

Dirk Uffelmann

Postcolonial Studies: Processes of Appropriation and Axiological Controversies

The Slavic appropriation of postcolonial studies in the early twenty-first century served as an arena for various controversies – this is the thesis which the following handbook entry seeks to defend. Among these controversies, that regarding the question whether the relevant research featured a properly literary focus was at times less prominent. This might be regarded as a symptom of a general decline of literary theory. One might, however, also declare this as proof of the societal relevance of literary theory – in a novel transdisciplinary and transcultural disguise. The latter suggestion becomes plausible when looking at the other areas contested in the wake of this appropriation process – intercultural debates about the perpetrators and victims of imperial rule; axiological controversies saturated with anti-colonial indictments directed against external colonizers, internal elites, communism, and even Christianity; and interdisciplinary debates concerning the applicability of the notion of colonialism to intra-European relations of cultural hegemony and to contiguous empires. The following contribution will proceed with reconstructing the controversies in the aforementioned order, pointing to their varying relevance for literary theory. The overview will round off with outlining explicit appeals to ‘re-literaricize’ East-European postcolonial debates and with identifying lacunae of research to date.

The method applied consists of reconstructing the dialogical, agonal nature of the relevant debates. The underlying assumption is that scrutinizing various vectors of agonality – intercultural, axiological, interdisciplinary, and meta-literary controversies – helps to foster better understanding of what has been at stake in recent East European postcolonial literary theory.

1 Divergent processes of appropriation

Before digging into the aforementioned controversies, it is indispensable to outline the divergent patterns of appropriation (and neglect) of Anglo-American postcolonial studies. How did the processes of appropriation of postcolonial theory in Eastern, East-Central, and Southeastern Europe evolve and which transcultural dynamics characterize the divergent patterns of (dis-)appropriation? As demonstrated in the historical overview by Sproede and Lecke (2011, 66), the process of adoption was very uneven. Sproede’s and Lecke’s exclusive zeroing in on Poland,

Lithuania, and Russia, however, undeservedly limits the scope and neglects some of the earliest pioneers.

The initial spark for adopting postcolonial categories – Orientalism, Othering, hybridity, mimicry, subalternity, etc. – for the analysis of contemporary literature came from what one might regard as a double margin, which is characteristic since margins are epistemically elevated in Anglo-American postcolonial studies as well; it was migrant intellectuals such as Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, and Gayatri Spivak who spoke out most prominently on behalf of the disenfranchised of the post-colonial global order and Australian scholars (Ashcroft et al. 1989) who proposed the most seminal literary concept of ‘writing back’. In Slavic literary studies it is also an Australian, here the Ukrainian-Australian literary theorist Marko Pavlyshyn, who, in two precursory articles of 1992 and 1993, first demonstrated the usefulness of postcolonial categories for analyzing Ukrainian postmodernism (Pavlyshyn 1992; 1993). Before the pioneering role of Ukrainian postcolonial studies could eventually be acknowledged more than a decade later, it needed additional external encouragements from America (Spivak 1996, 297–298; Moore 2001; Cavanagh 2003; 2004) to trigger a corresponding debate in homegrown East-European literary theory. Given the global connectedness and the strong contribution of diaspora scholars working in the Anglo-American and German-speaking academia, postcolonial literary studies have remained a transnational phenomenon, with English serving as reference *lingua franca* also for Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian scholars (while the bulk of German-language research has been widely overlooked in the respective Slavic countries).

After the first Ukrainian glimmer and a few other brief precursory sketches (Kiossev 1998; Pirie 1998; Szkudlarek 1998), it took until the early 2000s for other East-European philologies to produce their first topical contributions. More often than not the very first publications steered the subsequent discussions in certain directions (which differ from philology to philology): the Polish-Texan scholar Ewa Thompson directed the Polish focus toward Russian writers as apologists of imperialism (Thompson 2000); Aleksandr Etkind (2001) proposed his novel concept of Russia’s internal colonization, based on a triangle constellation derived from Pushkin’s *Kapitanskaia dochka* (1836, *The Captain’s Daughter*); Romanian scholar Ion Lefter called for exploring the affinities between postcommunism and postcolonialism (Lefter 2001); and Germanist Clemens Ruthner scrutinized Austrian Orientalizations of the Hapsburg Slavs (Ruthner 2002). While the literary theory communities specializing in smaller cultures such as the Baltic countries or Kashubia eagerly adopted postcolonialism (Kelertas 2006; Osinski 2011), and while German-Slavic, especially Prussian-Polish interactions proved to be a fertile ground for postcolonially-inspired literary research (see, for example, Kopp 2012), even with regard to the forced population transfer after World War Two (Fiut 2003,

153; developed in Uffelmann 2017), the hesitation in the post-Hapsburg countries (Feichtinger et al. 2003), the later appropriation for Slovak literature (Pucherová and Gáfrik 2015), and the outspoken resistance in the Czech Republic (Luft 2003; cf. Uffelmann 2008) produced an intriguingly disparate map of postcolonial literary theory adoption in Eastern Europe. It turns out that in some countries such as Ukraine the proactive appropriation in literary theory, hand in hand with popular vulgarization of postcolonial categories in public discourse (*mutatis mutandis* also palpable in Uzbekistan), served an identity-building goal. In other traditions such as Czech philology the rejection (or – if this can be seen as a conscious action – neglect) fulfilled a less visible, but structurally analogous function. In some cases, the respective blindness is strategically partial, as with the Polish focus on the country as a victim of Russian and German colonialism (see Domańska 2008), but not as a colonizer with regard to Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belarus (cf. Uffelmann 2013). The inclusion of Poland's former Eastern Borderlands had been demanded several times (e. g. Bakula 2006; Gosk 2008), but only later triggered bigger-scale postcolonial research (Kresy; Kaps and Surman 2012).

Apart from the Czech exception, most East-European philologies have seen a process of institutionalization of postcolonially-inspired research. Testifying to this are a continuously growing number of edited volumes (Kelertas 2006; Korek 2007; Kuziak 2010; Stępnik and Trześniowski 2011; Kissel 2012; Kołodziejczyk and Śandru 2014; Pucherová and Gáfrik 2015; Smola and Uffelmann 2016), as well as the two multi-volume series *Seria Wydawnicza Centrum Badań Dyskursów Postzależnościowych* (*Publishing Series of the Center for Research in Post-Dependence Discourses*, since 2011) and *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe* (since 2012). These publications are supplemented by online platforms (<http://www.postcolonial-europe.eu/>, since 2009) and prestigious journals (such as *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* and *Teksty Drugie*), which have regularly provided a venue for related debates (see *Postcolonial or Postdependence Studies?* 2014).

2 Intercultural controversies

It comes as no surprise that postcolonial studies, which have from their very start scrutinized relations of hegemony of one culture over others, were especially susceptible to intercultural debates. Before the scope could be directed to disparate hegemonic relations *between* East-Central and East-European cultures, the initial provocation of “learning from the Third World,” for example by viewing the partitions of Poland through the prism of the parceling-out of Africa by European colonial powers in 1884 (Pirie 1988, 338), had to be digested. This digestion has taken

quite some time but has ultimately produced research that scrutinized the Polish and Russian literary gaze at Africa (Domdey et al. 2017), South Asia (see also some contributions on Czech and Slovak travel writing in Pucherová and Gáfrík 2015) or at Polish self-positioning toward Native Americans (Surynt 2006, 90–96). It proved productive to relocate not only the ‘Oriental’ object of Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) from the Middle East to the East of Europe (Wolff 1994; Todorova 1997; Adamovsky 2006), but also to move the Orientalizing observer from ‘the West’ to the Eastern part of Europe: while Ewa Thompson in her 2000 book *Imperial Knowledge* blamed Russian literature for Tsarist imperialism (cf. also Layton 1994; Dickinson 2002; Ram 2003), others demonstrated how various interrelations between East-Central and East-European literatures have been prone to Othering (Petković 2003; Kovačević 2008; Kissel 2012; Born and Lemmen 2014; Lecke 2015). This pertains also to internal Orientalism as in the case of the Europeanized elite of modern Russia looking down at ethnic Russian peasants and provinces:

The main trajectories of Russian colonization were not directed outside, but to the interior of the metropolis: not to Poland and even not to Bashkortostan, but to the villages of the gubernias of Tula, Pomor’e, and Orenburg. (Etkind 2001, 65, expanded in Etkind 2011)

Something comparable applies to internal hegemonic relations inside the Hapsburg Empire (Simonek 2003, 133). Here, however, the construction of difference relies less on class culture than on linguistic or religious differences. Given these more obvious distinctions, it is remarkable that the inner-Hapsburg focus could in no way mirror the stunning success that the model of Russia’s internal colonization had for Russian literary theory (Etkind et al. 2012).

For most of inner-Slavic hegemonic relations there is one major villain: Ukrainian and Polish postcolonially-inspired literary theory especially displays badly concealed anti-Russian sentiments and a shift from academic inventory to actual self-defense from foreign cultural ‘colonization’ (Thompson 2005). Interestingly, this concerns not only actual colonial power, but also literary analyses with the help of postcolonial categories: when Russian-born, but Amsterdam-based sociologist Maxim Waldstein (2002) diagnosed Orientalizing implications in the reportages by famous Polish travel journalist Ryszard Kapuściński, this stirred up a wave of anger in Polish literary studies (for the heated debate, see the overview in Zajas 2010). It required the *grande dame* of Polish literary studies, Maria Janion, to acknowledge the justness of Waldstein’s reading (Janion 2007, 228–241). Other theoreticians felt compelled to transpose their anti-imperialist stance into resistance against ‘Russian’ postcolonial theory even if it was produced in the diaspora as well; not only right-wing combatant Ewa Thompson, but also sober scholars such as Vitaly Chernetsky (2007, 43) and Tamara Hundorova (2013, 34)

thought it necessary to argue against Etkind's theory of Russia's internal colonization because recognizing Russians as victims of Russian colonial rule, too, would in their view undermine the victim status of Poland, Ukraine, etc. Even if a heuristic focus on a certain group of victims such as internal colonization in no way precludes other focalizations (Etkind et al. 2012, 24), it remains symptomatic that talking about certain victims creates immediate suspicion of minimizing the suffering of other victims of Russian rule.

3 Axiological controversies

With such claims of exclusivity for certain external victims, we have arrived at the political implications of debating the imperial legacy of communism in Eastern Europe, which surfaced for the first time during the Lisbon conference of Soviet and East-Central European writers in May 1988 (see the contributions in Uffelmann 2016). The almost unanimous, but epistemically fatal assumption is that colonialism has exclusively negative repercussions on the political culture of the colonized (circling around *ressentiment*: Hundorova 2007; 2013, 48–60; Thompson 2007). Negating the complicity of the “colonized” in the national varieties of communism and undialectically externalizing the perpetrator purifies the victim which, if defined in terms of a national community, gives rise to nationalism. In the Polish debate, Ewa Thompson has personified this tendency (Kołodziejczyk 2014, 139; see also the overviews by Golinczak 2008 and Zarycki 2014, 89–114), and in the Russian debate, it is Konstantin Krylov's nationalist foreword (2006) to Aleksandr Govorunov's Russian translation of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (cf. Sproede and Lecke 2011, 59–60). Those who accuse others of a nationalist misuse of postcolonial categories, which they view as a genuinely leftist subversive intellectual practice, have, however, not been spared reciprocal accusations either (see Geraci 2015, 357 against Etkind 2011). A peculiar case is the Polish attempt at ‘customizing’ postcolonial studies for an allegedly unique Polish situation, ‘post-dependence studies’ (*studia postzależnościowe*). Here is how the study group defines its orientation:

The rationale behind the network is to investigate the condition of post-dependence underlying the contemporary Polish society and culture specifically, and, in a broader perspective, defining the difference of Central-Eastern Europe from its Western counterpart. (*Post-Dependence Studies Centre* 2009)

This moderately nationalizing project of post-dependence studies came under attack as well (Dąbrowski 2014 against Gosk 2008 and Kołodziejczyk 2014), which

is partially justified due to the propagation of a structurally mononational navel gaze.

Given the strong politicization of Catholicism in Poland, dating back if not to the partition period, then to resistance against communist rule, the Polish controversy also affects Christianity. The political left made an attempt at denouncing Christianity as a colonizing force in itself (Janion 2007), inevitably triggering Catholic postcolonial protest (Skórczewski 2013, 407–425). Literary attacks on the cultural hegemony of the Catholic Church were countered with the means of a novel category introduced by Dariusz Skórczewski – ‘postcolonial disavowal’ (*postkolonialne wyparcie*; Skórczewski 2014).

An axiological discussion led by Ukrainianists Marko Pavlyshyn, Tamara Hundorova, and Vitaly Chernetsky went much more calmly: Pavlyshyn proposed an ethically optimistic distinction between confronting anti-colonial verve and conciliatory postcolonial stance (Pavlyshyn 2016, 62). Although Hundorova and Chernetsky might not disagree with the desirability of Pavlyshyn’s normative ethics, they regarded a similar clear distinction as incompatible with postcolonial studies, whose strength they saw in analyzing paradoxes of infection and the *longue durée* of repercussions of colonialism:

[...] it appears somewhat abstract and does not give due weight to the complex structure of postcolonial consciousness, which, in our opinion, erases neither coloniality, nor anticoloniality, but rather transcends them, simultaneously reconstituting the situation of subalterity and deconstructing it. (Hundorova 2007, 342–343; trans. by Marko Pavlyshyn 2016, 63)

4 Interdisciplinary controversies

Having already featured in intercultural and axiological controversies, Aleksandr Etkind has also been a prominent voice in debating the methodological split between advocates of a Russianized variety of postcolonialism, especially the theory of Russia’s internal colonization, and of new imperial history (Gerasimov et al. 2014), the former coming from literary studies, the latter from history departments. The Russian historians who promoted their concept of (post-)imperial studies, most visibly in the online journal *Ab imperio*, insisted that ‘colonization’ *sensu stricto* applied to overseas colonies only and should not be metaphorically transferred to Eastern Europe (for more on *Ab imperio*, see Sproede and Lecke 2011, 55–57). Here it was Ewa Thompson who pointed out the opposite, anti-essentialist position in her essay “A jednak kolonializm” (2011, “It Is Colonialism After All,” 2014), refuting generalized rejections, for example, by Borkowska (2010):

Contending that colonialism is immune to changes in definition is an example of both passive acknowledgement of theories worked out in conditions far different from those in Poland as well as misunderstanding essentialism itself. (Thompson 2014, 70)

In contrast to historians' marked distance toward postcolonial approaches, film studies (Condee 2012; cf. also Mazierska et al. 2014) have rather smoothly adopted literary theories such as Etkind's 2003 thesis of a continuous "Siuzhet vnutrennei kolonizatsii" ("Plot of Internal Colonization") in Russian literature. Polish academia also saw various non-agonistic social science applications for conceptualizing inequalities in class (Buchowski 2006) and regional differentiations (Zarycki 2007), something also reintroduced into studying regional literature from a postcolonial perspective (Mikołajczak 2015). Another trend reacting to attempts at "national customization" of postcolonial studies is reglobalization (see Sowa 2008). The most outspoken critic of any East-European specificity is the Russian-Swedish scholar Madina Tlostanova who, together with Walter Mignolo, voted for a decolonial option as part of a global left-wing commitment (Mignolo and Tlostanova 2012, 17), more informed by extra-(West-)European "colonial histories of South America and the Caribbean and of Central Asia and the Caucasus under the Russian empire and the Soviet Union" (Mignolo and Tlostanova 2012, 34) than by post-structuralism and – as should be added – its ambiguizing reading techniques.

5 Appeals for a 're-philologicalization' of East-European postcolonial research

As transpires from the preceding sketch of the intercultural, axiological, and interdisciplinary debates, the use of postcolonial categories in East-European literary studies has often remained on the macro-level of general evaluation. In contrast, if actual literary texts were analyzed, analyses were frequently restricted to the micro-level of interpreting single works. What remains less scrutinized is the meso-level – be this with regard to particular epochs (such as postmodernism; Chernetsky 2007), genres (like the Polish *gawęda*; Gall 2007), or social phenomena (such as migrant literature; Artwińska 2010; Uffelman 2010), be it with attempts at introducing new theoretical categories that transcend the register of prefabricated terms such as hybridity (creolization [*kreol'stvo*]; Abushenka n.d.) and cross-fertilizing Anglo-American postcolonial studies with homegrown East-European notions. The wish for meso-level proposals of East European postcolonial literary theory has periodically led to calls for returning to literature. Although

the pioneering article by Clare Cavanagh from 2003/2004 indulged in extensive name-dropping of Polish classical writers of the twentieth century whom Cavanagh regarded as deserving postcolonial interpretations, it failed to provide any in-depth analysis. Etkind's thesis of a plot of internal colonization, consisting of a triangle composed of Russian beauty, man of the people, and man of the elite, has been found fruitful for further analyses (Lipovetsky 2012), even if the triangle is not entirely appropriate for the very text by Pushkin on which it was based (cf. Sproede and Lecke 2011, 49). Several Germany-based scholars have therefore demanded to rephilologize postcolonial categories by grounding cultural hegemonies in intertextuality (Kirschbaum 2016), in rhetoric (metonymy as a 'trope of identity' [*Identitätstrope*]; Kirschbaum 2018) or by deliberately bracketing other disciplines from an investigation of the postcoloniality of Slavic *literatures* under postcommunist conditions (Smola and Uffermann 2016, 14–15).

Despite these calls, observers drawing on the agonality of the para-postcolonial debates arrived at the conclusion that the intra-philological discourse about a literary theory like postcolonial studies accomplished a political action, to be precise, that literary theory functioned as a performative means of cultural politics (Uffermann 2013).

Given this secondary, extra-literary and extra-philological trajectory, the Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian debates, which have experienced a veritable boom since 2005, have left several desiderata: despite isolated efforts by Layton (1994), Zabuzhko (1999), Tlostanova (2010), and Gradszkova (2012), the association of postcolonialism and gender has not led to much research in Slavic studies. Almost nothing has been done in the field of postcolonial studies of Internet literature (cf. Merten and Krämer 2016). Even more astonishing in the East-European context is the neglect of the emergence of cultural hegemony out of differences in class as envisaged by Eugene Weber for French peasants (Weber 1976). Some first attempts have been made in pointing to another internal other, at times disappearing out of sight behind the back of Etkind's Russian peasant other – the ethnic literatures of Russia (Smola and Uffermann 2017), which were only paradoxically favored by the Soviet construct of multinational literature (Frank 2016).

The rather widespread mononational bias of Slavic postcolonial (auto-) research prompted some scholars to call for "comparative studies of postcolonial discourses" and "postcolonial polycentrisms" (Bakula 2011, 141). This transnational angle would ideally not only have been applied to inner-East-European cultures, but also to the cross-area comparison of 'classical' postcolonial countries and the former Second World. Something similar was studied in political science by Beissinger and Crawford (2002), but still awaits its accomplishment in actual literary analyses. More promising than a comparative approach seems to be an

interactive one as proposed by Heinrich Kirschbaum in his combined study of Polish and Russian romantic literature (Kirschbaum 2016) or claimed by Boris Groys for the feedback loop constitutive of Russia's modern intellectual history:

The Russian creative artist of the last 150 years resembles an African tribal chief who visited a cubist art exhibition, or an Oedipus who consulted Freud's writings on the Oedipus complex: he reflexively and strategically handles the gaze of the Western observer which is directed toward him. This gaze does not reach the "essence" of Russian culture – not because it is not correctly focused but because this very culture is nothing other than play with the Western gaze. (Groys 1995, 11)

While investigations of political transculturation have led to groundbreaking results in connecting Russia's subaltern empire to Eurocentrism (Morozov 2015), similar effects deserve many more detailed literary explorations. Peculiar varieties of transculturation in the sense of Mary Louise Pratt (1992) such as self-exoticization, self-Orientalization or self-colonization deserve to be freed from automatic negative evaluation (Georgiev 2012), giving way to a more optimistic recognition of feedback loops as a culture-building (Kiossev 1998) and ironic-creative process (Uffelmann 2010), also honoring the subversive potential of the mimicry of the colonized in the sense of Bhabha (1994) and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (1988). An epistemic shift from conservative lament to subversive creativity might also be welcome regarding political axiology; as one of the mostly overlooked precursors of Polish postcolonial studies called for as early as in 1998: "Let us think about our decolonisation" (Szkudlarek 1998, 57).

References

- Abushenka, Uladzimer. "Mitskevich kak 'kreol': Ot 'tuteishykh heneolohii' k heneolohii 'tuteishastsy.'" *Fragmenty*. <http://knihi.com/storage/frahmenty/sem-abuszenka.htm> (15 February 2022).
- Adamovsky, Ezequiel. *Euro-Orientalism: Liberal Ideology and the Image of Russia in France (c. 1740–1800)*. Oxford et al.: Lang, 2006.
- Artwińska, Anna. "Między Polską i Niemcami: Literatura 'emigracyjna' a postkolonializm." *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 54.2 (2010): 27–37.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Garret Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Bakuła, Bogusław. "Kolonialne i postkolonialne aspekty polskiego dyskursu kresoznawczego (zarys problematyki)." *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2006): 11–33.
- Bakuła, Bogusław. "Studia postkolonialne w Europie Środkowej oraz Wschodniej 1989–2009: Kwerenda wybranych problemów w ramach projektu badawczego." *Kultura po przejściach, osoby z przeszłością: Polski dyskurs postzależnościowy – konteksty i perspektywy badawcze*. Ed. Ryszard Nycz. Krakow: Universitas, 2011. 137–165.

- Beissinger, Mark R., and Crawford Young (eds.). *Beyond State Crisis? Postcolonial Africa and Post-Soviet Eurasia in Comparative Perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2002.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London et al.: Routledge, 1994.
- Borkowska, Grażyna. "Perspektywa postkolonialna na gruncie polskim." *Teksty Drugie* 5 (2010): 41–52.
- Born, Robert, and Sarah Lemmen (eds.). *Orientalismen in Ostmitteleuropa: Diskurse, Akteure und Disziplinen vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2014.
- Buchowski, Michał. "The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother." *Anthropological Quarterly* 79 (2006): 463–482.
- Cavanagh, Clare. "Postkolonialna Polska: Biała plama na mapie współczesnej teorii." Trans. by Tomasz Kunz. *Teksty Drugie* 2/3 (2003): 60–71.
- Cavanagh, Clare. "Postcolonial Poland." *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004): 82–92.
- Chernetsky, Vitaly. *Mapping Postcommunist Cultures: Russia and Ukraine in the Context of Globalization*. Montreal et al.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007.
- Condee, Nancy [Kondi, Nensi]. "Sovremennoe rossiiskoe kino i problema vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelman [Uffel'mann], and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 760–786.
- Dąbrowski, Mieczysław. "Wilki w Rosji: Subaltern? W imperium? (Polemika z konceptem 'postzależności')." *Porównania* 15 (2014): 105–120.
- Dickinson, Sara. "Russia's First 'Orient': Characterizing the Crimea in 1787." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 3.1 (2002): 3–25.
- Domańska, Ewa. "O poznawczym uprzywilejowaniu ofiary (Uwagi metodologiczne)." *(Nie) Obecność: Pominięcia i przemilczenia w narracjach XX wieku*. Eds. Hanna Gosk and Bożena Karwowska. Warsaw: Elipsa, 2008. 19–36.
- Domdey, Jana, Gesine Drews-Sylla, and Justyna Gołąbek (eds.). *Another Africa? (Post-)Koloniale Afrika-Imaginationen im russischen, polnischen und deutschen Kontext*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2017.
- Etkind, Aleksandr. "Fuko i tezis vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 49 (2001): 50–73.
- Etkind, Aleksandr. "Russkaia literatura, XIX vek: Roman vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 59 (2003): 103–112.
- Etkind, Alexander. *Russia's Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*. Cambridge: Polity, 2011.
- Etkind, Aleksandr, Dirk Uffelman [Uffel'mann], and Il'ia Kukulin (eds.). *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012.
- Feichtinger, Johannes, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky (eds.). *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003.
- Fiut, Aleksander. "Kolonizacja? Polonizacja?" *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2003): 151–156.
- Frank, Susi. "'Multinational Soviet Literature': The Project and Its Post-Soviet Legacy in Iurii Rytkeu and Gennadii Aigi." *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism*. Eds. Klavdia Smola and Dirk Uffelman. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016. 191–217.
- Gall, Alfred. "Die *gawęda* als literarisches Medium der Gedächtnispolitik." *Romantik und Geschichte: Polnisches Paradigma, europäischer Kontext, deutsch-polnische*

- Perspektive*. Eds. Alfred Gall, Thomas Grob, Andreas Lawaty, and German Ritz. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007. 108–133.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York, NY, and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Georgiev, Plamen K. *Self-Orientalization in South East Europe*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2012.
- Geraci, Robert. Review of *Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience*, by Alexander Etkind. *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity* 43.2 (2015): 356–357.
- Gerasimov, Il'ia, Sergei Glebov, Aleksandr Kaplunovskii, Marina Mogil'ner, and Aleksandr Semenov. "V poiskakh novoi imperskoi istorii." *Novaia imperskaia istoriia postsovetetskogo prostranstva*. Kazan': Tsentr Issledovaniia Natsionalizma i Imperii, 2004. 7–29.
- Golinczak, Michalina. "Postkolonializm przed użyciem wstrząsnać!" *Recykling idei* 10 (2008): 108–113.
- Gosk, Hanna. "Polski dyskurs kresowy w niefikcjonalnych zapisach międzywojennych: Próba lektury w perspektywie *postcolonial studies*." *Teksty Drugie* 6 (2008): 20–33.
- Gradskova, Iuliia. "Kúli sem'i kúli: zhenshchiny 'otstalykh narodov' i sovetskie politiki kul'turnosti." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelman, and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 664–683.
- Groys, Boris. *Die Erfindung Rußlands*. Munich and Vienna: Hanser, 1995.
- Hundorova, Tamara. "Ressentiment v postkolonial'nii perspektivi (ukraïns'kyi vypadok)." *Kurier Kryvbasu* 7/8 (2007): 340–349.
- Hundorova, Tamara. *Tranzhytna kul'tura: Symptomy postkolonial'noi travmy*. Kyiv: Grani-T, 2013.
- Janion, Maria. *Niesamowita słowiańszczyzna*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2007.
- Kaps, Klemens, and Jan Surman (eds.). *Galicja postkolonialnie, możliwości i granice*. Special issue of *Historyka: Studia Metodologiczne* 42 (2012).
- Kelertas, Violeta (ed.). *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Amsterdam and New York, NY: Rodopi, 2006.
- Kiossev, Alexander. "Otherness, Again: Notes on Self-Colonizing Cultures." *Bulgaria-avantgarde*. Ed. Haralampi G. Oroshakoff. Cologne: Salon Verlag, 1998. 137–146.
- Kirschbaum, Heinrich. *Im intertextuellen Schlangennest: Adam Mickiewicz und polnisch-russisches (anti-)imperiales Schreiben*. Vol. 3 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016.
- Kirschbaum, Heinrich (ed.). *Wiedergänger – Pilger – Indianer: Polen-Metonymien im langen 19. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 5 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2018.
- Kissel, Wolfgang S. (ed.). *Der Osten des Ostens: Orientalismen in slavischen Kulturen und Literaturen*. Vol. 1 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2012.
- Kołodziejczyk, Dorota. "Post-Colonial Transfer to Central-and-Eastern Europe." Trans. by Marta Skotnicka. *Teksty Drugie English Edition*, Special Issue 1 (2014): 124–142.
- Kołodziejczyk, Dorota, and Cristina Şandru (eds.). *On Colonialism, Communism and East-Central Europe – Some Reflections*. Special issue of *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 48.2 (2014).
- Kopp, Kristin L. *Germany's Wild East: Constructing Poland as Colonial Space*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2012.
- Korek, Janusz (ed.). *From Sovietology to Postcoloniality: Poland and Ukraine from a Postcolonial Perspective*. Huddinge: Södertörns Högskola, 2007.

- Kovačević, Nataša. *Narrating Post/Communism: Colonial Discourse and Europe's Borderline Civilization*. London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2008.
- Krylov, Konstantin. "Itogi Saïda: zhizn' i kniga." Edward [Edvard] Saïd, *Orientalizm*. Trans. by Aleksandr V. Govorunov. St. Petersburg: Russkii mir, 2006. 599–637.
- Kuziak, Michał (ed.). *Słowacki postkolonialny*. Bydgoszcz: Teatr Polski w Bydgoszczy, 2010.
- Layton, Susan. *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Lecke, Mirja. *Westland: Polen und Ukraine in der russischen Literatur von Puškin bis Babel'*. Vol. 2 of *Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2015.
- Lefter, Ion B. "Poate fi considerat postcomunismul un post-colonialism?" *Postcolonialism și Postcomunism: Cahiers de l'Echinox Journal* 1 (2001): 117–119.
- Lipovetsky, Mark. "Sovetskie i postsovetskie transformatsii siuzheta vnutrennei kolonizatsii." *Tam, vnutri: Praktiki vnutrennei kolonizatsii v kul'turnoi istorii Rossii*. Eds. Aleksandr Etkind, Dirk Uffelman, and Il'ia Kukulin. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2012. 809–845.
- Luft, Robert. "Machtansprüche und kulturelle Muster nichtperipherer Regionen: Die Kernlande Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien in der späten Habsburgermonarchie." *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Eds. Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003. 165–187.
- Mazierska, Ewa, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Närke. "Postcolonial Theory and the Postcommunist World." *Postcolonial Approaches to Eastern European Cinema: Portraying Neighbours On-Screen*. Eds. Ewa Mazierska, Lars Kristensen, and Eva Närke. London and New York, NY: I.B. Tauris, 2014. 1–39.
- Merten, Kai, and Lucia Krämer (eds.). *Postcolonial Studies Meets Media Studies: A Critical Encounter*. Bielefeld: transcript, 2016.
- Mignolo, Walter D., and Madina V. Tlostanova. *Learning to Unlearn: Decolonial Reflections from Eurasia and the Americas*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2012.
- Mikolajczak, Małgorzata. "Między mimikrą a rebelią. Pejzaż (post)kolonialny regionalnej literatury." *Teksty Drugie* 5 (2015): 283–305.
- Moore, David Chioni. "Is the Post- in Postcolonial the Post- in Post-Soviet? Toward a Global Postcolonial Critique." *Papers of the Modern Language Association* 16.1 (2001): 111–128.
- Morozov, Viatcheslav. *Russia's Postcolonial Identity: A Subaltern Empire in a Eurocentric World*. Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Osinski, Wojciech. *'Wiatr od morza': Aussöhnung oder Abgrenzung? Stefan Żeromski's literarische Geschichtsverarbeitung der deutsch-polnischen Nachbarschaft im Lichte der postkolonialen Theorie*. Dresden: Thelem, 2011.
- Pavlyshyn, Marko J. "Post-Colonial Features in Contemporary Ukrainian Culture." *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 6.2 (1992): 41–55.
- Pavlyshyn, Marko J. "Ukrainian Literature and the Erotics of Post-Colonialism: Some Modest Propositions." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 17.1/2 (1993): 110–126.
- Pavlyshyn, Marko. "'The Tranquil Lakes of the Transmontane Commune': Literature and/against Postcoloniality in Ukraine After 1991." *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism*. Eds. Klavdia Smola and Dirk Uffelman. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016. 59–82.
- Petković, Nikola. *A Central Europe of Our Own: Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, Postcomunism [sic] and the Absence of Authenticity*. Rijeka: Adamić, 2003.

- Pirie, Donald. "The Agony in the Garden: Polish Romanticism." *Romanticism in National Context*. Eds. Roy Porter and Mikuláš Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 317–344.
- Postcolonial or Postdependence Studies?* Special Issue of *Teksty Drugie English Edition* 1 (2014).
- Post-Dependence Studies Centre*. 2009. http://www.cbdb.polon.uw.edu.pl/index_eng.html (15 February 2022).
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London et al.: Routledge, 1992.
- Pucherová, Dobrota, and Róbert Gárik (eds.). *Postcolonial Europe? Essays on Post-Communist Literatures and Cultures*. Leiden and Boston, MA: Brill Rodopi, 2015.
- Ram, Harsha. *The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.
- Ruthner, Clemens. "'K.(u.)k. postcolonial'? Für eine neue Lesart der österreichischen (und benachbarter) Literatur/en." *Kakanien revisited: Das Eigene und das Fremde (in) der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie*. Eds. Wolfgang Müller-Funk, Peter Plener, and Clemens Ruthner. Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 2002. 93–103.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Simonek, Stefan. "Möglichkeiten und Grenzen postkolonialistischer Literaturtheorie aus slawistischer Sicht." *Habsburg postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*. Eds. Johannes Feichtinger, Ursula Prutsch, and Moritz Csáky. Innsbruck et al.: StudienVerlag, 2003. 129–139.
- Skórczewski, Dariusz. *Teoria – literatura – dyskurs: Pejzaż postkolonialny*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2013.
- Skórczewski, Dariusz. "Radykalna konwersja jako postkolonialne wyparcie: Kulturowe samowypnanie w powieściach Piotra Ibrahima Kalwasa jako ostateczne rozwiązanie (post-)totalitarnej traumy." *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 62.1 (2014): 45–67.
- Smola, Klavdia, and Dirk Uffermann (eds.). *Postcolonial Slavic Literatures After Communism*. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2016.
- Smola, Klavdia, and Dirk Uffermann (eds.). "Thematic cluster: Postkolonial'nost' postsovetsskikh literatur: konstruktii etnicheskogo." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 144 (2017): 420–508.
- Sowa, Jan. *Ciesz się, późny wnuku! Kolonializm, globalizacja i demokracja radykalna*. Kraków: Universitas, 2008.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. "Subaltern Talk: Interview with the Editors (1993–94)." Gayatri C. Spivak, *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. Eds. Donna Landry and Gerald Maclean. New York, NY, and London: Routledge, 1996. 287–308.
- Sproede, Alfred, and Mirja Lecke. "Der Weg der *postcolonial studies* nach und in Osteuropa: Polen, Litauen, Russland." *Überbringen – Überformen – Überblenden: Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems. Cologne et al.: Böhlau, 2011. 27–66.
- Stępnik, Krzysztof, and Dariusz Trzeźniowski (eds.). *Studia postkolonialne nad kulturą i cywilizacją polską*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2011.
- Surynt, Izabela. *Postępy, kultura i kolonializm: Polska a niemiecki projekt europejskiego Wschodu w dyskursach publicznych XIX wieku*. Wrocław: Centrum Studiów Niemieckich i Europejskich im. Willy Brandta Uniw. Wrocławskiego, 2006.
- Szkudlarek, Tomasz. "Miejsce / przemieszczenie / tożsamość." Trans. by Tadeusz Z. Wolański. *Magazyn Sztuki* 19 (1998): 49–60.

- Thompson, Ewa. *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism*. Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.
- Thompson, Ewa. "Said a sprawa polska: Przeciwno kulturowej bezsilności peryferii." *Europa: Tygodnik idei* (29 June 2005): 11–13.
- Thompson, Ewa. "Sarmatyzm a postkolonializm: O naturze polskich resentymentów." *Dziennik.pl* (5 November 2007). <http://wiadomosci.dziennik.pl/wydarzenia/artykuly/193060,sarmatyzm-i-postkolonializm.html> (15 February 2022).
- Thompson, Ewa. "It Is Colonialism After All: Some Epistemological Remarks." Trans. by Jan Szelągiewicz. *Teksty Drugie English Edition* 1 (2014): 67–81.
- Tlostanova, Madina V. *Gender Epistemologies and Eurasian Borderlands*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Uffelmann, Dirk. "Palackýs 'Dekonstruktion' Mitteleuropas." *Die Slaven und Europa*. Eds. Gerhard Ressel and Henrieke Stahl. Frankfurt/M. et al.: Lang, 2008. 345–370.
- Uffelmann, Dirk. "Autoidentyfikacja ze Wschodem w narracjach polskich migrantów." Trans. by Zuzanna Ossowska. *Rocznik Komparatystyczny* 1 (2010): 253–277.
- Uffelmann, Dirk. "Theory as Memory Practice: The Divided Discourse on Poland's Postcoloniality." *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe*. Eds. Uilleam Blacker, Alexander Etkind, and Julie Fedor. Basingstoke and New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 103–124.
- Uffelmann, Dirk (ed.). "Divide et impera": *The Lisbon Conference of 1988*. Special issue of *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* 72.1 (2016): 1–99.
- Uffelmann, Dirk (ed.). *Umsiedlung, Vertreibung, Wiedergewinnung? Postkoloniale Perspektiven auf deutsche, polnische und tschechische Literatur über den erzwungenen Bevölkerungstransfer der Jahre 1944 bis 1950*. Special issue of *Germanoslavica* 28.1/2 (2017).
- Waldstein, Maxim K. "Observing Imperium: A Postcolonial Reading of Ryszard Kapuscinski's Account of Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia." *Social Identities* 8.3 (2002): 481–499.
- Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1976.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana. *Khroniky vid Fortinbrasu*. Kyiv: Vydavn. Fakt, 1999.
- Zajas, Paweł. "Zagubieni kosmonauci: Raz jeszcze o Imperium Ryszarda Kapuścińskiego i jego krytykach." *Teksty Drugie* 3 (2010): 218–231.
- Zarycki, Tomasz. "Polska a jej regiony a debata postkolonialna." *Oblicze polityczne regionów Polski*. Ed. Małgorzata Dajnowicz. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Finansów i Zarządzania, 2007. 31–48.
- Zarycki, Tomasz. *Ideologies of Eastness in Central and Eastern Europe*. London: Routledge, 2014.