

## A Perception of the Imperial Order by a Russian Élite Woman in the 19th Century Caucasus: A Concise Analysis on Propaganda Authored by Vera Zhelikhovskaia on the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878\*

XIX. Yüzyıl Kafkasya’da Rus Seçkin Kadının “İmparatorluk Düzenine” Algısı: 93 Harbi’ndeki Vera Jelihovskaya’nın  
Propandasına Kısa Değerlendirme

Motoaki-akiyo SANO\*\*

### Abstract

In the history of the Russian Empire, women played various roles. Along with Turkish historiography on Turkic Muslim women, current studies on the Russian Empire as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious polity and current studies on Russian women’s and gender history are unified from the 2010s, after the multi-ethnic/multi-religious nature of the Russia Empire became the theory based on more lucid legal/administrative regulations. The newly unified current indicates the imperialistic practices of Russian Women and the gendered nature of the Russian Empire. This article, to contribute to the new current, examines propaganda, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* (Our Orthodox Soldiers), by one of the famous female authors, Vera Zhelikhovskaia (Jelihovskaya), who had lived in the Caucasus for several decades, not à priori but critically considering the social meaning of “femininity”. By intersectional analyses of gender-ethnicity-denomination-subjecthood, this article attempts to elucidate how a Russian woman recognised and represented the polity of Russia and various people in Russia during the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878. The hierarchy, in which Russian men are on the top, Russian women submitting to and caring for Russian men come after, non-Russian/Orthodox subjects are the second-class compatriots, and the “Turks” are completely disdained and excluded, finally almost without any non-Russian/Orthodox women.

**Keywords:** Russian Empire, Russo-Ottoman War (1877-1878), Imperialism, Women’s History, Caucasus

### Öz

Açıktır ki Rusya tarihinde kadınlar farklı roller oynamıştır. Oysa Türk Tarihçiliği’nin Rusya’da Türk lehçeleri konuşan kadınlarını incelemenin yanı sıra, Çarlık Rusya’yı bir sömürgecilğe dayanan bir imparatorluk olarak kabul eden araştırmaları ve Çarlık Rusya’nın kadın tarihini açıklamayı amaç edinen araştırmaları, daha belirli yasal çerçevelerin bulunduğu Çarlık Rusya’nın çok-milletli ve çok-mezhepliği teori olarak kurulduğundan sonra, ancak 2010’larda birleşmeye başladı. Bu araştırmalarının yeni akım, yani Çarlık Rusya’nın çok etnikli kadınlarını kapsayan araştırmalar, Rus kadınların emperyalist davranış pratikleri ve Çarlık Rusya sömürgeciliğinin cinselleştirilmiş mahiyetini açıklamaktadır. Bu makale bahsedilen akıma katkı sağlamak için, meşhur Rus kadın yazarlardan, XIX yüzyılda Kafkasya’da yaşadığı Vera Zhelikhovskaia(Jelihovskaya)’nın *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* (Bizim Ortodoks Savaşçılarımız) adlı propagandasını, a priori değil, “kadınlığın” toplumsal anlamını, eleştirel bir şekilde ele alarak, cinsiyet-millet-mezhep-vatandaşlık bağlamında kesişimsel analizinin yöntemiyle, 93 Harbi’nde Rus Kadın’ın nasıl Çarlık Rusya’nın yöntemi ve halklarını algılayıp yansıttığını incelemekteyiz. Zhelikhovskaia’nın anlatımında Çarlık Rusya’da savaşanlar Rus erkeklerinin en tepede olduğu, Rus erkeklerine boyun eğen ve onlara bakan Rus kadınlarının daha sonra geldiği, gayri-Rus ve gayri-Ortodoks tebaanın ikinci sınıf yurttaşlar olduğu ve “Türklerini” hakaret ettiği ve dışlandığı bir hiyerarşi belirgindir ki âdeti orada gayri-Rus ve gayri-Ortodoks kadınların yerine rastlanmaz.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Çarlık Rusya, 93 Harbi, Sömürgecilik, Kadın Tarihi, Kafkasya

\* I would like to thank Ekaterina Gutova, Project Lecturer at the University of Tokyo, for verifying the accuracy of the author's comprehension of the Russian text in the primary source.

\*\* Doctoral Student, The University of Tokyo, Russian and East European Area Studies, considered.otjulpnv13232420@gmail.com  
ORCID: 0009-0009-7003-0356

Atıf/Citation: Sano, M.A. (2025). A Perception of the Imperial Order by a Russian Élite Woman in the 19th Century Caucasus: A Concise Analysis on Propaganda Authored by Vera Zhelikhovskaia on the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878. *Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(1), 13-30.

Geliş Tarihi	10.01.2025
Kabul Tarihi	06.02.2025
Yayın Tarihi	30.06.2025
Değerlendirme	İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme
Etik Beyan	Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Benzerlik Taraması	intihal.net
Etik Bildirim	lisansustu@erdogan.edu.tr
Çıkar Çatışması	Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman	Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.
Telif & Lisans	Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

## 1. Introduction

From the nineteenth century to Putin's Government today, most of the sovereigns are male either in the Russian proper or in the other post-Soviet nations. Nonetheless, in the history of Russia, female sovereigns like Catherine II the Great dominated the Empire, and in the Russian Federation female political activists are also notorious, like Maria L'vova Belova, whom ICC warranted to arrest because of the mass deportation of Ukrainian children. Therefore, even though women have been more peripheral than men, it is somewhat significant to consider the status of women in Russian political authority, or ideology, whose practice and perception might also imply the gendered nature of multi-ethnic/religious Russia from the modern era until today.

This article focuses on a female writer, Vera Zhelikhovskaia (Jelihovskaya), from these women in the Russian authority, and her book of Propaganda, and examines the perception of women, the Russian imperial order, and Zhelikhovskaia's evaluation of women in the Empire.

In the studies on Russian history, there are two currents: Studies on the Russian Empire as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious polity from the 1990s<sup>1</sup> and studies on Russian women's and gender history from the 1970s<sup>2</sup>. Turkish historiography also has contributed to the comprehension of the multi-ethnic/religious Russian Empire and the women in the Russian Empire for the twentieth century. This historiography tends to focus heavily on the cases of Turkic-Muslim minorities and women in Russia, not so on the others, including Russian women<sup>3</sup>. The existence of more lucid legal/administrative regulations on non-Russians and non-Orthodox than on women seems to make the previous researches indicate the multi-ethnic and multi-religious nature of the Russian Empire, but not so the sexualised nature. These currents had not unified until the 2010s, when new current of works on women's and gender history in the Russian imperial order, like Katya Hokanson's book *A Woman's Empire* and Malika Zekhnii's article "Invisible Bodies", elucidates the gendered nature of Russian

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, Dominic Lieven pointed out the problem of governing multi-ethnic empires, and Paul Werth depicted the Russian Empire as a multi-religious one: Lieven, D. (1999). Dilemmas of Empire 1850-1918. Power, Territory, Identity, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 34(2), 163–200; Werth, P. (2013). Religion. In Dixon, S. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Russian History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Also see note 9.

<sup>2</sup> The examples of studies on Russian women's and gender history are of Natalia Pushkareva in Russian, Barbara A. Engel and Barbara E. Clements in English: Clements, B. E., Engel, B. A., & Worobec, Ch. D. (eds.) (1991). *Russia's women: Accommodation, resistance, transformation*, Berkeley: University of California Press; Engel, B. A. (1992). Engendering Russia's history: Women in post-Emancipation Russia and the Soviet Union, *Slavic Review*, 51(2), 309-322; Pushkareva, N. (1996). *Women in Russian History: From the Tenth to the Twentieth Century*, Levin, E. (trans.), London: Routledge; Clements, B. E. (2012). *A history of women in Russia: From earliest times to the present*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

<sup>3</sup> In the middle of the twentieth century, a representative Turkish historiography seemed to emphasise the oppressive aspects, or the governance, of the Russian regime to some extent. However, from the late century, Turkish historiography focused more on the Turkic agencies and compromising aspects of the Russian Empire, seemingly in the currency of social-cultural-intellectual history. For example on Turkic people in Russia: Kurat, A. N. (1965). Rus hâkimiyeti altında İdil-Ural Ülkesi: Eski Kazan Hanlığı ve Başkurt İli XIX. yüzyıla kadar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(3-4), 91-126; Devlet, N. (1996). İsmail Gaspıralı dönemi ve Ruslarla uzlaşma, *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 2, 403-408.

On Turkic women in Russia, from the last twentieth century, Turkish scholars proceed the study of women in Ceditçilik, like Şefika Gaspıralı, and publications in Muslim-Turkic languages. For example: Şengül Hablemitoğlu, Necip Hablemitoğlu, *Şefika Gaspıralı ve Rusya'da Türk Kadın Hareketi: (1893-1920)*, Ankara: Ahmet Veli Menger Vakfı, 1998; Kanlıdere, A. (2000). Rusya Müslimanlarının kongrelerinde kadın sorunu (1905-1917), *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 2, 139-148; Okcu, E. (2022). Rusya Türklerinde kadın hakları meselesi, *Genel Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(8), 827-838; Kızır, E. K. (2023). Azerbaycan'ın ilk kadın gazetesi Işık(1911-1912)'tan sağlık meselesi: Kadın ve çocuk sağlığı, *Türk Dünyası Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 28-35.

Empire and its imperial order from other perspectives than Turkic-Muslim women<sup>4</sup>. This article follows the new current.

Hokanson's book indicates Russian imperialism, or "civilising mission", but "humaneness, acceptance, awareness" of Russian women<sup>5</sup>. However, this publication has a minor limitation due to describing femininity somewhat à priori. On the other hand, Zekhni applies the notions of sexuality to the gender history in the Russian imperial order and elucidates gender norms and prostitution in Central Asia. Because the notions of sexuality have the potential to deepen understanding of what and how masculine-feminine is, this article combines the approaches of Hokanson and Zekhni. It examines the imperialist performance by describing the femininity of Russian women in the nineteenth century.

This article applies the intersectional analysis to the Russian Empire. Kimberle Crenshaw proposes the notion and the approach of "intersectionality" in order to consider gender discrimination and racial discrimination as one complexity<sup>6</sup>. Whilst some Western scholars found the notion of "intersectionality" applicable to the issues of gender and colonial intimacy<sup>7</sup>, Kim Puja indirectly proves the validity of the idea of "intersectionality" even when examining quasi/non-Western imperialism and gender. Kim analyses gender, ethnicity, class, and location intersectionally and indicates that the "subjecthood" of the Empire of Japan was not so inclusive but discriminatory, especially against non-Japanese women<sup>8</sup>. This article follows Kim's approach to examine the Imperial Order and inclusiveness/exclusiveness of the notion of Russian "subjecthood" (with the Imperial Order), changing the object from a legal problem to an epistemological problem of identity, and taking the criteria as gender, ethnicity, and denomination due to the multi-religious nature of the Russian Empire.

In this study, the object is the Caucasus. That is partly because the researchers have found the Caucasus the most typical arena of Russian Imperialism<sup>9</sup> and partly because of the existence of another objective for Russian Imperialism, the Ottomans<sup>10</sup>. One of the researchers on the Caucasus indicates a Russian imperial order in which the Imperial Russian ethnography and the administration, based on the ethnography, had interconnectedly designated the forerunner of the policy in the USSR<sup>11</sup>. Therefore, the Caucasus is an appropriate realm to examine both the Imperial Order and Imperialism of the Russian Empire.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hokanson, K. (2011). Russian women travelers in Central Asia and India, *The Russian Review*, 70, 1-19; Hokanson, K. (2022). *A Woman's Empire: Russian Women and Imperial Expansion in Asia*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press; Zekhni, M. (2022). Invisible bodies: Civilising mission, sexuality, and prostitution in fin de siècle Russian Turkestan, *Cultural and Social History*, 19(2), 141-159.

<sup>5</sup> Hokanson, 2022, pp.238-241.

<sup>6</sup> Crenshaw criticised both anti-racism and feminism until the late 1980s. Accordingly, because black men represented anti-racism and white women did feminism, this anti-racism and feminism could not have paid any attention to the particular problems and circumstances for black women. Then Crenshaw indicates the intersection between race and sex: Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex, *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1, pp.139-167. After that, intersectional thinking becomes applicable not only to race-sex intersections.

<sup>7</sup> Camiscioli, E. (2013). Women, gender, intimacy, and empire, *Journal of Women's History*, 25, pp.140-142.

<sup>8</sup> 金富子 (2009)「宗主国／植民地における『臣民』とジェンダー ——兵役義務・参政権・義務教育制」、『季刊 戦争責任研究』(66)、pp.11-23. (in Japanese)

<sup>9</sup> For example: Acar, K. (2004). An examination of Russian Imperialism: Russian military and intellectual descriptions of the Caucasians during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, *Nationalities Papers*, 32:1, 7-21; Gutmeyr, D. (2017). Borderlands Orientalism or how the savage lost his nobility: The Russian perception of the Caucasus between 1817 and 1878, Wien: LIT Verlag; Tanrıverdi, M. (2017). Kafkasya'da Ruslaştırma siyaseti (XIX. yüzyıl ve XX. yüzyıl başları), *Vakanüvis - Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2, 538-557; Turan, R. (2023). Kafkasya'da Rus kültür politikaları (XIX.-XX. yüzyıl), *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 35, 209-230.

<sup>10</sup> Taki, V. (2011). Orientalism on the margins, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 12(2), 321-351.

<sup>11</sup> Jersild, A. L. (1996). Ethnic modernity and the Russian Empire: Russian Ethnographers and Caucasian Mountaineers, *Nationalities Papers*, 24(4), 641-648.

Taking the notions and approaches below into account, it become understandable by which people with which criteria Zhelikhovskaia included or excluded from the Russian imperial order. Zhelikhovskaia, from the point of view of a Russian elite woman, fundamentally assumed the Russian Empire as a multi-ethnic and multi-religious one but represents the constructed hierarchy within the Empire, which offers the Russian women comparative high status, and the exclusion of certain people.

This article first introduces Zhelikhovskaia herself and the book of Propaganda, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*. After that, the next part indicates the significance of a collective identity for the book. Then, this article analyses her discourse of gender, ethnicity, denomination, and citizenship, to describe the view of the Russian imperial order by Zhelikhovskaia considering the gendered aspect.

## 2. Primary Source: Zhelikhovskaia's Origin, Personality, and Propaganda

In this article, the primary source is Russian propaganda from a female perspective: Vera Zhelikhovskaia, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* (Our Orthodox Soldiers), St. Petersburg, 1885<sup>12</sup>.

The author of the source, Vera Petrovna Zhelikhovskaia (née Gan) is the daughter of Elena Gan (née Fadeeva), one of the famous Russian female authors. Even if the birth name Gan implied Vera's Germanic origin, Vera is an offspring of the Fadeev family, Russian. Vera is also the maternal cousin of Count Sergei Vitte (Witte), a minister of the late Russian Empire, as Vera's mother and Sergei's mother are sisters, so Zhelikhovskaia may well be a member of the Russian élite society. Born in 1835, Zhelikhovskaia moved to Tiflis, the administrative-cultural centre of the Russian Caucasus and the capital of Georgia Today in 1847. She got married two times: first to Iakhontov, and after Iakhontov's death, second to Zhelikhovskii. After the death of the second spouse in 1880, moved to Odessa, and in 1885 Zhelikhovskaia moved to St. Petersburg<sup>13</sup>. Zhelikhovskaia was so prolific and familiar a person to the Caucasus that she submitted some articles to the local newspapers<sup>14</sup>, published local tales of Caucasus<sup>15</sup>, and a book, *Kavkaz' i Zakavkaz'e* (Caucasus and trans-Caucasus), comprehensive descriptions of the Caucasus region<sup>16</sup>. She died in 1896. In short, Zhelikhovskaia participates both in the Russian élite society and in the locality of the Caucasus.

Zhelikhovskaia published *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* in 1885, seven years after the termination of the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878. The publisher is "the publishing of the permanent committee of the Ministry of National Education to construct national reading, established according to the Supreme Order<sup>17</sup>".

<sup>12</sup> В. Желиховская. (1885а). Наши воины православные. СПб: Издание учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, министеромъ народнаго просвѣщенія постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній.

<sup>13</sup> Натан Ф. Левин. (2015). Вера Петровна Желиховская в Пскове. // Вестник Псковского государственного университета. Серия «Социально-гуманитарные науки», №2, С.217-223; Z., M., Zhelikhovskaia, Vera Petrovna, In Zirin, M. (ed.). *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* (pp.742-743). London: Greenwood Press. Her sister is Elena Blavatskaia famous in Russian Theosophy and, in an examination on Blavatskaia, Hokanson does not specifically remark on Vera Zhelikhovskaia likely because Zhelikhovskaia does not have a relation to Hokanson's main topic, Central Asia: Hokanson, 2022, pp.111-113.

<sup>14</sup> Norton, B. T., & Gheith, J. M. (eds.). (2001). *Improper profession: Women, gender, and journalism in Late Imperial Russia*, Durham: Duke University Press, p.310.

<sup>15</sup> Zhelikhovskaia published many «razskaz'» or tales of the Caucasus. About bibliography, See: Желиховская, Вѣра Петровна // Библиографическій словарь русскихъ писательницъ. Ред. Николай Н. Голицын. СПб, 1889. С.113-114; М. Z., "Zhelikhovskaia".

<sup>16</sup> В. П. Желиховская. (1885b). Кавказъ и Закавказье: Съ картою Кавказа. СПб: на средства Изд. о-ва, при учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, Министеромъ Народнаго Просвѣщенія Постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній.

<sup>17</sup> Издание учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, министеромъ народнаго просвѣщенія постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній. Moreover, Zhelikhovskaia published another introductory book (Желиховская 1885b), by the very similar name of Изд. о-ва, при учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, Министеромъ Народнаго Просвѣщенія Постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній.

Zhelikhovskaia described the situation of Tiflis in the war, in which she had seemingly engaged in nursing. On the pages, there are vivid expressions of the circumstances and experiences of the sick/wounded soldiers in the eyes of a nurse. Nonetheless, this book is obviously propagandistic as the following examination will show. Considering its propagandistic nature, absence of auxiliary sources, and the vague boundary between fiction and non-fiction, the facts in the book might be distorted and fabricated. In other words, The facts might not be true.

However, the propaganda book is more appropriate for analysing representations and discourses epistemologically, which representations and discourses this article will examine.

### 3. The Inquiry on Zhelikhovskaia's Imperial Perception

#### 3.1. Whom Does Zhelikhovskaia Attribute the Identity of "Us" to?

Firstly, one might focus on the name, "OUR Orthodox soldiers", which implies the author's identity politics. In the Russian Empire, there were many attributions of identity: Orthodoxy, Ethnicity-Nationality, and gender<sup>18</sup>. The term "Orthodox soldiers" suggests that the denomination of Orthodox Christianity has some importance.

In the meantime, who was attributed to the term "us"? If "we" were Orthodox Christians, are "we" irrespective of any ethnicity or citizenship (also Kryashens, baptised Yakuts, or Ottoman Rums)? If "we" were Russian citizens, could "we" be not only Russians but also inorodtsy (инородцы)? If "we" were female, would "we" as feminine assist soldiers as masculine, if so, whose assistance would represent the gender bias and roles in the Russian Empire? The way of how to understand "us" has such problems.

At least, it is clear that Zhelikhovskaia had a certain collective identity that she calls "us", which intersected with the denominational identity of Orthodoxy.

The discourse "we" was generated in the colony of the Russian Empire, in other words, a part of the representation of the Russian Empire. This article examines the substances of Zhelikhovskaia's "us", the collective identity, reading the representation of the Empire in which the discourse "we" was generated, then proves the perception of the Imperial Order by Zhelikhovskaia.

#### 3.2. War and Imperial Polity

What can be under discussion first is the perception of the Russian Empire as a polity and its war by Zhelikhovskaia, based on the description of the source. Zhelikhovskaia commented when the Russian Army occupied Ardahan, an Ottoman position in the Caucasus:

*Successes in Asia Minor, almost without any impedance, solemn march of our [Russian] Army, unceasing captures of enemy villages and Kurdish detachments, first capture of Bayazit without any blood flow of Orthodox Christians: All these successes over-filled the heart with rejoicing pride. The capture of Ardahan fortress, in which, according to the words of all the eyewitnesses, our soldiers marched jovially as if in a ceremonial triumph, strengthened the confidence in success and the mightiness of our Caucasian Army*<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> See notes 1 to 5.

<sup>19</sup> Быстрые успѣхи въ Малой Азіи, почти безпрепятственное, чуть не торжественное шествіе нашихъ войскъ; непрерывныя сдачи непріятельскихъ деревень, отрядовъ Курдовъ; первая сдача города Баязета, не стоившая ни одной капли крови православной; всѣ эти удачи переполняли сердца радостной гордостью. Взятіе крѣпости Ардагана, на штурмъ которой, по

According to this comment, it is clear that Zhelikhovskaia praises the captures of the territory of the enemy, the Ottoman Empire, like “enemy villages”, “Bayazit”, and “Ardahan Fortress” and the Ottoman Army of the enemy such as “Kurdish detachments”. Along the specific “Caucasian Army”, the collective identity “we” existed.

This section has two probabilities to interpret. On the one hand, the case was undoubtedly military success(es) accomplished by the Russian Empire, as a polity. On the other hand, she praised the case, the occupation of Ardahan, by “our soldiers” as individuals. Zhelikhovskaia apparently approved Russia’s war against the Ottomans, the identity of which polity corresponded to the identity of Zhelikhovskaia’s “us” to some extent.

Assistance for the war against the Ottomans by Zhelikhovskaia is remarkable in the last pages of *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*. After detailed tales of “death rather than surrender” and “martyrdom” of Russians, especially Osipov who had not surrendered but accomplished a suicidal crash, Danilov who had kept the faith and died due to torture, and Nikitin who had refused conspiracy and was skinned so killed, she concluded the last paragraph of the book in such an allegation:

*We make a bow lowly, valiant Russian soldiers! Eternal memory for the war dead for the sake of fatherland as our brothers! ... Many years – loud glory for our Orthodox troops!*<sup>20</sup>

In this part, the attributions of companion, or what Zhelikhovskaia recognised criteria to be companion, concentrate. “Russian soldiers” were ethnically Russians<sup>21</sup> and occupationally combatants. The expression, not “our siblings” but “our brothers”, indicates the criterion of masculinity. Adding the attribution of “the war dead-s” and concluding the word “Orthodox”, Zhelikhovskaia praised the people with such attributions as ethnic-Russian Orthodox-believer masculine combatants, especially the war dead-s.

Nevertheless, what we must notice is the fact that Zhelikhovskaia herself does not belong to one with the attributions as Russian Orthodox male soldiers even though she praised them. “We”, including her, “make a bow” to Russian Orthodox soldiers. Zhelikhovskaia was a woman even Russian, she did not combat but nurse. Ultimately Zhelikhovskaia, exactly her first-person attribution “we”, was not a Russian Orthodox male soldier, which was not the answer to the query of who are “us”. Then, Zhelikhovskaia and Russian Orthodox male soldiers need to be examined in detail as individuals with such criteria as gender, ethnicity, denomination, and citizenship.

### 3.3. Gender: Zhelikhovskaia’s Representation of “Women”

In the first place, how gender norms did Zhelikhovskaia have, and how did Zhelikhovskaia perform or identify her as a genuine “woman”? To examine the gendered nature of certain thoughts, one might as well wonder

---

словамъ всѣхъ очевидцевъ, солдаты наши шли бодро, весело, какъ на праздничное торжество, еще болѣе усилило вѣру въ успѣхъ и силу Кавказскихъ войскъ. : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.17.

<sup>20</sup> Кланяемся вамъ низко, доблестные русскіе солдаты! Вѣчная память погибшимъ во бояхъ за отечество братьямъ нашимъ!.. Многія лѣта, -громкая слава нашему православному воинству! *Желиховская*., 1885а, С.79.

<sup>21</sup> The term “Russian” has two dimensions: Русский (Rus) and Россиянин (Rusyalı). The former Русский means the ethnicity of Russians in a narrow definition. The latter Россиянин means the subjects of the multi-ethnic Russian Empire or Russian Federation in a broad definition. In this article, the author used the term “ethnic-Russian” as Русский, the term “subjects of the Russian Empire” as Россиянин, and the term “non-Russian” as those who are Россиянин attributed to the Russian Empire but not ethnic Русский.

not only the gender norms of the thoughts but also the identification and the performance of the one who constructed the thought<sup>22</sup>. Here is a description by which Zhelikhovskaia expressed her perception of women:

*After the day all metamorphosed. A lot of new anxieties and new occupations for peaceful residents of the city appeared. Women every day gathered for the works not accustomed to them. In Tiflis, ladies gathered at one of the government buildings, and even though it was hot during the summer, sat to sew underclothing, cut off bandages, and spin thread for Lazarettos. They were hard at work to construct barracks and fulfilled a lot of demands by the Red Cross Society. Very many women, especially mothers, wives, and sisters of the soldiers, departed to the operating [Russian] Army as sisters of mercy (i. e. nurses with religious implication— M. A. S.)<sup>23</sup>.*

What we can understand from Zhelikhovskaia's descriptions here is the fact that "women", especially "mothers, wives, and sisters of the soldiers" united, assisted with military supplies, and worked as nurses related to the Red Cross Society. In the context of this war, it was the gender norms of Zhelikhovskaia that women support soldiers, in times male family members of these women, mainly in home-fronts.

These gender norms seemed to reflect the historical context of gender in Russia. In the nineteenth-century Russian Empire, the lifestyle of familistic domesticity started to coexist. Then, women's obedience to men and affection to men sympathise. In this context, it is understandable to women assisting soldiers in Zhelikhovskaia's discourse. If the description reflects the real situation in the wartime Tiflis, the change of family norms in nineteenth-century Russia, with influence by the Western one, seems to have reached a colony such as the Caucasus<sup>24</sup>.

After the norms, the following problems are identification and performance. About them, relating the identity "us", Zhelikhovskaia herself said:

*We, Russian women, every day being with sick and wounded soldiers for several hours, during the war, had more capability to know them than those who did not be present. In front of the command, in front of all, usually soldiers [should be] embarrassed. For us, they are not soldiers, but sick, weak people waiting for help and ease, fight for us all, "my darling", Ivan-s, namely Petr-s. They were not afraid of us and initiatively opened their sufferings, senses, and thoughts. So, we love them, they love us deeply! So now we can talk about them confidently that we speak of the truth, rather, speak out than exaggerate<sup>25</sup>.*

"Ivan-s" and "Petr-s" seem to originate from Ivan IV the Terrible and Petr I the Great, the Great ethnic-Russian sovereigns, considering that the book, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*, orients itself to praising Russia. Interestingly, Zhelikhovskaia represented the patients like the great Russians, ethnic-Russian Orthodox men.

<sup>22</sup> Taking Judith Butler's "performativity" thesis into account, this article examines the femininity of Russian women also from the viewpoint of gender as an accumulation of performances: Butler, J. (1990=2006). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, London: Routledge.

<sup>23</sup> Все преобразилось съ этого дня. Явилось множество новыхъ заботъ, новыхъ занятій мир-нымъ жителямъ городовъ. Женщины стали собирать каждый день для непривычныхъ имъ работъ. Въ Тифлисѣ барыни собирались въ зданіи одного изъ правительствѣяныхъ учреждений и несмотря на скоро наступившій жаръ, все лѣто прилежно сидѣли за шитьемъ бѣлья, за разрѣзываніемъ бинтовъ, щипкой корпіи для лазаретовъ; а также трудились по устройству бараковъ для раненыхъ, исполняли множество требованій по обществу Краснаго Креста. Очень многія женщины, въ особенности матери, жены и сестры военныхъ, ушли въ дѣйствующую армію, сестрами милосердія. : *Желиховская*, 1885а. С.5-6.

<sup>24</sup> Familism in Russia first appears in the urban middle class and diffused to Siberia in the Empire era: Clements, 2012, pp.145-146, 154-156.

<sup>25</sup> Мы, русскія женщины, ежедневно бывая съ больными и ранеными солдатами по нѣсколько часовъ, въ продолженіи всей войны, болѣе имѣли возможности узнать ихъ нежели кто бы то ни было. Предъ начальствомъ, предъ всѣми, въ обычное время, солдаты стѣснены. Для насъ же они были не солдаты, а больные, слабые, ждавшіе помощи и облегченія, за всѣхъ насъ пострадавшіе люди, «голубчики» Иваны, да Петры. Они не дичились насъ, охотно открывали намъ свои страданія, чувства и помыслы. Оттого-то мы ихъ и они насъ глубоко полюбили! Оттого-то мы теперь и можемъ говорить о нихъ съ увѣренностью, что говоримъ правду, что скорѣе не договариваемъ, чѣмъ преувеличиваемъ. : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.45-46.

There are three significant discourses in this “Ivan-Petr” passage. The first is that here “we” are in apposition to “Russian women”. The second is that the passage implies such participation in nursing by Zhelikhovskaia herself to stay “with sick and wounded soldiers for several hours”. Even though *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* includes so much information about behaviours and tales in the hospitals and the lazarets that represent the author’s participation, here lucidly “we, Russian women” are grammatical subjects of nursing as performance. The third is that “they were not afraid of us, initiatively opened their suffering, sense, and thought. So, we love them, they love us deeply”: Based on the discussion below, soldiers are obviously masculine, whilst “we” are feminine. Unlike embarrassment in front of men, the sick and wounded “initiatively open their suffering, sense, and thought”.

These three discourses in this “Ivan-Petr” passage suggest the “affection” or “intimacy” between the sick/wounded and women. Zhelikhovskaia’s “we, Russian women” nursed, in short, cared for<sup>26</sup>. Thus, Zhelikhovskaia identified herself as “a Russian woman”, or one having a collective identity “we”, assumed that women should have had an ethical nature to care for to some extent unlike men, and practised performances of the ethical nature by nursing<sup>27</sup>.

Examining the collective identity “us” with the gender norms, identity, and performativity of Zhelikhovskaia based on the criterion of gender, it is obvious that Zhelikhovskaia had the gender norms, according to which women owed obedience to male members of the family and intimately cared for the men in reflecting the Russian family norms more Westernised. Moreover, it is obvious that Zhelikhovskaia identified herself as a woman and indeed cared for men intimately. Zhelikhovskaia’s “us” sufficiently included “women” – as long as they were ethnic Russians.

### 3.4. Ethnicity and Language: Zhelikhovskaia’s Representation of “Mountaineers” and “Georgians”

In the last section, when noticed that the collective identity was inclusive of women as long as ETHNIC-Russians, then we need to think about whether or not the identity was inclusive of non-Russians in the Caucasus such as Georgians, taking into account that Zhelikhovskaia frequently related her “us” and being ethnic-Russian. In other words, what to consider is the criterion of ethnicity when examining the collective identity. This section investigates the representation of non-Russians, in particular, Orthodox believers by Zhelikhovskaia.

Zhelikhovskaia seemed to be familiar with major indigenous ethnicities or the multi-ethnic sphere in the Caucasus. She described the topography, ethnography, folklore, and the tales of Georgians, Armenians, Tatars, Mountaineers, and Cossacks in her book, *Kavkaz’ i Zakavkaz’e*, published in 1885, the same year as the publication of *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*<sup>28</sup>. She devoted 30 pages to Georgians, 10 to Armenians, 20 to Tatars-

---

<sup>26</sup> The usage of the nomenclature “care” owes to Carol Gilligan’s feminist approach into psychology. Gilligan indicated that there is not only justice perspective of ethics on inequity more likely in moral dilemma of men but also care perspective of ethics on attachment more likely in that dilemma of women, and Gilligan suggests the significance of both of two ethical orientations, both justice and care: Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34(3), 223–37. Here especially Russian women had attachments to sick and wounded soldiers, unlikely the Russian men and apparatus as the command.

<sup>27</sup> One reservation to examine gender norms in the Russian Empire here is the limitation of “motherhood” as women’s gender role but the producer as the role in the Russian Empire and the Russian patriarchy, which implies that the Western gender norms are not consistently applicable to the Russian example. Especially Lindenmeyr indicated the limitation of “motherhood”: Lindenmeyr, A. (1993). Maternalism and child welfare in Late Imperial Russia, *Journal of Women’s History*, 5(2), 114-125.

<sup>28</sup> Желиховская, 1885b. See note 16.

Mountaineers, and 20 to Cossacks<sup>29</sup>. Information of Cossacks was almost tales of bravery<sup>30</sup>. Even though the description was uneven, Zhelikhovskaia seemingly remarked on the multi-ethnic nature of the Caucasus, but she presumably dared praise the ethnic-“Russian”.

Zhelikhovskaia gave accounts of non-Russian but Orthodox allies. For instance, the militia of Mountaineers was as follows:

*There were militia of Orthodox mountaineers-savages: Tuşins, Pşavs, and Khevsurs. These non-large tribes in almost unassailable mountains in the north-east of Tiflis, rarely go out from there. Now they organised their own volunteer corps and voluntarily came out from their deep forest to the light of God, in order to participate in our war against their sempiternal enemy – Muslims. The loyalty and courage of these tribes (whose population does not exceed over 35000) appeared in a proverb<sup>31</sup>.*

According to Zhelikhovskaia, Mountaineers who were Orthodox believers “to the light of God, in order to participate in our war against their sempiternal enemy – Muslims”. Zhelikhovskaia seemed to have focused on the denominational criterion of Orthodoxy and regarded the mountaineers as comrades. She also might believe in the loyalty of the mountaineers so that “The loyalty and courage of these tribes appeared in a proverb”. The “loyalty” can be interpreted as “loyalty” to the Russian Empire in the context of the Russo-Ottoman war, which had a colour of the holy war between Christian-Orthodox Russia and Muslim Ottomans. Therefore, it is clear that these mountaineers as subjects belong to a polity, the Russian Empire, regardless of their status. In this case, these Orthodox mountaineers were comrades of “us” as per both criteria, subjecthood, and denomination.

Nevertheless, Zhelikhovskaia does not address the mountaineers as “us”, but instead as “savages”. Even though she referred to the mountaineers as the Orthodox comrades in Russia, as long as the comrades were not ethnic-Russian, Zhelikhovskaia likely excluded the comrade from “us” and regarded them as “savages”. Depending on the ethnic otherness, Zhelikhovskaia added an Imperialist discourse to her consciousness to be comrades.

The next example is her description of Georgians. For several pages, Zhelikhovskaia narrated a course of tales on Georgian fighting on the side of Russia. In the beginning of this part, she depicted as follows:

*... not us, nor Russian. That is obvious as the face, also as the tongue, because he was delirious, as I firstly thought [that he spoke] in Turkish, but, it appears that [he spoke] simply in Georgian.*

*Presumably Adjarets' (i.e. Adjarian, Acar or Acaralı – M. A. S.) in any case [be] from Batum! We thought, still imagining the sick in prisoners. And we even felt sorry for him. As you know, if he is Adjarets – Georgian, so means a Christian, with(?) us fought under the Turkish cane<sup>32</sup>.*

---

<sup>29</sup> Желиховская, 1885b, С.114.

<sup>30</sup> Желиховская, 1885b, С.93-113.

<sup>31</sup> То была милиція православныхъ горцевъ дикарей: Тушинъ, Пшавовъ, и Хевсуровъ. Живутъ эти небольшія племена въ почти неприступныхъ горахъ, на сѣверо-востокъ отъ Тифлиса, и почти никогда изъ нихъ не выходятъ. Теперь они составили свое ополченіе и добровольно вышли изъ своихъ лесныхъ дебрей на Божій светъ, съ тѣмъ, чтобы принять участіе во войнѣ нашей съ ихъ вѣковѣчными врагами – мусульманами. Храбрость и вѣрность этихъ народцевъ (которыхъ численность, не превышаетъ 35,000 челов.) вошла въ пословицу. : Желиховская, 1885а, С.38.

<sup>32</sup> ... не нашъ, не Русскій: это было и по лицу видно, да и по рѣчамъ, потому что онъ бредилъ, какъ я сначала думала, по турецки, но оказалось, что просто по грузински.

Должно быть Аджарецъ какой нибудь изъ-за Батума! подумали мы, все еще воображая, что это больной изъ плѣнныхъ. И даже еще пожалѣли его. Вѣдь если онъ Аджарецъ — грузинъ, такъ значить христіанинъ, а съ нами дрался изъ подъ турецкой палки. : Желиховская, 1885а, С.52.

According to Zhelikhovskaia, Georgian was neither “us” nor “Russian”. “Adjarets-Georgian” was “Christian” and “with(?) us fought”. This sentence is somewhat difficult to understand as one can interpret that the Acar fought the war on both sides of Russia and the Ottomans. It is more plausible to interpret the Acar on the side of Russia because she identified Acar as Georgian and regarded Georgians as the comrade as explained below. In any way, Georgians/Acars were the comrades as per the criterion of denomination and may well be as per that of subjecthood, namely neither “us” nor “savages”.

In any way, Zhelikhovskaia distorted the nature of Acar. Batum was ceded after the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878 and became a part of the territory of the Russian Empire. Furthermore, as many residents in Acara became Muslim until then, even linguistically Georgian-Kartveli, Acar was different people to Georgian in cultural terms, especially denominational<sup>33</sup>. Acar-s in Batum were Georgian Muslims belonging to the Ottomans until Treaty of Berlin (1878). Despite the cultural background of Acar, Zhelikhovskaia only took notice of the ethnic-linguistic peculiarity of Georgian origin and regarded Acar as Georgian, regardless of the former Ottoman presence and Islamic denomination. In this respect, Zhelikhovskaia distorted Acar and altered two significant criteria in this analysis, the denomination and the subjecthood of Acar, as if Acars had been pro-Orthodox and pro-Russian.

The episode of a Georgian comrade followed the tale of Acar. Accordingly, a woman rushed into the barrack and met again with a sick person, whose name was Otiia, and who was the spouse of the women from the Aznaur’, in short, Georgian nobility. After Otiia expounded the significance of the Holy War to the spouse, he went to the war front, fighting. The spouse assumed the death of Otiia and became provident. Then, she met again with her spouse, Otiia<sup>34</sup>. Zhelikhovskaia noted: “Instead, how happy when she noticed the husband in our ‘Turkish prisoner!’ And we all congratulated this poor woman ...<sup>35</sup>” In this episode, she described that the Georgian piously fought on the side of Russian Empire, without any “savage”-ry. She seemed to underscore both Orthodoxy and the contribution of Georgians.

In this part, two things are clear. Firstly, the comrades were not “us”, nor equivalent “Russian”, even though the denomination was Orthodoxy and the subjecthood was of Russia. Secondly, although Georgians and mountaineers shared both its denomination of Orthodoxy and subjecthood to Russia, according to Zhelikhovskaia, only mountaineers were “savage”. These things represent Zhelikhovskaia’s imperial hierarchy, even partially, that Russian was on top, Georgian was the next, and “savage” Mountaineer was after that, so the representation and Imperialism by the Russian woman were not homogeneous.

### 3.5. Religion and Denomination: Zhelikhovskaia’s Representation of Multi-religious Russia

When analyzing Zhelikhovskaia’s representations, every individual above was an Orthodox believer, either masculine or feminine, either ethnic-Russian, Georgian, or mountaineer. However, Turkish scholars have been interested in Turkic Muslims in Russia, and as Paul Werth argues, the Russian Empire was multi-religious<sup>36</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> Aydın, M. Acara, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi. According to a recent research article, into the eighteenth century, the Islamization of Acara proceeded to the extent in which approximately 100 Camii had been registered until the earliest nineteenth century: Bay, A. (2023). Acara’da İslamlaşma: Vakıflar üzerine toplumsal bir okuma denemesi, *Van ilahiyat dergisi*, 11/18, 78-121.

<sup>34</sup> Желиховская, 1885а, С.52-59.

<sup>35</sup> Зато какова была ея радость, когда она узнала въ нашемъ «плѣнномъ Туркѣ» своего мужа! И мы всѣ порадовались съ бѣдной женщиной. ... : Желиховская, 1885а, С.58.

<sup>36</sup> See Werth, 2013. In Türkiye, there is a tradition of research on Russian Muslims as noted. See note 3.

In the book including “Orthodox” in the name, it is problematic how Zhelikhovskaia depicted non-Orthodox believers in multi-religious Russia.

Zhelikhovskaia described the activity of each non-Orthodox denomination during the war in the following manner:

*The Molokans, almost all occupying carriage, in addition to donations, propose free transportation of soldiers to the barracks directed to them. Armenian shopkeepers, not becoming stingy, dedicated many of things from first to tenth: lots of provisions, cloths, tobacco, books, cards, pictures, and amusing things like them, [they] carried to barracks. Tiny brotherhoods of Tiflis evangelists and anabaptists donated thousands of the Gospel, the Psalter, and Prayer books. Muslims did not stand out: in accordance with the suggestion of the spiritual leader, Müftü Hüseyin, Tatars in Tiflis many times gathered donations to “the struggling soldiers”. This clever Müftü (in short, chief clergy of Tatars) read the preach for the flock in Mescid[Camii – M. A. S.]: “We all, the loyal subjects of Russian Tsar, now must join - without the difference of believing faith, he said, all they are duties to help the strugglings for the native land and to facilitate its progress”. ...<sup>37</sup>*

From this part, not only Molokans, Armenians, evangelists, and anabaptists, namely other Christian denominations than Orthodoxy, supported the war, but also Müftü of Tatars, the spiritual leader of Russian Muslims, supported the war on the behalf of Russian Empire, regarding Russian Tatars as “the loyal subjects of Russian Tsar” and calling for “joining - without the difference of believing faith” as well. This depiction did not include any typical expression of Colonialism - “savage”.

Thus, Zhelikhovskaia was not hostile toward non-Orthodox believers, Molokans, Protestants, Armenians, and Muslims, as long as the believers belonged to the Russian Empire as the subjects, despite the denominations and the ethnicities being decisively different to Orthodoxy and Russian. Even in these cases, she did not call Armenians and Tatars “us”, of course nor “Russian”. Considering that the latter, Tatars, were “loyal subjects of the Russian Tsar”, the non-Orthodox believers in the Russian Empire were excluded from “us”, or “Russians”, but submissive to Russians.

### 3.6. Subjecthood: Zhelikhovskaia’s Representation of “Turks”

This article has examined Zhelikhovskaia’s «us» from several perspectives. It seems to become clear that the perception of Zhelikhovskaia had a somewhat imperialist nature, which was able to fluctuate depending on the objects. These objects were in common – subjects of the Russian Empire as the criterion of subjecthood was constant.

Below, changing the criterion of subjecthood, this section will examine Zhelikhovskaia’s representation of the Ottoman subjects, whom she called “Turks”. Despite some differences to the case of Russian subjects, the representation of the Ottomans is worthy of examination, because the Ottomans were just “Orient” in the eyes

---

<sup>37</sup> Молокане, почти всѣ занимающіеся извозомъ, кромѣ многихъ пожертвованій, предложили даровой перевозъ солдатъ отъ станціи до назначенныхъ имъ баракъ. Армяне лавочники не скупились на пожертвованія множества предметовъ и первой и десятой необходимости: груды запасовъ, одежды, табаку, книгъ, даже картъ, картинъ и тому подобныхъ увеселительныхъ предметовъ, перевозились обозами въ бараки. Небольшія братства тифлискихъ евангелистовъ и перекрещенцевъ жертвовали тысячи евангелій, псалтирей и молитвенниковъ. Мусульмане—и тѣ не отстали: по предложенію своего духовнаго главы, муфтія Гуссейна, тифлискіе Татары много разъ собирали пожертвованія на «страждущихъ воиновъ». Этого умный муфтіи (т. е. главный священникъ татарскій), читаль, по этому поводу, даже проповѣди своей паствѣ въ мечетяхъ: «Мы всѣ, вѣрноподанные Русскаго Царя, нынѣ должны сплотиться, — безъ разбора вѣроисповѣданій, говорилъ онъ. Всѣ обязаны помогать страждущимъ за отечество и способствовать преуспѣванію его!»... : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.18-19.

of Russia<sup>38</sup>, and because “Turks” in the Caucasus had become ruled by the Russians as Russian Empire had expanded its realm in the Caucasus. Therefore, the Ottomans, or “Turks”, were the ruled “Orient”, which would become an object of the imperial perception.

Zhelikhovskaia had nursed «Turkish» prisoners as she depicted:

*Many Georgian militia-staffs and mountaineers existed in ours. Also, there were not a few Turkish prisoners, who first squinted and were afraid of doctors, comrades in barracks, a servant, and even us. Of women, they not only were afraid but also disdained, and it is acknowledged for me that our hearts could not remain for the infidels so as for our sicked persons. No matter how much they suffered, all [we] involuntarily thought, looking upon these black, brutish ugly faces, that: “Oh, brother, we here remedy you; but our wounded be fallen to you, you would immediately peel his skin<sup>39</sup>”.*

In this part, Zhelikhovskaia indicated the disdain of women by “Turks” and “our” inability to be concerned with “Turks” the same as “our sicked persons”. Zhelikhovskaia apparently argued that it is impossible for Russian women and the “Turks” to interact in a relationship, in which, “we love them [Russian soldiers], they love us deeply!” What the term “we” meant here included being women, as the author paraphrases women’s relationships to “Turks” of “our” relationships to “Turks”.

What a nurse could not be concerned with “Turks” as comrades means that the nurse acted based on “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin<sup>40</sup>”, in other words, the nurse discriminated “Turks” in the current sense.

Of course, the current sense is somewhat inappropriate to discuss the 19<sup>th</sup> century. There are some conceivable reasons: it is simply anachronistic for us to consider the propaganda in the 1870s by the convention concluded in 1960; in 1870s Europe, such understanding of “Turks” was very ordinary; women disdained “Turks” because previously “Turks” disdained women. However, these reasons are not plausible because of a prominent exception in the same war. Another Russian woman, Ekaterina Bakunina solicitously nursed “Turks”, even without “any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin”, and did not indicate the disdainful attitude of “Turks” to women<sup>41</sup>. Even though the “Turks” actually disdained the women, the “Turks” could not tell as long as Zhelikhovskaia, an experienced and literate writer, was able to depict the “Turks” as “brutish ugly” with full rhetorical strategies whilst not excerpting saying of the “Turks”. Zhelikhovskaia had a predominance over the “Turks” to produce any discourse. Thus, it is somewhat accurate that Zhelikhovskaia discriminates against the “Turks”.

Moreover, the discourse is more lucid. On the one hand, non-Russians were at least the “savages” for Zhelikhovskaia. On the other hand, “Turks” were “infidels”, which she never called one belonged to the

<sup>38</sup> Taki, 2012; Davidova, E. (2012). Gender and culture in the Turkish Province: The observations of a Russian woman traveler (1868), *Aspasia*, 6, 79-95.

<sup>39</sup> Много было у насъ и Грузинъ милиціонеровъ и Горцевъ; немало и Турокъ плѣнныхъ, которые въ началѣ всегда ужасно косились, боялись и докторовъ, и товарищей по баракамъ, и прислуги, и даже насъ. На женщинъ они, кромѣ страха, еще смотрѣли съ большимъ презрѣніемъ и признаюсь, что и наши сердца не могли такъ лежать къ этимъ изувѣрамъ, какъ къ своимъ больнымъ. Какъ бы они ни страдали, а все невольно думалось, глядя на эти черныя, звѣрскія рожи; «Ну, братъ, мы вотъ тебя лечимъ; а попадись къ вамъ нашъ раненый, ты бы съ него живо кожу содралъ!» : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.50-51.

<sup>40</sup> *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*, Article 1st.

<sup>41</sup> Bakunina, calling herself «Turkophile dame», nursed “Turkish” prisoners: *Екатерина Бакунина*. (1879). Годъ на Кавказѣ: При военно-временныхъ госпиталяхъ. Отрывки изъ писемъ старшей сестры милосердія краснаго креста Екатерины Бакуниной. // Сборникъ военныхъ разсказовъ 1877- 1878, II, СПб: Изданіе Кн. В. Мещерскаго, С.419-496, especially, 442-443.

Despite Bakunina's identity seeming to be more as a nurse than as a woman, it needs another detailed discussion to prove how she identified herself as a nurse, the discussion is omitted here.

Russian Empire but used only here, “Turks” have “black, brutish ugly faces”, using which term she represented Turkish counterparts not as “savages”, but as “brutish” in worse. She gave the most detailed account of the alleged inhumanity of the “Turks” than others: “Our wounded be fallen to you, you would immediately peel his skin”. At least, the discourse of “Turks”. By any means, the discourse of “Turks” in the book was different to non-Russian nor Orthodox subjects in the Russian Empire and was in an extraordinarily disdainful tone.

Some Russian’s perception of “Turks” is, however, unlike the perception by Zhelikhovskaia. In the hospital, some Russians aided “Turks”, one of whom made Zhelikhovskaia recognise herself as very prejudiced and discriminative:

*And how reluctantly the helping hands were raised! ... and what? It is shameful to acknowledge and necessary to say, that in relation to us, people identifying themselves as learned Christians, our pure soldiers frequently illiterate were favourable genuine Christian examples! ...they did not have any malice toward these recent enemies of them. They talked and joked with them and treated them with tobacco. Not refusing, more healthy [Christian soldiers] served Turkish sick person or Kabardian.*

*What! [For] which are they guilty? Who are we, who are they, - all is only one! They fulfilled their own duty to the native land. Not for malice, but for oath each other they struggled ... God is with them! They are also people... Probably on their own behalf, about them, wives also, mothers as well, pray to their own God!*

*An aged soldier who lied side by side with prisoners told such a thing to us. And I acknowledged that I felt ashamed of my petty feelings when I compared [the tiny word] to the great words of the soldier in [my] mind<sup>42</sup>.*

The soldiers, «favourable genuine Christian examples» without “any malice toward these recent enemies of them”, served Turkish sick person or Kabardian. The soldiers are plural, so not a petty coincidental exception. The argument “they are also people”, which one of the soldiers indicates, made Zhelikhovskaia herself become “ashamed due to [my] own tiny word”, full of revilements at “Turks”. Even though Zhelikhovskaia fundamentally disdained “Turks” in her imperial perception, she was able to change the perception by the real person. In short, her imperial perception was inconsistent when the real person could influence, or on the individual level.

Just after becoming ashamed, concluding the sixth chapter of *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*, Zhelikhovskaia became defiant one more:

*No! Our Orthodox narod did not diminish, if in the middle of him, without interruption abreast, such feelings appeared, such good speeches sounded! So for great narod, - there is great future. Here, because of this, those who know Russian narod cannot doubt Russia’s future success<sup>43</sup>.*

---

<sup>42</sup> И какъ-то неохотно руки подымались имъ помогать!.. И что же? Стыдно признаться, а надо сказать, что и въ этомъ отношеніи намъ, людямъ считавшимъ себя учеными и христіанами, наши простые, часто неграмотные солдатики подавали благіе, истинно христіанскіе примѣры!.. Въ нихъ не было ни малѣйшей злобы противъ этихъ недавнихъ враговъ своихъ. Они разговаривали и шутили съ ними, и табачкомъ ихъ подчивали, и непрочь были, кто поздоровѣй, услужить больному Турку или Кабулетцу.

Чтожъ! Чѣмъ они повинны?.. Что мы, что они, - все едино! Долгъ свой предъ отечествомъ сполняли. Не по злобѣ, - а по присягѣ другъ дружку били... Богъ съ ними! Они тоже люди... Чай, въ своей сторонѣ, объ нихъ тоже жены, да матери свою Бога молятъ!»

Такъ говорилъ намъ однажды пожилой солдатъ, лежавшій рядомъ съ пленнымъ. И признаюсь: стыдно стало мнѣ за свои мелкія чувства, когда я въ душѣ сравнила ихъ съ великими словами этого солдата. : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.51. Especially the argument of the soldier is syntactically peculiar in regards to its Subject-Object-Verb word order in Russian texts, for which this article cannot make any critical explanation yet.

<sup>43</sup> Нѣтъ! Не измелъчалъ нашъ народъ православный, если среди его, сплошь да рядомъ, проявляются такія чувства, слышатся такія хорошія рѣчи! А великому народу, —великая будущность. Вотъ почему тотъ, кто знаетъ народъ Русскій, не можетъ сомнѣваться въ будущности и преуспѣяніи Россіи. : *Желиховская*, 1885а, С.52.

Thus, Zhelikhovskaia praised the Orthodox ethnic Russians and concluded the promised reliability of Orthodox Russians, with the excuse that “favourable genuine Christian examples” served vulgar “Turks” amicably<sup>44</sup>.

### 3.7. Place of Non-Russian/Orthodox Women

As indicated, Zhelikhovskaia depicted various characters in the Russian Empire, mostly male characters, like soldiers, müftü, or dwellers without any specific identification of Gender. The most representative female characters were the Russian women, “us” in Zhelikhovskaia’s expression. Then, it becomes a problem of the intersectionality of how Zhelikhovskaia depicted non-Russian/Orthodox women.

The answer is simple: Zhelikhovskaia does basically not refer to any non-Russian/Orthodox women, except the Georgian woman named after Maiko, the wife of Otiya, especially in this propaganda<sup>45</sup>. As well as Zhelikhovskaia described the humble Georgian women and miserable Tatar (Azeri) women in another book<sup>46</sup>, *Kavkaz’ i Zakavkaz’e*, she seemed to be familiar with the non-Russian/Orthodox Women in the Caucasus. It is considerable that most characters were male especially in propaganda, which implied the relationship between propaganda, manhood and war in the nineteenth century, even though it needs more accurate analysis to prove the relationship. Anyway, what is clear is that Zhelikhovskaia did not identify non-Russian/Orthodox women as specific groups with the Georgian exception, nor refer to the women.

### 4. Hierarchy in Zhelikhovskaia’s *Naši Voini Pravoslavnye*

This article has examined the imperial perception by Zhelikhovskaia at the polity and individual levels, based on the criteria of gender, ethnicity, denomination, and subjecthood, paying attention to the term “us”, apparently a representation of a collective identity to which she belonged, considering the discourse “us” in the wartime colonial capital as a reflection of the perception of Russian imperial organisation by her.

Zhelikhovskaia took the Russian war against the Ottomans for granted. In other words, she approved of Russia for the aggressive war against the Ottomans. Thus, Zhelikhovskaia was an imperialist.

As the term “we” exists in the approval, the discourse “we” might represent the identity of the Russian Empire. To put it briefly, “we make a bow” for ethnic-Russian Orthodox-believer masculine combatants, especially, war dead-s. Zhelikhovskaia identified herself as feminine and cared for men affectionally as a nurse, based both on the Russian patriarchy and on the familism of Western origin. Thus, in a narrow sense, she attributed the identity of “us” to collective Russian women, who submitted to and cared for the men. Along with the criterion of gender, Zhelikhovskaia excluded non-Russians in the Russian Empire from “us” as she ascribed Georgians to “not us, not Russians”. Zhelikhovskaia called Orthodox mountaineers “savages”, which implied the imperialistic nature of her perception. Moreover, Zhelikhovskaia regarded non-Orthodox subjects in the Russian Empire as compatriots, as she indicated Müftü’s preaching “the loyal subjects of Russian Tsar”. Even though acknowledging non-Russian/Orthodox subjects in the Russian Empire as compatriots, the imperialistic

---

<sup>44</sup> As mentioned above, whilst Zhelikhovskaia died in 1896 (Левин, 2015, С.219), she was not able to know the failures of Russia after 1896 such as the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-1905, the first World War, the Russian Revolution, and so on.

<sup>45</sup> Throughout the book, the only case in which a non-Russian/Georgian woman plays a necessary role in the plot is the story of Georgians. When searching such words as “Турчанка (Turkish woman)”, “Татарка (Tatar woman)”, Армянка (Armenian woman) from the PDF, there is no result, and doing the word “Женщина (woman)”, there are only Russian and Georgian results.

<sup>46</sup> Zhelikhovskaia depicted the (Georgian) women beating themselves up in the festival and the Tatar women who are abused by the men: Желиховская, 1885b, С.53-54, 75-78. These interesting cases are worth to be examined separately but are now omitted to discuss in detail, due to the limitation of space and theme.

woman excluded non-Russian/Orthodox subjects from the identity “us”, in time ascribing “savagery”, on the one hand.

On the other hand, Zhelikhovskaia obviously disdained the “Turks” full of insults, which she never ascribed to her compatriots. Even though Zhelikhovskaia occasionally felt shame at her thoughts on “Turks” one time, because of the kindness of another, Zhelikhovskaia interpreted the kindness as a merit of “our Orthodox narod” and modified an ideology promising the future of the narod.

The most invisible group was non-Russian/Orthodox women other than Georgians, detected by intersectional analysis. Zhelikhovskaia made the women invisible and did neither praise nor disdain.

According to the aforementioned criteria, Zhelikhovskaia’s identity “we” was a collective of Russian women caring about the gender norms in a narrow sense and a collective identity that regarded non-Russian/Orthodox subjects as compatriots but excluded from “our” selves in a broader sense. Zhelikhovskaia’s identity “us” in a narrow sense was submissive to ethnic-Russian Orthodox-believer masculine combatants.

Thus, Zhelikhovskaia’s imperial perception represents apparently the hierarchy, in which Russian men were on the top, Russian women came after, submissive to Russian men, and the hierarchy that excluded non-Russian/Orthodox subjects from Russians themselves, exploiting as “the loyal subjects of Russian Tsar”, even though the Georgians were more privileged than other non-Russian/Orthodox people as already indicated by some researcher<sup>47</sup>. The ascendance of Russian women was apparent, as far as the woman, Zhelikhovskaia, found “savagery” in non-Russian subjects, and mountaineers and ignored non-Russian/Orthodox women. Of course, the hierarchy never gave room for the “Turks”. On the other hand, Zhelikhovskaia ignored most of the non-Russian/Orthodox women even likely due to the alleged manhood in the war, which also implied the power relationship between Russian coloniser women and non-Russian colonised women.

Taking the hierarchy into account, the nature of the book, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*, was just that of patriotism. The most contrasting aspects of the book are the depictions of the subjects of the Russian Empire and the Ottomans. The descriptions converting the kindness to “Turks” to the merit of “our Orthodox narod”, and the description praising ethnic-Russian Orthodox-believer masculine combatants are commonly full of extolment of Russia. Advantageous to the Russian expansionism to Acara, Acar-s, Muslim Kartvelis in the Ottoman domain until 1878, were rephrased as “Georgians” as if the people would be Orthodox Christian Kartvelis in the Russian domain. Finally, considering these facts and that the book was published by a public publisher of the Russian Empire, this book, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*, is a book of authorised propaganda by the government of the Russian Empire<sup>48</sup>.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, it becomes clear that in the patriotic propaganda book, *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie*, Zhelikhovskaia, a Russian imperialist woman, represents the least inclusion of Russian subjects and its hierarchy, in which Orthodox Russian men on the top, and Orthodox Russian women at the following reigned non-Russians/Orthodox male-oriented subjects (and mostly invisible non-Russian/Orthodox female subjects) from the relative privileged Georgian to the “savage” mountaineers in Russian Empire, and the most exclusion of

---

<sup>47</sup> Previous research focused on the depiction of the Russo-Ottoman War, 1877-1878, frequently indicates Russian elites’ exceptionally favourable representation of Georgians at that time: Acar, 2004, pp.7-21; Gutmeyr, 2017, pp.222-223.

<sup>48</sup> It is interesting that the propaganda has a gendered nature. The term “we” indicates women in a narrow sense, whilst the author Zhelikhovskaia represents her gender identity, gender norms, and performativity as a Russian woman.

the Ottomans, or “Turks”, both as a polity and as concrete subjects. Especially discussing the status of women, the second supreme group in the hierarchy, Russian women, were supposed to intimately, or affectionally, care for men, especially Russian men, according to the gender norms of Russia in the 1870s. As a second group member, Zhelikhovskaia identified herself, codified, and performed femininity as per the gender norms. The group, Russian women, was in a privileged position also in terms that the Russian woman almost ignored non-Russian/Orthodox women and their agency.

The examination of Zhelikhovskaia’s *Naši Voini Pravoslavnie* recounts the gender norms and imperial perception of a Russian woman in wartime: the hierarchy in which Russians were on the top in the multi-ethnic/religious Russian Empire; women, presupposed ethnic-Russian women, submissive to and caring for men would be seen even in the 1870s Russian Empire. Zhelikhovskaia’s book was published in Saint Petersburg. It is unknown how the imperial perception reflected the actual situation of the Caucasian frontier. In any way, Zhelikhovskaia integrated gender norms and imperial perception into her patriotic propaganda. The situation of the Empire and gender comprises the historical background of Today’s Russia, which has officially reinforced and legally promoted “traditional familism”, presupposed the Russian family, and intensively mobilised non-Russians for the present Russo-Ukrainian War.

**Conflict of Interest and Contribution Declaration:** The authors declared that they have no conflict of interest. The article is a single-authored article.

## Reference

*International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.*

*Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi.*

Acar, K. (2004). An examination of Russian Imperialism: Russian military and intellectual descriptions of the Caucasians during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, *Nationalities Papers*, 32:1, 7-21.

Bay, A. (2023). Acara’da İslamlaşma: Vakıflar üzerine toplumsal bir okuma denemesi, *Van ilahiyat dergisi*, 11/18, 78-121.

Butler, J. (1990=2006). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, London: Routledge.

Camiscioli, E. (2013). Women, gender, intimacy, and empire, *Journal of Women's History*, 25, 138-148.

Clements, B. E., Engel, B. A., & Worobec, Ch. D. (eds.) (1991). *Russia’s women: Accommodation, resistance, transformation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clements, B. E. (2012). *A history of women in Russia: From earliest times to the present*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex, *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1, 139-167.

Davidova, E. (2012). Gender and culture in the Turkish Province: The observations of a Russian woman traveler (1868), *Aspasia*, 6, 79-95.

Devlet, N. (1996). İsmail Gaspiralı dönemi ve Ruslarla uzlaşma, *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 2, 403-408.

- Engel, B. A. (1992). Engendering Russia's history: Women in post-Emancipation Russia and the Soviet Union, *Slavic Review*, 51(2), 309-322.
- Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34(3), 223-37.
- Gutmeyr, D. (2017). *Borderlands Orientalism or how the savage lost his nobility: The Russian perception of the Caucasus between 1817 and 1878*, Wien: LIT Verlag.
- Hablemitoğlu, Ş., & Hablemitoğlu, N. (1998). *Şefika Gaspıralı ve Rusya'da Türk kadın hareketi: (1893-1920)*, Ankara: Ahmet Veli Menger Vakfı.
- Hokanson, K. (2011). Russian women travelers in Central Asia and India, *The Russian Review*, 70, 1-19.
- Hokanson, K. (2022). *A Woman's Empire: Russian Women and Imperial Expansion in Asia*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jersild, A. L. (1996). Ethnic modernity and the Russian Empire: Russian Ethnographers and Caucasian Mountaineers, *Nationalities Papers*, 24(4), 641-648.
- Kanlıdere, A. (2000). Rusya Müslimanlarının kongrelerinde kadın sorunu (1905-1917), *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 2, 139-148.
- Kızır, E. K. (2023). Azerbaycan'ın ilk kadın gazetesi Işık(1911-1912)'tan sağlık meselesi: Kadın ve çocuk sağlığı, *Türk Dünyası Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 28-35.
- Kurat, A. N. (1965). Rus hâkimiyeti altında İdil-Ural Ülkesi: Eski Kazan Hanlığı ve Başkurt İli XIX. yüzyıla kadar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(3-4), 91-126.
- Lieven, D. (1999). Dilemmas of Empire 1850-1918. Power, Territory, Identity, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 34(2), 163-200.
- Lindenmeyr, A. (1993). Maternalism and child welfare in Late Imperial Russia, *Journal of Women's History*, 5(2), 114-125.
- Norton, B. T., & Gheith, J. M. (eds.). (2001). *Improper profession: Women, gender, and journalism in Late Imperial Russia*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Okcu, E. (2022). Rusya Türklerinde kadın hakları meselesi, *Genel Türk Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(8), 827-838.
- Pushkareva, N. (1996). *Women in Russian History: From the Tenth to the Twentieth Century*, Levin, E. (trans.), London: Routledge.
- Taki, V. (2011). Orientalism on the margins, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 12(2), 321-351.
- Tanrıverdi, M. (2017). Kafkasya'da Ruslaştırma siyaseti (XIX. yüzyıl ve XX. yüzyıl başları), *Vakanüvis - Uluslararası Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2, 538-557.
- Turan, R. (2023). Kafkasya'da Rus kültür politikaları (XIX.-XX. yüzyıl), *Karadeniz İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 35, 209-230.
- Werth, P. (2013). Religion. In Dixon, S. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Russian History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Zekhani, M. (2022). Invisible bodies: Civilising mission, sexuality, and prostitution in fin de siècle Russian Turkestan, *Cultural and Social History*, 19(2), 141-159.
- Z., M., Zhelikhóvskaia, Véra Petróvna, In Zirin, M. (ed.). *Dictionary of Russian Women Writers* (pp.742-743). London: Greenwood Press.
- Библиографический словарь русских писательниц. Ред. Николай Н. Голицын. СПб, 1889.
- Екатерина Бакунина. (1879). Годъ на Кавказѣ: При военно-временныхъ госпиталяхъ. Отрывки изъ писемъ старшей сестры милосердія краснаго креста Екатерины Бакуниной. // Сборникъ военныхъ разсказовъ 1877- 1878, II, СПб: Изданіе Кн. В. Мещерскаго, 1879, С.419-496.
- В. Желиховская. (1885a) Наши воины православные. СПб: Изданіе учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, министромъ народнаго просвѣщенія постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній.
- В. П. Желиховская. (1885b) Кавказъ и Закавказье: Съ картою Кавказа. СПб: на средства Изд. о-ва, при учрежденной, по Высочайшему повелѣнію, Министромъ Народнаго Просвѣщенія Постоянной комиссіи по устройству народныхъ чтеній.
- Натан Ф. Левин. (2015). Вера Петровна Желиховская в Пскове. // Вестник Псковского государственного университета. Серия «Социально-гуманитарные науки», №2, С.217-223.
- 金富子 (2009) 「宗主国／植民地における『臣民』とジェンダー ——兵役義務・参政権・義務教育制」、『季刊 戦争責任研究』(66)、pp.11-23.[in Japanese: Kim, P. (2009). ‘Subjecthood’ and gender in the suzerain-state / colony: Compulsory military service, suffrage, and mandatory education system, *The Report on Japan’s War Responsibility*, 66, 11-23.]