

As Feminine as Granite: Nationalist Women Writers of the Interwar Diaspora
Paper presented at the ASN Convention in New York, April 13, 2007

The women poets of the Prague School of Ukrainian literature exemplify a curious poetic paradox. The interwar poems of Olena Teliha, Oksana Ljaturyns'ka, and Natalija Livyc'ka-Xolodna are, like the works of the male poets of this group, imbued with a patriotic fervor and a militant stand in defense of the moral justice and dignity of the struggle of Ukrainians for their national aspirations. Under the circumstances, this was hardly surprising. After the final victory of the Bolsheviks in Ukraine, the political remnants of the Ukrainian National Republic, the so-called Petliurite emigration, settled in and around Prague, where they found a mostly friendly reception in Tomáš Masaryk's Czechoslovakia. Many of them later re-located to Warsaw. Among the characteristic cultural features of the aesthetics of this emigre community was a focus on strength and battle, militancy and aggression, the hard and the tough. This was no less true of the women in their ranks. Yet these women also introduce a conspicuous strain of women's themes into their works. These themes include sexuality, femininity, and tenderness. They also address issues of women's equality in a feminist spirit. The paradoxical relationship between these themes of hardness and tenderness, militancy and femininity, aggression and sexual desire is one of the most distinctive characteristics of these women poets.

This characteristic feature, the juxtaposition of hard and soft, has been noted by previous commentators, although not in exactly the same formulation I shall advance. In this brief paper, I shall not examine all the writing on this topic, but I will mention that there are important essays by Rubchak on Livyc'ka-Xolodna¹ and Ševelov on Ljaturyns'ka² and on Teliha³, where the elements of this juxtaposition are discussed. Indeed, many critics who examine the works of these poets cannot help but notice the presence of militant and aggressive bravado side by side with a focus on women's passion and sensuality. These are prominent features of the works of these writers and not something that readers must work to discover. But these qualities are not merely juxtaposed in the works of these women poets, they are blended or harmonized to produce a series of images clustered around the theme of strong womanhood, of tough, granite-like femininity, and of an aggressive militancy grounded in characteristically women's attributes, particularly women's sexuality.

The poetic images of what we might call aggressive sensuality, or granite femininity are not merely aesthetic constructs, although they are certainly that as well. They are products of a conscious and rational view, albeit a passionately held view, of the proper role for women in society. Among the three women whose poetry concerns us here, Teliha's views on feminist issues are by far the best known. They are documented in her journalistic writing and in her correspondence. While it isn't a foregone conclusion that Livyc'ka-Xolodna and Ljaturyns'ka shared these views, it is probably safe to assume that their own views were not very far removed from them. Surely Teliha would not have expressed her views on women and their social role so

1. Bohdan Rubchak. "Serce nadvoje rozderte." (Introduction) *Natalja Livyc'ka-Xolodna. Poeziji, stari i novi*. New York: Sojuz Ukrajinok, 1986, pp. 7–57.

2. Jurij Ševel'ov. "Nad kupkoju popelu, ščo bula Oksanoju Ljaturyns'koju" in *Oksana Ljaturyns'ka: Zibrannja tvoriv*, Toronto: Orhanizacija Ukrajinok Kanady, 1983, pp. 9–67.

3. Jurij Šerex (Ševel'ov). "Bez metalevyx sliv i bez zitxan' daremnyx." in *Olena Teliha. Zbirnyk*, O. Ždanovyč, ed. Detroit: Zolotyj xrest, 1977. pp 452–61 (originally in *Arka*, 1947, 1.)

openly and clearly in her letters to Livyc'ka-Xolodna, if she had not thought that the latter's views on the issue were at least sympathetic if not similar.

In 1935 Teliha published an essay on the portrayal of women in Ukrainian literary works. It appeared in Dmytro Dontsov's *Vistnyk*⁴ and was given a title that reflected Teliha's usual provocative, flirtatious style "Iakymy nas prahnete?" (How do you desire us? or How do you like us?) The essay examines the presentation of women in works of Ukrainian literature and compares these Ukrainian portrayals with those of other literatures, particularly Russian and English. Teliha argues that there are essentially two types of female characters in Ukrainian literature, the woman-slave and the vamp. She berates her contemporary poets, such as Malanjudk and Mosendz for their excruciating focus on the eternally suffering woman, defender and prisoner of the Ukrainian hearth. She also chastises the modernist poets, particularly Pačovs'kyj, for their dreamy and frivolous images of Haljas and Dzunjas, the quintessential Ukrainian nymphets. As a contrast, she offers the women portrayed by English and Scandinavian writers, Jack London, Rudyard Kipling, William J. Locke, John Galsworthy, Knut Hamsun, Henrik Ibsen and others, who, according to Teliha, exemplify the modern ideal of woman. "The chief characteristic of this gallery of magnificent female images," says Teliha, "is their blend of womanliness and manliness, lover and comrade, which turns them into real persons and attracts men to them."⁵

Teliha's ideal image of the modern woman is clearly a reaction to a number of social phenomena of the recent past. She is, of course, a product of the general feminist sentiment of the early 20th century that established the notion of women's equality as the cornerstone of all serious thought about the social position of women. But she is also clearly reacting to what she considers the excesses of feminism. In describing the two types of women commonly presented in Ukrainian literature, the slave and the vamp, Teliha discounts a third type, which she associates with Soviet literature: This type, she says, appears as "a severe, energetic, unsentimental 'woman as comrade.' But this version usually has so little femininity that, while eliciting respect, it never evokes love and adoration."⁶ Can the point be any clearer than this? For Teliha, love and adoration are prerequisite elements in any formulation of the ideal of womanhood. A woman is not a woman unless she is admired by men.

Teliha is not seduced by a modern ideal woman who is not defined by her sexual relation to men. Choosing a model from English fiction, Teliha focuses on Rudyard Kipling's short story "William the Conqueror," in which the titular hero is a woman who does not shirk from the hardships that her brother and his friend, her prospective lover, endure while ministering to the victims of a famine in India. Of this quite unusually named woman, Teliha says, "that she is becoming disillusioned with the man she loves because he wants to tear himself away for at least one day from his onerous duty of combating famine ... by the desire to see her. But the danger

4. *Vistnyk*, 1935, 10: 735–45. Reprinted in Oleh Ždanovyč Štul', ed. *Olena Teliha. Zbirnyk*. Paris: Ukraïnskyj Zolotyj Xrest, 1977; as well as in Osyf Zinkevych, comp. *Olena Teliha. Vybrani tvory*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2006.

5. Головна прикмета тієї галерії прекрасних жіночих образів — це їх з'єднання жіночості з мужністю, а коханки з товаришем, що робить з них правдиву людину і прив'язує до них мужчину. *Zbirnyk*. 73.

6. Є, щоправда, і третя відміна: різка, енергійна, позбавлена сентименту, «жінка-товариш». Але ця відміна має переважно так мало жіночості, що — викликаючи пошану — ніколи не викликає любови й адорації. *Zbirnyk*. 66.

passes, and she loves him, laughs, and cries. She loves her cozy home, music, dancing, and flowers. English literature and life are full of such women. Each of them often accompanies her husband to his most dangerous undertakings, but she never becomes an Amazon devoid of feminine charm.”⁷ Kipling and Teliha clearly share a common virtue: Duty, duty, duty. But Kipling’s story is built precisely on the unusualness of this masculine-named-woman. William does not represent Kipling’s idea of the *ewige Weibliche* any more than her baby-nursing, goat-milking paramour is a model of masculinity. In fact, what Teliha likes most in the story is that the woman plays a supporting role in the life of her man, who is performing a great social duty. But she is not his equal or his partner. She too is hardened to duty, but her duty is not beside him, but behind him in a supporting role. More generally, her role is to provide the inspiration that keeps him going. And this inspiration is precisely in a woman’s attractive powers over a man, not in her motherly or housekeeping skills. In Kipling’s story, it is the heroic man who must teach the woman how to milk a goat and feed an infant.

This image of a woman working together with her man and supporting him in performing their mutual social duty is further reinforced in Teliha’s review of women’s magazines.⁸ Like many a run-of-the-mill feminist, she denounces the saccharin sweetness and concentration on femininity that characterizes a number of the journals she reviews. “This is a femininity of the worst kind,” she says, “which does not evoke praise from men, nor excitement, but an ironic smile.”⁹ But Teliha is equally critical of feminist intellectual women’s journals. Milena Rudnyts'ka’s *Zhinka* was just such a publication, but Teliha sees no place for anything that women do apart from their men. Moreover, she says, that the wind that blows from the journal *Zhinka* is “not the fresh breeze of contemporary thought, but the long spent wind of the past century: feminism, in its ancient and now irrelevant form, and compassionate liberalism, which is finally and forever discredited in the eyes of the current generation on account of the shameful obstructive role they played in our struggle for liberation.”¹⁰

The outline of Teliha’s view of an ideal woman that flows from these two essays is further reinforced in her correspondence. Indeed, the collection of letters to Natalja Livyc'ka Xolodna that Marta Skorupska edited¹¹ is an invaluable source of information about the key figures of the Prague School and their views. The letters to Livyc'ka-Xolodna from Dontsov and Teliha from

7. ... молода дівчина почуває, що розчарується в чоловіка, якого кохає, оскільки він відірветься хоч на один день від свого важкого обов'язку боротьби з голодом в Індії, і поверне до затишного намету, хоч би повернути туди і тягло його лише бажання побачити саме її. Але минає небезпека — і вона кохає, сміється і плаче. Любить затишний дім, музику, танці і квіти. Таких жінок повно в англійській літературі і в житті. Кожна з них не раз супроводжає свого чоловіка в найнебезпечніших його підприємствах, але ніколи не стає амазонкою, позбавленою жіночого чару. *Zbirnyk*, 73

8. “Slipa vulytsja,” *Vistnyk*, 1938, 4: 290–97. Reprinted in *Olena Teliha. Zbirnyk*.

9. Це та жіночість найгіршого роду, що викликає не пошану, а зневагу з боку чоловіка; не захоплення, а іронічну усмішку. *Zbirnyk*, 80.

10. ... віє не свіжий подих сучасності, а давно вішумілий вітер минулого століття: фемінізм, в його давній, не актуальній тепер формі, і лібералізм з гуманністю, що вже раз назавжди дискредитовані в очах нсучасного покоління, з огляду на ту ганебну гальмуючу ролю, яку вони відіграли в нашій визвольній боротьбі. *Zbirnyk*, 85.

11. *Zbirnyk*, 80.

the summer of 1933 indicate that there was a controversy regarding the “eroticism” of Livyc'ka-Xolodna's poems at this time. The controversy took flight after a polemical article appeared in the Catholic journal *Dzvony* criticizing Dontsov and the erotic poetry that he allowed in his *Vistnyk*. While this was largely a political battle between two opposing ideological camps, it is clear that questions about a woman's role in society in general and women's sexuality in particular, were attracting the attention of the Ukrainian intellectuals in Warsaw and Prague. In her letter to Livyc'ka-Xolodna from August 16, 1932, for example, Teliha, reacting to something Livyc'ka had written in a previous letter, expounds on her views about women. She discusses the attitude of men to various qualities in women, specifically beauty and intelligence. Teliha concedes immediately, that men have little interest in intellectual women. But she sees this as something normal. Using Sofija Rusova as her whipping horse, Teliha tells Livyc'ka “would you yourself, if you were a man, get excited by her? Shoes—size 42, skirt hanging crooked, collars dirty. Even we women, dear Natusja, value a man not just by his intellect but by his external appearance. Just try to get excited by Prof. Bidnov, even in his youth.”¹² Teliha, is barely 26 at this time, so we might allow for some youthful exuberance on this subject. In fact, she goes on in the letter to discount mere beauty. With a modesty that seems less than entirely sincere, she tells Livyc'ka that beauty is not the best way to attract a man. Comparing her own meager beauty to that of two other women, she says that she nevertheless has far more attention from men than they do. This “energy”—she uses the Russian word *ізіуминка*—that distinguishes you and me from the likes of Zonja, Teliha tells her friend, is what insures that we are and will be far more loved than she, whom no one but her unfortunate husband could possibly love. It is not my purpose here to attack the character of a passionate young woman—Teliha's love life is the stuff of legends—but rather to note the importance to her of the question of women's relations with men. The interest was such that but a few weeks after this letter, on Sept 6, 1932, Teliha is already talking about a plan for a joint lecture on the “types of women” that she, Livyc'ka, and Zoja Plitas were to compose.¹³

The centrality of a romantic—dare we say sexual—understanding of the what it means to be a woman has been noted in Teliha's world view previously, most notably by Bojchuk and Rubchak in their annotations to the anthology *Koordynaty*. This puts her in stark contrast with the previous generation of Ukrainian feminists, particularly the participants of the *Pershyj vinok* anthology, to which she pays tribute at the beginning of her review of women's journals. For the generation of Kobyljans'ka, Kobryns'ka, Lesja Ukrajinka and their colleagues, the central issue was precisely how a woman was to balance the competing demands of her mind and her body, of her personal ambitions and her sexual desires. Many of Lesja Ukrainka's complex female characters embody such a dilemma. For Teliha and her generation of Ukrainian nationalist women, the dilemma is resolved by the subordination of all desires to a higher patriotic goal. In this configuration, a woman's sexual nature is not in conflict with her other goals and thus it

12. Але, хіба-б ти сама, на місці чоловіків захоплювалася-б нею? Черевики — № 42, спідниця криво вдягнена, комірці брудні. А тже-ж і ми, Натуся, в чоловіках цінимо не лише розум, а і зовнішній вигляд, ану спробуй захопитися проф. Бідновим, хоч би і в молодості? *Materijaly do istoriji literatury i hromads'koji dumky. Lystuvannja z amerykans'kux arxiviv 1857–1933*. Ed. Bohdan Struminski and Marta Skorupsky. New York: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US, 1992. Letter 74, from August 16, 1932, p. 612.

13. Cf. *Materjaly* p. 637, n. 3 and p. 344, n. 5.

becomes a defining feature of a liberated woman.

One final instance of this topic in Teliha's writings deserves mention before I turn to the poetry itself. In a poem that was not published until 1934, but which had apparently been composed and shared with Teliha a year earlier¹⁴, Livyc'ka-Xolodna uses the image of a "vamp," understood as a glamorous, exotic, and heartless seductress, a *femme fatale* character from popular movies of the time. In a letter to Livyc'ka from June 24, 1933, Teliha playfully alludes to this poem and admits to her friend "I have come to feel a terrible longing for my Vamp, sinful, passionate, and in need of a stern rebuke. I'd gladly sit in a café with you and eat a creme pastry. And you?"¹⁵ The allusion here is clearly not just to the poem itself, but to the controversy over eroticism mentioned above. Teliha's playful tone makes clear that she sees this matter as unremarkable. For these two women, the vamp image can be innocent or even positive. In her essay, "Jakymy nas prahnete," Teliha will use the vamp image as a label for an offensive male view of women as sexual slaves, but clearly in this letter, the vamp is understood differently, certainly not as something inherently and exclusively negative. For these two young women, this was a popular stereotype of one variety of women. The theatricality, the cinematic melodrama of this role notwithstanding, it was an image with which these women could choose, at least in some measure, to identify.

In his magisterial essay on the poetry of Livyc'ka-Xolodna, Bohdan Rubchak makes clear this identification with the image of a vamp on the part of the poet. Tracing the thematic structure of Livyc'ka's poetry, Rubchak sees a story line that consists of the interaction of two poetic personas, the "real woman" and the "vamp." He sees these two poetic masks in the different sections of Livyc'ka's first collection of poetry from 1934 entitled *Vohon' i popil* (Fire and Ashes). In Rubchak's view, these two masks interact in a dialectic interaction of attraction and revulsion. The poet first celebrates a traditional, "real woman" in the *Barvin-zillia* chapter of the collection. Here, the role of the woman is categorically defined as the mother of the hero's children. In the next chapter, *Červone i čorne*, argues Rubchak, this ideal love is despoiled and contaminated with carnal passion characterized by fiery red lips that taste of salty blood. In Rubchak's formulation this dialectic between pure and impure love is resolved by a focus on poetry itself only in Livyc'ka-Xolodna's later mature poetry, written and published long after the war, in a different country by a much more mature woman. In the final section of the 1934 collection, however, the narrative of the poet's two masks remains unresolved. The chaste love of the first chapter and the ravenous sensuality of the second are succeeded by a hopeless solitude in the third. But this solitude is informed by memory and unfulfilled desire. This remembered pleasure in hopelessness produces precisely the image of tough tenderness, of quietly recollected passion that characterizes the work of the three women poets.

Livyc'ka-Xolodna, the most sophisticated and complex of the three, presents the image of a hard femininity most thoroughly and with the greatest amplitude. Because her two pre-WWII collections are thematically focused, the first on love the second on patriotism, and because these thematic collections are in fact narrative structures of a sort, the images appear not only in

14. Cf. *Materialy* p. 711, n. 17.

15. Я страшно вже скучила за своїм Вампом, грішним, пристраним і потрібуючим заушників. Охоче-б вже посиділа з тобою десь в кавярні, і з'їла-б тістечко з кремом. А ти? *Materialy* p. 710.

individual poems but in the framework of the collections as a whole. Most importantly, *Vohon' i popil* is as a whole, an embodiment, a synecdoche of sorts, for this central theme. The juxtaposition of the mask of the chaste lover with the sinful vamp is in itself an instance of this formulation. Livyc'ka-Xolodna has explicitly thematised what Teliha and Ljaturyns'ka display only incidentally. The theme of tough tenderness, of granite femininity persists on a variety of levels in her poetry. Livyc'ka-Xolodna arranges her poetry in a narrative sequence, but she also builds chains or clusters of images, that might even be understood as symbols. These clusters share the thematic burden with the narrative.

In *Vohon' i popil* there are a number of such images associated with each of its three chapters. In chapter one there is the early spring, with its blue color and its individual flowers. In chapter two there is the color red. It's on lips, in blood, and in fire. It is associated with lush summer vegetation and sunsets. But in the end, red transforms into black and becomes the color of death, night, and decay. In the third chapter the theme color is gray, the color of ashes and of winter skies. But throughout the collection, Livyts'ka mixes these images, juxtaposes them in order to construct her emotional drama. Lips burn red in winter. The gray days of autumn still share summer's warmth. Eyes filled with tears do not extinguish the fire in the heart. These thematic clusters are not only mixed, they are applied as remembered motifs, as reminders of a different reality, a perspective forgotten or subsumed. They punctuate the various poems with hints of what is missing but remembered.

At the end of the first collection, Livyc'ka-Xolodna gently moves from love to patriotism. In her second collection, *Sim liter* (Seven letters, 1937) whose title alludes to the word Ukraine (but could also suggest Petliura) the patriotic theme is central, but the narrative story has parallels to the earlier, erotic collection. The first chapter sketches a tender and delicate affection for the homeland. The verse is once again blue, as the poet longs *За краєм що, як Божий рай, / Цвіте блакиттю й сонцем грає.* (VII, 96) But the mood and the color scheme change in subsequent chapters, as the fire of a Prague dawn and the blood of Symon Petliura on the streets of Paris evoke grief, anger, and the desire for retribution:

Кров'ю серця стікають уста,
кров'ю слова набрякають.

Мужність, суворість і чистота... (На розпуттях, 104)

The thematic clusters of the first collection infiltrate and inform the second. The ultimate thematic significance of tough tenderness, of aggressive sensitivity, of granite femininity it turns out, for Livyc'ka-Xolodna, as for Teliha and Ljaturyns'ka, is simple patriotism.

Olena Teliha's poetry has a somewhat hortatory, publicistic character. Iurii Shevelov describes this quality as similar to that of "album" poetry, that is, discrete, individual poems written to display a particular sentiment clearly, unambiguously, and in a specific context¹⁶. It differs in the extreme from the poetry of Livyc'ka-Xolodna, which is a poetry of inward-looking, thoughtful, narrative self-contemplation. Where the images and symbols of Livyc'ka's poetry are cumulative and continuous, Teliha's are particular and disposable. But her relatively small oeuvre is nevertheless characterized by an overall sentiment. Her poetry is focused on a woman's

16. Jurij Ševel'ov. "Bez metalevyx sliv i bez zidhan' daremnyx," *Olena Teliha: Zbirnyk*. Pp. 452–61.

pride in patriotic feeling or, more generally, as Ševel'ov puts it,¹⁷ in a proud faithfulness, where the faith (and the pride) is that of both a citizen and a lover. This characteristic sentiment leads naturally to expressions and imagery that juxtapose the qualities of women with a severe and aggressive loyalty. As we have seen in her publicistic writing, for Teliha, the qualities of women included both sexuality and the traditionally feminine range of values including beauty, sensitivity, and service. Her poems thus often hinge on the juxtaposition of what are expressly construed as conflicting images. Very often, this is simply militant patriotism and the nurturing, traditionally non-aggressive role of women. But the range of contrasts spans a variety of topics. Among these the erotic and semi-erotic are particularly noteworthy.

The contrast between passion and honor is sometimes embodied in abstract motivational terms, as in the programmatic poem, “Sučasnykam:”

Не лічу слів, даю без міри ніжність.

А може в цьому й є моя сміливість:

Палити серце в хуртовині сніжній,

Купати душу у холодній зливі.

But more frequently, it is sexual in implication, if not in substance, as in the images of coy seduction in her dance poems, “Tango” and “Kozačok,” where burning passion is juxtaposed to romantic submission.

The erotic theme in Teliha’s poetry has been discussed by commentators on Teliha’s works and is something of a crimson flag (if not a red herring), since it usually prompts remarks that move quickly from her poetry into her personal life. This is particularly true of the poems dedicated or presumed to be dedicated to her close friend, Dmytro Dontsov. On this subject I simply direct readers to examine the materials on Teliha’s biography, but in particular the commentary and information compiled by Marta Skorupska in her notes to the letters of Livyc'ka-Xolodna¹⁸, including the variant texts of the poem, “Podorozhnij.” But regardless of the view one may take on Teliha’s relationship with Dontsov, what bears note in this regard is that it is precisely the contrast in this poem of weakness and strength, of honor and passion that allows readers to see a biographical subtext in the words. Absent this emotional paradox—this sense of conflicting imperatives between the woman and her stern public persona—this poem (and others like it) would be nothing more than another statement of a patriot’s dilemma.

Oksana Ljaturyns'ka’s poetry, unlike Teliha’s, does not evoke biographical snickering or a litany of moralizing exculpations. The world of her poetry is very formal—critics have spoken of ritual as the centerpiece of her poetic world¹⁹. In the adult poetry she wrote in this period—which means the collection *Knjaža emal'*—her focus is on the world of prehistoric, or early historic Ukraine. She writes about barbaric warfare, Rus' princes, pagan cults, and even drawings on cave walls, as she titles one of her poems. This largely historical landscape is not one where women can usually play a prominent role. In a sense, Ljaturyns'ka signals the importance of softness, tenderness, and delicacy precisely by their absence, by the clear sense in which her poetry

17. Shevelov. Ibid.

18. *Materialy* p. 725–32.

19. Iurii Shevelov in his introduction to her Collected Works. *Oksana Ljaturyns'ka: Zibrani tvory*. Ed. Bohdan Hoshovs'kyi and Svitlana Kuz'menko. Toronto: Orhanizatsiia Ukrainok Kanady, 1983.

concentrates on the hard, the cruel, the difficult, and the brutal. Warriors battle, hunters struggle for survival, and princes bask in the glory of their high station. The reader is attacked with violence, suffering, and endurance at every step. The natural response is both awe and some degree of alienation, perhaps even revulsion. This implicit tension, this duality through absence, is a vital element of Ljaturyns'ka's poetic stance.

But her poetry is not without some direct indications of the soft and the feminine. Although Ljaturyns'ka's poetry does not have the narrative cohesion of Livyc'ka-Xolodna, it does show the markers of thematic punctuation, of poems interspersed at a particular place in the cycle to draw attention away from the wild and point to the domesticated, the civilized, and the feminine. On the simplest level, this might be an allusion to Christianity, or to nature. But in a few specific poems she focuses specifically on women. There is the voice of Jaroslavna, lamenting her warrior husband and wishing for an end to violence. But there is also Ol'ha, the mother of Svjatoslav, implicitly basking in her son's military glory. And most significantly, there is the image of the great grandmother on a family heirloom. The image of this ancestral woman evokes a racial notion of inherited glory and riches and a shared sense of the sentiments that characterized the violent, active lives of the inhabitants of a previous age.

In Ljaturyns'ka's poetry, the female sexuality of her women colleagues in the Prague school of poets is absent. But her imagery still reflects the duality in their collective understanding of the role of women. These women, unlike their feminist predecessors of the generation just before theirs, reformulated their view of women in the cultural climate of Europe's increasing shrill drumroll leading up to World War II. They saw women not as men's equals or parallels, but as their lovers and their partners in a world of Darwinian merciless selection where the value of the soft side of civilized existence had been wiped away by the injustices of history in the previous quarter century. Only a strong woman can ensure the survival of herself, her lover, and her nation. But her role was not to be confused with that of a man.

Maxim Tarnawsky
University of Toronto

Livyc'ka-Xolodna, Natalja. *Poeziji, stari i novi*. New York: Sojuz Ukrajinok, 1986.
Ljaturyns'ka, Oksana. *Zibrannja tvoriv*. Toronto: Orhanizacija ukrajinok Kanady, 1983.
Teliha, Olena. *Vybrani tvory*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2006.

Kryvčykova, Oksana. "Pervynni styxiji jak osnova 'novoho' nacional'noho mifu 'Praz'koji školy." *Slovo i čas* 2001, 4: 79–82.

Il'nyč'kyj, Mykola. *Vid "Molodoji muzy" do "Praz'koji školy"*. L'viv: Instytut ukrajinoznavstva im. Krypjakevyča NANU, 1995.

Nabytovyč, Ihor. "O. Teliha versus L. Mosendz: Ideal žinky-borcja v poeziji ta publicystyci." *Sičeslav* 2006, 3: 124–29.

Rubchak, Bohdan. "Serce nadvoje rozderte." (Introduction) *Natalija Livyc'ka-Xolodna: Poeziji stari ii novi*. New York: Sojuz Ukrajinok, 1986. pp. 7–57.

Jurij Šerex (Ševel'ov). "Bez metalevyx sliv i bez zitxan' daremnyx." in *Olena Teliha. Zbirnyk*, O. Ždanovyč, ed. Detroit: Zolotyj xrest, 1977. pp 452–61 (originally in *Arka*, 1947, 1.)

Jurij Ševel'ov. "Nad kupkoju popelu, ščo bula Oksanoju Ljaturyns'koju" in *Oksana Ljaturyns'ka: Zibrannja tvoriv*, Toronto: Orhanizacija ukrainok Kanady, 1983, pp. 9–67.