Decolonial analytics in translation history: Ukrainian literature in the contested space of English translation

IRYNA ODREKHIVSKA

Decolonial analytics in translation history: Ukrainian literature in the contested space of English translation

Decolonization. Translation. Ukrainian literature. English translation. Appropriation. Indirect translation.

The article offers a decolonial reading and critically examines the ways in which Ukrainian literature and culture have been represented in Anglophone translation since the 19th century to the present day, revealing the colonial aesthetic and social imaginary influenced by both the Russian imperial and subsequent Soviet lenses. For this, I develop a decolonial analytics in the historical studies of translation through a four-step framework: 1) *archeology of knowledge* through (non-)translation, investigating the foundations of knowledge embedded in translation practices, 2) *deconstructive reading* of translations to analyze the power structures and built-in distortions, 3) *paratextual positioning* of translation, exploring the underlying ideologies, and 4) *re-existence*, concluding with a re-evaluation of translational contribution to decolonial resistance. Grounded in a corpus analysis, the article posits three common colonial strategies in the history of translating Ukrainian works via the Russian imperial/Soviet lens into English: 1) *cultural appropriation*, 2) *indirect translation into English through Russian*, and 3) *centering on Russian imperial and Soviet recognition* of the piece in its English-language publication. These strategies have resulted in a parallel, Russified narrative of Ukrainian literature in Anglophone academia.

Iryna Odrekhivska
Department of Translation Studies
and Contrastive Linguistics
Center for Academic and Cross-Cultural
Communication
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
Ukraine
iryna.odrekhivska@lnu.edu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0002-2568-8775

School of Slavonic and East European
Studies
University College
London
United Kingdom
i.odrekhivska@ucl.ac.uk

Translation has long been considered "a form of metastatement" about the source text (Holmes 1988); yet, only in recent decades has it been recognized that this act of second-degree reflection, or metarepresentation, transcends mere subjectivity because geopolitical discourses inevitably shape the knowledge systems informing translation practices (Spivak 2021; Baker 2015; Tymoczko 2000). In view of this, decolonial studies, arising as a critical response to the misrepresentation, historical silencing, and objectification of others by dominant actors (Ramos and Daly 2016, xvi) – a phenomenon Aníbal Quijano (2000, 215) termed as the "coloniality of power" – can be equally applicable to the field of translation. Indeed, recent emergence of decolonial perspective within translation studies sheds light on how translation practices intersect with power dynamics, representation, and cultural hegemony (Chamber and Demir 2024). It underscores the transformative potential of translation, which, historically having been an instrument of colonization, also serves as "a vehicle for decolonizing and undermining imperial frameworks and their related biases and systems" (2). Engaging with translation through the lens of decolonial thought, particularly through the groundbreaking works of Frantz Fanon, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, Aníbal Quijano, Abraham Tobi and more recent contributions by Walter Mignolo and Catherine Walsh, and thus conceptualizing translation as a productively disruptive force opposing colonial imageries, has become one of the central directions in contemporary theoretical translation studies (see Batchelor 2014; Harrison 2016).

Building upon the existing scholarship, the present article opens a critical and practical space for decolonial studies in translation history by asserting that historical re-reading of translations can also be decolonial through "performing the questioning of *why* we see things the way we do" (Ramos and Daly 2016, xxvi) leading to the analysis of the *coloniality of translation*. Adopting a decolonial approach, this article critically examines how Ukrainian literature and culture are positioned in English translations spanning from the 19th century to the present, pointing to the colonial aesthetic and social imaginaries influenced by both Russian imperial and subsequent Soviet perspectives. My attempt is to provide a revisionist examination, uncovering hidden biases and paternalistic attitudes shaped by historical and political forces, which even now continue to prevail within Anglophone knowledge production on Ukrainian literature.

For this, the article first develops a decolonial analytics in the historical studies of translation through a four-step framework: 1) *archeology of knowledge* through (non-)translation, investigating the foundations of knowledge embedded in translation practices, 2) *deconstructive reading* of translations to analyze the power structures and built-in distortions, (3) *paratextual positioning* of translation, exploring the underlying ideologies, and 4) *re-existence*, concluding with a re-evaluation of translational contribution to decolonial resistance. Afterwards, grounded in a corpus analysis, the article proceeds to identify three common colonial strategies in the history of translating Ukrainian works into English via the Russian imperial/Soviet lens: 1) *cultural appropriation*, 2) *indirect translation into English through Russian*, and 3) *centering on Russian imperial and Soviet recognition*

of the piece in its English-language publication. Overall, the study argues that these strategies have resulted in a parallel Russified narrative of Ukrainian literature persisting within Anglophone academia, often unchallenged and still relied upon in Slavic studies curricula.

DECOLONIAL ANALYTICS IN TRANSLATION HISTORY

Broadly speaking, fostering a critical reevaluation of the historical and cultural foundations of knowledge production is crucial. Abraham Tobi (2020, 253) highlights the importance of this by articulating the perspective of *epistemic injustice*: "Why should we decolonise knowledge? One popular rationale is that colonialism has set up a single perspective as epistemically authoritative over many equally legitimate ones, and this is a form of epistemic injustice" (253). In this context, translation history possesses a decolonial potential as it serves as a lens through which to examine power dynamics, cultural hegemony, and colonial legacies inherent in linguistic exchanges. By interrogating translation practices, uncovering silenced voices, and challenging dominant narratives, translation history can contribute to the decolonization of knowledge and the promotion of diverse perspectives and epistemologies.

Decoloniality, as an epistemological pursuit, involves delinking from the imposed structure of knowledge, commonly referred to as the "colonial matrix", and subsequently reconstituting alternative ways of thinking and speaking (Mignolo and Walsh 2018). As Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni notes, "every human being is born into a valid and legitimate knowledge system" (2017, 51), suggesting that the process of delinking entails abandoning the epistemic framework one has permanently relied upon – a framework defined as "a historically generated, collectively sustained system of meanings and significance by reference to which a group understands and evaluates the world" (Bhargava 2013, 401).

A decolonial approach in translation history examines the foundations of knowledge (the abovementioned "framework") that are embedded in translation practices, as well as gives the recognition of ex-colonized epistemic sites as valid sources for revealing the complexity of their cultural representation in the world. This approach proves viable for interrogating the lingering dominance of Russian imperial or Soviet epistemology in the Anglophone image of Ukraine, a relevance heightened by the growing power of English as a global lingua franca. Gayatri Spivak (2005, 93–94) aptly directs attention to the responsibility of the translator into English, specifically emphasizing cases when the source literary text is not originally written in one of the languages of northwestern Europe. She underscores the necessity for translators "to enter the protocols of the text" (94), sensing the laws specific to them – a stance that is central to the concept of *epistemic humility*, described as "an attitude of awareness of the limitations of one's own epistemic capacities and an active disposition to seek sources to help overcome these shortcomings" (Wardrope 2015, 341). It is imperative to acknowledge the pervasive colonial framing evident in numerous existing English translations of Ukrainian literary works. Consequently, a critical deconstruction of these representations becomes essential to advance the decolonization of knowledge on Ukraine.

IRYNA ODREKHIVSKA

With this in mind, to scrutinize and unearth the historical coloniality embedded within translation practices, the present study has developed a four-step framework of decolonial analytics in translation history. The initial stage lies in the *archeology of knowledge through (non-)translation*, which aims at excavating existing translation products and examining the underlying structures of knowledge and ideologies inherent in those practices, akin to uncovering layers of sediment in archeology to reveal hidden artifacts and their structures. The inclusion of potential non-translations here recognizes that deliberate omissions also contribute to shaping knowledge in significant ways. The second stage is *deconstructive reading* of translations to engage in a critical analysis of their stylistic rendering and pragmatic transfer, thereby revealing built-in socio-political agendas, visible distortions, and tangible narratives. The subsequent stage examines the *paratextual positioning of translation*, providing further insight into how knowledge was constructed, transmitted, and transformed through accompanying texts that framed the translation event. This analysis underscores the broader implications of the translation practice in question within the discourse at that particular moment in time, as well as its implications for the future. In the fourth and final stage, *re-existence* emerges as the culmination of such decolonial historical praxis, providing a comprehensive re-evaluation of the translational contribution to decolonial re-positioning. This stage invites a critical reflection on how translation practices can facilitate the reshaping of colonial narratives and the assertion of alternative epistemologies.

Indeed, applying this framework through archaeological investigation of knowledge-making, deconstructive readings of translations, examination of their paratextual positioning, and emphasis on the "re-existence" of works beyond colonial translation practices offers a platform to contest established knowledge production. While the proposed framework outlines distinct steps, these elements are not intended as a rigid sequence. Rather, they are interconnected and can be employed iteratively to elicit the multifaceted dimensions of knowledge generation and transfer in colonial translation practices.

MAPPING COLONIAL PRACTICES IN THE REPRESENTATION OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE IN ENGLISH

Employing a corpus-based approach that revealed "a pattern of accumulated effects" (Hewson 2011, 87) on how the translated texts were positioned and interpreted, the study delineates three prominent colonial strategies in the history of translating Ukrainian works via the Russian imperial/Soviet lens into English: 1) *cultural appropriation*, 2) *indirect translation into English through Russian*, and 3) *centering on Russian imperial and Soviet recognition* of the piece in its English-language publication. It is essential to expose how these strategies underscored the complex dynamics of power and representational agendas inherent in translation practices of Ukrainian literary culture.

The first strategy is *cultural appropriation*, when the term "Ukrainian" was not prominently featured in the title, and the text was interpreted through the lens of the Russian imperial perspective. The first-ever collection containing Ukrainian

texts in English rendition was compiled by Benjamin Beresford and entitled *Russian Troubadour, or A Collection of Ukrainian and other National Melodies* (1816). The title itself reflects a problematic framing: by foregrounding the term "Russian", it obscured the distinct Ukrainian identity of the works included (as well as other nations) and perpetuated the idea that Ukrainian culture was a subset of Russian culture. The publication's introductory element, called "Advertisement", declared: "The Ukraine has ever been the Provence of the Russian Empire, and, together with the White and the Lesser Russia, still continues to be the nursery of national airs. The inhabitants of those districts may, indeed, be considered as the genuine Troubadours of the nation" (Beresford 1816, front matter). Referring to Ukraine as a "province" of the Russian Empire and its people as mere contributors to a singular "national", meaning Russian, identity lays bare the colonial perspective embedded within the publication, which aims to erase any possibility of a distinct Ukrainian cultural voice and fit the mold of the dominant Russian imperial narrative. This edition set a precedent that was followed in subsequent publications. For example, William Ralston's 1872 publication *The Songs of the Russian People, as Illustrative of Slavonic Mythology and Russian Social Life*, which is still widely reprinted, and his 1873 work *Russian Folk Tales*, effectively erased the Ukrainian origin of certain materials by presenting them from the outset as inherently Russian (Ralston 1872; 1873). In 1889, Albert Henry Wratislaw, a Briton of Czech descent, presented a collection of translated folk tales *Sixty Folk Tales from Exclusively Slavonic Sources*, under the general "inclusive" naming of Slavonic, which comprised nine Ukrainian tales in English translation.

In 1894, *Cossack Fairy Tales and Folk Tales* by Robert Nisbet Bain, a British historian who worked for the British Museum, were published simultaneously in London and New York, containing translations of 27 Ukrainian stories, hence marking the first instance of Ukrainian fiction being extensively translated into English. The introduction drew a clear line:

> Ruthenian is a language intermediate between Russian and Polish, but quite independent of both. Its territory embraces, roughly speaking, that vast plain which lies between the Carpathians, the watershed of the Dnieper, and the Sea of Azov, with Lemberg and Kiev for its chief intellectual centres. Though it has been rigorously repressed by the Russian Government, it is still spoken by more than twenty million of people. It possesses a noble literature, numerous folk-songs, not inferior even to those of Serbia [...]. (1916, 9)

In the introduction, Bain's highlighting of the Ruthenian[1] language is notable. However, it is important to underscore that in 1892, two years before *Cossack Fairy Tales and Folk Tales*, Bain published a separate volume titled *Russian Fairy Tales*. This raises the question of why Bain, while positing Ruthenian language and culture as a distinct domain, still opted not to follow a similar pattern for the title of the Ruthenian collection as he did with the Russian one. The exclusive emphasis of "Cossack" in the title prompts further investigation into Bain's editorial decision. After all, he drew upon three foundational Ruthenian folklore collections by Panteleĭmon Kulish,[2] Ivan Rudchenko, and Mykhaĭlo Drahomanov, representing the full spectrum of Ruthenian culture under both the Habsburg and Russian empires. Two potential explanations emerge for Bain's editorial framing. Firstly, he might have opt-

ed for a politically neutral framing strategy by associating the tales primarily with Cossack identity. This approach would have avoided directly acknowledging their Ruthenian origin in the title, which could have been a contentious issue to perform at the time. Cossacks, historically, held a complex relationship with the Russian empire. While they enjoyed a degree of autonomy and self-governance, they were also loyal to the Tsars and played a vital role in Russian expansion and military campaigns throughout the 18th and 19th centuries. Their prowess as cavalrymen made them a key component of the Imperial Army, and they were also extensively utilized for police functions and border security, both along national frontiers and within the empire's own ethnic boundaries (extending as far as Astrakhan and the Urals). Given this context, emphasizing "Cossack" in the title could have served as a way to maintain a neutral stance without wading into the complexities of Ruthenian identity.

Only in 1911, Ethel Lilian Voynich, an Irish-born novelist, authored a collection *Six Lyrics from the Ruthenian of Taras Shevchenko, also the Song of the Merchant Kalashnikov from the Russian by Mikhail Lermontov* in London. Evident from the very title, she undertook the pioneering effort to make a clear linguistic distinction between two languages – Ruthenian and Russian in Anglophone reception. She foregrounded a decolonial perspective to the understanding of Ukrainian literature, emphasizing in the preface the necessity of acknowledging and translating works written in the language less accessible to Western audiences:

> I am so sensible of this that, had Shevchenko written in a language as accessible to most English readers as French or German, this volume would perhaps not have been published. But if a man leave immortal lyrics hidden away from Western Europe in a minor Slavonic idiom between Russian, Serbian and Polish, it seems hard that he should go untranslated while waiting for the perfect rendering which may never come. Inadequate as are these few specimens, they show some dim shadow of the mind of a poet who has done for the Dnieper country what Burns did for Scotland. (Voynich 1911, 5)

Interestingly, the collection also takes the epigraph from the poetry by C. A. Nicholson: "A dead voice / called to me / From a rotting grave / in far Ruthenia, / the voice of a long-dead slave / in far Ruthenia…" (front matter). This choice of epigraph as a paratextual framing is quite symbolic and telling, hinting at the silenced Ukrainian voices of the past and the importance of reviving the cultural heritage of Ukraine.

Subsequently, in 1916, *Songs of Ukraina, with Ruthenian Poems* was published in London, Paris, Toronto and New York in translation by Florence Randal Livesay. The collection commenced with a foreword posing the question "Ukrainian song… But do you know what the Ukraine is?" (Livesay 1916, 9) and concluded with the assertion "if the Ukraine has lost her written history, it is still preserved in her historical songs" (14), which could be treated as a decolonial gesture, reclaiming the historical narratives and identity of Ukraine through its songs and poetry. This publication marked a significant moment, initiating a new trajectory in the positioning of Ukrainian literary works in the Anglophone space, however some previous publications were still reprinted, carrying their ideological anchoring.

The second colonial strategy lies in *indirect translation via Russian intermediaries*. Often, Ukrainian literary works were initially translated into Russian, resulting in the erasure of identitarian elements and the neutralization of ethnic character, and only after this step did they serve as source texts for English translation. In fact, the practice of translating from Ukrainian to Russian before English highlights the hegemonic structure, where Russian as a dominant language exerts control over Ukrainian as a colonized language. It constitutes a form of linguistic imperialism, marginalizing the inherent voices and culture of the source language through the imposition of an imperial-mediated narrative. In contrast, translation directly from Ukrainian to English, without the intermediary pivot of Russian, implies a deliberate distancing and delinking from the former networks of colonial influence, facilitating the reconstitution of Ukraine's own literary identity (Odrekhivska 2024).

The phenomenon of Ukrainian via Russian into English translation achieved particular prominence during the mid-20th century, in the aftermath of World War II. It is likely that this period saw a deliberate attempt to filter the perception of Ukrainian literature for the West, shaping it to align with Soviet ideology. This is evidenced by the concentration of translations published by the Moscow Foreign Languages Publishing House. For instance, in 1957, Ivan Franko's *Boa Constrictor and Other Stories* were included in a collection from this publisher, featuring English translations by Fainna Solasko from Russian. Similarly, the 1958 edition of Mykhaĭlo Kotsiubyns'kyĭ's *Chrysalis and Other Stories*, released by the same press, exemplified this practice by presenting English translations from Russian by Jacob Guralsky. Both these editions were supplemented by prefatory elements in Russian, featuring alternative Russian titles *Udav i drugie rasskazy* and *Kukolka i drugie rasskazy* correspondingly. Ivan Franko, a renowned Ukrainian classic, and Mykhaĭlo Kotsiubyns'kyĭ, an acclaimed Ukrainian modernist writer, never composed works in Russian. Kotsiubyns'kyĭ even demonstrably influenced several of his fellow prominent Ukrainian writers, including Volodymyr Vynnychenko, to prioritize Ukrainian in their literary output. Analyzing indirect rendition exposes the colonial hangover in literary translation, where Ukrainian voices are first filtered through Russian as a dominant language before reaching wider audiences, perpetuating linguistic hierarchies.

Interestingly, the Kotsiubyns'kyĭ's English via Russian edition was republished in 2001 by Fredonia Books (Netherlands) and is now widely available. Furthermore, it features a quote from Maxim Gorky's review of Kotsiubyns'kyĭ's literary style on the back cover. It is important to note that at the behest of Maxim Gorky, a three-volume edition of Mykhaĭlo Kotsiubyns'kyĭ's works was compiled and published in Russian between 1910 and 1917, which perhaps served as a basis for the 1958 English translation. In fact, Gorky and Kotsiubyns'kyĭ met in person on Cyprus and formed a strong rapport; the Russian writer even penned a brief memoir about his Ukrainian colleague. However, the inclusion of a quote from a notable Soviet cultural leader in the 2001 edition that features the republication of the indirect translation perpetuates a lingering Soviet inscription. It also manifests the third colonial strategy – *centering on Soviet recognition*. It implies that Ukrainian texts first had to gain recog-

IRYNA ODREKHIVSKA

nition within the Soviet context, with Soviet Russian authors then framing the paratext of the English translated edition, thereby reinforcing the Soviet narrative of/perspective on Ukrainian literature. It functioned as a gatekeeper, requiring Ukrainian texts to gain "approval" before reaching a wider audience. This approval often came with a twist: translators were strictly selected for ideological compliance in rendering the works into English, whereas Soviet literary establishment authors would then frequently contribute prefaces, introductions, or other elements to the English translations, which was indeed the case with Kotsiubyns'kyĭ's translation.

Another relevant case regarding the duality in the decoding of Anglophone representation of the Ukrainian culture can be exemplified by the figure of the 18th-century philosopher Hryhorii Skovoroda. There has been a large-scale initiative to present his texts in English by Glagoslav Publishing, resulting in well-elaborated editions such as *The Garden of Divine Songs, Collected Poetry of Hryhory Skovoroda* (2016) and *The Complete Correspondence of Hryhory Skovoroda: Philosopher and Poet* (2016) under the translatorship of Michael Naydan. However, there is a parallel English narrative about "Grigori Savvich Skovoroda", as posited by Daniel H. Shubin following his Russian adaptation of Skovoroda's name in the 2012 volume *Skovoroda: The World Tried to Catch Me but Could Not*. It contains a biography, analysis of Skovoroda's philosophy, and a translation into English of several selections of his work from Russian. In the paratextual framing on the back cover of the edition, Shubin describes Skovoroda as a "Russian Socrates" and "the first philosopher on Russian soil in the true sense of the word" (Shubin and Skovoroda 2012). This description, as well as all these editions, reflect the existence of two parallel narratives in the present-day Anglophone cultural space, with some narratives attempting to assimilate him into the purely Russian sociocultural tradition, while others strive to recognize his Ukrainian heritage and the unique contributions he made to Ukrainian philosophy and literature. This duality shows an intrinsic complexity in translational reading and interpretation of hybridity of cultural identities.

In fact, Skovoroda was an imperial subject and did live in Moscow and St. Petersburg for three years while serving in the imperial choir of the Russian Empress Elizabeth I. Later, for five years, he served as the musical director of a Russian mission in Hungary. After that, he returned to Kyïv and taught in Pereiaslav and Kharkiv. Despite Skovoroda's connection to the Russian empire through his professional engagements, it is crucial to resist categorizing him solely as a Russian thinker and avoid any oversimplification. In a key contribution to understanding Skovoroda's work, scholar George Shevelov aimed to dismantle oversimplified views and establish a foundation for in-depth analysis of the philosopher's language and style. Shevelov argued that Skovoroda's linguistic background was rooted in the educated circles of Sloboda Ukraine and his language, while incorporating many biblical, ecclesiastical, political, and personal references, was fundamentally rooted in the Slobozhanshchyna variety of standard Russian used by these educated classes (Shevelov 1994). This complexity highlights the challenges of untangling cultural identity within an imperial framework, where affiliation and intellectual life could intersect in nuanced ways.

RE-EXISTENCE: DECOLONIZING THROUGH TRANSLATIONAL AGENCY

As previously discussed, re-existence serves as the concluding stage of decolonial analytics, offering a critical re-evaluation of the translational contribution to decolonial resistance. To challenge and confront the proliferation of Russian imperial (including Soviet) narratives, as well as reclaim agency of Ukrainian culture, it was the Ukrainian academic diaspora in the US and Canada who started an extensive presentation of English translations of Ukrainian literature.

In 1956, amidst a period when Moscow-based foreign languages press was publishing a series of indirect translations of Ukrainian literature via Russian into English, Yar Slavutych released an English-language anthology in the US titled *Muse in Prison: Eleven Sketches of Ukrainian poets killed by Communists and Twenty-two Translations of Their Poems*, with a foreword by Clarence Manning. The collection showcased the banned poetry by Mykola Zerov, Pavlo Fylypovych, Maik Yohansen and other representatives of Ukrainian Executed Renaissance who were shot in the Sandormokh forest as prisoners of the Solovki Soviet concentration camp. George Luckyj translated stories by Mykola Khvylovy, who tragically took his own life during the Soviet purges, and published them in the 1960 volume *Stories from the Ukraine*, accompanied by his special preface. And in a few years, in 1964, *Their Land: An Anthology of Ukrainian Short Stories* edited by Michael Luchkovich, with the biographical sketches by Bohdan Krawciw and a preface by Clarence Manning, was published by Svoboda Press in Jersey City, New York. Following this, under the editorial guidance of George Luckyj, Ukrainian Academic Press presented a bilingual Ukrainian-English reader *Modern Ukrainian Short Stories* in 1973. This anthology included texts by many prominent Ukrainian 20th-century writers, among them Vasyl Stefanyk, Mykhaĭlo Kotsiubyns'kyĭ, Mykola Khvylovy and Hryhorii Kosynka. These publications, alongside others from the Ukrainian diaspora, assumed a key role in shaping a different – decolonial – narrative about Ukrainian literature, shedding light on suppressed voices and offering an in-depth representation of Ukrainian culture beyond the confines of Russian-dominated narratives. They became vehicles for intervention and recrafted perceptions of Ukrainian literary culture in the English-language contested cultural space.

CONCLUSION

I have suggested that there is value and potentiality in conceptualizing translation history as a decolonial exercise. I have also attempted to elaborate on decolonial analytics in the historical studies of translation and, in a rather cursory manner, presented a decolonial re-reading of the history of translating Ukrainian literary texts into English, pointing to the pervasive influence of Russian imperial and Soviet lens. Applying the designed four-step framework of decolonial analytics to the corpus analysis has revealed three prevalent colonial strategies: cultural appropriation, indirect translation through Russian, and emphasis on Russian or Soviet validation. These strategies underscore a deliberate and sustained effort over time by Russia to propagate in Anglophone contexts either the assertion of a common historical past with

Ukraine or the positioning of Ukraine as an integral component of a broader Russian cultural sphere.

In view of this, George Steiner reasonably argued that translation is key to understanding "referential recognition", or "larger questions of inherited meaning" (1992, 491), and it is especially relevant in the context of Ukrainian literature's representation in English translation, where linguistic and cultural features were often manipulated to serve political agendas. Considering the limited scope of the current study, future investigations might explore in more detail the long-term impacts of these colonial strategies on the reception of Ukrainian culture in the English-speaking world, as well as they could focus more on specific case studies or comparative analyses to broaden the scope of conceptual treatment of translation coloniality.

NOTES

1 The term *Ruthenian* functioned as a linguonym until the turn of the 20th century for what is now known as the Ukrainian language. In the 19th century, the Ruthenian language existed under two distinct *political* labels, Galician Ruthenian and Little Russian (the latter was used within the Russian Empire, downplaying its distinct character), though the core language remained the same. The 1876 Ems ban on using Ukrainian in print throughout the Russian Empire led to a surge of printing initiatives in Habsburg Galicia, which in turn helped solidify a unified vision of the Ruthenian (later – Ukrainian) language.

2 The Library of Congress system without diacritics is used for the Romanization from Cyrillic script.

REFERENCES

Bain, Robert Nisbet. [1894] 1916. *Cossack Fairy Tales and Folk-Tales*. Selected, ed. and trans. by Robert Nisbet Bain, illustrated by Noel Le Nisbet. London: George G. Harrap & Company.

Batchelor, Kathryn. 2014. *Decolonizing Translation: Francophone African Novels in English Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Baker, Mona, ed. 2015. *Translating Dissent: Voices From and With the Egyptian Revolution*. London and New York: Routledge.

Beresfrod, Benjamin. 1816. *The Russian Troubadour, Or A Collection of Ukranian, and Other National Melodies. Together with the Words of Each Respective Air Translated into English Verse by the Author of the German Erato, Interspersed with Several Favourite Russian Songs. Set to Music by Foreign Masters, And Translated by the Same Hand, Printed for the Translator*. London. Accessed on April 24, 2024. https://archive.org/details/RussianTroubadourBeresford1816/page/n7/mode/2up.

Bhargava, Rajeev. 2013. "Overcoming the Epistemic Injustice of Colonialism." *Global Policy* 4, 4: 413–417. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12093.

Chambers, Claire, and Ipek Demir. 2024. "Introduction: Translation in the Service of (De)colonisation." In *Translation and Decolonization: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, ed. by Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir, 1–14. London and New York: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324"9781003351986-1.

Harrison, Olivia C. 2016. "Translational Activism and the Decolonization of Culture." *Expressions maghrébines* 15, 2: 45–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/exp.2016.0021.

Hewson, Lance. 2011. *An Approach to Translation Criticism: Emma and Madame Bovary in Translation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Translation Library. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.95.

Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Ed. by Raymond van den Broeck. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Livesay, Florence Randal, ed. 1916. *Songs of Ukraina: With Ruthenian Poems*. London and Toronto: JM Dent.

Mignolo, Walter, and Catherine Walsh. 2018. *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*. Durham: Duke University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822371779.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J. 2017. "The Emergence and Trajectories of Struggles for an 'African University': The Case of Unfinished Business of African Epistemic Decolonisation." *Kronos* 43, 1: 51–77.

Odrekhivska, Iryna. 2024. "Translation as Delinking from Colonial Narratives: Oksana Zabuzhko's Fiction in English." *Black Sea Philological Journal* 4: 90–96. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/bsps-2024.4.13.

Quijano, Anibal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America." *International sociology* 15, 2: 215–232.

Ralston, William. 1872. *The Songs of the Russian People, as Illustrative of Slavonic Mythology and Russian Social Life*. London: Ellis & Green. Accessed on April 24, 2024. https://archive.org/details/songsofrussianpe00ralsuoft/page/n5/mode/2up.

Ralston, William. 1873. *Russian Folk-Tales*. London: Smith Elder & Co. Accessed on April 24, 2024. https://archive.org/details/russianfolktales00ralsrich/page/n5/mode/2up.

Ramos, Juan G., and Tara Daly, eds. 2016. *Decolonial Approaches to Latin American Literatures and Cultures*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-93358-7.

Shevchenko, Taras. 1911. *Six Lyrics from the Ruthenian of Tarás Shevchénko; Also: the Song of the Merchant Kaláshnikov, from the Russian of Mikhail Lérmontov*. Trans. by Ethel Lilian Voynich. London: Elkin Mathews.

Shevelov, George Y. 1994. "Prolegomena to Studies of Skovoroda's Language and Style." In *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles*, ed. by Richard H. Marshall and Thomas E. Bird, 93–132. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.

Shubin, Daniel, and Grigori Skovoroda. 2012. *Skovoroda: The World Tried to Catch Me but Could Not*. N. p.: Daniel H. Shubin.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2005. "Translating into English." In *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*, ed. by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, 93–110. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2021. "The Politics of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, 4th ed., ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 320–338. London and New York: Routledge.

Steiner, George. 1992. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tobi, Abraham T. 2020. "Towards a Plausible Account of Epistemic Decolonisation." *Philosophical Papers* 49, 2: 253–278. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/005568641.2020.1779602.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2000. "Translation and Political Engagement: Activism, Social Change and the Role of Translation in Geopolitical Shifts." *The Translator* 6, 1: 23–47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2000.10799054.

Voynich, Ethel Lilian. 1911. "Preface." In *Six Lyrics from the Ruthenian of Tarás Shevchénko; Also: the Song of the Merchant Kaláshnikov, from the Russian of Mikhail Lérmontov*, trans. by Ethel Lilian Voynich, 5–6. London: Elkin Mathews.

Wardrope, Alistair. 2015. "Medicalization and Epistemic Injustice." *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy* 18, 3: 341–352. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11019-014-9608-3.