

Cognition, Communication, Discourse, 2025, 31, 7-18  
<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/cognitiondiscourse>

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2025-31-01>

Received October 1, 2025; revised November 17, 2025;  
 accepted November 24, 2025; published on-line December 25, 2025

## PARATEXTS AS AN ACT FOR RESISTANCE: MYKOLA ZEROV AND RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS OF THE UKRAINIAN CANONICAL POETRY

Oryslava Bryska

PhD, Associate Professor,

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

(1 Universytetska St., Lviv, 79000, Ukraine);

e-mail: [Oryslava.bryska@lnu.edu.ua](mailto:Oryslava.bryska@lnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9732-8587>

**Article citation:** Bryska, O. (2025). Paratexts as an act for resistance: Mykola Zerov and Russian translations of the Ukrainian canonical poetry. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse*, 31, 7-18.  
<https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2025-31-01>

### Abstract

Paratexts that accompany translations are of great importance from the historical perspective as they reveal certain factors that influenced the translation presentation and perception. Their importance is even more enhanced when the original texts are of national and cultural significance. The problem acquires a set of additional variables when texts are translated into the dominant culture. The paratexts analyzed in the research are exemplary in terms of their methodology developed with the decolonizing perspective in mind in the 30s of the 20th century in Ukraine and pertain the legacy of the national Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko being translated into Russian, the language of the long-term colonizer of the Ukrainian lands upon that time. The colonial status of the Ukrainian literature as translated into Russian enhances the importance of paratexts as it was a way of steering the perception of translation which was deprived of proper objective presentation or manipulation. Authored by the leading theoretician of translation and literary studies scholar in Ukraine of the time, Mykola Zerov, the paratexts trace which colonizer's goals prevailed at which period, how the practice was implemented, and if there was a place for genuine appreciation of the genius of a poet who is a representative of the subjugated nation. The research aims to trace the specific elements of such translation paratexts relying upon the elements of colonial translation theory and sociological approach to translation.

**Keywords:** *paratexts, canonical texts, worldview, translation strategy, translator, artistic values, social significance, patronage.*

### 1. Introduction

Translation of canonical works has always been a matter of heated discussions in terms of multiple asymmetries on a variety of levels and not limited to linguistic or literary perspectives. The tendency to account for the historical context and ideological influences in translation studies has been especially prevailing recently with resort to paratexts as an essential source for such data.

Translation from Ukrainian into Russian between the 50s of the XIX century and the 30s of the 20th century is a very peculiar phenomenon. The period is marked by the drastic change of power in the region with not so much difference in the status of Ukraine as a subjugated nation as the result. However, many things have undergone radical change during this time and so has the Ukrainian literature that experienced its essential upbeat after 1905 and before communism had been established. With the fall of empire Shevchenko's perception is changed from an opposition to tsar's regime to his approval as a proletarian poet but not more than that. So, the contribution of Mykola Zerov marks

an essential move forward in this respect as he was acutely aware and very well academically informed of the role the translation can play in self-identification of Ukrainian literature and culture.

Paratext as a term was first introduced by Gerard Genette in 1982 and was more prolifically presented in his monograph *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* that became internationally available in 1997 (Genette, 1997). According to the scholar, paratexts make up an intermediary space shared by the book, author, publisher and reader (1997, p. 2). Genette differentiates between peritexts and epitexts among paratexts, where the first accompany the publication and the latter represent it as separate entities (1997, p. 4). Peritexts are represented by book titles, prefaces, afterward, notes to the texts etc., while epitexts are interviews with the author, marketing material, private letters and other pertinent elements but beyond the publication. Gennette does not address the category of translation paratexts as such with some exceptions of prefaces to translations (1997, p. 264). Among the first to mention paratexts in the field of translation was Laurence Venuti, bringing to the focus the issue of translator invisibility and the problem of titles (Venuti, 1995). Among the first scholars to mention Genette's theory in regard to translation were Urpo Kovala and Theo Hermans in 1995 and 1996. Thus, paratexts in translation studies have only later been given attention regarding their decisive role in translation presentation and perception (Pleijel & Podlevskikh Carlström, 2022; Batchelor, 2018; Gil-Bardaji et al., 2012).

The paratexts analyzed in the research are selected as exemplary in terms of their methodology developed with the decolonizing perspective in mind in the 30s of the 20th century in Ukraine and pertain the legacy of the national Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko being translated into Russian, the language of the long-term colonizer of the Ukrainian lands upon that time. They were authored by Mykola Zerov, a renowned Ukrainian literary studies scholar, translator and translation theoretician of the 10s-30s of 20th century in Ukraine, who vastly contributed to the development of translation studies by his vision of translation as a shaping factor in culture identification (Shmiher, 2008; Cherednychenko, 2015; Bryska, 2019; Kolomiyets, 2023).

The studies of Ukrainian literature perception are usually founded on the translations of a set of timelessly canonical authors such as Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko among a few others. Perception of Shevchenko's works was the subject of analysis since the time first translations appear with a separate branch "shevchenkologia" (Shevchenko studies) started by Volodymyr Koriak in 20s 20th cen. in Ukraine and profusely supported by other Ukrainian literary studies scholars, headed further by Pavlo Phylypovych, a contemporary and colleague of Mykola Zerov in his literary stance (Phylypovych, 1925).

Paratexts dedicated to the Russian translations and retranslations of the Ukrainian canonical works (Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko), chosen for the analysis, shed light on a set of important intricacies that contributed to the overall development of Ukrainian literature perception at the period of harsh colonial regime in the Ukrainian history. They are also extensively revealing in terms of the colonizer's ideology and purposes pursued by the translators into Russian. Mykola Zerov's attempts to analyse the translations of Ukrainian canonical works trace which colonizer's goals prevailed at which period, how the practice was implemented, and if there was a place for genuine appreciation of the genius of a poet who is a representative of the subjugated nation. One may refer to the paratexts as anticolonial as they indicate the cases of direct censorship and illustrate other kinds of limitations imposed that had a direct impact on the national author and culture perception within the colonizing culture preventing an objective view of it. The colonial status of the Ukrainian literature as translated into Russian enhances the importance of paratexts as it was a way of steering the perception of translation which was deprived of proper objective presentation. Thus, the methodology chosen by the author of the paratexts is illustrative of the decolonization perspective and may also be characterized as an act of resistance in the decade of Stalin's calamities.

## 2. Method

This study employs a qualitative and historically grounded approach to the analysis of paratexts that accompanied Russian translations and retranslations of canonical Ukrainian works, primarily those

of Taras Shevchenko and Ivan Franko. The methodological basis of the research is shaped at the intersection of paratextual studies (Genette, 1997; Batchelor, 2018; Gil-Bardaji et al., 2012; Pleijel & Podlevskikh Carlström, 2022), critical translation studies, and postcolonial/decolonial frameworks (Venuti, 1995; Tymoczko, 2010; Spivak, 1993), supported by the elements of sociological approach to translation (Bourdieu, 2002) as well as the theory of manipulation (Lefevere, 1992).

The paratexts under analysis are treated as in a certain way ideological documents that aimed to mediate between the Ukrainian source text, the Russian translation, and the Russian-reading public diachronically. This analysis followed the following steps: 1) contextualization of the paratexts (it was important to situate each paratext in its historical and political context); 2) paratext genre and motifs: identifying recurring motifs such as (a) framing of Shevchenko and Franko as “regional” rather than “national” authors; (b) attempts to neutralize or appropriate their political radicalism; (c) emphasis on linguistic inferiority of Ukrainian to Russian; (d) selective admiration of “folkloric” or “aesthetic” aspects at the expense of ideological content. 3) interpretive reading through a decolonial lens: evaluating whether the paratexts served as instruments of colonial domination (erasure, appropriation, censorship) or, conversely, whether they contained moments of resistance, looking for its voice in the dominant discourse, or spaces where genuine appreciation for the subjugated nation’s literary genius emerged.

Mykola Zerov’s writings on translations of Ukrainian canonical works are read as an early form of anticolonial analysis, mapping how colonial translation practices operated and where they failed to suppress Ukrainian literary agency. His methodology—often philological, contextual, and comparative—forms a key interpretive axis of this article.

### 3. Findings

The paratexts examined reveal a layered and often contradictory colonial strategy in shaping the perception of Ukrainian canonical literature when mediated through Russian translation. One may single out the following findings on the peculiarities of the anticolonial type of paratexts elaborated by Mykola Zerov as of 20s-30s of the XX century. Mykola Zerov’s anticolonial perspective in the analysed writings provides a counter-discourse to the then ongoing manipulative practices. By analyzing translation strategies in the paratexts, he identified where colonial ideology dictated interpretive frames and where translators betrayed either incompetence or unwillingness to fully engage with the original. His emphasis on fidelity to the genius of Shevchenko and Franko, prolifically supported by his awareness of imposed limitations, allows us to read his metaparatexts as acts of resistance during Stalin’s calamities. Mykola Zerov’s analyses anticipate later postcolonial critiques by showing how translation could serve both domination and resistance.

Thus, the peculiarities that were found in the paratexts were: colonial framing of the national canon, distortion of the original author’s worldview; appropriation and neutralization of the culturally unique imagery and the senses it carried; linguistic hierarchization; censorship and silencing; simplification versus genuine admiration strategies.

### 4. Discussion

#### 4.1. Historical context in translation perception as presented in the paratexts with decolonizing perspective

Mykola Zerov’s works on translations from Ukrainian reflect a peculiar selection of goals. He is interested in what preconditioned the choices made by the Russian translators both in terms of the selection of originals and translation strategies. Another criterion of translator’s activity characteristics is the resources they resort to, based on their understanding of the original author’s individual style and worldview presentation. If taken within the boundaries of colonial interpretation and manipulation theory, the translator’s activity is presented in view of the patronage and censorship policies.

The significance of Shevchenko’s and Franko’s canonical legacy to the understanding of Ukrainian culture and literature as independent unites was consistently opposed in line with the

policies of political dominance of the Russian culture over the Ukrainian. The censorship lens was of different character throughout the period characterized by Mykola Zerov – between 1870s and 1930s, hence the research was very apt and significant as it was revealing which translators and to which extent were dependent on the dominant poetics and what was the ideological grounding for it. Thus, the goal of the critic was to provide the characteristics of the poet's literary style and the level of its reproduction in translation and to comment on the extent of original's interpretation both in terms of the scope of ideas represented and the artistic value (translation strategies). Not less important is the perception by the Russian reader as the result of certain patronage policies.

Serving as a continuation of the profound historical and literary analysis of Taras Shevchenko's and Ivan Franko's creative legacy conducted and presented earlier in his works, a translation studies analysis of Shevchenko's poetry in the Russian language becomes a distinctive endeavor by Mykola Zerov, not to mention the historical period it appeared in – the beginning of the 1930s – period of worsening colonial terror and conversion of Shevchenko into a proletarian poet. Both Shevchenko-related paratexts utilize diachronic analysis to illustrate the achievements and shortcomings of the translations. In the case of the preface to F. Solohub's translation collection – it is an overview of all major endeavors in presenting Shevchenko's legacy to the Russian culture starting from 1870s until 1930s.

The most illustrative in terms of canonical works reproduction are Mykola Zerov's works on Russian translations of Taras Shevchenko's poetry and one of Ivan Franko's. Among them there is an article, published in the Ukrainian journal "Life and Revolution" ("Zhyttia i revolutsiya") in 1930 in Kyiv as a tribute to one of the most prolific and dedicated Russian translators of Shevchenko's poetry into Russian Ivan Bielousov under the title "Ivan Bielousov - the Russian Translator of Kobzar" (Ivan Bielousov, rosiyskyi perekладач "Kobzaria" ) (Zerov, 1930/2003, pp. 773–783); a preface to the collection of selected poetry by Taras Shevchenko translated by Fiodor Solohub published in Saint-Petersburgh in 1934, with a thorough overview of all the previous translations into Russian and titled "Shevchenko's "Kobzar" in Russian Translations" ("Kobzar" Shevchenko v russikh perevodah") (Zerov, 1934/2003, pp. 1000–1028). The preface was published under the name of M. Novytskyi, the author known in Russian publishing industry at the time. The authorship of Mykola Zerov was attributed by Viacheslav Briukhovetsky only many years later (Briukhovetskyi, 1990). One more text scrutinized is a review of the Russian translation of Ivan Franko's "Moses" done by translator V. Diatlov that was published in a literary periodical "The Bookman" ("Knyhar") as a critical overview right after the translation publication within the first series of the library for those in the captivity in 1918.

The preface was published in 1934 – a time of severe terror in Russia-occupied lands, Holodomor, and persecution of all those involved in seeking Ukrainian identity recognition. On the other hand, the preface accompanied already a major accomplishment in the retranslation of Shevchenko's legacy publication into Russian. One might assume it was time to recognize the genius of his creativity, and it appeared to Mykola Zerov as one of the finer quality translations of Shevchenko's poetry into Russian so far. But it was one of the first publications during the communist regime, which was eagerly manipulating key Shevchenko's ideas about equality and an all-embracing Slavonic nation. These features are not traced by the author of the preface, however, he does provide the characteristics of the deviations that point to the fact of manipulation I will attend to further in this article. The very acceptance of Shevchenko's poetry new retranslation was another milestone and needed proper presentation.

The article dedicated to Ivan Bielousov is also a diachronic review, but of the life-long dedication of the poet to Shevchenko's genius and is written for the Ukrainian target audience. The article is an appreciation of the extended effort invested to Shevchenko's perception in Russia but is not limited to that. Despite a very thorough and exhaustive overview of the translator's activity and external characteristics of the contribution to Shevchenko's translated poetry the article in its second half is dedicated to the analysis of the translations artistic value. It follows similar theoretical grounds

as Mykola Zerov's other critical writings and offers tangible conclusions for translators of nationally significant poetry. Mykola Zerov lists the most essential difficulties that arise in the process. Among them he mentions 1) poetic syntax and phraseology enriched by the sources of folklore and biblical origin; 2) mastery of Shevchenko's versification technique that is characterized as strongly structured rhyme (14-syllabus or 11-syllabus verse, divided into two lines with a stressed but not fixed syllable each), aesthetically appealing euphony composed of subtle alliterations and assonances; 3) rhythmic specificity reflected in multiple enjambments; 4) lexical abundance of culture-specific stylistic devices. The translator is presented as the one who compiled at least five collections of Shevchenko's poems – in the years of 1900, 1906, 1911, 1918 and 1919, which means the contribution is unequivocal in terms of the selection of poetry and their number as well as due to the apt period of time, when the censorship restrictions were lifted almost entirely (Zerov, 1930/2003, pp.773–783).

The review to Ivan Franko's epic poem is presented with quite a similar scheme of analysis dedicated to the complexities posed by the original form and style, though it is much more limited in scale and does not attend to the diachronic overview of the author's translations or collections into Russian. However, this paratext is also revealing in terms of the level of a translator's mastery and original in-depth understanding.

There are two divergent cultural policies that the translators of Shevchenko as of 1934 worked under – the one that was implemented by tsarist ideology and the one by communist. Both utilized censorship as tool to control the cultural dissemination of Ukrainian literature to a large extent with the difference in the character of the action. The tsarist policy was rather overt, openly banning the use of the name of the nation and territory, publishing of anything related to or in Ukrainian overall. The communist policy was covert. It was proclaimed as the one advocating for equal rights of all the nationalities presented in the Soviet Union, though with open prohibition of anything that seems to be elite (so called "bourgeois" by character). So, anything that was classified as high culture or highly intellectual fell under latter category and was deemed unacceptable. Thus, the policy welcomed anything Ukrainian but that was to be dedicated to or about the poor, low profile, socially unprotected etc. Translators working in the years between the establishment of the two practices are marked by the feature of the most exhaustive range of the poetry by Shevchenko, though are still under the influence of Russian culture dominance.

Censorship during the tsarist rigid regime is presented in the paratext by the cases of Nikolai Herbel and Nikolai Chmyriov, whose collections of Shevchenko's poetry translations appeared in 60–70s of the 19th century (Zerov, 1934/2003, pp. 1003–1007). The constraints pertained to the selection of poems; thus, the genre of socio-political poems was banned from being translated, presenting Shevchenko mostly as a lyric poems author, far from being a voice of the nation. Chmyriov's translation contribution (of 1874) is considered to be more stylistically coherent with some poems evaluated as one of the most successful for that period. However, with the limitations still in force, the choice of poems for translation does not exceed further than the elegies, while the epic poems of substantial socio-political value are still left out. The appreciation of the translator's style amounts to the fact that the mastery of N. Chmyriov is higher than Herbel's and thus more representative of the original's literary value of poetics.

Later 70s and 80s 19th present a stagnation in Shevchenko's poetry translation, as in any other Ukrainian-related activity due to Emsk and Valuyev Ukases of 1876 and 1863 by which the Russian tsar Alexander II prohibited the printing in the Ukrainian language of any original works or translations. However, the following attempts, starting at the end of 1880s and during the following twenty-five years brought about a dedicated advocate appreciative of Shevchenko's poetic legacy I. Bielousov, whose first collection was twice as big in volume as the latter one (Zerov, 1934/2003, pp. 1007–1010). The article analyzed here presents him as one of the most prolific translators of Shevchenko's poetry in terms of the range and number of works presented. Though this was a transition period in the empire, the case is quite illustrative how the dominant poetics is not able to exert the influence on those able to identify and attempt to reproduce the originality of the source

texts, regardless of its author's origin. However, this is where Mykola Zerov signified the importance of poetic mastery in embracing the original's value and its decent reproduction, which was the case of Bielousov. Mykola Zerov underlines that his approach towards translation strategy of total loyalty to the original text may be not sufficient in reproducing the source text author's poetics, where the lack of mastery may take toll. On the other hand, the approach is presented positively in terms of consistent deviation from the dominant Russian poetics. The texts are devoid of the bookishness and unnecessary embellishments, which were quite frequently resorted to by other translators of Shevchenko's poetry.

The remaining part of transitioning period presents Maksim Slavinskii and Ivan Koltonovskii, who were working in a tandem and combined their effort in both providing even wider selection of poems. Their first collection of 1911 exceeded even the one by Bielousov in the same year. The attempt is mentioned to be positively accepted even by the Ukrainian critics. It is characterized by Mykola Zerov as being stylistically more diverse and avoids blind following of the dominant poetics, with colonizer's ideology still in force after the collapse of tsarist regime (Zerov, 1934/2003, pp. 1010–1014).

The collection of translations by Fiodor Solohub introduced by the preface under analysis presents an attempt by the translator made during the period of the deeply established communist regime, tightening its grip on the culture of subjugated nations. This fact predetermined a need to establish the new perception of Shevchenko's poetry – as an opponent of imperialism and an advocate of the masses. Mykola Zerov covertly explains the fact by indicating the translator's motivation for socio-political poem selection and clear avoidance of any biblical elements of the text. Thus, the historical context in this kind of paratexts is often fundamental in clarifying what the motivation of texts selection and strategies there was in this or that case.

#### **4.2. Canonical author worldview presentation**

The attempts of translation of Shevchenko's and Franko's poetry are generally characterized in terms of their ability to embrace the author's worldview and reproduce the key features of the original author's style. By undertaking the diachronic approach in his analysis of the translations the critic establishes that decisive for the worldview presentation is the selection of works in terms of the genres and their socio-political significance. This aspect is referred to by Mykola Zerov as an outer characteristic of the translator's activity, while an analysis of the approach undertaken is presented as the inner value and is accompanied with a set of text samples to illustrate it.

The worldview of the original author carrying a national significance demands profound research and interpretation from both literary and social perspectives. When the culture the works are translated to is dominant, this aspect is of even more grave importance since it carries the conduit of ideas a colonized nation relates to and identifies itself with. Mykola Zerov dedicates a substantial part of the preface to tell that during the first period of Shevchenko's legacy translation into Russian multifaceted selection of poetry and their distribution within the collection are often insufficient and poor to be able to illustrate the variety of ideas and resources that the original author utilized to communicate his worldview.

One of the brightest examples of Shevchenko's worldview distorted presentation in the preface is changing the versification forms he applied. Most of the translators at that period believed he utilized pure folklore versification techniques while in fact they are a mixture of folk songs and psalms as well as other genres deeply rooted into the lore and Christian literature. Shevchenko was motivated to cover the themes that were related to the people of his social layer, which made him a people's spokesman in front of the dominant powers. Thus, any attempts to translate his poetry by the Russian lore versification techniques or to use bookish solemn versification techniques that were popular in Russian literature at that time were characterized as doomed to failure in terms of the original reproduction and completely deprived the verses of their socially significant sounding. Such approaches as well as total lack of poems dedicated to socially and politically significant topics in the

first collections are openly presented by Mykola Zerov as the policy of censorship (Zerov, 1934/2003, pp. 1002–1003). Hence, the obvious underestimation of his genius and worldview during 1870s–1890s.

The dominant literary society representatives in Russian empire make up a bright example of the literary elite that ruled on which products were to be allowed into the culture and which not. As pinpointed by Zerov, during Shevchenko's life and for the following fifteen years after his death Russian elite was hardly acquainted with the whole range of the poetry due to fact of censored mentioning of Ukraine and anything related to it. They were convinced that Shevchenko was a mediocre poet, using folklore in his poetry, dedicated mainly to nature and life of the poor. To prove the fact, Mykola Zerov mentions that the first published translated poem was one by the representative of a smaller literary circle in Russia, N. Herbel, and was presented without mentioning an original author's name whatsoever. Herbel is also claimed to have authored three collections of poems by Shevchenko, but among the verses he presented were small-scale genres - songs and ballads only. According to Mykola Zerov, Herbel's habitus limited his interpretation of Shevchenko's worldview to the one similar of Mykola Hohol and Yevhen Hrebinka whose creativity was well known to him due to their tilting to the Russian literary tradition and romantic worldview. Meanwhile, such characteristics were scarcely present only in part of Shevchenko's poems written during the initial period in his creative life, hence the worldview presentation was distorted.

Thus, the selection of originals through the period of about eighty years of history of Shevchenko's poetry perception in Russian in the preface is claimed as decisive in terms of national author worldview presentation and is substantiated by Mykola Zerov in the following way: 1) for proper understanding of the socio-historical aspect of the significance of the creative work and its reproduction in the process of translation; 2) for well-rounded interpretation of the author's views by the target reader; 3) for the proper arrangement of the works in the translation collection, as the evolution of thought, imagery, or worldview takes place from poem to poem (Zerov, 1930/2003). The censorship practice resulted in poor choice of works during the first attempts at translation into Russian, namely narrowing down to the verses dedicated to nature and those closely related to folklore tradition, which gave a distorted understanding of his contribution and were far from revealing the canonicity of Shevchenko's legacy. This predetermined quite a belated acceptance of Shevchenko's genius by the Russian reader in the tsarist state.

As suggested by Mykola Zerov, censorship was not the only reason for poor selection and presentation of verses to Russians. It was also a superficial understanding of the original by the translators and their inability to identify the socially significant ideas or stylistics used to enhance them and what's more to reproduce them – the kind of poetry was simply not available in their literature at that time. Thus, it often manifested itself as an indeliberate smoothing over of the sharpness of the socio-political and prophetic content of Taras Shevchenko's poetry and not only distorted the worldview motives embedded by the original author but also diminished the artistic and ideological value of the text (Zerov, 1930/2003). The overall tendency to manipulate the translation for the benefit of the colonizer is quite clearly stated in the following statement by Mykola Zerov: “The translators (...) were not always inclined to highly evaluate the poetic value of Shevchenko: tended to see in his “imperfect” rhymes a sign of improper education, and in their schoolish sense of self-perfection, in their translations corrected him, left his delicate melody and play of intonations unnoticed (...)” (Zerov, 1934/2003, p. 1015).

#### **4.3. Translation strategy analysis as a decisive factor in proper presentation of an author and the literary genius**

The discussion of a translation strategy is key in defining the quality of translation. As mentioned before, Mykola Zerov is determined that the reproduction of the resources reflecting the author's worldview is decisive in ensuring a proper quality of such translation. The issue is chosen to be presented through the lens of strategies used to tackle the original artistic value and it remains in the focus in each case of retranslation characterized by Mykola Zerov.

The most prolific part is dedicated to versification as it is one of the most complicated stumbling blocks for the translators of Shevchenko's poetry. Mykola Zerov's major idea is that even those who can trace it are not able to translate it to the extent needed. Not to mention sustain the recognition of the genius representative of the country under colonization. Deliberate change of the versification techniques is claimed to have resulted in the texts of bookish and cliche type of literature, not of particular interest for the target audience.

Mykola Zerov also analyzes the reproduction of the stylistic register of the original text in direct correlation with its semantic content. Particular attention is paid to capturing the widest possible range of formal and poetic features of the original, asserting that success in translation can only be achieved when the versification principles of the poetic work are correctly identified and maximally preserved in the translation. Overall, Mykola Zerov devotes considerable attention to the interpretation of this issue concerning Shevchenko's poetry since the versification technique by Taras Shevchenko was often mistakenly considered technically imperfect and simplistic leading to a lack of adequate requirements for its reproduction. This aspect is of utmost importance due to its connection with the content, as the size of the poem and its variations within a single work often serve to emphasize changes in mood or tone and acquiring significant expressive meaning. Thus, Mykola Zerov places this criterion among the most significant in the process of analyzing translations of Taras Shevchenko's works and substantiates the high level of versification peculiarities in Shevchenko's poetic legacy. The translation of F. Solohub that the preface is written for is recognized by Mykola Zerov as the best one in terms of reproducing the expressiveness of Shevchenko's poetry as well as its more or less tangible coherence with the stylistic plane of the original but in the way that is relevant for the translator's mastery, thus compensating for the losses in one's idiolect (Zerov, 1934/2003).

A similar approach can be observed regarding the intonational contour of the text and euphony. These aspects directly influence the artistic and aesthetic impression of poetry, and therefore, its reception largely depends on how deeply the translator senses the intonational changes and reproduces them in the target text. Euphony, by its nature, is extremely language-dependent and complex to identify in the translation process, thus the appropriate level of its reproduction or compensation in a translation demonstrates the translator's high level of skill. According to Mykola Zerov, the translations by F. Sologub significantly surpass others in this aspect and therefore possess more adequate artistic and aesthetic value than the previous one concerning the original (Zerov, 1934/2003).

Other obvious obstacles the translators faced were Ukrainian realia, phraseology, syntax, folklore elements, euphony, and solemnity of his revolutionary poems, where he utilized the prophecy elements and biblical terms. Thus, Mykola Zerov delineates the inability of the translators to tackle the challenges on one hand, and their intentional removal of certain elements of Ukrainian origin and unnecessary embellishment of the verses by the Russian elements on the other.

Translator's idiosyncrasy is usually highlighted as defining in regard to the strategies the translators chose for rendering Shevchenko's poetry into Russian and are allocated to the influence of literary tendencies in the target culture. Not only was it limiting in presenting the worldview of Shevchenko as mentioned earlier but it also reflected on the resources utilized. According to Mykola Zerov, Herbel, working within the framework of this literary movement, often deviated from the original Shevchenko's text, transforming its stylistics, since only a portion of Taras Shevchenko's poetic works can be categorized within the framework of Romanticism style. Additionally, Mykola Zerov pinpoints the deliberate transcription of lexical elements from the original text. The consequence of such Ukrainianization of the Russian text is a stylistic reduction of the work and an introduction of unnecessary pejorative connotations, thereby diminishing the artistic and aesthetic value of the text. Herbel also leaves untranslated the lexemes that have direct counterparts in the Russian language, such as "zhyto/жито" (rye), "sviekrukha/свекруха" (mother-in-law), "zhinka/жінка" (woman), and "ochipok/очіпок" (headscarf), which further stipulated for the Ukrainian lexical items acquisition of some negative low-key connotations (Zerov, 1934/2003, p. 1005). As summarized by Mykola Zerov, the language of the translation resembles a certain massed-up mixture of Russian and Ukrainian, making it sound like a kind of dialect, obviously deprived of artistic value.

Despite the linguistic proximity between the original and translated languages, rendering a non-equivalent lexicon poses an almost insurmountable challenge for the translators of Taras Shevchenko's works. Particularly, the symbolism derived from the folklore layer of the text serves as a direct instrument for conveying its ideological and artistic content. Mykola Zerov examines specific techniques employed to address these elements, highlighting how each method affects the nature of the translated text, including its artistic and aesthetic value, as well as the reception of the cultural foundation of the work. Thus, Mykola Zerov elaborates on the importance of maintaining consistency in the chosen strategy, while allowing for a certain neutralization of the everyday component in favor of the emotional depth of poetry (Zerov, 1934/2003, p. 1019).

It is worth noting that during that period, Ukrainian translation studies embraced somewhat liberal views regarding the reproduction of specific elements found in Ukrainian texts. For instance, Ivan Franko, being a prominent writer, translator, and critic, authored a few research works on the German translation of Shevchenko's poems. He distinguishes between canonical and non-canonical works, attributing national significance to the former, which includes Taras Shevchenko's works. Franko identifies two approaches to their interpretation: 1) a free interpretation of the text while preserving formal characteristics to maintain simplicity and melodic expression, which undeniably influences the reader's impression of the work; 2) a meticulous reproduction of the text at the expense of disregarding the rhythm and rhyme of the original. Regarding translations of Taras Shevchenko's works into German, Ivan Franko leans towards a certain relaxation of the requirements for faithful rendering of the formal and stylistic peculiarities of the original in favor of the conceptual correspondence between the original and the translation of canonical works (Franko, 1983, pp. 520–530). However, one is to pinpoint it was not an approach that Mykola Zerov would support, laying a substantial emphasis on the stylistic side of the text reproduction being closely intertwined with the ideas expressed, underpinning their significance for the author and the nation he represents.

The reproduction of poetic syntax from the original is another task among the most challenging in the translation process of the works. Mykola Zerov acknowledges that losses are inevitable in poetic translation, and thus, successfully preserving the leading elements of this genre is a notable achievement (Zerov, 1918/2003). Interestingly, when comparing translators' achievements in reproducing this aspect, the critic asserts the decisive role of poetic syntax in classifying the text within the translation genre, whether it is a translation or an adaptation. Overall, revolutionary ideas, directed against the ruling regime, both in Shevchenko's and Franko's poetry, are often presented in epic poems that stylistically utilized biblical lexical and syntactic means as well as certain prophetic concepts, solemn figures, and images, even the plot as is the fact with "Moses". Resorting to biblical texts and tools is also a feature of canonicity and thus demands higher expertise to be reproduced.

The article under analysis presents a vivid example of the translator's inability to grasp and reproduce the artistic quality of the original. Though being quite complementary and positive in terms of the years dedicated to the legacy of the Ukrainian national poet, the paper provides quite a critical presentation of his achievements in rendering the poetry, admitting his limited artistic resources as a poet. Among the strategies he follows, the slavish following of the original is traced by Mykola Zerov most often, which, however, is not devoid of its flaws as a result (Zerov, 1930/2003, pp. 773–783). Meanwhile, Shevchenko's worldview and the selection of poetry for translation is by no means an effort in the direction of Shevchenko's appreciation and thus Mykola Zerov lays an essential emphasis on Bielousov's role in expanding and significantly enriching Russian readers' reception of Shevchenko's legacy and its quality.

Another sample of limited understanding of the original is presented in the review. As the poem is highly symbolic and representative of Franko's national and political views, summarizing his position, the preface could be key in establishing its role. The translation which is the subject of this paratext is indeed accompanied by two introductions – of the original author's (also translated into Russian) and the translator's one. However, Mykola Zerov points to the irrelevance of certain ideas mentioned in the translator's one. The critic is at times very much opposed to the way the nationally significant poem is presented, particularly the simplification of its ideological character. Thus,

Mykola Zerov's review of the translation touches upon the ideology behind the author's work as well as its artistic value (Zerov, 1918/2003, pp. 223–226).

### 5. Conclusions

According to Mykola Zerov, the aim of a translator of canonical works is to ensure a well-rounded original author worldview presentation, which largely depends on the translation strategy selected. Overall, it was a combined effort of censorship practices as well as poor level of mastery of the translators in their ability to identify the senses and worldview of a great Ukrainian that yielded the underestimation and belated acceptance of Shevchenko's genius by the Russian reader in the infancy period of Shevchenko's poetry reception. In this respect the paratexts signify the idea of a translator's idiom playing an essential role in achieving the needed level of original's interpretation. The level of the translator's mastery is another essential component of the analysis as well as the scrutiny of compensation techniques on the relevant level. Those are mentioned as techniques to withstand the dominant poetics taking over the originality of the source text, which is often a case in such asymmetric interrelations. Censorship and colonial influences of the cultural practices were mostly manifested in the limited choice of originals for translation which was far from being representative of the key motifs of the originals for quite a while. Overall, the appropriate degree of reproduction of the historical and cultural context is stated as one of the most significant characteristics when presenting translated works of national significance, according to Mykola Zerov. Based on the analyzed examples one can assume that successful attempts of translation at the time were those that even under the censored conditions managed to reproduce a set of core idiom features of the original author and/or of the source text, which in its turn was largely dependent on the literary mastery of a translator and their ability to grasp the scope.

The paratexts analyzed pinpoint the fact that translations or retraductions of texts canonical to some cultures are to be accompanied by the paratexts due to a variety of factors of linguistic and social character. Translating into the culture of a colonizer makes it even more acute necessity. The paratexts are fully capable of steering and shaping the presentation and perception of a certain literature and culture in another context, if allowed. The study revealed the following peculiarities of the paratexts of anticolonial type: colonial framing of the national canon, distortion of the original author's worldview; appropriation and neutralization of the culturally unique imagery and the senses it carried; linguistic hierarchization; censorship and silencing; simplification versus genuine admiration strategies.

The cases under analysis proved that the lack of paratexts prevented acceptance and appreciation of the authors at earlier periods and that it was largely deliberately done due to the cultural practices undertaken by the colonizer. In the cases of translations from the culture of the colonized, it is the context and the idiom that are to be an essential component of the analysis paratext as they are revealing of the influences exerted and the extent of independence the translator could afford. Further studies of the paratexts that belong to the colonial period in Ukrainian literature might provide quite prolific evidence as to the efforts undertaken to steer the national literature presentation abroad.

### Declaration of competing interests

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest or funding for this research.

### References

- Batchelor, K. (2018). *Translation and paratexts*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). Habitus. In J. Hillier & E. Rooksby (Eds.), *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 27–34). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Briukhovetskyi, V. (1990). *Mykola Zerov: The literary and critical essay*. Kyiv: Radianskyi pysmennyk. (in Ukrainian).
- Брюховецький, В. *Микола Зеров: літературно-критичний нарис*. Київ: Радянський письменник.

Bryksa, O. (2019). Mykola Zerov's view of translation as a history of national identity shaping. In L. Harmon & D. Osuchowska (Eds.), *National identity in translation* (pp. 43–51). Berlin : Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b16040> 2019

Cherednychenko, O. (2015). The metr of the Ukrainian translation (on 125th anniversary of Mykola Zerov). *The Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University in Kyiv*, (1), 6–9. Retrieved from <https://surli.cc/fhizgi> (in Ukrainian).

Чередниченко, О. (2015). Метр українського перекладу (до 125-річчя з дня народження Миколи Зерова). *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка*, (1), 6–9.

Franko, I. (1983). Shevchenko in German. In M. T. Yatsenko (Ed.), *Collection of works: in 50 volumes* (Vol. 38, pp. 520–530). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (in Ukrainian).

Франко, І. (1983). Шевченко по-німецьки. М. Т. Яценко (ред.), *Зібрання творів: у 50 т.*, (Т. 38, с. 520–530). Київ: Наукова думка.

Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* (Vol. 20). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gil-Bardají, A., Orero, P., & Rovira-Esteva, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Translation peripheries: Paratextual elements in translation*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Kolomiyets, L. (2023). Between censorship and nation building: the first Ukrainian lecture courses on translation studies from a historical perspective. In M. Djovčoš, M. Kusa, I. Hostova, & E. Perez, *Translation studies in Ukraine as an integral part of the European context* (pp. 63–89). Bratislava: VEDA, Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.31577/2023.978022420150>

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. London and New York: Routledge.

Phylypovych, P. (1925). For the study of Shevchenko and his time. In P. Phylypovych (Ed.), *Shevchenko and his time*. Volume 1 (pp. 7–37). (in Ukrainian).

Филипович, П. (1925). До студіювання Шевченка та його доби. П. Филипович (ред.), *Шевченко та його доба. Збірник перший* (с. 7–37). Київ: Державне видавництво України.

Pleijel, R., & Podlevskikh Carlström, M. (Eds.). (2022). *Paratexts in translation*. Berlin: Frank & Timme. <https://doi.org/10.26530/20.500.12657/58048>

Spivak, G. C. (1993). The politics of translation. In *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (pp. 179–200). New York: Routledge.

Shmilher, T. V. (2008). *History of Ukrainian translation studies in the 20th century: Key issues and periodization* (Doctoral dissertation). Kyiv: AKD. Retrieved from: <https://dissertation.com.ua/node/673808> (in Ukrainian).

Шмігер, Т. В. (2008). *Історія українського перекладознавства ХХ сторіччя: ключові проблеми та періодизація* (Дис. канд. наук). Київ: АКД.

Tymoczko, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Translation, resistance, activism*. Amherst, Boston, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility. A history of translation*. London: Routledge.

Zerov, M. (1918/2003). Ivan Franko "Moses" [Review]. In M. Sulima (Ed.), *Ukrainian writings* (pp. 223–226). Kyiv: Osnovy. (in Ukrainian).

Зеров, М. (1918/2003). Іван Франко «Мойсей» [Рецензія]. *Українське письменство/упоряд. М. Сулима* (с. 773–784). Київ: «Основи».

Zerov, M. (1930/2003). Ivan Bielousov. The Russian translator of *Kobzar*. In M. Sulima (Ed.), *Ukrainian writings* (pp. 773–783). Kyiv: Osnovy. (in Ukrainian).

Зеров, М. (1930/2003). Іван Белоусов. Російський перекладач «Кобзаря». *Українське письменство/упоряд. М. Сулима* (с. 773–784). Київ: «Основи».

Zerov, M. (1934/2003). Shevchenko's *Kobzar* in Russian translations. In M. Sulima (Ed.), *Ukrainian writings* (pp. 1000–1028). Kyiv: Osnovy. (in Ukrainian).

Зеров, М. (1934/2003). «Кобзарь» Шевченко в русских переводах. *Українське письменство/упоряд. М. Сулима* (с. 1000–1028). Київ: «Основи».

## ПАРАТЕКСТИ ЯК АКТ НЕПОКОРИ: МИКОЛА ЗЕРОВ І РОСІЙСЬКІ ПЕРЕКЛАДИ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ КАНОНІЧНОЇ ПОЕЗІЇ

Ориєніла Бриська

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка

(1, Університетська вул, Lviv, 79000, Україна);

e-mail: [Oryslava.brynska@lnu.edu.ua](mailto:Oryslava.brynska@lnu.edu.ua)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9732-8587>

Рукопис надійшов 1.10.2025; отримано після доопрацювання 17.11.2025; прийнято до друку 24.11.2025;  
опубліковано онлайн 25.12.2025

### Анотація

Паратексти, що супроводжують переклади, мають неабияке значення в історичній перспективі, адже виявляють чинники впливу на презентацію та сприйняття перекладу. Їхня роль стає ще вагомішою, коли звертаємося до перекладів творів національно-культурної ваги. Проте переклади мовою культури колонізатора вимагають дещо іншої методології аналізу. У розвідці розглядаються паратексти авторства Миколи Зерова, провідного літератора, перекладача і перекладознавця, створені в 20-30-і роки 20 ст., які присвячені перекладам творів Тараса Шевченка та Івана Франка російською, мовою колонізатора українських земель та культурного надбання українського народу. Аналізовані праці вказують на колоніальний статус української літератури в російських перекладах різних періодів, що підкреслює значну роль паратекстів для цільового читача, адже стають орієнтирами у сприйнятті того, що було оригінально авторським і не зазнало об'єктивного відтворення чи стало об'єктом маніпуляції. Праці є показовими щодо їхнього деколонізаційного характеру і дають можливість простежити мету перекладів кожного аналізованого періоду, практики та стратегії, що застосовувалися в різні періоди, і чи справді було непідробне зацікавлення генієм поетів підневільної нації. Метою даної розвідки є з'ясувати провідні компоненти таких паратекстів у підході Миколи Зерова, виокремити особливості перекладних канонічних текстів, які він вважав найвагомішими для належного відтворення і сприйняття цільовим читачем, а також простежити методологію аналізу перекладацької стратегії із врахуванням соціальних та політичних чинників. Дослідження з'ясовує особливості таких паратекстів з перспективи теорії колоніального перекладу, а також у руслі соціологічного підходу.

**Ключові слова:** паратекст, канонічний текст, світогляд, перекладацька стратегія, переклада, художня цінність, соціальне значення, патронаж.

### Декларація про конфлікт інтересів

Авторка не має конфлікту інтересів щодо цієї статті.