 2000. In her last book, *Natsionalizm, seksual'nist', orientalizm: skladnyi svit Ahatanhela Kryms'kogo* (Nationalism, sexuality, orientalism: the complicated world of Ahatanhel of the Crimea), she explores the tragic life of Ukrainian poet, scholar, translator and literary historian Agatangel Kryms'ky (1871–1942). In *Feminizm* (Feminism), a collection of her works, interviews and talks published after her death, the focus is shifted from politics to the wider objective of creating a national women's movement and developing women's individual identities in Ukrainian society. Pavlychko predicted that the future of an independent women's movement lay with non-governmental groups—later a distinctive characteristic of Ukrainian feminist movements of the 'second wave' (i.e. from the mid-1990s onwards). Her last two books have significantly contributed to the establishment of Pavlychko as an outstanding literary and feminist critic and progressive voice of Ukrainian women.

**Viktoriya M. Topalova**
Ph.D. Candidate, The University of British Columbia

## SOURCES

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. *Letters from Kiev*. Myrna Kostash, trans. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1992.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. "Between Feminism and Nationalism: New Women's Groups in the Ukraine." In Mary Buckley, ed. *Perestroika and Soviet Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, 82–96.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya."Facing Freedom: The New Ukrainian Literature." Introduction to Ed Hogan, Michael Naidan, Oksana Zabuzhko, Mykola Riabchuk and Askold Melnyczuk, eds. *From Three Worlds: New Ukrainian Writing*. GLAS Series. Boston, MA: Zephyr Press, 1996.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. "Modernism vs. Populism in Fin de Siècle Ukrainian Literature: A Case of Gender Conflict." In Pamela Chester and Sibelan Forrester, eds. *Engendering Slavic Literatures*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1996, 83–103.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. "Feminism in Post-Communist Ukrainian Society." In Rosalind J. Marsh, ed. *Women in Russia and Ukraine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, 305–314.

(C) Keefer, Janice Kulyk and Solomea Pavlychko, eds. *Two Lands, New Visions: Stories from Canada and Ukraine*. Reissue edition. Coteau Books, 1998.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrażns'kii literaturi* (Modernist discourse in Ukrainian literature). Kiev: Lybid', 1997; Revised second edition. Kiev: Lybid', 1999.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. "Women's Discordant Voices in the Context of the 1998 Parliamentary Elections in Ukraine." In Anna Bull, Hanna Diamond and Rosalind Marsh, eds. *Feminisms and Women's Movements in Contemporary Europe*. London: Macmillan, 2000.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. *Natsionalizm, seksual'nist', orientalizm: skladnyi svit Ahatanhela Kryms'kogo* (Nationalism, sexuality, orientalism: the complicated world of Ahatanhel of the Crimea). Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Osnovy," 2000.

(C) Pavl'ychko, Solom'iya. *Feminizm* (Feminism). Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Osnovy," 2002.

(D) Aheyeva, Vira P. *Intelektual'na biohrafiya Solomiž Pavlychko* (Solomiya Pavlychko: an intellectual portrait). Kiev: Dukh i litera, 2001.

# **PCHILKA,** Olena (real name Olha Petrivna Kosach, born Drahomanova) (1849–1930)

Ukrainian writer, editor, translator, ethnographer and women's activist; corresponding member (from 1925) of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Olena Pchilka (pseudonym of Olha Petrivna Kosach, born Drahomanova) was born in Hadiach (in the region of Poltava) on 29 July 1849, to a landed noble family steeped in liberal and intellectual traditions. Her father, Petro Yakymovych Drahomanov (1802–1866), was a graduate of the St Petersburg Law Academy who also wrote, published and translated short stories and poetry. Her mother, Yelizaveta Ivanivna Drahomanova (born Tsiatska, 1821–1895), was semi-literate (she could read but could only sign her name), yet it was she who introduced Ukrainian folklore to the Drahomanov family and instilled a love for its richness in her children. The Drahomanovs had five children altogether, among them Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–1895), a historian, publicist, folklorist, literary critic and public activist who emigrated in 1876 and taught at Sofia University (Bulgaria) from 1889 until his death. He would play an important role in the lives of Olena Pchilka and her daughter, ***Lesia Ukrainka*** (see also ***Julia Malinova***).

Olena Pchilka received her primary education from her father and in 1861, Mykhailo Drahomanov placed her in the Kiev Institute for Girls of the Nobility, from which she graduated in 1866. In 1868, she married Petro Antonovych Kosach (1842–1909). Kosach, who was also from a noble family, received his primary education at the Chernihiv Gymnasium and entered St Petersburg University, from which he was expelled for his part in the student movement. He nevertheless succeeded in entering Kiev St. Volodymyr University, where he graduated in legal science. After they married, the couple moved to Zviagel (now Novohrad-Volynsky in the region of Zhytomyr), where Kosach held a legal position. In 1879, the family moved to Lutsk, later

purchasing a land share in Kolodiazhne (in Kovel, in the region of Volyn) and building the house where they would live until the death of Petro Kosach.

In 1876, Pchilka published her first work *Ukrainskiy narodnyi ornament* (Ukrainian folk design), edited by Mykhailo Drahomanov and Volodymyr Antonovych. It was written in Russian in accordance with the so-called Emsk Decree (1876), which explicitly prohibited any kind of publishing activity in the Ukrainian language on the territory of the Russian Empire. In 1879, after the family had moved to Lutsk, Pchilka set up a publishing house: the *NHV* (Small Volyn Group). In 1880, the *NHV* published *Spivomovky* by Stepan Rudansky ("spivomovky," a word invented by Rudansky, is roughly translatable as "singing words"), thereby rescuing the forgotten poet from obscurity. A year later, Pchilka published her translations of works by Mykola Hohol and her own play, *Suzhena–Ne Ohuzhena* (She who is promised but not disgraced). In her foreword to the Hohol translations, Olena Pchilka stated explicitly that her primary goal was to develop the Ukrainian language and bring it out of the home into the public sphere. By the early 1890s, Olena Pchilka was publishing quite regularly, for example in the Lviv magazine *Zoria* (Star). She soon became an acknowledged writer and a key figure of Ukrainian literary and thus cultural life.

In her much-criticized writings, Olena Pchilka strove to transcend limitations posed by Ukrainian nationalist-populist discourses. She sought new topics that were not related to village life (conceptualized at that time as the sole basis for the Ukrainian national idea). In her own words: "...I set out in a new field–though I remain, so to speak, on the fresh ground of the very same Ukrainian field, Ukrainian literature, Ukrainian life... [My heroines] are all taken from the lives of the people; though they are not the heroines of Vovchok, Kulish, or even Shevchenko (those delicate lovers, sisters, women), they are still the figures of patriot women" (Bohachevsky-Chomiak 1999, 42). Her heroines, like herself, shaped by her ideas on the position of women and the importance of women's role in the development of the nation, went very much against the grain of the society she lived in and did not receive popular acclaim.

An energetic woman with a keen sensitivity to women's inequality in Ukrainian society (split at that time between the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires and regarded as two independent entities by the Ukrainians themselves), Olena Pchilka was actively involved in many spheres of Ukrainian cultural and political life. Together with ***Natalia Kobrynska,*** Pchilka edited and published an anthology, *Pershy Vinok* (First wreath, 1887). Among the works selected for *Pershy Vinok* were Pchilka's novel *Tovaryshky* (Girlfriends) and poems by ***Lesia Ukrainka,*** which had been smuggled into Halychyna. The anthology played a key role in the development of a women's literature in Ukraine, opening up a female space in literature and social life that had remained hitherto unexplored. Subsequently, both editors hoped to publish another anthology *Druhy Vinok* (Second wreath) but this plan was never realized. In the 1890s, Pchilka received with enthusiasm a proposal by M. Pavlyk, editor-in-chief of *Narod*

(Nation; the official organ of the Radical Party) to establish and publish a special newspaper for Ukrainian peasant women.

One of the few public activists to regard women's public activity to be an inseparable part of, if not a driving force behind the Ukrainian national movement, Olena Pchilka invested a great deal of energy in affairs seemingly irrelevant to 'women's causes.' She was one of five delegates to submit, in 1904, a petition to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, requesting permission to publish books in Ukrainian. In 1905, when the Revolution resulted in the liberalization of education, in particular of higher education, Pchilka urged the Ukrainian intelligentsia to raise funds for a Ukrainian people's university. Later, having moved to Poltava to edit and publish a magazine *Ridny Kray* (Homeland) and an appendix, *Moloda Ukrayina* (Young Ukraine, 1906–1914), Pchilka agreed to head the Poltava regional branch of the *Vserosiyska spilka rivnoupravlinnia zhinok* (All-Russian Union for Women's Equality), which had branches in nine cities of the Right-bank Ukraine and which worked for women's equality and the defence of national interests. Although she was not very popular in the Right-bank Ukraine due to what many perceived as her 'radical' politics, Pchilka nevertheless urged Ukrainian women to establish women's organizations as part of a broader national endeavor. Together with Maria Yanovska, she represented the *Kyivska Zhinocha Hromada* (Kiev Women's Community), a Ukrainian branch of the *Vserosiyska spilka rivnoupravlinnia zhinok*, at the All-Russian Congress of Women (organized by the *Vserosiyska spilka rivnoupravlinnia zhinok*) in St Petersburg (1908). At this event, Pchilka presented a report entitled "The Tasks of Ukrainian Women." The text itself has not been preserved but, judging from other sources, it seems likely that Pchilka discussed the role of the national women's movement for the future of Ukraine and the ways such a movement could serve the country as a whole. In other words, Pchilka's emphasis is likely to have subordinated the specific needs of women to those of 'the nation' and the national cause.

After the death of her daughter (***Lesia Ukrainka***) on 8 August 1913, Olena Pchilka moved to Hadiach and there (from 1917 to 1919) began editing the *Hazeta Zemstva Hadiatskoho* (Hadiach zemstvo newspaper). From 1921, Pchilka resided permanently in Kiev, where she worked for various (e.g. ethnographic and literary) commissions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In April 1925, she was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, in spite of the fact that she was not entirely supportive of communist rule and, after the 1917 Revolution, had avoided political life. The early 1920s—the 'korenizatsia' years during which state policy sought to establish national languages as the state languages of the corresponding republics (including Ukraine)—was a period of 'national revival' in Ukraine: a brief period in the history of the Right-bank Ukraine when Ukrainian language, culture and science were promoted by the administration. Later, in 1927, purges directed against national activists swept away many members of the cultural elite, including the families of Olga and Izydora Kosach.

After Olena Pchilka's death (from pneumonia) on 4 October 1930, she was buried in Kiev Baikhove cemetery, alongside her husband, only son Mykhailo and daughter Lesia Ukrainka. In 1944, her daughters Olga Petrivna Kosach-Kryvyniuk (1877–1945) and Izydora Petrivna Kosach-Borysova (1888–1980) left the USSR to avoid persecution. Her other daughter, Oksana Petrivna Kosach-Shymanovska (1882–1975), moved to Czechoslovakia shortly after her marriage in 1908 and remained there for the rest of her life, never to return to Ukraine.

**Natalia V. Monakhova**
Ph.D. Candidate (Comparative Literature),
National University "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"

## SOURCES

(C) Pchilka, Olena. *Opovidannia, z avtobiografiyeyu* (Short stories and autobiography). Rukh, 1930.
(D) Chernyshov, Andry. "Olena Pchilka." *Nevmyrushchi* (Immortal) (Kharkiv: Prapor, 1970): 137–173.
(E) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. *Bilym po bilomu: Zhinky v hromadskomy zhytti Ukrayny* (White on white: women in Ukrainian public life). Kiev: Lybid, 1999.
(E) Smoliar. L. O., ed. *Zhinochi studii v Ukraini: Zhinka v istorii i siohodni* (Women's studies in Ukraine: woman in history and today). Odessa: AstroPrint, 1999.
(E) Karmazina, Maria. *Lesia Ukrainka*. Kiev: Alternatyvy, 2003.

# **RUDNYTSKA,** Milena (1892–1979)

Ukrainian political activist and publicist; organizer of the women's movement and participant in the national liberation struggle in western Ukraine (1918–1939); President (1928–1939) of the *Souz Ukrainok* (Union of Ukrainian Women); deputy (1928–1939) to the Polish Parliament.

Milena Rudnytska was born on 15 July 1892 in Zborov, a small town in eastern Galicia (today in Ukraine), at that time part of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. At the end of the nineteenth century, the political situation in this eastern and economically backward province of the Habsburg Empire had been determined by a lasting conflict between Poles and Ukrainians. Roman Catholic Poles had traditionally dominated cultural and political life in Galicia and turned favorable conditions under the Austro-Hungarian constitutional monarchy (which guaranteed the cultural rights of minorities) to their own advantage: namely the integration of the Polish nation. Greek Catholic Ukrainian peasants were economically exploited by Polish landlords and the Ukrainian elite was Polonized. Encouraged by the example of the more advanced nations in the Habsburg Empire (such as the Czechs) and stimulated by competition with the Poles, the Ukrainian intelligentsia fought for the political and cultural rights of Ukrainians and for the territorial autonomy of eastern Galicia. The years of Milena Rudnytska's childhood were marked by the struggle of Ukrainians for access to education in their language and in particular for a Ukrainian university in Lviv.

Milena's mother Olga Rudnytska, maiden name Ida (1862?–1950), came from a poor Jewish merchant family. Milena's father, Myhaylo Rudnytsky (1856–1906), was a public official (notary) from a Ukrainian gentry family. They had waited almost ten years before marrying because the parents on both sides had opposed the union. In the end, Milena's mother had converted to Christianity. Milena remembered her parents' marriage as a happy one. The family spoke Polish; later, Milena's mother Olga learned a little Ukrainian from her children. Milena had four brothers and was surrounded by intellectually and politically active young people throughout her childhood. All her brothers became prominent intellectuals and public figures: Myhaylo (1889–1975), a philologist; Volodymyr (1890–1974), a lawyer; Ivan (1896–1995), an

essayist and Antin (1902–1975), a composer and musician. Milena's father, with whom she had a close relationship, participated actively in the cultural life of the Ukrainian community. Milena experienced his early and unexpected death in 1906 as an irreplaceable loss.

Milena Rudnytska attended a gymnasium in Lviv (1903–1910) and later studied mathematics and philosophy at Lviv and Vienna universities (1910–1917). Vienna accommodated a Ukrainian community with a vibrant cultural and political life and in this stimulating environment, Rudnytska developed an interest in politics. She received a diploma in pedagogy (1917) and began writing a doctoral dissertation without ever completing it. In Vienna, she met Pavlo Lysiak (1887–1948), a journalist and a lawyer she had come to know through her brothers. She married him in 1919 and gave birth to a son, Ivan, but the marriage was not a success and Rudnytska ended up raising her child alone. She never married again and devoted herself to professional activity and political work.

In 1918, the Habsburg Empire collapsed but the Western Ukrainian People's Republic, proclaimed in Lviv that same year, did not survive. After a short but severe military conflict between Poles and Ukrainians in 1919, eastern Galicia became *de facto* part of the new Polish state. Its oppressive policy towards national minorities stimulated a national mass mobilization of Ukrainians. Rudnytska enthusiastically supported the short-lived Ukrainian government, but was not satisfied with the inferior role assigned to women within the national liberation movement. She focused her activities on organizing women and raising their civic consciousness. She saw feminism as a means of mobilizing women *en masse,* and involving them in practical political work on behalf of the future Ukrainian nation. [Rudnytska rarely used the term 'feminism' and when she did so, it was usually as a synonym for 'the women's movement:' i.e. practical work among women aiming to educate them as active and conscious citizens of the (future) state. She avoided 'feminist' in favor of 'women's' simply because she was seeking to address a mass female audience.] Rational, energetic and well educated, with an independent mind and strong political talents, Rudnytska was destined to become a leader.

After her return to Lviv in 1920, Rudnytska became one of the activists of the *Souz Ukrainok* (Union of Ukrainian Women), the most influential mass women's organization in eastern Galicia. The *Souz Ukrainok* was established in 1920 after the reorganization of the *Ukrainska Zhinocha Hromada* (Ukrainian Women's Hromada), which had been established in 1908. The *Souz Ukrainok* was also active in other regions of western Ukraine and maintained contacts with Ukrainian women in Europe and North America. According to estimates, it had between fifty and one hundred thousand members in Galicia alone. Most of these were peasant women. The leadership of the *Souz Ukrainok* was recruited from the local intelligentsia: teachers, wives of priests, etc. In addressing the needs of the peasants, the *Souz Ukrainok* tried to combine the aims of economic modernization in the villages with that of strengthening the

role of women in the local community. Together with other prominent women (Olena Sheparovych, Olena Sichynska and Olena Stepaniv), Rudnytska supported women's groups and cooperatives and helped set up a women's press, organize women's conferences and represent Ukrainian women at the international level (e.g. in the International Council of Women, ICW). [Between 1920 and 1925, the Ukrainian National Council of Women was affiliated to the ICW. At the Washington congress of the ICW in 1925 "the question arose as to whether, in absence of any responsible government in Ukraine, the NCW of the country could remain a member" (*Women in a Changing World*, 1966, 53). Though the ICW was organized on the national principle and Ukraine, as a stateless nation, could no longer be a member, Ukrainian women cooperated with the Council informally and took part in congresses as observers and invited guests.] In 1928, Rudnytska was elected President of the *Souz Ukrainok* and retained this position until 1939. She also became an ideologist of the Ukrainian women's movement in Galicia and regularly contributed to the Ukrainian press. From 1919 onwards, she wrote for the women's socialist magazine *Nasha Meta* (Our goal) and cooperated with the feminist journals *Zhinka* (Woman), banned by the Poles in 1938; *Hromadianka* (Woman-citizen) and *Ukrainka* (Ukrainian woman). She also wrote for the only Ukrainian daily, *Dilo* (Action). From 1935 to 1939, Rudnytska was the editor of *Zhinka*.

Rudnytska's feminism was a product of her practical political activities. In her early writing, she drew attention to the conflict between family duties and professional interests, suggesting that the unequal distribution of household work was the main obstacle to women's participation in social life. She underlined that, until present times, women had been excluded from human history but now they had a chance to transform the state, society and the dominant culture on the basis of new values. Developing her own vision of the political and social role of Ukrainian women, she stressed that once basic civic rights had been won by women, women had important duties towards the community and the nation. The struggle for equality was only the beginning; the new aim was to make women aware of their equal responsibility for the future of the nation. Influenced by wider trends in late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century European feminisms–which emphasized women's relationalism as mothers, wives, managers of households and educators of families–Rudnytska combined a commitment to women's emancipation with the idea of the specific social responsibility of mothers for the community. Among Ukrainians in eastern Galicia, lacking a state of their own and struggling for national survival, the emphasis was on women's constructive rather than subversive roles within the traditional institutions of family, church and community. Rudnitska sought to modernize these institutions but also tried to build her feminism upon them. Tolerance and democracy versus radicalism and violence, women's common interests versus class and political conflict, these were the tensions shaping her understanding of feminism. Unlike many other activists, she never felt sympathy for socialism and was never attracted to Soviet Ukraine as an

alternative to national liberation. This said, under Rudnytska's leadership the *Souz Ukrainok* was open to women of very different political persuasions.

In June 1934, Milena Rudnytska, along with other activists, organized a mass women's congress in Stanislaviv (now Ivano-Frankivsk). Despite harassment from the Polish authorities, more than ten thousand delegates from Galicia, Volhynia, as well as from Europe and North America, demonstrated the unity and strength of the women's movement. At the congress, the *Vsesvitniy Souz Ukrainok* (World Union of Ukrainian Women) was created, which became a powerful international organization representing Ukrainian women worldwide.

Rudnytska's activities were not restricted to the women's movement. From 1925, she was an active member of the *Ukrainske Natsionalno-Demokratychne Obiednannia* (*UNDO*, Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance), the most influential political party of Ukrainians in Galicia. At the same time, never a slave to party discipline, she tried to keep the *Soiuz Ukrainok* out of party disagreements. When in 1935, during the election campaign for the Parliament, *UNDO* attempted to instrumentalize women and tried to impose its candidates on the *Soiuz Ukrainok*, Rudnytska left the party in protest against *UNDO* policy.

In 1928, Rydnytska became an elected member of the Polish Parliament. An excellent and charismatic speaker and a gifted politician, she fought against ethnic and sexual discrimination and worked on commissions for education and international relations. She used her position to fight against the Polonization of education and to defend Ukrainian teachers against political harassment, but she also defended Ukrainian women's organizations against the repressive measures of the Polish government. Her international activities were also focused on the political and economic situation of the Ukrainians. In 1931, Rudnytska was one of three Ukrainian delegates to the League of Nations, where she denounced the Polish 'pacification' campaign against the Ukrainian national minority and condemned Polish offensives to deny Ukrainians access to education in their own language and crush Ukrainian organizations. She was also invited to give a speech in the British House of Commons on the situation of the Ukrainians in Poland. Another focus of Rudnytska's international activities was the Famine in Soviet Ukraine in 1933, silenced by the Soviet leadership. She tried to bring this catastrophe to the attention of the international public and organize help for its victims.

From the late 1920s, the political conflict between Ukrainians and the Polish state radicalized. Ukrainian women's activities were watched closely by the Polish government, which tried on more than one occasion to ban the *Souiz Ukrainok*, even arresting some of its leaders. With the Soviet occupation of western Ukraine in 1939, most women activists had to leave Galicia; in July 1941, the region was occupied by the German army.

Rudnytska moved to Cracow, later to Prague and Berlin, where her son—who became the prominent historian Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytsky (1919–1984)—was a student. In

exile, she concentrated on writing and in 1944, published her book *Zakhidna Ukraina pid bolshevykamy* (Western Ukraine under the Bolsheviks) in Prague; a second New York edition followed in 1958 (both editions were in Ukrainian). After the war, Rudnytska tried to restore the *Souiz Ukrainok* in emigration (Galicia being under occupation by the Soviets) and organize support for Ukrainian refugees. But her political and personal disagreements with other Ukrainian women's émigré organizations left her a marginal figure. In 1950, she moved to the USA, returning to Europe after eight years. She continued her studies, developed interests in philosophy and religion, but did not resume her political activities.

Milena Rudnytska died in Munich on 29 March 1979. She was re-buried in Lviv in 1993.

**Tatiana Zhurzhenko**
Dept. of Philosophy,
V. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine

## SOURCES

(A) Archives of the University of Alberta (Canada), Milena Rudnytska archive.
(A) Central State Historical Archive, Lviv (Ukraine): collection N319, Central Ukrainian Women's Society *Soiuz Ukrainok*; also collections N 358, 359, 344, 205. State Archive of Lviv Oblast: collections N1, 119.
(A) National Library, Warsaw and the Central State Historical Archive, Lviv, Archive of Ukrainian Parliamentary Representation.
(B) *Nasha Meta* (Our goal) (1919).
(B) *Dilo* (Action) (1922–1926, 1931, 1934).
(B) *Zhinka* (Woman) (1935–1937, 1939).
(C) Rudnytska, Milena. *Western Ukraine under the Bolsheviks*. New York, 1958.
(C) Rudnytska, Milena. *Statti, Lysty, Dokumenty* (Essays, letters, documents). Miroslava Diadiuk, ed. Lviv: Central State Historical Archive, 1998.
(E) *Women in a Changing World: The Dynamic Story of the International Council of Women since 1888*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966, 46; 53.
(E) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. *Feminists Despite Themselves: Women in Ukrainian Life, 1884–1939*. Edmonton: CIUS, University of Alberta, 1988.

# **UKRAINKA,** Lesia (real name Larysa Petrivna Kosach) (1871–1913)

Ukrainian woman-poet, writer, dramatist, literary critic and public activist.

Lesia Ukrianka (left) with Olha Kobylianska, 1901

Lesia Ukrainka (a pseudonym of Larysa Petrivna Kosach) was born on 25 February 1871 in Novohrad-Volynsky, the second child of six. Not wanting her children to grow up in an environment dominated by the Russian language, her mother (***Olena Pchilka***) did not send her children to school. Instead, she provided them all (including Lesia) with a solid home education that consisted of piano lessons, private classes with professors from the Kiev gymnasium for boys (e.g. in Greek and Latin) and tuition in French and German. Later in life, Lesia also mastered English and some Slavic languages and proved to be an able translator. Nevertheless, she always suffered from what she perceived to be her lack of systematic education.

In 1881, Lesia caught a cold that developed into a severe illness, turning her life into a continuous struggle against pain. At first, rheumatism was diagnosed; later, in 1883, bone tuberculosis was suspected and Lesia underwent surgery on the infected bones in her left hand. The operation was unsuccessful and she continued to suffer from diseased bones, joints and later, lungs. Her condition meant that for long periods of time she was removed from her family and others she loved, receiving treatment in Odesa, the Crimea (in southern Ukraine), Berlin, Zurich, Venice and Georgia (then part of the Russian Empire), where she died on 8 August 1913.

Her obvious talent was noticed early on: Lesia was nine when she wrote her first poem, "Nadia" (Hope), and thirteen when her poems "Safo" (Sappho) and "Konvalia" (Lily of the Valley) appeared in the Lviv journal *Zoria* (Star). In 1886, she assisted her mother in putting together the anthology *Pershy Vinok* (First wreath), in which her poems "Rusalka" (Water nymph), "Na Zelenomu Horbochku" (On a green hill) and others were published in 1887. From 1888 onwards, she regularly published in various Ukrainian periodicals and her first poetic collection, *Na Krylakh Pisen* (On

the wings of songs), was published in 1893 (in Lviv since the Ukrainian language was then forbidden in the Russian Empire).

Lesia Ukrainka took part in the activities of various public and political (mostly social democratic) organizations. For such activities she was (like her mother) subjected to secret police surveillance. Although she took a strong position on women's issues in her literary criticism and her dramatic writing, as well as in her private life, her poetry was different and was therefore highly praised in her own, and in Soviet times because it absorbed the aesthetics of populist nationalism and reflected dominant political (populist) lines; so much so that Ivan Franko (1856–1916), one of the key proponents of the aesthetic and cultural values of populism, called Lesia "the only man in all of modern Ukraine" (Franko 1981, 269). By contrast, her literary criticism introduced Western European intellectual traditions and new tendencies in European literature into Ukrainian cultural life, providing Ukrainian literary criticism with a new set of theoretical frameworks—see for example her "Dva napravlenia v noveishei ital'yanskoi literature: Ada Negri i d'Annuntsio" (Two directions in contemporary Italian literature: Ada Negri and d'Annuncio, 1899). She was one of the first to address women's representation in modern literature, presenting and later publishing a paper in *Zhyzn* (Life) entitled "Novye perspektivy i staryye teni: 'Novaya zhenshchina' zapadno-evropeiskoi belletristiki" (New perspectives and old shadows: 'The new woman' in Western European fiction, 1900). Similarly, her plays reflected the attempts of a female intellectual to transcend the boundaries set by Ukrainian literary tradition; to reshape dramatic and theatrical traditions and introduce new themes and genres. Through the silent and obedient shadows of Ukrainka's female protagonists, her plays laid bare the social, cultural and religious constraints on women's lives in the everyday. Her first play, *Blakytna Troyanda* (The blue rose; written in 1895/96 and first staged in Kiev in 1899), was harshly criticized by reviewers because it did not conform to populist ideology (as her much lauded poetry did).

Ukrainka's private life in some ways successfully resisted the patriarchal order, but it was a life filled with difficulties. She seems to have been a constant source of anxiety to her family because of her poor health, and she also behaved in ways unthinkable for a woman of her social standing. She engaged in two passionate friendships: one with Nestor Gambarashvili (1871–1966), a student from Georgia who lodged with the Kosaches in 1895 in Kiev; another with Serhy Merzhynsky (1870–1901), a Social Democrat and activist whom she met in 1898, visited in Minsk (Belarus) in 1900, accommodated in her home several times and cared for as he was dying in 1901. For a long time, Ukrainka rejected the marriage proposals of Klyment Vasyliovych Kvitka (1880–1953), a folklorist, ethnographer and musicologist whom she met in 1898 and with whom she lived for a while in a common-law relationship. In 1906, Ukrainka relented and her marriage was registered in 1907 upon her mother's wishes (Ukrainka herself saw marriage and its traditional religious ceremonies as oppressive social practices).

Lesia Ukrainka was buried in Kiev Baikhove cemetery, alongside her father and brother Mykhailo. It is only in recent times, thanks to the research of ***Solomea Pavlychko*** and Vira Ageeva, that Ukrainka's dramatic works have at last begun to attract proper academic interest as powerful feminist manifestos.

**Natalia V. Monakhova**
Ph.D. Candidate (Comparative Literature),
National University "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy"

## SOURCES

(C) Ukrainka, Lesia. *Zibrannia tvoriv u 12 tomakh* (Collected works in twelve volumes). Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1979.
(D) Zborovska, Nila. *Moya Lesia Ukrainka* (My Lesia Ukrainka). Ternopil: Dzhura, 2002.
(D) Karmazina, Maria. *Lesia Ukrainka*. Kiev: Alternatyvy, 2003.
(E) Franko, Ivan. *Tvory: u 50 t.* (Works in fifty volumes). Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1981, 31: 269.
(E) Pavlychko, Solomea. "Modernism vs. Populism in *Fin de Siècle* Ukrainian Literature." In P. Chester and S. Forrester, eds. *Engendering Slavic Literatures*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1996, 81–103.
(E) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. *Bilym po bilomu: Zhinky v hromadskomy zhytti Ukrayny* (White on white: women in Ukrainian public life). Kiev: Lybid, 1999.
(E) Smoliar. L. O., ed. *Zhinochi studii v Ukraini: Zhinka v istorii i siohodni* (Women's studies in Ukraine: woman in history and today). Odesa: AstroPrint, 1999.
(E) Ageeva, Vira. *Zhinochy prostir: Feministychnyi dyskurs ukrainskoho modernyzmu* (Women's space: the feminist discourse of Ukrainian modernism). Kiev: Fakt, 2003.