

# Soviet ideological and puritanical censorship of Ukrainian literary translations

NATALIIA RUDNYTSKA

---

DOI: 10.31577/WLS.2024.16.3.2

© Institute of World Literature  
Slovak Academy of Sciences

© Nataliia Rudnytska 2024

Licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

## Soviet ideological and puritanical censorship of Ukrainian literary translations

Ideological censorship. Ukrainian SSR. Literary translation. Ideologemes.  
Manipulation.

The article explores censorship of literary translations in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, delineating political and ideological modes and demonstrating the ideological underpinning of the puritanical mode. It describes the censorial system in the Ukrainian SSR as determined by the general goal of Soviet censorship and the local context. It then examines the censorship practices on the textual level in Ukrainian translations of novels by British and North American authors and highlights the variability of translations of the Soviet period.

---

Nataliia Rudnytska  
English Department  
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy  
Kyiv  
Ukraine  
rudnytska\_nn2010@ukr.net  
ORCID: 0000-0003-4596-8747

The aim of this article is to dwell on the category of ideological censorship in the Soviet context, to demonstrate the censorial tactics employed by this kind of censorship in Ukrainian translations, and to highlight the differences between the Ukrainian and Russian translations of the Soviet period. Censorship had a multifaceted impact on translated literature in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR; Baer 2022; Blium 2008; Rudnytska 2022; Sherry 2015; Witt 2011). Although in different “Soviet republics” it had the identical goal, its tasks also depended on local contexts, as it was in the Baltic States (Maskaliūnienė and Juršėnaitė 2023; Monticelli and Lange 2014) and Ukraine (Strilkha 2006; Kalnychenko and Kolomyiets 2022).

However, the system of ideological censorship of literary translations in the Ukrainian SSR (UkSSR) has not been sufficiently studied. Besides, “the terminological confusion associated with ‘ideology’” could not but influence the examining of the expression of ideology in translation (Faucett and Munday 2009, 137), and there is still a certain ambiguity associated with the ideological vs. political factors in the research of censorship of literary translations of the Soviet period. The case studies below, based on Ukrainian and Russian translations of novels by the British and North American authors John Galsworthy, Jack London, J. D. Salinger, Theodor Dreiser, and Ernest Hemingway which were available in the UkSSR, will focus on censorship practices on the textual level, including the use of ideologemes and the excision, substitution, or addition of fragments of text.

### THE CENSORIAL SYSTEM IN THE UKRAINIAN SSR

The eastern and central regions of Ukraine became part of the Soviet Union in 1922. That year a censorial body, directly subordinate to the People’s Commissariat of Education of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR), was created in the UkSSR – the Central Administration for Publishing Affairs. Such subordination contradicted to the Constitution of the UkSSR of 1919 and was objected to by the local government (Babiukh 2004, 81), so the Ukrainian Administration was made formally independent although its functions were identical to those of the Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs (the so-called Glavlit)<sup>1</sup> in Moscow. In 1925, however, the name of the body was changed to the Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs of the UkSSR (“Ukrholovlit”), and the three-tier management system identical to the Moscow Glavlit was developed: the Main Administration, oblast administrations, rayon/city administrations. The task of Ukrholovlit was to provide “politico-ideological, military and economic control over the published or broadcast literary works, manuscripts, books, posters, pictures, etc.”<sup>2</sup> (Postanova VTsVK 1931, 34).

Ukrholovlit was to ban works containing anti-Soviet propaganda, state secrets, pornography, or inciting ethnic strife (Goriaeva 1997). The latter – the national issue – became of paramount importance in the UkSSR after 1928, when the new course aimed at a “mutual enrichment” of languages and literatures of the “Soviet peoples” was launched, which in fact meant cultural homogenization and Russification with heavy domination of *Russian* translations of Western literatures and translations of *Russian* literature into the other languages spoken in the USSR (see Rudnytska

2022). Another factor that had a huge impact on Ukrainian literary translation was the state campaign against “bourgeois nationalism”, which also was supposed to play a role in Russification (for details see Kalnychenko and Kolomiyets 2022).

The western Ukrainian territories were occupied by the USSR in 1939, and the same policy in the sphere of translation as existed previously in the rest of Ukraine was introduced: the nationalization of publishing houses and introduction of censorship. Many local publishing houses and periodicals were closed, such as the *Dilo* newspaper in Lviv (1880–1939), which had published Ukrainian translations of works by American, British, French, German, and Russian authors, both on its pages and as book series.

Although censorial pressure was relaxed to a certain extent after Stalin’s death in 1953, the system of censorial control did not undergo significant changes until the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 (Fedotova 2009, 3).

### IDEOLOGICAL CENSORSHIP OF LITERARY TRANSLATIONS

Describing the censorship of domestic Soviet literature, Herman Ermolaev (1997, xiii) delineates puritanical censorship (concerning “sex, gore, foul language, offensive odours, unpleasant appearance, bad manners, uncleanness and certain parts and functions of the human body”) and political censorship (concerning the Party policy and the regime in general, the portrayal of certain figures and events, etc.). Building upon his framework in the analysis of Russian translations, Samantha Sherry defines a third type of censorial intervention – *ideological* censorship concerning “the ideological significance of particular linguistic items, which have been termed ‘ideologemes’” (2015, 8). However, such an approach – when Soviet puritanical censorship is examined as independent from ideology, and ideological censorship is limited to the manipulations or exclusions of ideologemes – testifies to an insufficient understanding of Soviet ideology and its pervasiveness. As we remember, the main aim of the Soviet censorial system was “politico-ideological” control, and it makes sense to dwell on these two components in greater detail.

An analysis of censorship of literary translations throughout the Soviet era demonstrates that there were certain kinds of censorial interventions obviously correlated with the Soviet policy of a particular period. For example, the years between the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (1939) and the Nazi invasion of the USSR (1941) saw the prohibition of previously published translations of antifascist works (see Blium 2008) and excision of references to fascism (Sherry 2015). Due to the Albanian-Soviet split (1956–1961) translations of Albanian literature were banned for over a decade. The dynamics of translations of Chinese literature closely followed the dynamics of Sino-Soviet relations (see Rudnytska 2022). The victims of repressions and enemies of the state became Orwellian “non-persons”, which induced banning of translations or literally “cutting out” or “gluing” the corresponding fragments of the books in shops and libraries (Blium 2008). Such censorship was obviously determined by the Party *policies* and therefore can be defined as political.

On the other hand, some content in foreign texts was *permanently* subject to censorial intervention – criticism of communism and everything Soviet, positive eval-

uation of “ideological enemies”, religious content, depictions of sex – and that was predetermined by the Soviet ideology. Firstly, polarization, a distinguishing feature of any ideology (Dijk 1998), and the view of communism as the final stage of human development made criticism of communism and all aspects of the Soviet state and society inappropriate as well as “praising the ideological enemy”. “Scientific atheism” as an integral component of Marxism-Leninism predetermined censoring religious content. The Soviet variant of puritanism was an important part of raising the “New Soviet person” – the latter was viewed as one of the most significant factors of social transformation (Kahanov 2019, 6), and literature was employed as an effective tool of the “formation” (*formovka*) of the Soviet reader (Dobrenko 1997). Ermolaev points out that “Puritanical censorship weeded out everything what was considered incompatible with the moral or aesthetic education of the Soviet man” (1997, xiii) but eschews to define Soviet censorship as ideological since in some respects it depended more on the current political course than the ideological stance. However, it is not true for puritanical bowdlerization of literary texts, which became an integral part of Soviet censorship. Bearing in mind the ideological significance of raising of the New Soviet man and the role of literature assigned in the process, the ideological underpinning of puritanical censorship becomes obvious.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, foreign literary works deemed ideologically inappropriate (criticizing the USSR, communism, totalitarianism, incompatible with the Soviet morals and aesthetics) were not translated in the UkSSR while published translations were often ideologically manipulated due to manipulation of ideologemes, excision, and substitution.<sup>4</sup>

## IDEOLOGEMES

In the USSR, a major means of ideological influence – the totalitarian discourse – was based on a system of ideologemes (Zemskaja 1996, 23); as translation brings texts and discourses together, it produces “new, unanticipated meanings in the receiving culture”, so ideological censorship aimed at “reimposing authorised meanings” (Sherry 2015, 8). In Ukrainian translations ideologemes such as “class”, “Communist”, “bourgeoisie”, “worker”, etc. were often omitted, substituted with a neutral word referring to the same denotata, or even added in translations.

For example, Jack London often uses the ideologeme “class” in *Martin Eden*, which was omitted in case it implied something undesired. In the following citation, where female workers are characterized not very positively, the ideologeme “class” is omitted in the Ukrainian translation by Mariia Riabova: “Good, as goodness might be measured in their particular class, hard-working for meagre wages” (London 1909, 51) – “Chesnotlyvi, naskil’ky mozhut’ buty chesnotlyvii zhinky, shcho vysnazhno pratsiuut’ za mizernu platniu” (1970, 58) [Good, as goodness might be measured for the women who work extremely hard for meagre wages].

In a situation where London emphasizes his protagonist’s *respect* for the workers, the ideologeme “class” is added in the target text: “He could not be disloyal to his kind, and it was to more than Lizzie Connolly that his hat was lifted” (London 1909, 103) – “Vin ne zbyravsia soromytysia svoho klasu i v osobi Lizzi Conoli pryvitav ne

til'ky ii" (1970, 112) [He wasn't going to look ashamed of his class, and it was more than Lizzie Connolly that he greeted].

Another often added ideologeme was "bourgeoisie", for instance, in Oleksandr Terekh's translation of *The Man of Property* by John Galsworthy: "The Club which old Jolyon entered on the stroke of seven was one of those political institutions of the upper middle class which have seen better days" (Galsworthy [1906] 1999, 24) – "Klub, do iakoho staryi Dzholion zaishov rivno o s'omii, nalezhav do tykh politychnykh zakladiv velykoi burzhuazii, iaki bachyly krashchi chasy" (1976, 30) [The Club which old Jolyon entered at seven sharp was one of those political institutions of the big bourgeoisie which have seen better days].

"Bourgeoisie" and its derivatives had a negative connotation in the Soviet discourse, so they could not be used to denote a positive character such as Blanket in Ernest Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: "He was no gypsy but a bourgeois from Valencia" (Hemingway 1940, 223). In Mar Pinchevs'kyi's translation "bourgeois" is omitted: "Vin buv ne tsyhan, a valensiets, do toho zh z mista" (1979, 239) [He was not a gypsy but a Valencian and of urban origin].

### EXCISION

Excision of textual fragments incompatible with the Soviet ideology enabled publication of Western literature, but it could result in misrepresentation of the ideas and characters of the source text. Numerous excisions were caused by the opposition between "Us", "Our" ("Soviet/socialist"), characterized positively, and negatively characterized "Them", "Their" ("capitalist"). There are dozens of similar excisions in Pinchevs'kyi's translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* caused by Hemingway's criticism of the Soviet Union and its policy, communism as a social order, warfare methods used in the Spanish Civil War, Spanish military leaders, Russians, and their military residence in Madrid (Kokhans'ka 2007, 14). In Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* one of the characters is described as "altogether a very acceptable individual of our great American upper class" (Dreiser [1900] 2009, 95), but in the translation by Eleonora Rzhevuts'ka "our" and "great" are omitted: "Zahalom tse buv tsilkom prystoinyi, typovyi predstavnyk vyshchykh klasiv Ameryky" (1971, 105) [He was altogether a quite decent, typical representative of the higher classes of America]. Another group of excisions in translations was provoked by the discrepancy between the concept of success in Western and Soviet societies. For example, in his novel *An American Tragedy*, Dreiser uses the word "successful" while describing his rich characters; as in the Soviet discourse "a rich person" had definitely a negative connotation, and success could not be associated with personal gain, in translations "successful" is omitted, e.g.: "he is so rich and successful" (Dreiser [1925] 2003: 112) – "vin duzhe bahatyi" (1955, 125) [he is very rich].

Elimination of *religious* allusions was another common procedure, as in Ivan Bushe, Leonid Smilians'kyi and Leopold Iashchenko's translation of *An American Tragedy* where references to Christmas are excised as well as preaching on the love of God, repentance and acceptance of Christ. However, out of eight quotes from the Bible used in the source text, four are translated, including those three which

concern universal moral principles corresponding to the Soviet ethics – on the destructive effects of alcohol and evil deeds, e.g.: “Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise” (Dreiser [1925] 2003, 8) – “Vyno – obmanshchyk; pyty – znachyt’ vpasty v bezumstvo; khto piddaiet’sia obmanovi – toi ne mudryi” (1955, 10) [Wine is a deceiver; to drink is to fall into madness; who surrenders to deceiving is unwise]. Besides these three quotes, the one on the power of faith is translated: in the USSR the concept of faith implied strong belief in *something*, for instance, in the “victory of communism”. The quote mentions not God but omnipotence of a believer, so it can be interpreted in different ways: “if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall move; and nothing shall be impossible to you” (Dreiser [1925] 2003, 8) – “Iakshcho v tebe ie vira zavbil’shky z zerno hirchychne, i ty promovysh do tsiie hory: ‘Rush iz mistsia,’ – vona zrushyt’, i nishcho ne bude nemozhlyve dlia tebe” (1955, 10) [If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, and you say to this mountain, “Move from your place”, it will move, and nothing will be impossible to you].

Descriptions of sex, traditionally tabooed body parts, and vulgarisms were widely omitted and could result in misrepresentation of characters, their relationships, etc. For example, in Dmytro Stelmakh’s translation of John Fowles’s *The Ebony Tower* vulgarisms (“cunt”, “pussy”), references to nakedness and tabooed parts of male and female bodies (“naked”, “vulva”, “breast”, “the nest of hair between her legs”, “well-hung”) were excised. As a result, the image of Henry Breasley becomes more conventional, which mitigates the conflict between social norms and freedom necessary for creativity. Besides, the significance of sexual attractiveness as an important ingredient of the relationship between David and Diana becomes, at the very least, obscure in the target text, e.g.: “as she went out through the door the galabya momentarily lost its opacity against the sunlight beyond; a fleeting naked shadow” (Fowles 1974, 4) – “U dveriax soniachni promeni na myt’ vykhopyly z halabiï obrysy divochoï postati” (1986, 5) [In the doorway the sunrays for a moment lighted the outline of the girl’s figure in the galabya].<sup>5</sup>

## SUBSTITUTION

Substitutions were often employed to eliminate the positive characterization of “ideological enemies”, as in the following fragment from *An American Tragedy*, where the main character compares his poor mother and rich aunt and notes diverse traits of the latter: “his mother (might Heaven keep her) not as distinguished or as experienced as his cold, superior, indifferent aunt” Dreiser [1925] 2003, 198). In the target text, however, instead of the positive traits (“distinguished”, “experienced”) the concept “svits’ka dama” [socialite] was introduced, which had a distinctly negative connotation in the Soviet discourse: “Maty (berezhy ii bozhe!) ne taka svits-ka dama, iak kholodna, hordovyta, baiduzha titka” (1955, 206) [Mother (god save her!) is not such a socialite as the cold, proud, indifferent aunt].

Substitution was employed to mitigate negative characterization of Russians and their actions in Hemingway’s *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, as in Robert Jordan’s con-

temptation about the misinformation spread by them: “But now he knew enough to accept the necessity for all the deception” (Hemingway 1940, 298) – “Ale vidto-di vin bahato choho zrozumiv i vyznav neobkhdnist’ prykhovuvaty pravdu” (1979, 312) [Since then he had realized many things and recognized the necessity to hide the truth].

Substitution was often used as a means of puritanical censorship in descriptions of sexual relationships: instead of “sex”, “desire”, “make love”, “pleasure”, “grope” in the source texts, in the target texts one could read about “love”, “joy”, “being together”, “hug”. For instance, in J. D. Salinger’s *The Catcher in the Rye*, Holden Caulfield mentions the headmaster’s daughter, saying that “she wasn’t exactly the type that drove you mad with desire” (Salinger [1951] 2001, 2). In Oleksa Lohvynenko’s translation the feeling is substituted by a more romantic one: “Til’ky zh vona ne z tykh, u koho mozhna vklepatysia po sami vukha” (1984, 3) [Only she isn’t the one to make you fall head over heels in love].

Substitutions of this kind are also used in Stelmakh’s translation of Fowles’s *The Ebony Tower*, e.g. “getting their legs open” – “shchob liahla z toboiu v lizhko” [for her to go to bed with you], “former sexual bantam” – “shchos’ vid ioho buinoi molodosti” [something from his exuberant youth], “grope” – “obiiniaty” [to hug]. However, of more interest for the present analysis is the substitution which is not motivated by puritanical censorship proper but is indicative of the Soviet concept of morality in general. The main character, seeing a great difference between his own personality and behavior and the famous artist’s, reflects on art and his own potential: “In the end it all came down to what one was born with: one either had the temperament for excess and a ruthless egocentricity, for keeping thought and feeling in different compartments, or one didn’t; and David didn’t. The abominable and vindictive injustice was that art is fundamentally amoral” (Fowles 1974, 298). As the old artist’s way of life was totally inconsistent with Soviet morality, in the translation art is defined not as “amoral” (i.e. unconcerned with the rightness or wrongness of something [www.oed.com]) but “immoral” (i.e. opposed to or violating morality; morally evil or impure [www.oed.com]): “Ohydna i mstyva nespravedlyvist’ poliahala v tomu, shcho mystetstvo v osnovi svoii amoral’ne” (1986, 306) [The abominable and vindictive injustice was that art is fundamentally immoral]. This substitution reflects the Soviet dichotomy “moral – immoral”, as nothing could be beyond morality, and nobody could be unconcerned with the rightness or wrongness of something. However, since the adjectives “amoral” and “amoral’nyi” are interlingual homonyms, such a translation could be the result of a translation error.

## ADDITION

Words or bigger fragments could be added in Russian translations to emphasize or introduce the desired characterization or create intertextuality between Western and Soviet literatures (Sherry 2015); addition was also broadly employed in Russian translations of Ukrainian literature to eliminate the negative characterization of the Soviet authorities, society, army, or avoid potential comparison between the Nazi and the Soviet regimes (see Rudnytska 2016). In Ukrainian translations,

however, we could find just a few instances of addition, which aimed to introduce or intensify negative evaluation.

In *The Ebony Tower*, Fowles characterizes the Freak's religious parents as "hair-raisingly bigoted parents" (Fowles 1974, 74); in Stelmakh's translation the word "cruel" is added to intensify the negative characterization: "Vona smishno rozpovidala pro svoïkh zhorstokykh i fanatychnykh bat'kiv" (1986, 5) [She told funny stories about her cruel and fanatical parents]. A similar addition is used in the translation of *An American Tragedy*, where "faith" acquires negative characterization due to the epithet "blind": "For behind her were all those years of religious work and faith" (Dreiser [1925] 2003, 328) – "Pozadu buly dovhi roky slipoï viry i sluzhinnia relihii" (1955, 340) [Behind her were long years of blind faith and service to religion]. In this translation negative characterization is also added to the description of an "ideological enemy" – a businessman – through addition of the word "dilok" [man of affairs] with extremely negative connotation in Ukrainian (the word implies sidelining of ethical principles and moral values in pursuit of profit): "His father was not as able as this, his great uncle" (Dreiser [1925] 2003, 76) – "Ioho bat'ko ne takyi zdibnyi dilok, iak tsei vazhnyi diad'ko" (1955, 84) [His father is not such a gifted man of affairs, as this important uncle].

## UKRAINIAN VS. RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS

One of the working principles of Soviet censorship was that the Russian translation of a foreign literary work was used as a "mediating filter" (Monticelli and Lange 2014, 102) for translations into the other languages of the USSR, correspondingly, most excisions or manipulations in translations into different languages coincided. However, there are numerous differences between the Russian and Ukrainian translations analyzed here.

Although many fragments were excised or manipulated in Pinchevs'kyi's translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, a comparative analysis with the Russian translation by Ievgeniia Kalashnikova demonstrates that these texts provide a different evaluation of the Soviets/Russians and their actions. For example, the fragments "in case the city should be abandoned" and "In the event the city should be abandoned" (Hemingway 1940, 248), which imply that the Soviet troops could be forced by the Spanish royalists to leave Madrid, are translated into Ukrainian without changes while Kalashnikova's translation implies that the Soviets control the situation: "iesli gorod budet resheno sdat" (1968, 257) [if they decide to abandon the city]. Hemingway's characters discuss another wave of Stalin's purges: "Here it reports the purging of more of thy famous Russians" (1940, 100), while in Kalashnikova's translation the object of the purge is made the subject, so the excerpt can be understood as describing the "famous Russians" struggling with an external enemy: "Vot tut pishut, chto tvoï znamenitye russkie eshche koe-kogo vychistili" (1968, 107) [Here it is written that thy famous Russians have purged somebody else]. The corresponding Ukrainian sentence has the same structure as the Russian one, but the word combination "v sebe" [among themselves] was added, which helped preserve the message of the source text: "Otut pyshut, shcho tvoï slavnozvisni rosiiany shche dekhoho v sebe vychystyly"



(1979, 108) [Here it is written that thy famous Russians have purged somebody else among themselves]. Describing the Soviet journalist Karkov, Hemingway mentions his “insolence”, which remains “insolent” (“zukhvalyi”) in Ukrainian but in Russian becomes “audacious” (“derzkii”), the only synonym which does not necessarily have a negative connotation.

The same tendency can be observed in puritanical (self)censorship:<sup>6</sup> the language of the Ukrainian translations is not limited to the literary variant with a restricted use of colloquialisms, like the Russian translations. For example, in *The Catcher in the Rye*, Salinger’s teenage characters speak colloquial English and use slang and profanity. In the translation by Rita Rait-Kovaliova, they mostly speak literary Russian with occasional use of colloquialisms such as “duratskii” [foolish], “chto za chert” [what the hell], “besit’sia” [go nuts] (1960). In the Ukrainian translation by Oleksa Lohvynenko they broadly use colloquial language (“trykliatushchii” [cursed], “prychandallia” [stuff], “idiotskyi” [idiotic], “ni bisovoho bat’ka ne vydno” [one can’t see the devil’s father], etc.; 1984), vulgarisms, and jargon, which compensate for the teenage slang that was absent in the Ukrainian language of the Soviet period.

In fact, such differences between the Russian and Ukrainian translations can be explained by the time lapse between the translations: if “ideologically appropriate” works such as London’s and Dreiser’s were translated in many languages and published promptly, “controversial” (in terms of ideology or aesthetics) literature in censored translations could be published only in Russian (as works by John Steinbeck, T. S. Eliot, Samuel Beckett, and others<sup>7</sup>) or was translated into different languages much later, so Ukrainian translations were published years, sometimes decades later than Russian ones.<sup>8</sup> As after Stalin’s death censorial pressure gradually became less severe, the time lapse provided for lesser censorial intervention in later Ukrainian translations. This tendency can be seen in the texts analyzed here: *An American Tragedy*, published in Ukrainian in 1955, when the censorship was still extremely strong, bore a great resemblance to the Russian translation of 1947. Conversely, the Russian and Ukrainian translations of *Sister Carrie* were published in 1951 and 1971 respectively, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in 1968 and 1981, *The Catcher in the Rye* in 1960 and 1984, and *The Ebony Tower* in 1979 and 1986, so the later publication dates created an opportunity for closer rendering of the source text.

## CONCLUSION

The censorial bodies of the UkSSR functioned as part of the all-Union system, and the censorship of Ukrainian literary translations depended on general ideological limitations and the current state policy. Ideologically motivated exclusion and manipulation of textual fragments were used to eliminate criticism of communism and everything Soviet, positive evaluation of “ideological enemies”, and religious content; puritanical censorship had ideological underpinning, as translated literature was to play a role in raising of the New Soviet person. Political censorship aimed to eliminate the content deemed inappropriate due to the policies of certain periods, such as references to fascism and enemies of the state.

The censorial procedures on the textual level included manipulating ideologemes, excisions, substitutions, and additions although the latter were used only sporadically. Ukrainian translations were checked against Russian ones, which were the first to publish and provided an ideologically appropriate interpretation of foreign texts, but the time lapse between the translations into the two languages provided an opportunity for closer reproduction of the source texts in Ukrainian translations. However, the date of publication should not be viewed as the only reason for such discrepancies, as the earlier, more strictly censored Russian translations were republished repeatedly, including the post-Soviet Russian Federation, which can testify to the significance of factors not connected with Soviet censorship.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The Library of Congress system without diacritics is used for the Romanization from Cyrillic script.
- <sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all translations from Ukrainian and Russian are by the present author.
- <sup>3</sup> Puritanical censorship of translations was also typical for the totalitarian regimes in Germany, Italy, Portugal, and Spain (see Rundle and Sturge 2010).
- <sup>4</sup> Besides manipulation and excisions of textual fragments, paratext played a substantial role in providing the desired interpretation of translated literary texts (see Rudnytska 2022; Sherry 2015).
- <sup>5</sup> It is significant that among the Ukrainian synonyms – “fihura”, “siluet”, “postat” – the translator (or editor) chose the latter variant, which is the one least associated with physical characteristics of a person, let alone their sexual attractiveness.
- <sup>6</sup> Due to the space limitations, we do not delineate censorship proper and self-censorship, as Soviet translators had to refer to the latter for various reasons (see Baer 2022; Sherry 2015).
- <sup>7</sup> The works of these and many other Western authors were published in Ukrainian only after 1988, when the censorial system relaxed considerably.
- <sup>8</sup> It was predetermined not by the state of the Ukrainian translation field itself, strongly developed since the late 19th century, but purely by the Soviet censorial policy, and besides translations released annually in the USSR, numerous Ukrainian translations were published abroad by the diaspora (Kolomiyets 2004; Strikha 2006).

## REFERENCES

- Babiukh, Vitalii. 2004. “Stanovlennia orhaniv tsenzury v Ukraini v 1917 – na pochatku 1920-kh rokiv” [The formation of censorial bodies in Ukraine in 1917 – the early 1920s]. *Istoriia Ukraïny* 27: 73–84.
- Baer, Brian James. 2022. “Censorship, Permitted Dissent, and Translation Theory in the USSR: The Case of Kornei Chukovsky.” In *Translation under Communism*, ed. by Christopher Rundle, Anne Lange, and Daniele Monticelli, 73–110. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blum, Arlen. 2008. “Index librorum prohibitorum zarubezhnykh pisatelei” [Index librorum prohibitorum of foreign writers]. *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie*, 92. Accessed on March 20, 2024. <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2008/92/bl12.html>.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE.
- Dobrenko, Evgenii. 1997. *Formovka sovetskogo chitatelia* [Formation of the Soviet reader]. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskii projekt.
- Draizer, Teodor [Dreiser, Theodore]. 1955. *Amerykans'ka trahediia* [An American Tragedy]. Trans. by Ivan Bushe, Leonid Smilanskyi, and Leopold Iashchenko. Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk.

- Draizer, Teodor [Dreiser, Theodore]. 1971. *Sestra Keri* [*Sister Carrie*]. Trans. by Eleonora Rzhhevuts'ka. Kyiv: Dnipro.
- Dreiser, Theodore. [1925] 2003. *An American Tragedy*. New York: Library of America.
- Dreiser, Theodore. [1900] 2009. *Sister Carrie*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ermolaev, Herman. 1997. *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917–1991*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Faucett, Peter, and Jeremy Munday. 2009. "Ideology." In *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd ed., ed. by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 137–140. London and New York: Routledge.
- Faulz, Dzon [Fowles, John]. 1986. *Vezha z chornoho dereva* [*The Ebony Tower*]. Trans. by Dmytro Stelmakh. Kyiv: Dnipro.
- Fedotova, Oksana. 2009. *Politychna tsenzura drukovanykh vydan v USRR–URSR (1917–1990)* [Political censorship of printed matter in the USRR–URSR (1917–1990)]. Kyiv: Parlamentske vydavnytstvo.
- Fowles, John. 1974. *The Ebony Tower*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Galsworthy, John. [1906] 1999. *The Man of Property*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goriaeva, Tat'iana, ed. 1997. *Istoriia sovetskoi politicheskoi tsenzury: dokumenty i kommentarii* [History of Soviet political censorship: Documents and commentaries]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Hemingway, Ernest. 1940. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. New York: Scribner.
- Holsuorsi, Dzon [Galsworthy, John]. 1976. *Vlasnyk* [*The Man of Property*]. Trans. by Oleksandr Terekh. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola.
- Kahanov, Yurii. 2019. *Konstruiuvannia "radianskoï liudyny" (1953–1991): ukrains'ka versiia* [Homo sovieticus identity construction (1953–1991): Case of Ukraine]. Zaporizhzhia: Inter-M.
- Kalnychenko, Oleksandr, and Lada Kolomyets. 2022. "Translation in Ukraine during the Stalinist Period: Literary Translation Policies and Practices." In *Translation under Communism*, ed. by Christopher Rundle, Anne Lange, and Daniele Monticelli, 141–174. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kheminguei, Ernest [Hemingway, Ernest]. 1968. *Po kom zvenit kolokol* [*For Whom the Bell Tolls*]. Trans. by Ievgeniia Kalashnikova. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.
- Kheminguei, Ernest [Hemingway, Ernest]. 1979. *Po komu podzvin* [*For Whom the Bell Tolls*]. Trans. by Mar Pinchevs'kyi. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola.
- Kokhans'ka, Iryna. 2007. "Literaturna reputatsiia romanu E. Kheminhevia 'Po komu podzvin' v amerykans'komu, rosiis'komu ta ukrains'komu literaturoznavstvi" [Literary reputation of the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* by E. Hemingway in American, Russian and Ukrainian literary studies]. Ph.D. Dissertation, Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University in Ternopil.
- Kolomyets, Lada. 2004. *Kontseptualno-metodolohichni zasady suchasnoho ukrainskoho poetychnoho perekladu* [Conceptual and methodological underpinnings of contemporary Ukrainian poetic translation]. Kyiv: VPTS "Kyivskiy universitet".
- London, Dzhek [London, Jack]. 1970. *Martyn Iden* [*Martin Eden*]. Transl. by Mariia Riabova. Kyiv: Dnipro.
- London, Jack. 1909. *Martin Eden*. New York: Macmillan.
- Maskaliūnienė, Nijolė, and Gintarė Juršėnaitė. 2023. "Passing through the Filter: Literary Translation from Spanish in Lithuania under Soviet Censorship." *Stridon: Journal of Studies in Translation and Interpreting* 3, 2: 5–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4312/stridon.3.2.5-27>.
- Monticelli, Daniele, and Anne Lange. 2014. "Translation and Totalitarianism: The Case of Soviet Estonia." *The Translator* 20, 1: 95–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2014.899096>.
- Postanova VTsVK i RNK USSR "Pro zatverdzhennia ustavu pro Holovne upravlinnia v spravakh literatury ta vydavnytstv" [The Decree of all-union CEC and the CPC of the UkSSR "On adoption of the statute on the Main Administration for Literary and Publishing Affairs"]. 1931. The Central State Archive, F. 166, Op. 10, Spr. 588: 34.
- Rudnytska, Nataliia. 2016. "Radianskyi pereklad rosiiskoiu movoiu iak zasib borot'by z 'ukrainskym natsionalizmom'" [Soviet Russian translation as a weapon against "Ukrainian nationalism"]. *Naukovi zapysky* 144: 218–221.
- Rudnytska, Nataliia. 2022. "Translation and the Formation of the Soviet Canon of World Literature." In *Translation under Communism*, ed. by Christopher Rundle, Anne Lange, and Daniele Monticelli, 39–72. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Rundle, Christopher, and Kate Sturge, eds. 2010. *Translation under Fascism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salinger, J. D. [1951] 2001. *The Catcher in the Rye*. St. Louis: Turtleback Books.
- Selindzher, Dzherom [Salinger, J. D.]. 1960. *Nad propastiu vo rzhi* [*The Catcher in the Rye*]. Trans. by Rita Rait-Kovaliova. Moscow: Izvestiia.
- Selindzher, Dzherom [Salinger, J. D.]. 1984. *Nad prirvoiu v zhyti* [*The Catcher in the Rye*]. Trans. by Oleksa Lohvynenko. Kyiv: Molod'.
- Sherry, Samantha. 2015. *Discourses of Regulation and Resistance Censoring: Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era Soviet Union*. Croydon: Edinburgh University Press.
- Strikha, Maksym. 2006. *Ukraïnskyi hudozhnii pereklad: mizh literaturoiu i natsietvorenniam*. Kyiv: Fakt.
- Witt, Susanna. 2011. "Between the Lines: Totalitarianism and Translation in the USSR." In *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts: Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*, ed. by Brian James Baer, 149–170. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Zemskaiia, Elena. 1996. "Klishe novoiazia i tsitatsiia v iazyke postsovetskogo obshchestva" [The cliches of the newspeak and citation in the language of the post-Soviet society]. *Voprosy iazykoznaniiia* 1: 19–25.