

A COMPARATIVE FEMINIST READING OF LESIA UKRAINKA'S AND HENRIK IBSEN'S DRAMAS

Svitlana Kryś

University of Alberta

389

The dramas of Lesia Ukrainka (1871-1913) have been widely analyzed in Ukrainian and Western scholarship. Many critics mention Henrik Ibsen's (1828-1906) *oeuvre* as a possible intertext for Ukrainka's works, but only in reference to her dramas *Blakytna troianda* [The Azure Rose] (1896) and *U pushchi* [In the Wilderness] (1898-1907). Thus, for example, when juxtaposing *The Azure Rose* to Ibsen's *Gengangere* [Ghosts] (1881), Mykhailo Drai-Khmara notes the theme of hereditary illness, which is developed in both works (124). When Ukrainka's *In the Wilderness* is compared to Ibsen's *Brand* (1866) and *Bygmester Solness* [The Master Builder] (1892)—as they are by Drai-Khmara (142), Ida Zhuravs'ka (148), Pavlo Fylypovych (107-08), and Vira Aheieva (235-39), to name a few—emphasis is placed on the conflict between the individual and society as well as the place of the artist in society, common themes to Ukrainka and Ibsen.

The intertexts in Ukrainka's dramas, which point to feminist ideas in Ibsen's writings, however, have not been studied or documented on a textual level since many critics take Ibsen's influence on Ukrainka simply for granted. For instance, Mykola Zerov only makes a few very general remarks regarding the parallels between Ukrainka's and Ibsen's works. Zhuravs'ka mentions the similarity between the leading female characters in Ukrainka's *Kaminnyi hospodar* [The Stone Host] (1912) and Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* (1890), but does not investigate the idea in a detailed fashion, limiting herself to the ideologically-biased conclusion, typical for Soviet scholarship, that Ukrainka's drama discards Ibsen's Nietzschean vision of a woman (164-65).¹ More recent Western scholarship—an article by Irene Makaryk—mentions a number of predecessors who have documented intertextual relations between Ukrainka and Ibsen, suggesting that the topic might have exhausted itself (25). Roman Weretelnik's

dissertation, *A Feminist Reading of Lesia Ukrainka's Dramas*, while mentioning Ibsen's influence, also does not develop the topic further. Aheieva, discussing Ukrainka's *The Azure Rose*, states that

no reviewer has tried to place *The Azure Rose* in the context of feminist ideas. Even the influence of Ibsen has been limited by critics to *Ghosts* [here, Aheieva has in mind the topic of hereditary influence—SK], although when one speaks about the inversion of gender roles, it is simply impossible to omit *A Doll's House*. (111)²

Unfortunately, Aheieva also does not offer a detailed analysis of the impact of Ibsen's feminist ideas on Ukrainka.

390 My article proposes to move beyond these suppositions and to trace how a female author, Ukrainka, develops feminist ideas found in a male author's, Ibsen's, *oeuvre*. It seeks to establish intertextual relations between Ukrainka's and Ibsen's works within a feminist conceptual framework.³ For my comparative analysis, I have selected Ukrainka's first drama *Blakytyna troianda* [The Azure Rose] (1896), her dramatic poem *Oderzhyma* [The Possessed] (1901), and her late drama *Kaminnyi hospodar* [The Stone Host] (1912), which I intend to contrast to Ibsen's plays *Et dukkehjem* [A Doll's House] (1879), *Gengangere* [Ghosts] (1881), and *Hedda Gabler* (1890). I will analyze Ibsen's depiction of female characters as well as their social roles, juxtaposing them to Ukrainka's vision of a woman and her role in society as presented in her works. By providing a general overview of the feminist ideas in Ibsen's dramas that echo in Ukrainka's writings, I will demonstrate the manner in which Ukrainka's works develop feminist ideas beyond Ibsen's and articulate a more sweeping departure from traditional views of women and a willingness to experiment with alternative social roles for them.

Ukrainka's interest in Ibsen and her familiarity with his dramas are well attested. In her critical works she raises the women's question in the context of speaking about Ibsen and another Scandinavian dramatist, Bjørnstjerne Björnson.⁴ I would also like to draw attention to Ukrainka's correspondence with her sister, Ol'ha Kosach, where she mentions reading Ibsen, attending a public lecture devoted to him and seeing a theatrical performance of *A Doll's House*. In a letter to the publisher Vladimir Posse, Ukrainka also mentions the possibility of a monograph on the subject of Ibsen's dramas (XI: 60, 145, 162, 191).⁵ All these examples provide strong evidence that Ukrainka knew Ibsen's works well.

Ibsen's *A Doll's House* was the first attempt to break away from the stereotypical "destiny" of heroines as depicted in 18th and 19th century narratives. The latter resulted either in the "heroine's integration into society, [...] [the] heroine's death in the flower of her youth [or in her] banishment to a living death," to quote Nancy Miller (xi). Elaine Showalter cites the revolutionary impact of Ibsen's London production of *A Doll's House* in 1889. We are told that, following the performance, "[...] women in the audience [...] lingered after the play, 'breathless with excitement' [...]" (vii). According

to Gail Finney, Ibsen “was widely credited with virtually inventing the emancipated woman in the last Act of *A Doll’s House*” (1994, 93). Nora, the main protagonist of the aforementioned drama, is, perhaps, one of the most widely analyzed personages in world literature. Such feminist critics as Clela Allphin, Vincent J. Balice, Gail Finney (1989, 1994), Errol Durbach, Joan Templeton, and Toril Moi, to name just a few, have researched in detail the woman’s question in Ibsen as well as his innovatory female character. My analysis of *A Doll’s House* will aim at identifying those feminist ideas that Ibsen will raise in his subsequent plays and which will later find parallels in Ukrainka’s *oeuvre*.

The main protagonist of *A Doll’s House*, Nora Helmer, falsifies a loan agreement with the lawyer Nils Krogstad. She needs money to cover a trip to Italy, made necessary to improve her husband’s health. When the truth becomes known to Torvald Helmer—Nora’s husband—he accuses her of committing a horrid crime, which, in his opinion, ruins his life, turning him and his career into “a miserable failure” (*DH* 76).⁶ He believes that Nora’s “corrupted nature,” revealed through the forgery, is a product of “her father’s irresponsible ways” (*DH* 76). As Torvald elaborates, “All your father’s irresponsible ways are coming out in you. No religion, no morals, no sense of duty . . .” (*DH* 76). The quote demonstrates an important issue, which very much interested Ibsen and became a topic of many of his dramas, namely that of heredity. Ibsen shows that heredity could function as a prison for future generations, forcing children to answer for the sins of their fathers.⁷

Torvald’s reaction leads to Nora’s disillusionment with the happy life she led until that time. She realizes that her position in the family is absurd, that she is treated solely as a child and a doll, and she suddenly demands the right to become her own person. “I am an individual, just as much as you are—or at least I’m going to try to be” (*DH* 82), she tells her husband. Torvald blackmails his wife with the societal duty prescribed to her, reminding Nora of Pastor Hansen’s instructions, which state that a woman is “first and foremost [...] a wife and a mother” (*DH* 82). However, “Ibsen’s woman” is already strong enough to insist on the opportunity to discover herself: “I’m not content any more with what most people say, or with what it says in books. I have to think things out for myself [...] I want to find out whether what Pastor Hansen told me was right—or at least whether it’s right for *me*” (*DH* 82-83). Nora recognizes the need to reach the plane of her husband, a goal that can be achieved by getting an education and by killing the “doll” in her own nature. Only then, in her opinion, will the two of them “make a real marriage” (*DH* 86). The last scene sees Nora leaving the house where she has been treated as “a doll wife,” (*DH* 80)—a child, an inferior to her husband. As Templeton states,

The poetry of Nora’s leavetaking lies in the hint of strength and the certainty of struggle as she shuts the door on the doll house to enter the night of the open world. The famous last stage direction is the final flourish in the play’s consummate destruction of the ideology of the two spheres [male and female—SK] through its systematic exposure of the foolishness of the chivalric ideal and the notion of a female mind. (145)

Thus, Ibsen's "newly-born woman" introduces the possibility of a female protest against her position in patriarchal society, which constructs femininity as something inferior to masculinity. Nora states: "I must try to discover who is right, society or me" (*DH* 83). It is precisely this idea, as well as the notion of a hereditary transmission of the sins of the fathers—both in moral and physical sense of the word—that become the topic of Ibsen's subsequent drama *Ghosts*.

In *Ghosts*, Ibsen's main female character is Mrs. Helene Alving who functions in the role of wife (to be more precise, the role of widow). She discovers that her husband was unfaithful to her. He occupied a high position at court—that of Chamberlain (Kammerherre), a title, as Peter Watts explains, "the King bestowed on prominent men, rather like [...] Knighthood, which entailed certain duties and privileges at Court" (291). However, in reality, he was nothing but a rogue. Mrs. Alving states: "The truth is this: that my husband was just as debauched when he died as he had been all his life" (*G* 116). When she discovered his cheating initially, she was in despair and decided to escape. If *A Doll's House* ends with Nora walking out the door, Mrs. Alving's story in *Ghosts* begins precisely with such "leavetaking." Her escape from the abusive relationship becomes not only a protest against her husband, but also a remonstrance against the social environment and its patriarchal code, which shuts its eyes to woman's mistreatment in the family. In this respect, Mrs. Alving's character gains strong features. Much like Nora, she takes a step against the patriarchal order by trying to run away. It is important to note that both characters reject their duties as wives and mothers, when thinking of escape. Just as Nora is blamed for "betraying [...] [her] most sacred duty" (*DH* 82), Mrs. Alving is reproached for precisely the same thing by Pastor Manders: "It didn't suit you any longer to be a wife, so you left your husband. You found it irksome being a mother, so you put your child out with strangers" (*G* 115). However, the escape never takes place. Ibsen does not give his heroine enough courage to fulfil her plan. Having left her home, Mrs. Alving goes to no one else but Pastor Manders for counselling, who tells her to perform her duty as a wife and return to her husband: "Yes, you should thank God I possessed the necessary strength of mind . . . that I managed to dissuade you from your hysterical intentions, and that it was granted to me to lead you back into the path of duty, and home to your lawful husband" (*G* 114). Thus, as events later demonstrate, Mrs. Alving succumbs to the authority of the patriarchal order by following Manders's instructions on all issues. Hence, her strength becomes only an illusion.

Bound by society's norms and principles, Mrs. Alving returns home to her husband (who continued his debauched ways to the point of conceiving a child with a maid), and tries everything possible to conceal the vile nature of their marriage, at least on the surface. The only way for her to survive is to overcome her husband, to occupy his place in the house, that is, to become the man of the house: "So I took over the control in the house . . . complete control . . . over him and over everything else. Because now I had a weapon against him, you see, and he didn't dare say anything" (*G* 118). To explain her actions, Ibsen develops the fate of runaway wives. A conversation

between Pastor Manders and Mrs. Alving reveals Pastor's sudden estrangement from the house of the Alvings after Mrs. Alving made an attempt to escape. The heroine herself understands the reason for this estrangement: "Oh, yes! [...] I was a runaway wife. One can never be too careful where such reckless women are concerned" (G 116). Mrs. Alving has realized that the only way to achieve something in society is to work in the shadow of her husband, who, despite his debauchery and drinking habits, still occupied a high social position: "you know, of course, how charming Alving could be. Nobody could believe anything but good about him. He was one of those people whose reputation is proof against anything they may do," Mrs. Alving tells Pastor Manders (G 117). To do otherwise, to protest openly, would have meant that Mrs. Alving would have had to follow the destiny of an outcast.

It is also important to note that in *Ghosts*, Ibsen further develops the theme of hereditary transmission of the predecessors' sins to subsequent generations, which he initiated in *A Doll's House*. Mrs. Alving attempts to keep her child away from his father so that he inherits neither his father's disease nor his dissolute behaviour or "irresponsible ways." She is even determined that her son inherits none of his father's money. Mrs. Alving calculates the exact sum of her husband's estate and puts it into an orphanage, intending to have Oswald benefit only from her account. As Templeton states,

The money for the orphanage has been carefully determined; it is, [Mrs. Alving—SK] says, her "purchase price," the exact amount that made the lieutenant [Alving—SK] such a good catch. She has calculated the precise figure so that from now on she and Oswald will have only the money she herself has earned. And finally, she explains with immense naïveté, "My son will inherit everything from me." (154)

Therefore, Mrs. Alving consents to live in the shadow of her husband in order to earn money and provide for her son. Hence, her motivation for becoming a strong woman, theoretically capable of living on her own, is conditioned by "feminine" motives⁸, i.e., the maternal instinct to protect her child.

Thus, in *A Doll's House*, Ibsen depicts how a woman comes to realize that she might be an equal to a man, and in *Ghosts*, on the basis of Mrs. Alving's character, he demonstrates that a woman has the potential—no matter how vague and illusionary it might be—to lead and to occupy traditional masculine positions, albeit still motivated by "feminine" reasons and forced to do it in the shadow of a man.⁹ Ibsen's *Ghosts* also was written as a response to the negative criticism and attacks on *A Doll's House* (Templeton 146). According to Templeton, Ibsen himself noted in a letter to the Swedish feminist Sophie Adlesparre that "*Ghosts* had to be written"; "After Nora, Mrs. Alving had to come" (146). Indeed, having made his heroine, Mrs. Alving, return home after an attempt to escape from her dissolute husband and choose to preserve the illusion of a traditional family on the surface for the sake of her son, Ibsen lifts the façade of patriarchal values, by revealing all the wrongs that it concealed, and, as Templeton notes, attacks "the sacrosanctity of the family" (159), which often victimized a woman and placed her on a lower, inferior position.

A woman's role in a family is greatly challenged in his later play, *Hedda Gabler*. According to Allphin, "[f]rom May to November of 1890, Ibsen had been intrigued with the problem of what a highly talented woman with no outlet for her creativity might do in a torpid marriage" (19). Hedda Gabler, the main character from the eponymous drama, occupies a prominent place among Ibsen's female protagonists. The heroine was indeed so strong that she was ahead of the time for which she was created. As Templeton states, "[w]hen *Hedda Gabler* appeared in the Oslo bookshops in December, 1890, it received the worst notices of any of Ibsen's plays since *Ghosts*, nine years earlier" (204). The reason for such disapproval, as the critic demonstrates, was the fact that the protagonist was perceived as simply unreal:

394 Reviewers in Scandinavia, England, and the United States accused Ibsen of wilful obscurity on the grounds that a Hedda Gabler could not exist [...] The play's early commentators [...] refused Hedda the status of woman because they found her unwomanly. Like the early critics of *A Doll House* who rejected the play on the grounds that no real woman would leave her children, *Hedda Gabler*'s detractors dismissed it as mere anecdote because its protagonist was an "inhuman woman—a savage [...] atrocious and intolerable." (Templeton 204-05)

From the beginning of the drama, Hedda is presented as a strong individual, who is the head of the family, besides the fact that she is also a dependent—she has no money and lives on her husband's aunt's annuity in a rented house. Ibsen switches the gender roles between Hedda and her husband, assigning his female protagonist characteristically "masculine" features, among which he places a particular emphasis on her affection for guns—a typical phallic symbol—which frightens her husband:

Hedda [*at the centre doorway, looking at [Tesman—SK] with concealed contempt*]. My pistols . . . Jörgen.
 Tesman [*alarmed*]. Pistols!
 Hedda [*with cold eyes*]. General Gabler's pistols.
 [*She goes out to the left through the back room.*]
 Tesman [*runs to the doorway and shouts after her*]. No, for the love of God, my darling
 Hedda . . . don't touch those dangerous contraptions! For my sake, Hedda! Eh? (HG 198)

Hedda is also deprived of distinctive "feminine" emotions, such as love, and is presented as a rational, cold-blooded person. When the friend of the house, Judge Brack, asks her whether she is in love with her husband, Hedda replies: "Ugh . . . don't use that glutinous word!" (HG 202).

Hedda wants to take complete control over her own destiny. Fully understanding society's laws and principles, she realizes the need to marry in order to occupy a decent place in society. Thus, she married herself to Tesman, thinking that he might be the best match for her: "And then when he came along and was so pathetically eager to be allowed to support me. . . . I don't really see why I shouldn't let him?" (HG 203). However, as Templeton notes, "the bumbling man whose timidity she pitied

[her husband—SK] turns out to have a great deal to say [only—SK] about two topics—his speciality and his slippers—and what Hedda thought would be a satisfactory marriage of convenience has turned out to be a nightmare of boredom and odious conjugal duty” (217-18). Indeed, as Hedda herself states: “as one makes one’s bed one must lie on it” (HG 207). Boredom, prison-like constraint within the house walls, and the hints dropped by Tesman and his aunt about a possible pregnancy, as well as the physical reality of Hedda’s pregnancy *per se*, drive her insane. Ibsen’s female heroine no longer fits within the conventional roles of a mother and a wife. On the contrary, she possesses the character of her father, General Gabler. The only thing Hedda desires is power. She wills to rule, be it her own destiny or the fates of other people. As Allphin states, “Hedda Gabler’s father is an unseen ghost influencing her [...] The visual suggestion, offhand comments, even the title of the play reveal her father’s potent yet unseen presence. Her father’s portrait hangs over the sofa in the living room as a constant reminder to the audience of his influence” (41). Thus, in *Hedda Gabler*, Ibsen continues the topic of heredity, which was of such interest to him. It is important to note that in this play he allows a daughter to incorporate the masculine features of her father, the General, the symbol of masculinity itself, as well as of class, and the ideology that accompanies his position of aristocratic and military importance. The ideology of “Gablerism,” thus, lies behind all of Hedda’s actions and motivates her behaviour.

395

Hedda’s desire to rule people is seen in her intention to manipulate her husband as a marionette into becoming a politician: “I often wonder whether [...] I could get Tesman to go in for politics” (HG 208), she says to Judge Brack. When the latter doubts Tesman’s suitability for such a role, Hedda replies: “But don’t you think I might get him to do it, all the same?” (HG 208). Hedda tries to manipulate men in the play, either guiding them to transcend their class limitations and rise to greater heights of achievement, or destroying them. In this capability, she seems to resemble the female counterpart of the Nietzschean *Übermensch*. Indeed, as Evert Sprinchorn notes, “contemporary critics immediately saw Hedda as a kind of superwoman, a higher being who places herself above society’s moral standards, a woman liberated from conventional attitudes towards motherhood and family life” (50-51). Such Hedda’s ability is best seen in her attitude to Tesman’s competitor and her former suitor, Ejlert Lövborg. Under Hedda’s influence, who tries to put the “vine leaves” back in his hair, the former alcoholic drinks some of punch and decides to go to Judge Brack’s party. As Sprinchorn states, Hedda’s image of Lövborg is that of a Dionysian figure: “She is conjuring up an image of Dionysus as Nietzsche pictured him [...] the German philosopher described his Goethean superhuman as a ‘highly cultured human being [...] a man to whom nothing is forbidden, except *weakness*’” (50). Nevertheless, Lövborg fails his role and instead of creating a furore at Judge Brack’s with his new book, he loses the manuscript. Having understood his failure, Hedda attempts to arrange Lövborg’s suicide. She even lends him one of her guns and instructs him to “let it happen . . . beautifully” (HG 245). Sprinchorn notes that “when her lost

comrade falls short of her image of him as Nietzsche's Dionysus, [...] [Hedda—SK] asks him to regain some of his lost glory by making his suicide a beautiful gesture, an aesthetic feat beyond the comprehension of shallow souls" (51). Simultaneously, in an act of furious jealousy Hedda burns Lövborg's the manuscript—his "child" with her sexual rival, Thea Elvsted, who—perhaps, unconsciously—competed with Hedda in the control of Lövborg: "Hedda [*looking straight ahead*]. So that silly little fool [Thea Elvsted—SK] has had her fingers in a man's destiny [...]" (HG 244). However, none of Hedda's plans are realized. Lövborg shoots himself accidentally, without the slightest intention of doing so. Her husband decides to reconstruct Lövborg's book instead of taking care of his own career, thus crushing Hedda's vision of him as well. Moreover, Mrs. Elvsted decides to collaborate in reconstructing Lövborg's "dead child." At the end, Hedda is threatened by Judge Brack who recognized her pistol at Lövborg's death scene. Unable to cope with her failure and realizing that the only thing she still controls is her life, Hedda commits suicide. As Allphin notes, "when the battle was lost, [Hedda—SK] chose not to be taken captive by Judge Brack or to be imprisoned by Tesman" (41). Nevertheless, the suicide is not a negative withdrawal, but rather an example of positive assertion of Hedda's identity—"Gablerism". It can be best characterized as heroism, courage, action. Hedda freely chooses her own destiny and fulfills it beautifully. As Sprinchorn concludes,

396

When she takes her own life, she escapes from the slave morality of those who surround her and becomes the magnificent barbarian. She takes time to play the Dionysian music for her own death [...] When she shoots herself, she acts destructively and wantonly but without meanness or rancour. By her own standards and Nietzsche's, she dies in beauty. (54)

Hedda is Ibsen's strongest female protagonist. As Templeton notes, "[...] Hedda will not serve. She does not want to live for a man, but like one, i.e., for herself. 'She really wants,' Ibsen wrote in a working note, 'to live the whole life of a *man*'" (230). Nevertheless, the male author still does not allow his female character a self-sufficient existence. Indeed, Hedda's drive for a "masculine" life is not entirely her own, but rather that of her father whose ghost continues to live inside her. Hedda even shoots herself behind her father's portrait.¹⁰ Ibsen's Hedda is the pinnacle of a man's understanding of a woman. Strong enough to act like a man, she is still, however, the inferior Other. Ibsen's theme was picked up by a Ukrainian female author, Ukrainka, who developed it further, producing a woman as man's complete equal in her drama *The Stone Host*. Let us now turn to the analysis of Ukrainka's dramas *The Azure Rose*, *The Stone Host*, and her dramatic poem *The Possessed*, comparing them with the plays we have just investigated.

Ukrainka's awareness of, and familiarity with, Ibsen's works—the first to represent a woman as a protagonist of tragedy and a *dramatis persona* of history—is clearly stated in her first drama, *The Azure Rose*, where the main female protagonist, Liubov Hoshchyns'ka, in a conversation on hereditary transmitted diseases, directly refers

to Ibsen: “Really, Ladies and Gentlemen, our conversation seems to be *à la Ibsen*. What should one do? Our poor generation has taken so much blame for carelessness, egoism that it finally decided to improve its reputation. Thus, it raised the urgent issue of heredity” (AR, III: 17).¹¹ Weretelnyk offers an interesting suggestion that Ukrainka’s switch to the genre of a drama might have come as a result of Ibsen’s influence: “Drama [...] seemed a natural choice at this time for Ukrainka, especially considering the theme of *The Azure Rose*, as she had come to admire the work of Henrik Ibsen, himself a “feminist” writer” (37-38).

Thus, there is no doubt that Ukrainka was inspired by Ibsen’s feminist ideas, and his interest in heredity, which she also raised and reconsidered in her own works. While in *A Doll’s House*, *Ghosts*, and *Hedda Gabler*, Ibsen raises the question of hereditary transmission of disease or character traits from the father to either female (as in the case of Nora and Hedda Gabler) or male (as in the case of Oswald, Mrs. Alving’s son) heirs, Ukrainka centres her attention exclusively on women. *The Azure Rose* presents an interesting reconsideration of the father-son tandem in *Ghosts*, by focusing on a female pair: mother-daughter. Weretelnyk, who conducted a feminist reading of *The Azure Rose*, concludes that “Ukrainka’s distinctly feminist depiction of female madness presents a powerful challenge to the beliefs and myths surrounding female instability and insanity prevalent in society, medical opinion, and literature of the time” (36). Moreover, Ukrainka transcends the boundaries of a stereotypically feminine world, and demonstrates that there is no such thing as a characteristically “female” illness.¹² In *The Azure Rose*, she makes her male character, Orest, suffer from precisely the same nervous “female” illness that Liubov was considered to have inherited from her mother. As Orest’s mother, Mrs. Hruicheva states in a conversation with Liubov: “I do not know who was worse in his insanity: you during your illness or Orest afterwards” (AR, III: 95).¹³

Ukrainka’s first female protagonist, Liubov, is already a much stronger woman than Ibsen’s early female characters, Nora and Mrs. Alving, and can be compared to his famous Hedda Gabler. Liubov is portrayed as an educated woman, who has read much from the works of “scientific authorities”¹⁴ (AR, III: 28). She has a modern vision of life and even contemplates the issue of free love. Mylevs’kyi, Liubov’s friend, notes: “This is the first time I see a young woman who has such courage in her thoughts” (AR, III: 29).¹⁵ Liubov is enamoured of risk. In a conversation with Orest, she exclaims: “Do you understand that it is not the prize that matters! The most important aspect of a lottery, like in any other gambling activity, is risk and the process of achieving a goal” (AR, III: 33).¹⁶ Weretelnyk speculates that Liubov’s hysteria comes about as a result of the fact that “[...] no one takes seriously [her artistic ambitions—SK],” while Orest’s talent is never questioned (36). As the scholar notes, “Liubov [...] harbours ambitions of becoming an artist. She tells Orest that she has a desire to ‘burn out’ in a ‘blaze’ rather than ‘burn’ slowly over a ‘low’ glaze [...] This comment shows her desire for some great achievement, an achievement not possible because she is a woman” (46, fn. 20). In her aspirations, Liubov very much resembles

Hedda Gabler. Like Hedda, she chooses her own destiny. She is unwilling to accept the only option a woman has in society, i.e., becoming a marriage partner. In Liubov's view, this path is impossible primarily because she is certain of her own mental illness and also because of her aspirations to engage in alternative social roles. As a result, she chooses suicide. As Weretelnik states,

They [society—SK] fear that Liubov, like her mother before her, will go mad and will ruin Orest in the process. After professing her love for Orest, Liubov does go mad, but not for the reasons everyone expects. Rather, her action represents a *voluntary* [italics are mine—SK] descent into madness as a viable alternative to her predicament. Faced with no option [...] Liubov commits suicide. (37)

Liubov's choice is a challenge to society's rules, which state, as Aheieva correctly notes, that a "young lady" is a certain function of the established code of behaviour (a function that is rather simple and well-understood); she is not an individual, and can achieve status in society only *via* marriage" (102).¹⁷

398 Ukrainka's dramatic poem *The Possessed* further demonstrates the development of a female protagonist—a "new woman"—whose nascent image is seen in Liubov. Here, the female character, Miriam, dares to argue with the Messiah himself, who is sent by God to perform God's will on Earth. By disagreeing with his orders, she attempts to oppose not only a man's or society's will, but also that of God. Miriam refuses to submit as a slave to God's will, and challenges society's and divine law, both of which require the Messiah's death for the sake of the people's salvation: "I hate everyone and everything because of [what they did to—SK] him [...] and the people's law, which allowed the innocent to die, and the divine law, which requires/ suffering, blood and shameful death/ of the one who loved everyone and forgave everyone, for the redemption of the sins of insane generations" (*O*, III: 139).¹⁸ In spite of the Messiah's command to love her enemies, Miriam curses them and gives up her life because of her love for Him, all the while understanding that this will lead to her eternal damnation. Thus, the Messiah's sacrifice, in her case, was in vain. Nevertheless, she chooses to follow her own will, and not the one assigned to her from above, which is, in her opinion, hostile and unjust: "Messiah! If you have spilt your blood for me... even a drop of blood in vain... [then—SK] now I/ will give my life... for you... and my blood... and soul... altogether freely!.. Not for the sake of happiness.../ not for the sake of the Kingdom of Heaven... no... but on account of my love!" (*O*, III: 147).¹⁹

Ukrainka's most profound female character is depicted in her drama *The Stone Host*. Written in 1912, *The Stone Host* is a rewriting of the Don Juan theme from a feminist perspective. According to Aheieva, "Following George Sand and her novel *Lélia*, Lesia Ukrainka was, perhaps, the first author in European literature to express a woman's attitude toward the image of Don Juan" (112).²⁰ Oksana Zabuzhko, in her turn, argues that Lesia Ukrainka, while leaving the plot unchanged, presented "not a version of the legend, but rather a subversion of it, and, most importantly, its archetypal content, by giving the floor, for the first time, to full-fledged women characters"

(7). Indeed, by attaching her drama to a well-known intertext, Ukrainka radically revisits one of the major myths of European masculine-centered culture and grants the centrality to a female character, Donna Anna.

There are two, quite contrasting, female figures in this drama: Dolores, a self-sacrificing and masochistic woman, and Donna Anna who is strong and domineering. Dolores is Anna's antipode. I contend that Ukrainka takes the feminist argument to a higher level by creating the masochistic character of Dolores to strengthen the "masculinity" of Anna. This duality resembles the female pair of Mrs. Elvsted-Hedda Gabler from Ibsen's play. But, while Ibsen's "masculine" woman is threatened by her female antipode—bourgeois, Christian, non-feminist Thea Elvsted—who at the end wins over Hedda's husband by agreeing to help him restore the late Lövborg's notes, Ukrainka's Dolores is not a real opponent for Anna; rather, she serves to underline Anna's superiority.

Anna attempts to take her destiny into her own hands. She comes across as a very proud, strong woman, intelligent and capable of manipulating society when the need arises—that is, when her husband is murdered by Don Juan. If we forget for a moment Anna's wavering between power and love at the beginning of the drama, she appears as a stereotypically "masculine" character, thirsting for power and high social position.²¹ Even Don Juan notices this and states in one of their dialogues that she does not resemble a woman: "Anna!/ I did not know you until this moment. It's as if you were not a woman,/ and your charms are greater than a woman's!" (*SH*, VI: 161).²²

At the beginning of *The Stone Host*, Donna Anna is set to marry—of her own free will (something Ukrainka stresses)—the Commander, a man who occupies a high position in society. Donna Anna thinks of her husband-to-be as "a stone," "a mountain" (*SH*, VI: 81, 111),²³ and as a symbol of indissoluble law and reason, which separates her from the world of passion and feelings. Ukrainka depicts the Commander in terms of "wisdom." He is very considerate of tradition and expects his future wife to be the same. In his own words, "It is not I who will tie her [hand in marriage—SK] but God and the law./ I will not be any freer than she is" (*SH*, VI: 87).²⁴ For him the act of taking the marriage vows, the "high oath" (*SH*, VI: 87),²⁵ is the utmost moment of truth, which cannot be broken by anyone. So solemn is the Commander's commitment to law and tradition that Donna Anna calls it "[...] terrifying" (*SH*, VI: 88),²⁶ and although her intonation betrays that she only feigns fear, this foreshadows upcoming events, where reason will be pitted against love.

Love is embodied in the character of Don Juan, who never obeys tradition and accepts everything with humour and irony. For Don Juan, the intimate and personal is higher than the collective, social law. For this reason, he chooses to become an outcast.

The fourth act presents Anna's doubts about whether she was right to choose the Commander as her husband. It seems to her that the constraints of society, which she accepted by marrying him, are proving to be too much for her. Anna wonders

whether she can bear such social restrictions and whether her desire to gain power, next to her husband, is worth pursuing after all. As Aheieva states,

Anna feels her soul growing hard because of the irreconcilable doctrines of traditional behaviour, [the requirements of—SK] court etiquette [and—SK] the aimless existence within the framework of habitual women's interests (clothes, jewellery, church preaching). [...] It seemed to her that she might reach the top rungs of society, forbidden to women, with the help of man-the-leader, man-the-“mountain.” However, for the young wife, the mountain castle turns out to be only a comfortable prison. (113)²⁷

The rigidity of Madrid society irritates Anna; she misses the happiness and entertainment of Seville. In chasing power, Anna realizes that she has to trade in her previous carefree Seville life, and this leads to her depression. On seeing Anna's frustration, the Commander suspects that she might be regretting her choice: “You sigh? Well, you knew beforehand/ what duties awaited you here. You have chosen your destiny consciously [...]” (*SH*, VI: 127).²⁸ The Commander seems to enjoy the law itself, unlike Anna, whose highest gratification comes from the pursuit of power, and for the sake of which she agrees to submit to the law. The Commander understands Anna's needs and knows how to tempt her. He secretly reveals to her the prospect of occupying the throne one day, which raises Anna's spirit. In her words: “Forget my caprices—they have passed long ago” (*SH*, VI: 127).²⁹ The Commander then recognizes Anna's power and strength: “These are the words of a real Grandess!” (*SH*, VI: 127)³⁰

Although the Commander positions Anna on the pinnacle of power next to him, she still knows that she is under his rule. However, when the Commander dies at the hands of Don Juan, Anna has the opportunity, to quote Aheieva again, to “[...] fulfill her desire of occupying the highest societal ranks, of conquering the highest castle,” but “not [as—SK] an imprisoned princess [...] but [as—SK] a sovereign lady, a master of the situation” (119).³¹ Nevertheless, Anna realizes that a woman cannot achieve anything on her own in this society—she needs masculine support. As Aheieva states, “[w]ithout the support of [...] a man the patriarchal woman cannot rise to the heights” (119).³² Therefore, Anna decides to involve Don Juan, luring him to serve her. Her desire to manipulate Don Juan reminds us of Hedda Gabler's attempt to control Lövborg. Anna does so by paraphrasing Don Juan's own romantic words: “Would the bondage/ of such rigid etiquette/ ever be terrifying for me, if I knew that inside my stronghold/ my beloved awaits me?” (*SH*, VI: 144).³³ Later Anna offers Don Juan the Commander's position and proposes marriage (thereby acting out a typically masculine role): “Why would not you also live here, on the pinnacle?” (*SH*, VI: 156),³⁴ “Would it not be better if we combined our strength to conquer that mountain firmly” (*SH*, VI: 157).³⁵ While Hedda's attempt fails, Anna is successful in her control over Don Juan.

Anna has assimilated into society so thoroughly and mastered the lessons of her late husband so well that she herself has become the very society she disdains. By absorbing so much of the Commander's doctrine, she has transformed herself into

the Commander. Her philosophy—“One needs stone [which in this case means the law–SK]/ to build firmly/ one’s life and happiness” (*SH*, VI: 143)³⁶—very much resembles the Commander’s words. Don Juan falls under the spell of Donna Anna, becoming nothing but a shadow, a ghost of the Commander himself. The foreshadowing of Don Juan’s fall is seen at the beginning of the last act, when he sits down in the Commander’s chair and faces his rival’s portrait that hangs on the wall. In my interpretation, the last scene, in which the Commander’s ghost appears, demonstrates the complete assimilation and subordination of the concept of freedom to the concept of law and power. The Ghost of the Commander triumphs!

Aheieva interprets Anna’s fall under the spell of the Commander’s doctrine as an example of the “new woman” who is still unable to change society and is forced to succumb to its rules. She states,

As an individual, the modern woman here can already stand against the man and strengthen her own solitude. However, such a modern woman cannot change the social structure, which scorns and humiliates “the second sex.” [...] Strong enough to stand abreast with the chosen man, to realize herself in the chosen field, she is still too weak to change the patriarchal society. The author of *The Stone Host* demonstrates exactly such a moment of tragic indeterminacy and bifurcation in the position of the modern woman. (132)³⁷

401

However, I would like to take Aheieva’s argument further and propose that the tragic ending of Ukrainka’s drama portrays not a specifically *female*’s surrender to society’s doctrine but rather the tragedy of *an individual* who becomes a prisoner of society’s strict laws, once she gains power. *Both* Anna and Don Juan are entrapped within the social prison, which demonstrates Ukrainka’s view on the equality of genders.³⁸ In *The Stone Host*, the “new woman” is on par with the man (in some ways, given Don Juan’s weakness, even stronger).

In proceeding now with a more detailed comparison between Ukrainka’s and Ibsen’s dramas, I should note that even on the level of the title, it is possible to trace the intertextual connection between *Ghosts* and *The Stone Host*, for in a sense the ghost of the Commander at the end of Ukrainka’s play alludes to Ibsen’s. But the more important question is: are the heroines of each drama, Donna Anna and Mrs. Alving, similar? On the surface, they in fact seem alike: both usurp male power to attain a position in society, to rise to the top, so to speak. Also, both women protest against the established law of society: Mrs. Alving does it by trying to run away from her husband and Donna Anna by secretly meeting with Don Juan in the gazebo during the masquerade and later again in the cemetery. However, they both understand that open protest will not lead to any positive results for themselves. They are too intelligent to alienate themselves from society (Donna Anna, as we saw, rejects the masochism of Dolores), opting instead for marriage as an avenue to success.

On the other hand, the characters created by the Scandinavian male and the Ukrainian female authors are also very different. Mrs. Alving’s usurpation of male power is only illusory. Alving’s ghost still haunts the house, and Pastor Manders is,

in fact, the very person who makes all important decisions. What also distinguishes Mrs. Alving from Donna Anna is motivation. Mrs. Alving has a son. Therefore she is also a mother. Maternal instinct is what motivates her. In Mrs. Alving's words, "I had to bear [...] [my husband's debauchery—SK] for the sake of my little boy [...] So I took control in the house" (G 118). In contrast, Ukrainka's female character is driven by stereotypically "masculine" concerns. Like a man, she thirsts for power and dominance for its own sake. Donna Anna wants to rule men (she even attempts to do that at the masquerade ball in Seville by assigning them the dance order). In this aspect Ukrainka's *The Stone Host* does not only revive Ibsen's play *Ghosts* but also brings to life his other play, *Hedda Gabler*, to whose eponymous character Anna can justly be compared. However, as I have already indicated, Hedda's motivations are also not entirely her own, but rather those of her father whose ghost continues to live both inside her and in the apartment (the ideology of "Gablerism" has formed Hedda's character; his portrait also hangs on the wall). Anna, on the other hand, is

402 free from the hereditary/ideological or maternal influences. For this reason, I believe that Ukrainka's vision of a woman transcends her Scandinavian predecessor's idea of a new woman. As a woman author, she recognizes that women can thirst for power too. In contrast, Ibsen's female characters, Mrs. Alving and Hedda Gabler, are either forced by circumstances or heredity/ideology to assume a "masculine" role in the family.

The reason Ukrainka placed her strongest female character within the context of a seventeenth-century legend about a Spanish grandee is not only to undermine the masculine myth itself, but also to deflect criticism from contemporary society, which, to reiterate, condemned and rejected Ibsen's bravest character, Hedda Gabler, as simply improbable. Liubov, Ukrainka's female character from her first drama, also received negative responses from the critics. As Weretelyk states, "*The Azure Rose* was not Ukrainka's only planned drama based on the life of the [contemporary—SK] intelligentsia. Around 1908 Ukrainka prepared the plan for a drama about an urban family. [...] There is good reason to believe that Ukrainka abandoned the drama because of the negative critical reception of *The Azure Rose*" (36, fn. 1). Therefore, I suggest that Ukrainka took a plot from the past to avoid shocking her readers and spare herself negative reactions, which would have prevented her contemporaries from seeing the woman she wished to portray.

The tragic endings in all of Ibsen's and Ukrainka's plays imply that society is not ready to accept radical challenges to traditional gender roles and that the ghosts/spirits, i.e., customs of previous generations, still haunt society. It was precisely the concept of the ghost of the woman as shaped by patriarchy that was of such interest to both the Ukrainian and Scandinavian dramatists. According to Peter Watts,

Ibsen was obsessed with the burden of the past; he felt that though men seemed outwardly to be progressing, their minds were not advancing at the same pace. "I think," [Ibsen—SK] wrote, "that we are sailing with a corpse in the cargo." And in his verse

letter *From Far Away* to George Brandes in 1875, he wrote of the ghosts of dead ideas and beliefs that haunt the youth of the Scandinavian countries. (294)

As a result, Ibsen turned to the investigation of such ghosts in his contemporary society. He uses Mrs. Alving and Hedda Gabler to show that a woman has the potential to lead and occupy traditional masculine positions; however, due to the deeply rooted ghosts of patriarchal ideology in society, she might not have a chance to prove herself or fully develop her potential without risk of becoming an outcast. To put it in the words of his heroine, Mrs. Alving:

The reason I'm so timid and afraid is that I can never get properly rid of the ghosts that haunt me [...] I'm inclined to think that we are all ghosts [...] It is not just what we inherit from our mothers and fathers that haunts us. It's all kinds of old defunct theories, all sorts of old defunct beliefs, and things like that. It's not that they actually live on in us; they are simply lodged there, and we cannot get rid of them. (G 126)

Ukrainka, in her turn, especially in the late works *The Possessed* and *The Stone Host*, chose to transform themes from the past. Thus, the Biblical narrative turns into a story of a woman protesting against divine law. The legend of the Spanish grandee, Don Juan, on the other hand, becomes a feminist narrative, interpreted from the perspective of a woman. In other words, it is liberated from the traditional ghosts of patriarchy, that is, the prison of the Chivalric Code and idolization of the Lady. Having deprived the historical narratives of their traditional ghosts, Ukrainka imbues them with the dominating issues of her own time—the question of a powerful female individual and her behaviour in the modern world. Ukrainka, like Ibsen, demonstrates that society is not ready to receive a “new woman.” For this reason, she must assimilate to the ghosts to prosper within society’s limits. Mrs. Alving, for example, names an orphanage after her dissolute husband, although she builds it with her own money. Hedda Gabler is influenced by her father’s ghost and cannot form a “masculine” character on her own. Ukrainka’s Donna Anna, portrayed as an equal to a man, attempts to challenge the society with her wits: she subdues Don Juan, creating a submissive substitute for the Commander. However, she is still unable to solve the problem of how to engage a male as an equal, preferring to turn him into a puppet. Despite the tragic endings, however, Ukrainka’s dramas are significant for the fact that she places all levers of action (and, hence, power) in the hands of her female protagonists. Liubov, Miriam and Donna Anna drive the play rather than being driven by its plot. What significantly distinguishes Ukrainka’s strongest female protagonist, Donna Anna, from Ibsen’s famous Hedda Gabler—which represent his most advanced vision of a woman—is the fact that Anna, in her aspiration for power, the traditional prerogative of a man, chooses it without being influenced by the shadow of the father. While Ibsen’s strongest character, Hedda Gabler, also chooses power, the ideology—“Gablerism”—hangs over her.

This article attempted to compare and contrast Ukrainka's and Ibsen's feminisms, as articulated in their dramas. I should note that feminist ideas were fashionable in the *fin-de-siècle* Russian Empire, and Ibsen was certainly not the only source of these ideas. However, as my article attempts to show, he appears to be a seminal influence—certainly, not exclusive, but one of the most importance, inasmuch as the issue was in the air. As my analysis demonstrates, Ukrainka's female characters obtain much stronger characteristics, than Ibsen's. From this I draw the conclusion that Ukrainka's dramas depict a more advanced vision of women. She moves in a new direction, starting thematically and conceptually where Ibsen ends. While the male writer, only recognizes the woman's right to protest against the patriarchal society and hints at the possibility of female power, independence, and ability to earn money, Ukrainka, a female, straightforwardly argues that men are not alone in desiring power; in her view, the "new woman" is an equal to the man. In his dramas

404 Ibsen examines the liberation of women—i.e., the process, by which women are able to establish their independent existence, while Ukrainka never doubts it. The issue Ukrainka raises in her triumphant *The Stone Host* is not whether women are free—the answer to this question is already obvious to her—but what should they choose, what is the price the individual (man or woman) willing to pay to achieve freedom and/or power.³⁹

WORKS CITED

- Aheieva, Vira. *Poetesa zlamu stolit': Tvorchist' Lesi Ukrainky v postmodernii interpretatsii* [The Poetess of the Turn of the Century: Lesia Ukrainka's *Oeuvre* in Postmodern Interpretation]. Kyiv: "Lybid'," 1999.
- Allphin, Clela. *Women in the Plays of Henrik Ibsen*. New York: Revisionist Press, 1975.
- Balice, Vincent J. *Ibsen's Feminine Mystique*. New York, Washington, Atlanta, Hollywood: Vantage Press, 1975.
- Drai-Khmara, Mykhailo. "Lesia Ukrainka: Zhyttia i tvorchist'" [Lesia Ukrainka: Life and Works]. *Literaturno-naukova spadshchyna* [Literary and Scholarly Works]. Eds. N.M.Maksymenko, L.P.Marchenko, L.V.Tunyk, L.S.Shorubalka. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2002.
- Durbach, Errol. *A Doll's House: Ibsen's Myth of Transformation*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.
- Ferguson, Robert. *Henrik Ibsen: A New Biography*. London: Richard Cohen Books, 1996.

- Finney, Gail. *Women in Modern Drama: Freud, Feminism, and European Theater at the Turn of the Century*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1989.
- . “Ibsen and Feminism.” *The Cambridge Companion to Ibsen*. Ed. James McFarlane. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Fylypovych, Pavlo. “Lesia Ukrainka.” *Literaturno-krytychni staty* [Literary and Scholarly Articles]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo khudozhn'oi literatury “Dnipro,” 1991.
- Ibsen, Henrik. *Four Major Plays*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Makaryk, Irene R. “Lesia Ukrainka’s *Blakytyna troianda*: Apropos the Theme of Psychic Murder.” *Studia Ucrainica* 2.5 (1984): 25-32.
- Miller, Nancy K. *The Heroine’s Text: Reading in the French and English Novel, 1722-82*. New York: Columbia UP, 1980.
- Toril Moi. *Henrik Ibsen and the Birth of Modernism: Art, Theater, Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Showalter, Elaine. “Introduction.” *Daughters of Decadence: Women Writers of the Fin de Siècle*. London: Virago Press, 1993.
- Sprinchorn, Evert. “The Unspoken Text in *Hedda Gabler*.” *Modernism in European Drama: Ibsen, Strindberg, Pirandello, Beckett. Essays from Modern Drama*. Eds. Frederick J. Marker and Christopher Innes. Toronto, Buffalo, London: U of Toronto P, 1998.
- Templeton, Joan. *Ibsen’s Women*. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Ukrainka, Lesia. *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 3: Dramatychni tvory (1896-1906)* [Collection of Works in Twelve Volumes. Volume 3: Dramatic Works (1896-1906)]. Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1975-1979.
- . *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 6: Dramatychni tvory (1911-1913). Pereklady dramatychnykh tvoriv* [Volume 6: Dramatic Works (1911-1913). Translations of Dramatic Works]. Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1975-1979.
- . *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 8: Literaturno-krytychni ta publitsystychni staty* [Volume 8: Critical and Publicistic Articles]. Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1975-1979.
- . *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 11: Lysty (1898-1902)* [Volume 11: Letters (1898-1902)]. Kyiv: “Naukova dumka,” 1975-1979.
- Weretelnik, Roman. *A Feminist Reading of Lesia Ukrainka’s Dramas*. PhD Dissertation. University of Ottawa, 1989.
- Watts, Peter, ed. “Notes.” *Ghosts and Other Plays*. By Henrik Ibsen. New York: Penguin Classics, 1964.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana. “Modernism, Feminism, Nationalism: The Death of Don Juan?” IWM Working Paper No. 2/2004: Vienna.

Zerov, Mykola. "Lesia Ukrainka: Krytychno-biografichni narys" [Lesia Ukrainka: Critical and Biographical Essay]. "Lesia Ukrainka: Z nahody novoho vydannia tvoriv" [Lesia Ukrainka: On the Occasion of the New Publication of Works]. *Ukrains'ke pys'menstvo* [Ukrainian Writers]. Comp. Mykola Sulyma. Kyiv: "Osnovy," 2003.

Zhuravs'ka, Ida. *Lesia Ukrainka ta zarubizhni literatury* [Lesia Ukrainka and Foreign Literatures]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii Nauk Ukrains'koi RSR, 1963.

ENDNOTES

- 406
- 1 I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Oleh S. Ilnytskyj, who has supervised the entire process of writing this article and has edited several draft versions of this work. I am also thankful to Prof. Maxim Tarnawsky, the discussant at the panel "Women in Twentieth-Century Ukrainian Literature" at the 2007 Annual CAS Conference, where I first presented this work, for his useful comments; as well as to Prof. George Mihaychuk and Dr. Marko Stech, who also commented on my presentation. My thanks go to Prof. Natalia Pylypiuk for reading the earlier draft of this article. Finally, I am especially indebted to the anonymous readers of *CRCL* for their constructive insights and helpful suggestions, many of which I incorporated into my text and which were very helpful in shaping the present version of this article. However, the opinions and errors, presented in this article, are entirely my own.

In Zhuravs'ka's opinion, the defeat of the main female protagonist, Donna Anna, in *The Stone Host* symbolizes Ukrainka's condemnation of the image of the Nietzschean woman, propagated in the number of works of the European authors, among which the scholar names Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler*.

 - 2 All translations are mine. The original quotes, which are transliterated according to the Library of Congress System (<http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~tarn/courses/translit-table.html>), will be provided in the footnotes. "Zhoden z retsenzentiiv ne sprobuvav postavyty «Blakytynu troiandu» v kontekst feministychnykh idei. Navit' ibseniv's'ki vplyvy krytyky obmezhuvaly «Pryvydamy» [u danomu vypadku Aheieva maie na uvazi temu spadkovosti—SK], khocha koly idet'sia pro inversiiu genderovykh rolii, to ne zhadaty «Lial'kovyi dim» prosto nemozhlyvo."
 - 3 The topic of intertextuality is fairly broad. Here are some of the more interesting sources: Graham Allen, *Intertextuality. The New Critical Idiom* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000); Monika Kaup, *Mad Intertextuality: Madness in Twentieth-Century Women's Writing*. Horizonte, Band 12 (Trier: WVT, 1993).
 - 4 Lesia Ukrainka, "Novye perspektivy i starye teni ('Novaia zhenshchina' zapadnoevropeiskoi bel-letristiki)" [New Perspectives and Old Shadows ('New Woman' of West European Fiction)] (1900), "Michael' Kramer: Posledniaia drama Gerharta Hauptmanna" [*Michael Kramer: The Last Drama of Gerhart Hauptmann*] (1901) and "Evropeis'ka sotsial'na drama v kintsi XIX st." [European Social Drama at the End of the 19th century] (1901). Reprinted in Lesia Ukrainka, *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 8: Literaturno-krytychni ta publitsystychni statti* [Collection of Works in Twelve Volumes. Volume 8: Critical and Publicistic Articles].
 - 5 Published in Lesia Ukrainka, *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh. Tom 11: Lysty (1898-1902)* [Volume 11: Letters (1898-1902)]: "[...] prochytala [...] skil'ky dram Ibsena" [...] read few dramas by Ibsen]; "Anichkov chytav lektsiuu publichnu pro Ibsena i tezh nevdalo" [Anichkov gave a public lecture on Ibsen, and it was also unsuccessful]; "Bachyla ia nedavno Ibsenovu «Noru» tut na stseni" [I recently watched Ibsen's *Nora* on stage here]; "[...] a monograficheski tol'ko i stoit pisat', chto o takikh veshchakh, kak, napr[imer], drama Ibsena" [...] in terms of monograph, one should write only about such things as, for instance, Ibsen's drama].

- 6 All quotes drawn from Ibsen's three dramas, selected for analysis, will be from the 1998 edition and will identify the drama in parenthesis, abbreviating the title to the first letters, followed by the page number, for example: (*DH* 76).
- 7 According to Robert Ferguson, "*A Doll's House* is [...] the first time Ibsen made extensive use in one of his plays of current theories of determinism and genetic heritage as a structure to underpin the psychology of his characters [...] In this he was belatedly responding to Georg Brandes's injunction to him in the 1870s that he should, as a modern writer, assimilate 'current scientific thinking'" (241). When speaking of determinism, one should also differentiate between moral determinism, i.e., an idea that children inherit their parents' moral 'irresponsible ways,' which Ibsen portrays on the example of Nora (as Ferguson states, "Nora behaves as she does because she is her father's daughter," [241]), and physical determinism, demonstrated in a hereditary disease, inherited by Dr. Rank in *A Doll's House*.
- 8 Clearly, "masculine" and "feminine" are very slippery terms. I use them to connote the traditional stereotypical views of the sexes and to identify the constructed nature of femininity and masculinity to which society regularly resorted at the time Ibsen's and Ukrainka's dramas were written.
- 9 As the preceding discussion demonstrated, Mrs. Alving, for all her strength, often proves to be incapable of making decisions on her own and relates on Pastor Manders's guidance. She might be best characterized as a "closet" feminist—she apparently reads many books, as the play reveals:

407

Manders. [...] Tell me, Mrs. Alving, how did *these* books get *here*?

Mrs. Alving. These books? They are books I am reading.

Manders. You read that sort of things?

Mrs. Alving. Of course I do.

Manders. Do you think reading that sort of thing makes you feel any better, or any happier?

Mrs. Alving. I feel, as it were, more confident.

Manders. Strange. How?

Mrs. Alving. Well, I find it seems to explain and confirm a lot of the things I had been thinking myself. That's the strange thing, Pastor Manders . . . there's really nothing new in these books; there's nothing there but what most people think and believe already. It's just that most people either haven't really considered these things, or won't admit them (*G* 101).

Unfortunately, one word from Manders, and all collapses.

- 10 See the description of the inner room where Hedda commits suicide: "*By the back wall of the inner room are sofa, a table, and a couple of chairs. Over this sofa hangs the portrait of a handsome, elderly man in the uniform of a general*" (*HG* 167) and the scene of Hedda's suicide itself: "*Hedda goes into the inner room and pulls the curtains together behind her [...] A shot is heard within. Tesman, Mrs. Elvsted, and Brack all start to their feet [...] [Tesman—SK] pulls the curtains aside and runs in. Mrs. Elvsted follows. Hedda lies stretched out dead on the sofa*" (*HG* 264).
- 11 All quotes, drawn from Ukrainka's works will be from the 1975-1979 edition and will identify the drama in parenthesis, abbreviating the title to the first letters, followed by volume number, a colon and the page number, for example: (*AR*, III: 17). "Spravdi, panove, rozmova nasha vykhodyt' *à la Ibsen*. Shchozh robyty? Nashe bidne pokolinnia stil'ky vzhe han'by pryinialo za neobachnist', ehoizm, shcho nareshti zadumalo popravty svoiu reputatsiiu i postavlyo rebrom pytannia pro spadkovist'."
- 12 Hysteria was considered a distinctively "female malady" at the time. For more details, see Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Heaven: Yale UP, 1979); Elaine Showalter, *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830-1980* (New York: Penguin, 1987), which discuss hereditary mental instability in the nineteenth-century representations of women. In this light, Ukrainka's subversion of current cultural stereotypes—gender-specific nature of hysteria—on the example of Orest, whom she endows with similar symptoms, becomes even more distinct.

- 13 “Ia ne znaiu, khto buv hirshe bozhevil'nyi, chy vy pid chas vashoi slabosti, chy Orest pislia.”
- 14 “naukovi avtorytety.”
- 15 “Pershyi raz bachu u molodoi divchyny taku smilist' dumky.”
- 16 “Ta rozumiite zh vy, shcho ne v tim syla, shcho vyhraty! V loterei, iak i v usiakii azartnii hri, holovne—rysk i osiahnennia mety.”
- 17 “‘pannochka’—tse pevna funktsiia ustalenooho kodeksu povedinky (funktsiia prosta i zaha'nozrozumila), vona ne osobystist', ne individual'nist', i zdobuty iakyis' status mozhe *lyshe* cherez shliub.”
- 18 “Ia vsikh i vse nenavydzu za n'oho [...] i toi zakon/ liuds'kyi, shcho dopustyv nevyanno zhynut',/ i toi zakon nebesnyi, shcho za hrih/ bezumnykh pokolinniv vymahaie/ strazhdannia, krovi i smerti soromnoi/ toho, khto vsikh liubyv i vsim proshchav.”
- 19 “Mesii! Koly ty prolyv za mene.../ khoch krapliu krovi darma... ia teper/ za tebe viddaiu... zhytia... i krov.../ i dushu... vse daremne!... Ne za shchastia.../ ne za nebesne tsarstvo... ni... z liubovi!”
- 408 20 “Pislia Zhorzh Sand z ii ‘Lileieiu’ Lesia Ukrainka chy ne pershoiu v ievropeis'kii literaturi vyslovyla vlasne zhinoche stavlennia do obrazu don Zhuana.” Further parallels between George Sand’s *Lélia* (the work Ukrainka much admired) and Ukrainka’s dramas require a broader study and cannot be addressed within the scope of this article.
- 21 Moreover, it is possible to suggest that Anna aspires to become an archetypal model of female power, a quasi-pagan figure of a potent female goddess, emerging through the amalgam of Christianity.
- 22 “Anno! Ia dosi vas ne znav. Vy mov ne zhinka/ i chary vashi bil'shi vid zhinochykh!”
- 23 “komandor mii—to sama hora.” “Khodimo, don Honzaho [...] vy spokiino stanete, mov kamin!”
- 24 “Ne ia ii zv'iazhu, a Boh i pravo./ Ne budu ia vil'nishyi, nizm vona.”
- 25 “velyka prysiaha.”
- 26 “se azh strashno.”
- 27 “Anna pochuvaie, iak nevbahanni prypysy tradytsiinoi povedinky, dvirs'koho etyketu, bezsil'ne isnuvannia u vuz'kykh ramkakh uzvychaienykh zhinochykh interesiv (vbrannia, prykrasy, tserkovne kazannia) kam'ianiat' ii dushu. [...] Ii zdavalosia, shcho zmozhe dosiahnuty suspil'nykh vershyn, zakazanykh zhintsi, z dopomohoiu cholovika-provodyria, cholovika-‘hory’. Ale nahirnyi zamok vyivliaiet'sia dlia molodoi druzhyny lyshe komfortabel'noiu v'iaznytseiu.”
- 28 “Zitkhaiete? Shcho zh, vam bulo vidomo,/ iaki vas tut povynnosti chekaiut'. Svidomo vy obraly vashu doliu [...]”
- 29 “Zabud'te moi khymery—vzhe vony mynuly.”
- 30 “Ose slova spravdeshn'oi hrandesy!”
- 31 “Vona osiahne mriiu pro naivyshchi suspil'ni shchabli, pro nahirnyi zamok, ale bude v n'omu ne uv'iaznenoiu pryntsesoiu [...] a povelytel'koiu, hospodyneiu stanovyshcha.”
- 32 “Bez opory na [...] cholovika patriarkhal'na zhinka ne mozhe pidnestysia u vysochin.”
- 33 “Khiba zh meni strashna bula b nevolia/ surovoi tsiiei etykety,/ iakby ia znala, shcho v moii tverdnyi/ mene mii liubyi zhde?”
- 34 “Chomu ne zhyty i vam na tsim verkhiv'i?”
- 35 “Khiba zh ne krashche nam z'iednaty sylu,/ shchob tvrdo horu tu opanuvaty.”

- 36 “Potriben kamin’/ koly khto khoche buduvaty mitsno/ svoie zhyttia i shchastia.”
- 37 “Iak osobystist’ moderna zhinka tut vzhe mozhe protystoiaty cholovikovi i utverdzhuvaty vlasnu samist’. Ale tsia moderna zhinka shche ne mozhe zminyty sotsial’nu strukturu, iaka uposlidzhuie i pryryzhuie ‘druhu stat’. [...] Dostatn’o syl’na, shchob staty vriven’ z cholovikom-obrantsem, shchob utverdyty sebe v iakiis’ znachymii diial’nosti, vona shche zaslabka, aby zminyty patriarkhal’ne suspil’stvo. Moment trahichnoi polovynchatosti, rozdvoienosti u stanovyschi modernoi zhinky i demonstruie avtorka ‘Kaminnoho hospodaria.’”
- 38 I thank Prof. George Mihaychuk for this idea.
- 39 I thank Prof. Maxim Tarnawsky for this idea.