

МИНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ВОЛИНСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ЛЕСІ УКРАЇНКИ

Кафедра прикладної лінгвістики

На правах рукопису

ЖИЛКО ОЛЕКСАНДР АДАМОВИЧ

**UNCOVERING TRAUMA IN UKRAINIAN WAR POETRY TRANSLATED
INTO ENGLISH**

Спеціальність: 035 Філологія

Освітньо-професійна програма: Прикладна лінгвістика. Переклад і
комп'ютерна лінгвістика.

Робота на здобуття освітнього ступеня «Магістр»

Науковий керівник:

ЗАСЄКІН СЕРГІЙ ВАСИЛЬОВИЧ,

доктор філологічних наук, професор

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНО ДО ЗАХИСТУ

Протокол № 5

засідання кафедри прикладної лінгвістики

від 25.11.2025 р.

Завідувачка кафедри



доц. Калиновська І.М

ЛУЦЬК 2025

АНОТАЦІЯ

Дипломна робота присвячена вивченю перекладу сучасної української воєнної поезії англійською мовою як психолінгвістичного та дискурсивного явища. Метою дослідження є виявлення і характеристика психолінгвістичних регулярностей перекладу, що визначають спосіб передачі травматичного дискурсу, когерентності та емоційно-когнітивних структур в англійських перекладах. Особлива увага приділяється тому, як нормалізація, експлікація, еквалізація та спрощення проявляються у перекладах на основі кількісного аналізу корпусу за допомогою LIWC2015 та якісного лінгвостилістичного аналізу маркових рядків — початкових поетичних імпульсів, що формують емоційне та смислове ядро тексту.

Об'єктом дослідження є процес перекладу української воєнної поезії англійською, а предметом — психолінгвістичні регулярності, що виникають у цьому процесі та впливають на передавання травматичної лексики, когерентності та маркового рядка. Завдання дослідження охоплюють укладання двомовного корпусу з 39 поезій, аналіз психолінгвістичних механізмів відтворення емоційно насищених текстів, визначення та дослідження маркового рядка та виявлення статистично значущих відмінностей між оригіналами і перекладами. У роботі застосовано корпусний статистичний аналіз за допомогою LIWC2015, лінгвостилістичне зіставлення оригіналів і перекладів, порівняльний аналіз перекладацьких трансформацій, інтерпретативний аналіз у межах теорії травматичного дискурсу та емпіричне збирання даних шляхом безпосереднього спілкування з авторами.

Наукова новизна роботи полягає у введенні поняття маркового рядка як нового аналітичного інструмента для опису генетичної структури поетичного тексту та доведенні його ефективності у психолінгвістичному та перекладознавчому аналізі. Дослідження показує, як ключові емоційні та концептуальні елементи поем зазнають трансформацій у перекладі та як психолінгвістичні регулярності впливають на передавання травматичного досвіду для англомовного читача. Результати можуть бути корисними для перекладознавства, психології мовлення та практики перекладу поетичних текстів.

Ключові слова: травма, воєнна поезія, переклад, психолінгвістичні регулярності, марків рядок, LIWC2015, поетична форма.

SUMMARY

This master's thesis examines the process of translating contemporary Ukrainian war poetry into English as a psycholinguistic and discursive phenomenon. The research aims to identify and describe the psycholinguistic translation regularities that shape English translations of Ukrainian war poems, with particular attention to the transmission and transformation of trauma-related discourse features, coherence patterns, and emotional and cognitive structures. The study focuses on how normalisation, explicitation, equalisation and simplification appear in translation, integrating quantitative corpus analysis using LIWC2015 with qualitative linguostylistic examination of author-identified Markan Verses, the generative poetic lines that form the semantic and emotional nucleus of the poem.

The object of the research is the translation of Ukrainian war poetry into English, while the subject is the psycholinguistic regularities that emerge in this process and influence the representation of trauma-related linguistic patterns and coherence markers. The tasks of the study include compiling a bilingual corpus of 39 poems and their translations, analysing psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in rendering emotionally charged poetic texts, and defining and examining the Markan Verse with regard to its transformation in translation. The research employs corpus-based statistical analysis using LIWC2015, linguostylistic comparison of poetic structures, comparative translation analysis, interpretative analysis within trauma discourse theory, and empirical data collection from authors to identify Markan Verses.

The scientific novelty of the thesis lies in introducing the concept of the Markan Verse as a new analytical tool for describing the generative poetic impulse and demonstrating its usefulness for psycholinguistic and translation analysis. The study shows how core emotional and conceptual elements of poems are transformed in translation and how psycholinguistic regularities shape this process. The results provide a deeper understanding of how trauma-related poetic discourse is mediated for the target-language reader and offer practical insights for translators working with emotionally charged literary texts.

Keywords: trauma, war poetry, translation, psycholinguistic regularities, Markan Verse, LIWC2015, poetic form.

INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1	9
Theoretical Framework for the Study of Trauma in War Poetry and Its Translation ...	9
1.1 Trauma studies.....	9
1.3 Contemporary Ukrainian War Poetry	18
1.4 Principles of Poetic Translation.....	22
1.5 The Markan Verse	33
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1.....	42
CHAPTER 2 Translation Regularities in English Translations of Ukrainian War Poetry: A Psycholinguistic Perspective.....	45
2.1 Introduction to the empirical study	45
2.2. The analysis of the corpora.....	47
2.3 Distribution of statistically significant markers across translation regularities	52
2.4 Interpretation of the Results	57
2.5 The Markan Verse	60
CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2.....	70
CONCLUSIONS	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77

INTRODUCTION

The full-scale war in Ukraine has profoundly reshaped contemporary Ukrainian literature, with poetry emerging as one of the most immediate and responsive forms of artistic expression. War poetry plays a crucial role in articulating traumatic experience, preserving lived reality, and transforming individual emotional reactions into collective cultural memory. In conditions of extreme violence and uncertainty, poetic texts often capture fragmented perception, emotional intensity, and cognitive disorientation that are central to the experience of trauma.

The translation of Ukrainian war poetry into English is of particular importance, as it enables the transmission of this experience beyond national and linguistic boundaries and facilitates intercultural understanding. However, translating trauma-related poetry involves more than the transfer of meaning: it requires the mediation of emotional, cognitive, and discursive structures that may be altered by psycholinguistic translation regularities such as normalisation, explicitation, equalising, and simplification.

The relevance of the present study lies in the need to identify and describe the psycholinguistic regularities that shape the English translation of Ukrainian war poetry, as well as to assess how these regularities influence the transmission of trauma-related discourse, emotional intensity, and coherence in translated poetic texts.

Research Aim

The aim of the thesis is to identify and describe psycholinguistic translation regularities governing the English translation of contemporary Ukrainian war poetry, with particular attention to the transmission and transformation of trauma-related discourse features, coherence patterns, and emotional–cognitive structures. The study aims to establish how processes such as normalisation, explicitation, equalising, and simplification manifest themselves in translation through quantitative corpus analysis using LIWC and qualitative linguostylistic analysis of author-identified Markan Verses, thereby clarifying the extent to which translated texts reproduce, modify, or

mediate the experiential dimension of traumatic poetic discourse for the target-language reader.

Object of research

The object of the research is the process of translating Ukrainian war poetry into English as a psycholinguistic and discursive phenomenon.

Subject of research

The subject of the research is the psycholinguistic translation regularities manifested in English translations of Ukrainian war poetry, including processes of normalisation, explicitation, equalising, and simplification, as reflected in coherence-related markers, trauma-related linguistic patterns, and the translation of the *Markan Verse*.

Research tasks

The tasks of the study include compiling a bilingual corpus of contemporary Ukrainian war poems and their English translations; analysing key psycholinguistic mechanisms involved in rendering emotionally charged poetic texts; and introducing, defining, and examining the concept of the *Markan verse* as the initial generative line of a poem, with particular attention to how its semantic and emotional nucleus is transformed in translation. The research applies LIWC as a quantitative tool for identifying lexical, emotional, cognitive, and coherence-related patterns across the corpus, and employs an independent-samples t-test to compare mean LIWC values between originals and translations in order to determine whether the observed differences are statistically significant. The study further aims to interpret these quantitative results within the theoretical framework of trauma discourse and translation studies, integrating statistical evidence with qualitative observations to identify the main tendencies that shape the transformation of war poetry in translation.

Research Methods

The study employs the following research methods:

- corpus-based statistical analysis using LIWC2015, applied to identify statistically significant psycholinguistic differences between Ukrainian original poems and their English translations;
- linguostylistic comparison, used to analyse Markan Verses in the source texts and their translations at the lexical, grammatical, and stylistic levels;
- comparative translation analysis, employed to identify and interpret translation transformations in terms of psycholinguistic regularities such as normalisation, explicitation, equalising, and simplification;
- interpretative analysis, used to contextualise quantitative and qualitative findings within the theoretical framework of trauma discourse and translation studies;
- empirical data collection through direct communication with authors, applied to identify Markan Verses based on authorial reflection on the creative process.

Scientific Novelty

The scientific novelty of the study lies primarily in the introduction of a new literary and translation-analytic concept, the Markan Verse. The Markan Verse is proposed as an analytical term designating the initial generative line of a poetic text, understood as the verbal nucleus around which the poem develops, regardless of its final position within the completed text. Unlike traditional approaches that focus on the first or most prominent line in the finished poem, this concept shifts attention to the creative impulse underlying poetic composition.

In addition, the study demonstrates the applicability of the Markan Verse as an object of psycholinguistic and translation analysis. By combining corpus-based statistical methods with qualitative linguostylistic comparison of author-identified Markan Verses, the research offers a novel perspective on how core emotional and conceptual elements of poetic texts are transformed in translation. This integrated approach extends existing models of translation analysis by linking psycholinguistic regularities with the internal generative structure of poetic discourse.

The proposed concept of the Markan Verse may be employed as an analytical tool in the qualitative analysis of poetry and its translation, enabling researchers and students to focus on the generative and emotionally salient elements of poetic texts. This approach can be integrated into academic courses on literary translation, stylistics, and discourse analysis as a means of combining close reading with psycholinguistic and corpus-based methods.

Practical Significance

The practical significance of the study consists in the applicability of its results to translation studies and the practice of poetic translation. The findings highlight recurrent psycholinguistic translation regularities, including normalisation, explication, equalising, and simplification, which may be taken into account by translators working with trauma-related poetic texts in order to make translation choices more conscious and critically informed.

The concept of the Markan Verse proposed in the study may be used as an analytical tool in the qualitative analysis of poetry and its translation, as well as in academic courses on literary translation and stylistics. In addition, the combined methodological approach integrating corpus-based analysis and linguostylistic comparison can serve as a framework for further research in translation studies and discourse analysis.

Approbation of Research Results and Publications

The main findings of the master's thesis were presented at the IX All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference of Young Scholars "Linguistic Horizons of the 21st Century", held on 4 November 2025. The conference papers based on the research were published in the Proceedings of the IX All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference of Young Scholars "Linguistic Horizons of the 21st Century."

CHAPTER 1

Theoretical Framework for the Study of Trauma in War Poetry and Its Translation

1.1 Trauma studies

1.1.1 Trauma as a Scientific and Interdisciplinary Object

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) defines trauma “*as the symptoms that occur following exposure to an event (i.e., traumatic event) that involves actual or threatened death, serious injury, or sexual violence [4]*”. Rather than being fully assimilated at the moment of occurrence, trauma often manifests itself indirectly and belatedly, particularly through disruptions in language, memory, and representation. This delayed registration has led scholars to conceptualize trauma not merely as a psychological condition but as a complex phenomenon that requires alternative narrative and aesthetic frameworks for its articulation and recognition.

The emergence of trauma as a scholarly object can be traced to nineteenth-century medical investigations into psychosomatic disorders associated with industrial and technological accidents. Early clinical studies focused on conditions such as “*railway spine* ” [57], in which victims exhibited severe psychological and bodily symptoms without detectable organic injury. Hermann Oppenheim introduced the term “*traumatic neurosis* ” [47] to describe this condition, framing trauma as a psychological wound analogous to a physical one. Jean-Martin Charcot further advanced this understanding by situating traumatic neurosis within the framework of hysteria and emphasizing the role of emotional shock in producing symptoms, thereby contributing to the gradual psychologization of trauma [17]. Pierre Janet identified dissociation as a key pathogenic mechanism, describing trauma as an experience that is split off from conscious awareness because it cannot be integrated at the moment of occurrence [33].

1.1.2 Psychological and Clinical Foundations of Trauma

These early clinical insights laid the groundwork for psychoanalytic approaches developed in the early twentieth century, most notably by Sigmund Freud. In his analysis of hysteria and war neuroses, Freud reconceptualized trauma as a breach in the psyche's protective shield caused by an overwhelming shock for which the mind is unprepared. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, he introduced the concept of repetition compulsion to explain the involuntary return of traumatic events in the form of nightmares, flashbacks, and intrusive memories. Freud's work also established the temporal paradox that remains central to trauma theory: traumatic events are not fully experienced when they occur but acquire their significance through belated reappearance in memory. Within this framework, therapeutic narration, often described as the “*talking cure*”, aims to integrate dissociated experience into a coherent personal history [29].

Contemporary clinical discourse on trauma is strongly shaped by the formal recognition of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder in 1980. PTSD conceptualizes trauma as a response to an external event or stressor “*outside the range of usual human experience*” [57] and identifies its effects through recurrent intrusive phenomena such as flashbacks, nightmares, and involuntary recollections. Crucially, this diagnostic framework introduced a causal model that foregrounded external responsibility, thereby transforming trauma into a category with legal, social, and moral implications. As Didier Fassin and Richard Rechtman observe, trauma has increasingly come to function as “*a moral judgment through which victims are recognized and legitimized within public discourse*” [26].

1.1.3 Cultural and Collective Trauma

From the late twentieth century onward, trauma theory expanded beyond the clinical domain into cultural, historical, and literary studies. This shift marked a move away from viewing trauma exclusively as individual pathology toward understanding it as a socially mediated and narratively constructed phenomenon. Within this

paradigm, trauma is not inherent in an event itself but emerges through processes of interpretation, representation, and collective meaning-making. Jeffrey Alexander conceptualizes this process as “*cultural trauma*”, arguing that trauma occurs when a collectivity comes to believe it has been irreversibly damaged by a catastrophic event that leaves “*indelible marks upon their group consciousness*” [3]. Cultural trauma, in this sense, is produced through narrative struggle and symbolic negotiation rather than through the event alone.

1.1.4. Trauma and Literary Representation

Literary theory has played a particularly significant role in articulating this expanded understanding of trauma. Cathy Caruth’s influential formulation of trauma as an “*unclaimed experience*” [14] emphasizes its inherent latency, according to which traumatic events are not fully assimilated at the moment of occurrence but return belatedly in repetitive and intrusive forms. For Caruth, this temporal disjunction renders trauma resistant to direct representation while simultaneously positioning literature as a privileged space for its articulation. Building on this insight, Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub conceptualize trauma in terms of testimony and witnessing, arguing that “*traumatic narratives are often fragmented and discontinuous because coherent narration is precisely what trauma disrupts*” [27].

The representational difficulty associated with trauma has led scholars to identify formal disruption as a defining feature of traumatic texts. Anne Whitehead observes that “*literary works dealing with trauma frequently employ fragmented structures, disrupted chronology, and narrative gaps that formally reproduce the symptoms of traumatic memory*” [60]. Dominick LaCapra further develops this approach by distinguishing between historical trauma and structural trauma and by advocating an ethical mode of engagement he terms “*empathic unsettlement*” [35], which resists both detached observation and appropriative identification.

1.1.5 Poetry as a Privileged Medium of Trauma

Poetry occupies a particularly acute position within this theoretical framework. The condensed form of poetic language, its reliance on fragmentation, and its

resistance to narrative closure render it especially suited to articulating traumatic experience. The paradox of writing poetry after historical catastrophe has been repeatedly acknowledged, most famously by Theodor Adorno, who questioned the possibility of poetic expression after Auschwitz while simultaneously recognizing its necessity by stating “*to write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric*” [2]. Holocaust survivor Paul Celan articulated this tension by asserting that language remained available to him despite yielding “*no words for what was happening*” [16], using poetry as a means of exploring the limits of expression. In this context, Carolyn Dean argues that literary witnessing establishes a form of epistemic trust between witness and reader, grounded in ethical attentiveness rather than claims of full understanding [23].

Taken together, the historical development and theoretical expansion of trauma studies demonstrate how trauma has come to be understood not only as a clinical diagnosis but as a critical framework for analyzing cultural memory, ethical responsibility, and aesthetic form. This understanding is particularly relevant for the study of war poetry, where traumatic experience is often articulated through formal disruption, fragmentation, and the destabilization of linguistic and poetic structures.

Taken together, trauma studies provide a theoretical framework for understanding trauma as a phenomenon that exceeds immediate psychological experience and manifests itself through temporal delay, fragmentation, and resistance to coherent representation. The historical development of the field demonstrates a gradual shift from clinical models of individual pathology toward cultural, ethical, and literary approaches that emphasize narration, memory, and form. Within this framework, artistic and literary texts, and poetry in particular, emerge as privileged sites for articulating traumatic experience, as they allow trauma to be expressed indirectly through structural disruption and aesthetic deformation. These insights are crucial for the analysis of war poetry, where traumatic experience is frequently encoded not only thematically but also at the level of poetic structure, linguistic instability, and formal markedness.

1.2 War Poetry as a Mode of Representing Trauma

1.2.1 War Poetry and the Break with Literary Tradition

War poetry is commonly distinguished as a literary phenomenon rooted in direct, visceral experience of armed conflict and characterized by a decisive rejection of idealized or glorifying representations of war. Scholars frequently contrast modern war poetry, particularly the “*trench lyric*” [12] that emerged during the First World War, with earlier poetic traditions that merely thematized war through heroic, patriotic, or mythologizing narratives. This distinction marks a profound epistemological and ethical break, as war poetry after World War I arises from the necessity to confront the psychological and physical realities of combat rather than to aestheticize or justify them.

The poetry of soldier-writers such as Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon exemplifies this rupture. Their work explicitly challenges the euphemistic rhetoric of patriotic discourse and the “*heroic view of war championed at home*” [56]. Esther Sánchez-Pardo situates the poetry of the Great War generation “*on the far side of the abyss of history*” [53], emphasizing its deliberate abandonment of the self-authorizing heroic tradition that had dominated earlier war verse. In this context, war poetry assumes a distinct ethical function. Owen famously articulated this aim in his draft preface, declaring, “*My subject is War, and the pity of War. The Poetry is in the pity*” [44]. For Owen, the task of the poet was not to glorify conflict but to warn and to speak truthfully, translating personal wounds into a universal ethical address.

A central criterion distinguishing war poetry from poetry that merely adopts war as a theme is the source of experience from which the poetic voice emerges. Scholars such as James Campbell differentiate the “*trench lyric*” [12], grounded in firsthand combat experience, from the more abstract and patriotic verse produced by non-combatants during the early stages of war. Lieutenant C. E. Andrews observed as early as 1918 that while many civilians attempted to write about war, the most enduring and canonical poetry emerged from soldiers who possessed a “*sense of the*

word" [5] shaped by lived experience. Siegfried Sassoon's poetry, in particular, articulates resentment toward a society that remained indifferent to the suffering of veterans, foregrounding the combatant's perspective as a privileged and ethically charged position from which war is narrated.

1.2.2 War Poetry and Direct Experience

War poetry is thus closely bound to traumatic experience and to the structural anxiety generated by modern, industrialized conflict. Rather than offering descriptive realism alone, it seeks to register the psychological failure to cognitively assimilate mass violence, mechanized killing, and the impersonal scale of modern warfare.

From the First World War onward, war poetry systematically abandons romanticized representations of battle in favor of documenting violence, loss, and devastation.

Owen's well-known critique of Horace's dictum *Dulce et decorum est* [4] exemplifies this shift, juxtaposing patriotic ideals with graphic depictions of bodily suffering and meaningless death. Such poetry emphasizes the insignificance and expendability of individual lives within industrial warfare, where courage and moral worth are rendered futile by the random logic of destruction.

1.2.3 Violence, Loss, and the Ethics of Representation

The traumatic nature of war is further articulated through the body, which emerges as a central site of inscription in war poetry. Poets employ visceral and often grotesque imagery to render psychological wounds visible through sensory and somatic experience. Scholars such as Santanu Das emphasize the somatic dimension of war poetry, arguing that psychological trauma is externalized through tactile imagery and embodied perception, producing what he describes as an "*embodied representation of madness*" [21]. The shattered human sensorium, caught between industrial modernity and chaotic matter, leaves the body exposed, fragile, and dehumanized. Elaine Scarry's work on pain and language further illuminates how extreme suffering resists linguistic representation, prompting poets to experiment with fragmented and distorted forms in order to articulate psychological distress [55].

At the level of mental experience, war poetry frequently centers on psychological rupture and madness. The phenomenon of shell shock, or war neurosis, is repeatedly depicted as a profound disintegration of the self caused by sustained exposure to horror. Drawing on psychoanalytic models, Sigmund Freud described such trauma as a breach in the psyche's "*protective shield*" [29], resulting in repetitive intrusions that manifest as hallucinations, flashbacks, and compulsive recollection. Poems such as Owen's *Mental Cases* and Sassoon's *Repression of War Experience* explore these psychodynamics, depicting the failure of repression and the return of traumatic imagery in distorted and intrusive forms [45] [54]. Trauma, in this sense, is marked by temporal dislocation: the event is not fully assimilated at the moment of occurrence but returns belatedly, haunting consciousness with fragments and echoes of the past.

1.2.4 Formal and Linguistic Features of Traumatic War Poetry

These psychological and somatic disruptions are not merely represented thematically but are enacted formally through the linguistic and structural features of war poetry. Conventional poetic language proved inadequate for conveying the affective intensity and cognitive rupture produced by industrialized warfare, necessitating radical formal innovation. Fragmentation and disrupted syntax emerge as defining characteristics of traumatic war poetry, achieved through shattered sentence structures, erratic enjambment, irregular meter, and grotesque imagery.

Edna Longley argues that "*this structural instability parallels the poet's psychological fragmentation, functioning simultaneously as a symptom of trauma and as a necessary mode of articulation.*" [38]

The rejection of regular meter and traditional lyrical forms is particularly significant. War poets frequently employ free verse, dissonance, and minimalist techniques to align poetic form with psychological breakdown. Owen's experiments with assonance and dissonance exemplify this strategy, deliberately undermining conventional harmony in order to confront the realities of war. Similar formal instability can be observed in later conflicts, in contemporary war poetry such as

Brian Turner's writing on the Iraq War, which relies on raw and fragmented language to convey immediacy and shock.

Visual and rhythmic instability further intensifies the reader's engagement with traumatic experience. Anti-heroic grotesque imagery and disrupted lineation compel a visceral confrontation with violence, ensuring that the poem's formal composition itself bears the trace of extremity. Rhetorical questions and direct address are frequently employed to destabilize the reader's distance and to implicate civilian audiences in the ethical crisis of war. Sassoon's repeated use of rhetorical questioning, as in "*Does It Matter*" [54], exposes the indifference of society toward wounded veterans and foregrounds the moral failure of collective forgetting.

Finally, psychoanalytic repetition plays a crucial role in the formal logic of war poetry. The compulsive recurrence of images and phrases mirrors the survivor's unconscious attempt to master the traumatic event retrospectively. Freud's concept of repetition compulsion provides a framework for understanding how poetic repetition functions both as an expression of unresolved trauma and as an effort toward psychic control. At the same time, such repetition may signal melancholic mourning, in which loss is internalized and resists closure, further reinforcing the fractured and unresolved quality of traumatic war poetry.

War poetry is widely conceptualized as "*a form of witnessing that responds to the traumatic reality of armed conflict and carries distinct ethical responsibilities*". Beyond documenting violence, war poetry functions as testimony that confronts horror, challenges dominant narratives, and safeguards historical memory. In this sense, it operates not only as an aesthetic practice but also as an ethical intervention that demands engagement from both writer and reader.

Scholars emphasize that poetry plays a crucial role in situations where traumatic events overwhelm conventional modes of articulation, producing what has been described as a crisis of witnessing. In the context of mass violence and war, the magnitude of suffering may render direct testimony fragmentary or unspeakable. War poetry emerges precisely at this threshold, seeking to restore communication where

trauma has disrupted language and recognition. As a medium of testimony, it provides a space in which the voices of soldiers, civilians, and survivors can be articulated and preserved, countering erasure and silence.

Carolyn Forché defines poetry of witness as “*a mode of writing whose language bears the trace of extremity, registering experiences that exceed ordinary representation*” [28]. From this perspective, poetic testimony does not aim to offer exhaustive explanation but to mark the presence of trauma within language itself. Similarly, Serhiy Zhadan emphasizes that “*poetry enables language to articulate the outer limits of turmoil and collective trauma, particularly in contexts of ongoing violence*”. [66] Josh Cohen further argues “*that in the aftermath of historical catastrophe, the poet functions as the agency through which the unsayable is allowed to be heard as such, without being resolved or assimilated into explanatory discourse*”. [20]

The ethical responsibilities of war poetry are inseparable from its function as witnessing. A central ethical imperative is truthfulness, often articulated as a duty to warn audiences who remain distant from the realities of war. Wilfred Owen famously asserted that the poet’s task is to “*warn*” and to remain truthful, insisting that “*The Poetry is in the pity*” [44]. This emphasis on pity signals an ethical commitment to translating individual suffering into a shared moral address. Paul Celan similarly insisted on the necessity of precision in poetic language, rejecting aesthetic transfiguration in favor of naming and locating trauma with exactness.

Another key ethical function of war poetry lies in its resistance to glorification and societal indifference. By dismantling romanticized or nationalistic narratives of combat, war poetry confronts the ideological frameworks that legitimize violence. Owen’s critique of the maxim *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* exemplifies this resistance, exposing the moral falsity of patriotic rhetoric through unflinching depictions of suffering. Siegfried Sassoon’s poetry likewise targets the indifference of civilian society toward wounded veterans, employing satire and moral indignation to reveal the social failure to acknowledge the long-term consequences of war.

War poetry also establishes an ethical relationship between witness and audience. Carolyn J. Dean argues that “*the act of testifying through literature forges a moral community grounded in epistemic trust, requiring readers to listen without appropriating or mastering the suffering of others.*” [23]. This relational dimension of witnessing implicates the audience ethically, transforming reading into a form of responsibility rather than passive consumption. Andreea Deciu Ritivoi similarly suggests that “*witnessing trauma draws the listener into moral proximity with the event, generating ethical accountability through affective engagement*” [51]. Cathy Caruth further emphasizes that “*listening to testimony entails accepting an ethical obligation as a participant in the event of trauma and its narration*” [14].

Finally, war poetry assumes responsibility for preserving cultural memory and resisting the erasure of historical trauma. Through circulation, public readings, and inclusion in literary canons, poetic testimony functions as an act of remembrance that ensures traumatic experiences are not consigned to oblivion. In articulating suffering through verse, poetry also contributes to processes of emotional and collective reckoning, offering a space in which trauma can be acknowledged without being resolved or neutralized.

Thus, the ethical dimension of war poetry cannot be separated from its aesthetic strategies. Formal choices are inseparable from the responsibility to resist silencing, to restore speech to marginalized experiences, and to maintain the visibility of trauma within cultural memory. War poetry, understood as an act of witnessing, occupies a critical position at the intersection of ethics, memory, and representation, preparing the ground for further inquiry into its translation and transmission across languages.

1.3 Contemporary Ukrainian War Poetry

1.3.1. War as Ongoing Trauma

Contemporary Ukrainian war poetry is widely defined as an urgent cultural and political response to ongoing Russian aggression, shaped by collective trauma,

conditions of permanent threat, and the imperative of international visibility. Unlike retrospective literary representations of war, this poetry emerges from an unfinished historical event, positioning itself within a temporal framework of immediacy, uncertainty, and existential rupture.

Scholarly assessments of Ukrainian poetry written after the full-scale invasion of February 2022 emphasize its function as a direct response to psychological shock and radical disruption of everyday life. This body of work operates as a form of collective witnessing, documenting war not as an abstract theme but as a shared and ongoing reality. Trauma in this context is frequently conceptualized as collective, arising from the violent break between pre-war existence and a radically altered present. The poetry records this rupture by articulating both factual experience and emotional response, thereby transforming individual perception into a communal narrative.

1.3.2 Emotional Registers and Survival Strategies

Researchers identify a complex emotional spectrum within contemporary Ukrainian war poetry, encompassing grief, fear, anxiety, and despair, alongside counter-traumatic affects such as anger and hatred directed toward the aggressor. Svitlana Fialka argues that these intense negative emotions are not merely expressive but functional, as they are strategically transformed into a resource for survival, social connection, and collective action. In this sense, poetry does not simply reflect trauma but actively participates in processes of psychological endurance and mobilization.

For many writers, poetic expression functioned as an immediate coping strategy during the initial phase of invasion. Dmytro Lazutkin describes his poetic practice as “*a continuous attempt to impose order on both external chaos and internal disintegration*”, while Mykhailo Nazarenko emphasizes poetry’s “*unique capacity to articulate wartime experience by merging the universal with the intensely personal.*” [42] This ability to compress emotional intensity and lived experience renders poetry a particularly effective medium for responding to the instability and uncertainty of wartime existence.

Scholars such as Tetiana Riazantseva and Yevheniia Kanchura analyze poetry written during the earliest phase of the invasion through the lens of metaphysical poetics, noting a heightened engagement with questions of sacred time, mortality, and transcendence. They argue that “*such metaphysical depth is characteristic of transitional historical moments marked by radical transformation, when established systems of meaning collapse and new ontological frameworks are sought*”[50].

1.3.3 Digital Media and Real-Time Witnessing

A defining feature of contemporary Ukrainian war poetry is its mode of production and dissemination within a digital environment. Social media platforms, particularly Facebook, function as a central literary ecosystem, simultaneously serving as space for composition, publication, circulation, and archival preservation. Poets such as Eva Tur, Vasek Dukhnovskyi, and Valeriy Puzik frequently compose and share verses in brief moments between military or volunteer duties, embedding poetic practice directly within the rhythms of wartime life.

This digital infrastructure enables what Harriet Murav describes as “*a poetry of real-time witnessing*” [41], in which the temporal gap between composition and reception is effectively eliminated. Vitaly Chernetsky further characterizes this process as “*profoundly democratic, allowing poetry to function as an accessible medium for public engagement and dialogue*” [19]. The result is a form of poetic reportage that blurs boundaries between literature, documentation, and testimony.

1.3.4 Language Choice and Linguistic Politics

The full-scale invasion also precipitated a significant linguistic shift within Ukrainian war poetry. Many poets made a principled decision to adopt Ukrainian as their exclusive language of expression, including previously Russophone writers such as Volodymyr Rafeyenko. This shift reflects a broader rejection of Russian imperial discourse and propaganda claims that framed the invasion as a defense of

Russophone populations. Language choice thus becomes a form of ethical and political positioning within the poetic act itself.

Beyond its domestic function, contemporary Ukrainian war poetry operates as a tool of cultural diplomacy and soft power. Yuliya Kazanova argues that “*by providing factual and emotional testimony, this poetry constructs a solidarity narrative aimed at fostering European and transatlantic political support*” [34].

Through translation and international circulation, Ukrainian war poetry addresses a global audience, inviting ethical recognition and political alignment.

Finally, scholars emphasize the aesthetic and cultural significance of this poetic corpus. Maria G. Rewakowicz contends that “*the authenticity of contemporary Ukrainian war poetry positions it as the antithesis of propaganda and enables its potential inscription within the global canon of war poetry*” [49]. By foregrounding the preservation of human dignity, ethical clarity, and emotional truth under conditions of extreme violence, this body of work aligns Ukrainian experience with broader historical traditions of war poetry while retaining its distinct geopolitical and cultural specificity.

Taken together, war poetry emerges as a distinct literary phenomenon shaped by direct experience of violence, traumatic rupture, and ethical responsibility. Across historical and contemporary contexts, war poetry consistently rejects idealization and instead articulates suffering through formal disruption, linguistic instability, and testimonial urgency. As a mode of witnessing, it functions not only to document individual and collective trauma but also to challenge dominant narratives, resist forgetting, and establish ethical relationships between poet, event, and audience.

Contemporary Ukrainian war poetry exemplifies these functions with particular intensity, as it arises from an ongoing conflict and operates simultaneously as cultural response, political intervention, and global appeal for solidarity. These characteristics underscore the necessity of approaching war poetry through the combined lenses of trauma theory, ethics, and form, and they foreground the importance of translation as

a critical site where traumatic experience is transmitted, negotiated, and rearticulated across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

1.4 Principles of Poetic Translation

1.4.1 Poetic Translation as a Specific Mode of Translation

Poetic translation is commonly characterized as a specific and highly demanding mode of literary translation due to poetry's intrinsic complexity and its inseparable relationship between form and meaning. Unlike other literary genres, poetry relies on aesthetic structures such as rhythm, sound, syntax, and visual organization not as secondary embellishments but as core carriers of meaning. For this reason, full equivalence in poetic translation is widely regarded as unattainable, since the structural interdependence of form and sense resists complete transfer between languages.

Scholars frequently describe poetic translation as a form of art in its own right, emphasizing its creative and interpretative nature. Rather than functioning as a purely technical operation, poetic translation is understood as a co-creative activity or a critical and dynamic displacement of the source text. The translator engages with the poem not only as a linguistic object but as an aesthetic system whose formal devices serve mnemonic, cultural, and emotional functions. Because poetic form contributes to cultural survival and transmission, the act of translation necessarily involves creative decision-making that reshapes the original while seeking to preserve its aesthetic force.

This understanding is closely aligned with Walter Benjamin's conception of translation as articulated in "*The Task of the Translator*". Benjamin frames translation as "*a redemptive mode that ensures the survival or continued life (Fortleben) of a literary work beyond its original linguistic boundaries*" [7]. Translation does not merely reproduce the original but enables it to live on in altered form. Jacques Derrida further develops this idea by arguing that translation introduces otherness into the text, allowing it to "*live more and better*" beyond the intentions

and limits of its author [24]. From this perspective, translation operates simultaneously as a poetics, an ethics, and a politics, foregrounding transformation rather than imitation.

Poetic translation has also been described as an intensified mode of reading. It is often characterized as the most intimate form of engagement with a text, requiring the translator to function as an “*intimate reader*” who surrenders to the poem’s internal logic and affective charge. Philip Roth’s reflections on translation conceptualize it as “*a form of reading in extremis, an experience that involves emotional exposure and heightened interpretative responsibility*” [52]. Such descriptions underscore the embodied and affective dimensions of poetic translation, reinforcing its status as a creative and experiential practice.

1.4.2 The Problem of Equivalence and Untranslatability

The widespread assertion that full equivalence in poetic translation is impossible is grounded in both linguistic and theoretical considerations. Clare Cavanagh encapsulates this dilemma by posing the recurrent question faced by translators: why preserve form at the expense of meaning, or meaning at the expense of form? In this sense, the impossibility attributed to poetic translation refers not to translation as such but to the impossibility of perfect translation.

Benjamin’s notion of linguistic kinship further clarifies this problem. He argues that “*translation becomes possible precisely because languages are related not through likeness but through a deeper reciprocal relationship*” [7]. Translation does not aim to replicate the original but to express this relationship between languages, allowing the text to undergo transformation. Homi Bhabha extends this idea by describing translation as “*a displacing form of imitation that destabilizes the authority of the original*” [9]. The original text is revealed as incomplete and open-ended, gaining significance through its capacity to be copied, transferred, and transformed.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, the impossibility of full equivalence can be explained through cognitive asymmetry. Translation involves the psychosemiotic reproduction of a source text within a new linguistic and cultural system, producing a cognitively asymmetrical target text. While conceptual information may be retained, stylistic, pragmatic, and affective features inevitably undergo deformation. Since the author and the translator are distinct cognitive agents, identical textual reproduction is impossible, reinforcing the view that translation is inherently differential rather than duplicative.

1.4.3 Form, Sound, Rhythm, and Visual Organization

Form plays a central and paradoxical role in this process. Poetic structure, including rhythm, syntax, sound, and visual layout, is inseparable from meaning, making its preservation both essential and problematic. Translators must continually negotiate the dilemma of “*rhyme and reason*”, aware that preserving formal patterns may distort semantic content, while prioritizing meaning may neutralize aesthetic tension. Poetic syntax often mirrors cognitive and emotional processes, and features such as fragmentation or ellipsis may embody psychological states or traumatic experience. Translation, therefore, must seek functional analogues rather than formal replicas in order to register comparable effects.

Rhythm and sound present additional challenges. The soundscape of a poem contributes significantly to its affective impact, linking linguistic form to bodily and emotional experience. When translating between languages with divergent phonetic and rhythmic systems, such as Ukrainian and English, the recreation of these effects is often technically unfeasible. As a result, translators may abandon strict metrical patterns in favor of free verse, accepting rhythmic loss in exchange for semantic or emotional clarity.

Visual organization likewise constitutes a meaningful dimension of poetic form. Line breaks, punctuation, spacing, and typographical choices can encode silence, rupture, or acceleration, particularly in texts that engage with trauma.

Structural instability, such as irregular meter or minimal punctuation, may parallel

internal psychological states and resist grammatical normalization. Translators must therefore consider visual form as part of the poem's meaning-making apparatus rather than as a purely decorative element.

1.4.4 Loss, Compensation, and Creative Transposition

The negotiation of loss and compensation is an inevitable aspect of poetic translation. Translators confront recurrent dilemmas involving form versus meaning, cultural specificity, and rhythmic integrity. Strategies of compensation often involve creative transposition, selective prioritization of core elements, or the introduction of formal innovation. As Clare Cavanagh suggests, the "*art of losing*" [15] inherent in poetic translation reveals that loss and gain are interdependent rather than oppositional. In some cases, translation introduces new forms or aesthetic possibilities into the target literature, transforming loss into cultural gain.

Ultimately, poetic translation functions as a high-stakes literary act in which relevance is achieved not through perfect fidelity but through the meaningfulness of the aesthetic gesture. The translated poem asserts its value by what it does rather than by what it reproduces, foregrounding transformation, interpretative responsibility, and creative engagement as defining principles of poetic translation.

1.4.5 Psycholinguistic Regularities

Psycholinguistic approaches conceptualize literary translation as a complex cognitive and emotional process in which the translator performs a psychosemiotic reproduction of the source text in the target language. Translation is understood not as mechanical substitution but as a dynamic sequence of interrelated mental operations that involve perception, interpretation, and creative reproduction of meaning. As a result of this process, the target text inevitably emerges as a cognitively asymmetrical construct that preserves conceptual content while transforming formal, stylistic, and pragmatic features.

Within this framework, Serhiy Zasiekin emphasizes that literary translation is governed by specific psycholinguistic regularities rooted in the interaction between conscious and subconscious mechanisms of information processing [1, p. 92].

Translation is viewed as a product of dual cognitive activity, in which rational analytical operations coexist with emotionally and imaginatively structured responses to the source text. This duality is particularly relevant for poetic translation, where meaning is distributed across both semantic content and aesthetic form.

The initial phase of the translation process involves perception and interpretation, which rely on dual cognitive coding. Drawing on Allan Paivio's dual coding hypothesis [46], interpretation operates simultaneously through a verbal-logical code and a concrete-imaginal code. These modes correspond to the functional asymmetry of the cerebral hemispheres, as explored by Roger Sperry and Yuri Lotman. The left hemisphere processes verbal material in a discrete, linear, and propositional manner, while the right hemisphere synthesizes emotionally charged, imaginal information in a holistic and non-linear way. Literary texts, and poetry in particular, activate both modes simultaneously, intensifying the cognitive demands placed on the translator.

Psycholinguistic research further distinguishes between implicit and explicit modes of processing. Implicit processing is automatic and intuitive, relying on procedural meaning encoded in function words and operating through parallel-distributed activation. This mode enables rapid anticipation and holistic perception of the text. Explicit processing, by contrast, is controlled and analytical, focusing on conceptual information carried by content words and drawing on conscious pragmatic and metalinguistic knowledge through local serial processing. Zasiekin notes that “*experienced translators tend to rely more heavily on implicit processing, whereas novice translators predominantly engage explicit strategies, a distinction that significantly affects translational outcomes*” [1, p. 148].

The aesthetic response elicited by a literary text also plays a crucial role in the perception phase. In texts that depict altered states of consciousness or intense emotional experience, the right hemisphere and intuitive processing are particularly activated. Drawing on Lev Vygotsky's theory of aesthetic response, this reaction is understood as the release of psychic energy that follows the tension between

perceived form and holistic meaning. In poetic translation, such aesthetic tension intensifies the translator's emotional involvement and shapes interpretative choices.

The reproduction phase of translation constitutes a creative and emotionally charged act in which interpreted meaning is re-encoded in the target language. Literary translation is therefore understood as a co-creative activity, producing a new text that remains functionally linked to the original while reflecting the translator's unique cognitive and emotional configuration. The psychosemiotic reproduction of the source text proceeds from internal, subjective meaning toward external verbal expression, revealing the inherent paradox of translation: meaning must be temporarily separated from form in order to be reconstituted, yet their inseparability defines the aesthetic integrity of the original.

Zasiekin emphasizes that "*the ultimate goal of this process is functional equivalence, understood as the maximal similarity between the reader's perception of the target text and that of the source text*" [1, p. 78]. This ideal state, often described as adequacy, presupposes the preservation of the original's communicative and aesthetic function rather than formal identity. However, absolute equivalence remains unattainable, as identical mental structures cannot be produced by different individuals. The complex interplay of conscious and unconscious processes ensures that each act of translation generates a distinct cognitive outcome.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, the impossibility of identical translation is not a failure but a defining characteristic of literary translation. Cognitive asymmetry reflects the creative nature of the translation act and underscores the necessity of interpretative choice, emotional engagement, and formal transformation. These principles are particularly salient in the translation of poetry, where meaning is densely encoded and aesthetic effect depends on subtle interactions between linguistic form and psychological response.

Psycholinguistic approaches conceptualize literary translation as a complex cognitive and emotional process in which the translator performs a psychosemiotic reproduction of the source text in the target language. Translation is understood not as

mechanical substitution but as a dynamic sequence of interrelated mental operations involving perception, interpretation, and creative reproduction of meaning. As a result of this process, the target text inevitably emerges as a cognitively asymmetrical construct that preserves conceptual information while transforming formal, stylistic, and pragmatic features.

At the core of Zasiekina's framework lies the dual coding hypothesis, according to which textual information is processed through both a verbal-logical code and a concrete-imaginal code. These modes correspond to the functional asymmetry of the cerebral hemispheres: the left hemisphere processes language in a discrete, linear, and propositional manner, while the right hemisphere synthesizes emotionally charged, holistic, and imaginal information. The dominance of one or the other mode during translation leads to predictable and empirically observable stylistic patterns in the target text.

Zasiekina identifies two major types of psycholinguistic regularities in translation. The first includes deviations from the source text, referred to as D-regularities, while the second encompasses deviations from the norms of the target language, known as C- or T-regularities. These shifts are particularly visible in the translator's handling of linguistic units that carry procedural meaning, such as pronouns, conjunctions, and discourse markers, which play a crucial role in shaping textual cohesion and interpretive flow.

Among the most common regularities are structural and stylistic deformations. Translation often demonstrates complication through increased lexical variety and lexical density, accompanied by normalization, manifested in reduced reliance on pronouns and greater conformity to target-language norms. On the syntactic and cohesive level, translations frequently display derationalization and implicitation, resulting in weakened logical cohesion and reduced use of causal markers and prepositions. These shifts reflect lowered levels of conscious analytical processing and the displacement of causal relations toward the periphery of the text.

Conversely, explicitation and simplification emerge when translators break complex sentence structures into shorter units or introduce additional discourse markers and fillers. While these strategies may enhance fluency and accessibility, they often indicate a tendency toward risk avoidance and compensatory behavior, potentially flattening the aesthetic tension of the original. Such regularities are not random errors but consequences of the translator's cognitive processing modes.

Zasiekin explains these regularities through the interaction of implicit and explicit processing. Implicit processing is automatic, intuitive, and grounded in procedural memory, relying on associative neural networks and corresponding to a synthetic cognitive style. Explicit processing, by contrast, is controlled and reflective, dependent on declarative memory and metalinguistic knowledge, and aligned with an analytical cognitive style. The balance between these modes varies across translators and directly influences the degree of deformation introduced in translation.

These psycholinguistic principles are especially relevant for literary and poetic translation, where form does not merely convey meaning but enacts psychological and emotional states. The adequacy of a poetic translation is therefore measured not by formal identity but by the achievement of a maximally identical aesthetic response in the reader. Such an effect arises when the text generates a productive conflict between perceived form and holistic meaning, leading to the discharge of psychic energy. In this sense, deliberate formal distortion may produce a stronger aesthetic impact than semantic fidelity alone.

The relevance of this framework becomes particularly evident in texts that represent trauma or altered states of consciousness. Literary and poetic texts dealing with trauma often abandon linear temporal organization in favor of cyclic or mythological time models and employ fragmentation, disrupted cohesion, repetition, and unusual imagery. These formal features are designed to activate right-hemisphere, concrete-imaginal processing. When translators normalize syntax, reduce fragmentation, or lower the embolism quotient by replacing non-semantic repetitions with logically coherent phrases, they inadvertently shift the reader toward left-

hemisphere verbal-logical processing. As a result, the psychosemiotic trace of trauma encoded in the original form is diminished or erased.

From this perspective, stylistic and structural deviations in traumatic texts cannot be treated as errors to be corrected. Rather, they function as deliberate artistic strategies that simultaneously register psychological rupture and enable its articulation. A psycholinguistically informed approach therefore imposes an ethical responsibility on the translator to recognize and preserve these deeper structures, encoding rupture rather than neutralizing it in the pursuit of fluency.

Ultimately, Zasiekin's model demonstrates that the success of literary translation depends on its capacity to activate appropriate dual coding pathways in the reader. By acknowledging the neurological and cognitive mechanisms underpinning textual perception and reproduction, translation can ensure the continued life of the work while preserving its emotional and psychological complexity. Failure to account for these mechanisms compromises the translation's ability to transmit the full depth of the source text and undermines its aesthetic and ethical force.

1.4.6 Trauma, Altered States, and Translation Risk

War poetry presents specific and heightened challenges for translation due to the fundamental tension between the chaotic, often unassimilable nature of traumatic experience and the formal constraints of poetic language. In this genre, aesthetic form is not merely a vehicle for meaning but a primary means of registering psychological rupture. As a result, translation strategies in war poetry are profoundly shaped by ethical, cultural, and historical considerations that frequently override concerns of formal symmetry or stylistic fluency.

One of the central difficulties lies in the dilemma of form versus meaning. As with poetry in general, the translation of war poetry confronts the persistent problem of "*rhyme and reason*", yet in this context the dilemma is intensified by the ethical stakes of representation. Attempts to separate form from meaning are especially problematic, since war poetry continuously foregrounds the "*forms of meaning and the meaning of forms*". Striving for formal likeness or full equivalence is therefore

widely regarded as unattainable and, in some cases, ethically misguided, as it risks neutralizing the disruptive force through which trauma is articulated.

Another major challenge arises from the inadequacy of language to fully capture traumatic experience. Trauma theory conceptualizes trauma as a psychological wound that resists immediate integration into consciousness and language. Drawing on Cathy Caruth's notion of trauma as an "*unclaimed experience*" [14], war poetry frequently relies on fragmentation, broken syntax, and narrative disjunction to register what exceeds representation. Translation strategies must therefore grapple not only with semantic transfer but with the reproduction of linguistic rupture itself. Normalizing these features in translation risks erasing the trace of trauma embedded in the original form.

The translation of war poetry is also marked by a high risk of affective and sensory loss. Poetry engages the body, mind, and emotions simultaneously, and its impact often depends on sound, rhythm, and phonetic patterning. In Ukrainian war poetry, meaning is frequently generated through sonic density, rhythmical tension, and wordplay, elements that resist direct transfer into English. The loss of these features can weaken the emotional immediacy of the text, forcing translators to seek compensatory strategies that preserve affective intensity even when formal equivalence is impossible.

Cultural and contextual specificity further complicates the translation process. War poetry often incorporates references to realia, regional vocabulary, political slang, and culturally embedded symbols that carry dense historical and emotional resonance. Ukrainian toponyms, idiomatic expressions, or politically charged terms may lose their force if omitted, domesticated, or reduced to explanatory glosses. Translators must therefore negotiate between accessibility for the target audience and fidelity to the cultural texture of the source text.

Linguistic politics constitute another crucial ethical factor, particularly in the context of the Russian-Ukrainian war. For many contemporary Ukrainian poets, the shift to the exclusive use of Ukrainian represents a principled political decision and a

rejection of imperial narratives. Translation must acknowledge this politicization of language and avoid assimilating Ukrainian poetry into a broader Russophone or depoliticized cultural space. Linguistic choice thus becomes inseparable from ethical positioning.

At the same time, translation of war poetry often functions as a tool of cultural diplomacy and international solidarity. Translated poems circulate globally as forms of emotional testimony intended to foster empathy, political awareness, and support. In this sense, translation operates as soft power, relying on the authenticity of emotional transmission rather than rhetorical persuasion. The success of such translations depends on their capacity to maintain credibility and resist propagandistic simplification.

Historical and aesthetic factors further influence translation strategies. The unprecedented scale of modern warfare has compelled poets to abandon conventional forms in favor of formal experimentation. Features such as shattered syntax, erratic enjambment, and grotesque imagery mirror psychological fragmentation and must be treated as meaningful structural choices rather than stylistic anomalies. As Edna Longley argues, the structural instability of war poetry parallels the poet's mental disintegration, a correspondence that translation must seek to preserve.

Repetition also plays a crucial role in war poetry, reflecting the psychological compulsion to repeat traumatic imagery and memories in an attempt to master the overwhelming event. Translators must therefore attend to repetition not as redundancy but as a symptom of trauma and a core expressive device. Similarly, war poetry frequently disrupts linear temporality, representing memory as belated, cyclical, or displaced. Contemporary Ukrainian poetry often employs temporal strategies such as the "*future-in-the-past*" to imagine postwar reconstruction from within a moment of ongoing catastrophe. Translating such temporal complexity requires sensitivity to both grammatical structure and historical context.

Contemporary Ukrainian poets likewise invoke figures such as Taras Shevchenko to situate present resistance within a longer historical continuum.

Translation strategies must therefore account for intertextual resonance and genre memory, ensuring that historical depth and ideological tension remain legible to the target audience.

Taken together, these factors demonstrate that the translation of war poetry is governed not only by linguistic constraints but by ethical responsibility, cultural specificity, and historical awareness. Translators are required to balance fidelity to traumatic rupture with the demands of intelligibility, producing texts that function simultaneously as aesthetic artifacts and acts of secondary witnessing.

The analysis has shown that poetic translation represents a distinct and inherently complex mode of literary translation in which form, meaning, and affect are inseparable. Unlike other genres, poetry resists full equivalence in translation, as its semantic and emotional force is often encoded in formal structures that cannot be transferred without transformation. Psycholinguistic approaches reveal translation as a cognitively and emotionally driven process that produces an inevitably asymmetrical target text shaped by dual coding, aesthetic response, and regular patterns of deformation. In the case of war poetry, these difficulties are intensified by the presence of traumatic experience, which frequently manifests through fragmentation, disrupted cohesion, and non-linear temporality. Ethical, cultural, and historical considerations further influence translation strategies, positioning translation as an act of secondary witnessing rather than neutral mediation. These observations highlight the necessity of more precise analytical tools capable of identifying zones of heightened poetic and translation tension, thereby justifying the introduction of a new heuristic concept for the analysis of poetic genesis and its representation in translation.

1.5 The Markan Verse

1.5.1 The Limitations of the Existing Terminological Apparatus in Poetry Studies

Scholars across literary theory have repeatedly emphasized that the existing terminological apparatus of poetry studies is insufficient for describing the complex origins and generative processes of poetic texts. This insufficiency stems from a fundamental tension between the dynamic, processual nature of poetic creation and the static, classificatory character of critical language. As a result, the moment of poetic genesis often remains theoretically marginalized or reduced to structural description.

One major limitation concerns the difficulty of capturing inner, pre-textual experience through established critical vocabulary. Peter Lamarque notes that conventional descriptive language is frequently “*inadequate to capture, portray, or do justice to the quality and intensity of inner life*” [36], producing accounts that appear “*remote*” or “*cold*” when compared to the vividness of poetic experience. Such observations point to a structural gap between lived affective impulse and the terms traditionally used to analyze poetic texts. Consequently, poetic origin is often displaced from the domain of theory and treated as either ineffable or irrelevant.

A second limitation arises from methodological constraints imposed by dominant twentieth-century critical traditions. W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, in formulating the concepts of the “*intentional fallacy*” and the “*affective fallacy*” [62], explicitly excluded authorial intention and reader response from legitimate literary analysis. While this move strengthened the autonomy of the text as an object of study, it simultaneously rendered the creative genesis of the poem theoretically inaccessible. As a result, the initiating impulse of a poem could no longer function as a stable analytical category.

This exclusion is further complicated by insights from psychoanalytic and cognitive criticism. Psychoanalytic theory has demonstrated that creative intention is often shaped by unconscious processes, meaning that the author cannot be treated as the transparent source of meaning. Yet, as critics have noted, acknowledging unconscious motivation does not eliminate the problem of origin; rather, it exposes the lack of adequate terminology for describing how poetic meaning first enters

language. Existing theoretical frameworks recognize the instability of intention but offer no precise conceptual tool for addressing the generative moment itself.

Limitations are also evident in the terminology used to describe poetic form. Traditional prosodic analysis, developed primarily for metrical verse, relies on idealized models of rhythm and stress. Charles Hartman argues that such models must be “*revised and rethought*” [32] in order to account for modern and non-metrical poetry, where rhythm, syntax, and lineation operate in irregular or disruptive ways. Similarly, Peter Robinson has shown that scansion often functions as a simplifying abstraction rather than an accurate linguistic description, producing multiple incompatible readings for a single poetic line. These tools describe the finished structure of a poem but fail to address how such structures emerge during the creative process.

Moreover, most existing terms privilege positional features of the completed text over genetic or processual ones. Concepts such as the *incipit* designate the opening words of a poem as they appear in its final form but do not account for the possibility that the generative element of a poem may be displaced, revised, or obscured during composition [61]. This structural bias reinforces the assumption that poetic origin coincides with textual beginning—an assumption that creative practice frequently contradicts.

Taken together, these observations indicate that the prevailing terminological framework of poetry studies lacks the conceptual precision necessary to describe poetic genesis as a distinct theoretical problem. While existing terms successfully classify formal features, thematic patterns, and historical contexts, they remain inadequate for capturing the moment at which poetic meaning first crystallizes into language. This limitation does not signal a failure of theory but rather highlights the necessity of terminological expansion. As literary theory has repeatedly demonstrated, the introduction of new analytical concepts is often required when existing categories prove insufficient for describing the complexity of their object.

The reviewed scholarship demonstrates that the existing terminological framework of poetry studies, while effective in describing formal structures and textual features, remains limited in its capacity to account for the origins and generative dynamics of poetic creation. Methodological exclusions of authorial intention and reader response, combined with the inadequacy of prosodic and structural terminology for capturing non-linear and pre-textual processes, have resulted in the marginalization of poetic genesis as an object of theoretical inquiry. As a consequence, the initiating impulse of a poem, understood as the moment when meaning first enters language, remains conceptually underdescribed. These limitations indicate the necessity of terminological expansion, particularly in the analysis of texts shaped by trauma, where poetic meaning often emerges through rupture, displacement, and fragmentation. Such conditions require the introduction of a more precise analytical concept capable of addressing poetic origin as a functional and generative phenomenon rather than as a positional feature of the finished text.

1.5.2 Introducing the Concept of the *Markan Verse*

The limitations of the existing terminological apparatus in poetry studies, outlined in the previous subsection, reveal a persistent blind spot in literary analysis. While contemporary theory offers a rich vocabulary for describing poetic form, structure, imagery, and reception, it remains comparatively under-equipped to conceptualize the generative origin of a poetic text, that is, the initial impulse from which the poem begins to grow. This gap becomes particularly evident in the analysis of trauma-related poetry, where meaning often emerges not through linear composition but through rupture, condensation, and delayed articulation. The introduction of the concept of the *Markan Verse* is proposed as a response to this theoretical deficiency.

The term *Markan Verse* draws its name and conceptual logic from biblical studies, specifically from the theory of **Markan Priority**. Within New Testament scholarship, Markan Priority refers to the widely accepted hypothesis that the *Gospel of Mark* was the earliest of the four canonical Gospels and that it served as a primary

source for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. This position emerged in the nineteenth century in response to the so-called Synoptic Problem and was developed by scholars seeking to explain the extensive verbal, structural, and thematic overlap among the Synoptic Gospels.

According to this theory, Mark represents the foundational narrative framework upon which later evangelists built their accounts, expanding, revising, and reinterpreting its material. Mark Goodacre, one of the most influential contemporary scholars of the Synoptic Problem, formulates this principle concisely: “*Mark was the first Gospel, and this was used by both Matthew and Luke*” [30]. This statement encapsulates the core insight of Markan Priority, namely that Mark functions as a textual origin whose generative role is not immediately visible in the final canonical order of the Gospels.

Crucially, although Mark is chronologically primary, it is neither the longest nor the most comprehensive Gospel. Its brevity and relative narrative austerity contributed to the historical loss of awareness of its priority. For centuries, Christian tradition assumed the primacy of the Gospel of Matthew, largely because of its theological fullness, narrative richness, and liturgical prominence. As a result, Mark’s foundational role was obscured by the very process of textual expansion it enabled. This paradox, a text that initiates a tradition yet becomes eclipsed by its continuations, provides a productive conceptual model for thinking about poetic genesis.

The *Markan Verse* is proposed as an analytical concept that designates the **generative line** of a poem, understood not as the first line in its final textual arrangement, but as the initial verbal impulse around which the poem subsequently develops. This line functions as the conceptual and affective nucleus of the poem, even if it is later displaced, transformed, or embedded elsewhere within the finished text.

Like the Gospel of Mark in relation to Matthew and Luke, the Markan Verse may lose its visible primacy in the final structure of the poem. It can appear in the

middle or at the end of the text, or it may be syntactically altered or semantically reframed. Nevertheless, it remains the point from which the poem's imagery, rhythm, and thematic trajectory originate. In this sense, the Markan Verse represents a **genetic rather than positional** category.

This distinction is essential. The concept does not claim that every poem has an identifiable Markan Verse accessible to the reader. On the contrary, one of its defining features is its epistemological opacity. In most cases, the Markan Verse can only be identified through authorial testimony, drafts, or reflective commentary. Its function is therefore primarily analytical rather than descriptive, offering a way to conceptualize poetic origin without reducing it to surface textual features.

1.5.3 Relation to Trauma and Poetic Genesis

The relevance of the Markan Verse becomes especially apparent in the context of trauma poetry. As trauma studies demonstrate, traumatic experience often resists immediate linguistic articulation and emerges belatedly through fragmented or displaced forms. In such cases, the poem may not begin where the traumatic impulse first entered language. Instead, the initiating line may be surrounded, reframed, or even concealed by subsequent textual growth.

The Markan Verse thus aligns with trauma theory's emphasis on latency, belatedness, and non-linearity. It provides a conceptual tool for understanding how poetic meaning can originate in a moment of rupture that is not structurally foregrounded in the final text. By focusing on genesis rather than arrangement, the concept allows for a more precise analysis of how traumatic experience is translated into poetic form.

1.5.4 Distinction from Related Concepts

The Markan Verse must be clearly distinguished from several established literary concepts with which it might appear to overlap. Most notably, it differs from the concept of the incipit, which traditionally designates the opening words of a literary work. While the incipit refers to a textual position, the Markan Verse refers to a creative function. The two may coincide, but they are not equivalent. The incipit

describes where a text begins for the reader, whereas the *Markan Verse* describes where the text begins for the author.

Similarly, concepts such as the opening line, motif, or image focus on identifiable textual elements within the finished poem. Genetic criticism, while concerned with drafts and compositional processes, tends to emphasize stages of revision rather than the initiating impulse itself. None of these concepts adequately capture the idea of a single generative line that precedes and conditions the poem's subsequent development while remaining potentially displaced within it.

What distinguishes the *Markan Verse* is its emphasis on origin without privilege. Like the Gospel of Mark, it initiates a process whose outcomes may overshadow it, reframe it, or render it structurally secondary. Yet without it, the text as it exists would not have come into being.

1.5.5 Definition of the *Markan Verse*

The *Markan Verse* may therefore be defined as the initial generative line of a poetic text, understood as the first verbal articulation around which the poem develops, regardless of its final position within the text. It functions as a genetic nucleus rather than a formal opening and may be identifiable only through authorial reflection or extratextual evidence. As an analytical concept, the *Markan Verse* enables the study of poetic origin as a dynamic, non-linear process, particularly relevant to texts shaped by trauma, fragmentation, and delayed articulation.

1.5.6 Limitations of the *Markan Verse* Concept

Despite its analytical potential, the concept of the *Markan Verse* is subject to a number of significant methodological and epistemological limitations that must be acknowledged in order to prevent its uncritical or speculative application.

First and most fundamentally, the *Markan Verse* is, in most cases, empirically inaccessible. Unless the author explicitly reflects on the process of composition, through interviews, diaries, drafts, or retrospective commentary, there is no reliable way to determine which line functioned as the generative nucleus of the poem. The finished text does not contain objective markers that would allow the researcher to

identify the Markan Verse with certainty. As a result, the concept cannot be used as a purely text-immanent analytical tool and remains dependent on extratextual evidence.

Second, even when such evidence is available, it cannot be treated as fully reliable. A substantial body of research in psychology and memory studies demonstrates that human testimony is inherently fallible. Autobiographical memory is reconstructive rather than reproductive, meaning that individuals do not retrieve exact records of past mental states but reconstruct them in accordance with later experiences, narrative self-understanding, and contextual cues. Authors may forget the precise circumstances of composition, retrospectively rationalize their creative choices, or unconsciously reshape their memories in ways that align with their present identity or ideological position. Consequently, authorial statements about poetic genesis must be approached critically and cannot be regarded as transparent access to the original creative moment.

A further limitation concerns the risk of methodological overextension. The Markan Verse is not a universal feature that can be assumed to exist in every poem. Some texts may emerge through gradual accumulation rather than from a single initiating line, while others may result from formal constraints, intertextual prompts, or collaborative processes that resist reduction to a singular generative impulse. Applying the concept indiscriminately would therefore risk imposing a model of origin where none is structurally or historically justified.

Finally, the concept challenges dominant critical traditions that prioritize the autonomy of the text and resist appeals to authorial process. From the perspective of strict formalism, the Markan Verse may appear methodologically suspect precisely because it refers to a pre-textual moment that is not directly legible within the finished work. This tension underscores the fact that the concept operates at the intersection of literary analysis, genetic criticism, and cognitive approaches, rather than within any single established paradigm.

Nevertheless, despite these limitations, the Markan Verse remains a productive and justified analytical construct. Its value lies not in providing definitive answers

about poetic origin, but in offering a conceptual vocabulary for articulating a dimension of poetic creation that is otherwise left unnamed. By acknowledging its epistemological constraints, the concept avoids claims to empirical certainty and instead functions as a heuristic tool, particularly suited to the analysis of trauma poetry, where meaning often originates in moments of rupture that are displaced, fragmented, or retrospectively obscured. In this sense, the Markan Verse contributes not a solution to the problem of poetic genesis, but a more precise way of formulating that problem within contemporary literary theory.

The introduction of the concept of the Markan Verse addresses a persistent gap in literary theory concerning the origin and generative dynamics of poetic texts.

Existing terminology has largely focused on formal structure, thematic development, and reader reception, while the initiating impulse of poetic creation has remained theoretically underarticulated. By drawing on the model of Markan Priority in biblical studies, the Markan Verse offers a conceptual framework for understanding poetic genesis as a functional and processual phenomenon rather than as a fixed textual position. This approach is particularly relevant for the analysis of trauma-related poetry, where meaning frequently emerges through fragmentation, displacement, and belated articulation, and where the generative moment of expression may not coincide with the formal opening of the text.

At the same time, the acknowledged limitations of the concept reinforce its methodological validity. The dependence on authorial testimony, the unreliability of autobiographical memory, and the inaccessibility of pre-textual creative moments necessitate a cautious and reflective application of the term. Rather than undermining its usefulness, these constraints position the Markan Verse as a heuristic and interpretative tool that enhances analytical precision without making claims to empirical certainty. As such, the concept contributes to the expansion of the theoretical vocabulary available for the study of poetry, enabling a more nuanced engagement with poetic origin, trauma, and translation, and preparing the ground for its application in the subsequent analytical chapters of this study.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

The theoretical chapter has demonstrated that the study of war poetry, and particularly contemporary Ukrainian war poetry, requires an interdisciplinary framework capable of accounting for trauma, ethical responsibility, poetic form, and translation as interdependent phenomena. Trauma studies provided the foundational conceptual lens through which traumatic experience is understood not as an immediately assimilated psychological event but as a phenomenon marked by latency, fragmentation, and resistance to coherent representation. The historical development of trauma theory, from early clinical models to cultural and literary approaches, has shown that trauma manifests itself most clearly through disruptions of language, memory, and form. Within this framework, literary texts, and poetry in particular, emerge as privileged spaces for articulating traumatic experience indirectly, through formal deformation and aesthetic instability rather than through linear narrative.

Building on this theoretical foundation, the chapter has established war poetry as a distinct literary phenomenon shaped by direct experience of violence, ethical urgency, and the rejection of idealized or glorifying narratives. From the trench lyric of the First World War to contemporary poetic responses to ongoing conflicts, war poetry consistently functions as a mode of witnessing that registers both individual and collective trauma. The analysis has shown that war poetry does not merely represent trauma thematically but enacts it formally through fragmentation, disrupted syntax, repetition, and non-linear temporality. These formal features are not stylistic anomalies but essential mechanisms through which psychological rupture and bodily inscription are translated into poetic language. The ethical dimension of war poetry further reinforces its testimonial function, positioning the poet as a witness who challenges societal indifference, resists ideological mythmaking, and preserves cultural memory.

The examination of contemporary Ukrainian war poetry has demonstrated how these general characteristics acquire particular intensity under conditions of ongoing war. Ukrainian poetic responses to Russian aggression function simultaneously as cultural documentation, psychological coping mechanisms, and political intervention. The immediacy of production, collective dimension of trauma, digital circulation, and deliberate linguistic positioning underscore the inseparability of aesthetic, ethical, and geopolitical factors in this corpus. Ukrainian war poetry thus exemplifies the convergence of trauma, form, and witnessing, while also foregrounding the crucial role of translation in transmitting traumatic experience beyond national and linguistic boundaries.

The chapter has further shown that poetic translation constitutes a uniquely complex mode of literary translation, in which form, meaning, and affect cannot be separated without significant loss. Theoretical perspectives on poetic translation emphasize its creative, transformative, and ethically charged nature, rejecting the possibility of full equivalence. Psycholinguistic approaches have deepened this understanding by conceptualizing translation as a cognitively and emotionally driven process that produces an inevitably asymmetrical target text. Serhiy Zasiekin's model, grounded in dual coding and neurocognitive regularities, has demonstrated how predictable patterns of deformation arise from the interaction of conscious and subconscious processing modes. In the context of war poetry, these processes become ethically consequential, as normalization or excessive explication in translation may erase the psychosemiotic trace of trauma encoded in the original form. Translation thus emerges as a form of secondary witnessing that carries responsibility for preserving not only semantic content but also formal rupture and affective intensity.

Against this theoretical background, the introduction of the concept of the Markan Verse has been justified as a response to a persistent gap in poetry studies. The analysis of existing terminological frameworks has shown that while literary theory possesses extensive tools for describing formal structure, thematic organization, and reception, it remains limited in its capacity to conceptualize poetic

genesis. The initiating impulse of a poem, the moment when meaning first crystallizes into language, is largely excluded from theoretical description due to methodological constraints, positional bias toward the finished text, and the marginalization of processual dynamics. Drawing on the model of Markan Priority in biblical studies, the Markan Verse has been proposed as a heuristic concept that captures poetic origin as a generative function rather than a textual position.

The Markan Verse conceptualizes the initial generative line of a poem as a genetic nucleus around which the text develops, regardless of its final placement. This model is particularly relevant for trauma poetry, where the originating impulse may be displaced, obscured, or reframed through subsequent textual growth. By distinguishing between origin and position, the concept allows for a more precise understanding of how traumatic experience enters poetic language in non-linear and belated ways. At the same time, the acknowledged limitations of the Markan Verse, including its dependence on authorial testimony and the unreliability of autobiographical memory, have been shown to strengthen rather than weaken its methodological validity. The concept does not claim empirical certainty but functions as an interpretative tool that expands the analytical vocabulary of poetry studies.

Taken together, the theoretical chapter has established a coherent framework for the subsequent analysis of Ukrainian war poetry and its translation into English. By integrating trauma studies, war poetry theory, translation studies, psycholinguistics, and the newly introduced concept of the Markan Verse, the chapter provides a foundation for examining how traumatic experience is generated, structured, and transmitted across languages. These conclusions prepare the ground for the analytical chapters, in which the interaction between poetic genesis, marked lines, and translation strategies will be explored in concrete textual examples

Overall, the stylistic analysis shows that while overt figurative devices such as elaborate metaphors or sound-based figures are rare in the analysed Markan Verses, stylistic expressiveness is nevertheless achieved through aphoristic compression, synesthetic imagery, rhetorical questioning, and fragmentation. In translation, these

effects are generally preserved at a functional level, though often reshaped through normalisation and explicitation. As a result, stylistic equivalence is achieved not through direct transfer of stylistic figures, but through the adaptation of their communicative and affective function within the norms of the target language.

CHAPTER 2

Translation Regularities in English Translations of Ukrainian War Poetry: A Psycholinguistic Perspective

2.1 Introduction to the empirical study

Translation studies have long documented the existence of recurrent patterns that distinguish translated texts from both their source texts and non-translated texts in the target language. Within descriptive translation studies, these patterns are commonly referred to as translation regularities and are understood as probabilistic tendencies arising in translation as a result of cognitive, linguistic, and communicative constraints [18][58].

Early systematic descriptions of translation regularities were proposed within discourse-oriented and descriptive approaches. Blum-Kulka [10] identified systematic shifts in cohesion and coherence in translated texts, while Berman [8] described a set of deforming tendencies affecting literary translation, including rationalisation and normalisation. These theoretical observations were later supported by corpus-based research, which demonstrated that translated texts tend to display increased explicitness, reduced stylistic variability, and greater structural regularity when compared to non-translated texts [6][37].

Subsequent developments in the field incorporated psycholinguistic and cognitive perspectives, shifting the focus from surface linguistic deviations to the mental processes underlying translation. Halverson[31] argued that translation regularities reflect general cognitive mechanisms of language processing, while experimental studies using key-logging and eye-tracking methods provided empirical evidence that processing effort, attention allocation, and automaticity influence the structure of translated texts [25].

Within Ukrainian linguistics, psycholinguistic corpus-based approaches to translation regularities were developed in the work of Serhii Zasyekin. His research paper, "Psycholinguistic Regularities of Reproducing Literary Texts in Translation

(Based on the English and Ukrainian Languages)," examined English–Ukrainian literary translation through an integrated methodology that combines cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, and corpus linguistics. The study focused on the analysis of function words and stylistic markers as indicators of unconscious translation processes and demonstrated that many translation regularities emerge from procedural aspects of language processing rather than from deliberate translation strategies. A significant practical outcome of this research was the development of a Ukrainian version of the LIWC2015 dictionary, specifically adapted for psycholinguistic analysis of Ukrainian texts.

Overall, the study of translation regularities has evolved from descriptive observations of textual shifts toward empirically grounded, cognitively oriented models of translation. Contemporary research increasingly combines corpus-based methods with psycholinguistic tools, allowing translation regularities to be interpreted as systematic outcomes of language processing during translation

2.2. The analysis of the corpora

This study is based on a parallel corpus consisting of 39 Ukrainian poems and 39 English translations produced by 14 leading authors of contemporary Ukrainian poetry. The corpus was designed to allow a systematic comparison between original texts and their translated counterparts.

To identify statistically significant differences between the two corpora, the texts were analysed using the LIWC2025 software. Independent samples t-tests were conducted for selected LIWC categories in order to reveal systematic psycholinguistic shifts between the Ukrainian originals and the English translations.

The analysis is conducted within the framework of regularities of translation, which focus on discourse-level and psycholinguistic transformations rather than on isolated linguistic operations. In this perspective, translation is understood as a process that may modify the emotional, cognitive, and experiential configuration of a text. Therefore, statistically significant differences revealed by LIWC2015 are

interpreted as indicators of discursive shifts in the representation of experience, rather than as direct evidence of individual translation strategies.

As a result of the LIWC2015-based analysis, a total of **53 linguistic indicators** demonstrated statistically significant differences between the corpus of Ukrainian original poems and their English translations (t-test, $p < .05$). These indicators span multiple LIWC dimensions, including structural, grammatical, affective, cognitive, social, perceptual, biological, motivational, temporal, and thematic categories

Out of the 53 significant indicators, **45 categories showed higher mean values in the English translations, while 8 categories were more frequent in the Ukrainian originals**. The dominance of English translations was observed across a wide range of LIWC categories, including function words, pronouns, prepositions, adjectives, adverbs, quantifiers, affective and emotional markers, social references, perceptual vocabulary, biological and bodily terms, motivational lexicon, temporal orientation, and existential themes.

In contrast, a smaller subset of indicators demonstrated higher frequencies in the Ukrainian originals. These include **Sixltr (long words), conjunctions, interrogatives, cause, differ**, as well as discourse-related categories such as **informal language, assent, and nonfluencies**. The presence of these markers indicates that, despite the overall quantitative dominance of the translated texts across most LIWC dimensions, certain linguistic features remain more characteristic of the original Ukrainian poetic corpus.

Overall, this distribution of statistically significant indicators establishes a clear quantitative asymmetry between the two corpora and provides the empirical basis for the subsequent interpretation of results in terms of psycholinguistic D-patterns of translation.

LIWC categories with higher Mean values in English translations

Table 2.1

Variable	Ukrainian original (n = 39)	English translation (n = 39)	t	p
Pronoun	3.812	4.214	-5.794	< .001
ppron	2.700	3.768	-7.185	< .001
I	2.138	2.758	-1.693	.047
We	0.878	1.686	-1.996	.025
She/He	0.393	2.555	-3.234	< .001
They	0.422	1.198	-3.042	.002
Prepositions	3.955	3.386	-5.516	< .001
Adverbs	2.316	2.024	-3.788	< .001

Adjec tives	2.006	2.188	-3.721	< .001
Comp are	1.630	1.643	-2.141	.018
Numb er	0.636	1.057	-4.270	< .001
Quant	0.571	1.352	-6.580	< .001
Affect	1.297	2.382	-7.501	< .001
Pose mo	0.778	1.721	-5.076	< .001
Nege mo	0.934	1.531	-6.766	< .001
Anx	0.072	0.388	-3.402	< .001
Anger	0.407	1.093	-5.001	< .001
Sad	0.721	0.990	-2.894	.002
Social	2.962	4.073	-7.724	< .001
Femal e	0.411	1.866	-1.855	.034
Male	0.164	1.934	-3.606	< .001
Insigh t	0.857	1.378	-4.058	< .001

Discre p	0.877	1.353	-2.974	.002
Perce pt	0.865	2.093	-8.192	< .001
See	0.405	1.165	-6.141	< .001
Hear	0.654	0.859	-2.467	.008
Feel	0.287	1.557	-4.163	< .001
Bio	0.892	1.968	-6.594	< .001
Body	0.374	1.066	-5.819	< .001
Healt h	0.721	1.032	-2.724	.004
Sexua l	0.120	0.245	-1.667	.050

LIWC categories with higher Mean values in Ukrainian originals

Table 2.2

LIWC Category	Ukrainian original (n = 39)	English translation (n = 39)	t	p
Sixltr	5.916	3.214	1 1.705	< .001
Conjunctio ns	2.950	2.400	2 .073	.0 21

Interrogatives	2.396	1.489	.210	.19	.0
Cause	1.876	1.234	.800	.38	.0
Differ	2.631	1.573	.062	.02	.0
Informal	2.101	1.256	.117	.19	.0
Assent	0.529	0.292	.914	.02	.0
Nonflu	0.770	0.148	.737	.43	.0

2.3 Distribution of statistically significant markers across translation regularities

Explicitation constitutes one of the most prominent translation tendencies observed in the analysed corpus. It refers to a systematic increase in the overt verbalisation of meanings that remain implicit, inferable, or context-dependent in the source texts. In the translations, this tendency manifests itself through a higher degree of semantic transparency, whereby emotional states, cognitive processes, perceptual experiences, and relational meanings are more frequently encoded explicitly.

One of the clearest indicators of explicitation is the LIWC category **affect**, which captures emotionally loaded lexical items. The significantly higher frequency of **affect** in the translated texts indicates that emotional content is more often lexicalised rather than implied. Instead of relying on narrative context or stylistic

suggestion, translators tend to render emotions directly, thereby reducing interpretative ambiguity for the target reader.

This tendency is further specified by the categories **posemo** and **negemo**, which represent positive and negative emotional expressions respectively. The increased presence of both markers in the translations suggests a clearer polarisation of emotional evaluation. Emotional attitudes that may be stylistically understated or indirectly conveyed in the source texts are rendered through explicit evaluative vocabulary, enhancing emotional clarity and accessibility.

More fine-grained emotional explicitation is reflected in the categories **anger** and **sad**, which denote specific emotional states. Their higher frequencies in the translated texts indicate a preference for naming emotions explicitly rather than leaving them to inference. This shift toward lexical precision contributes to a more transparent emotional profile of the translated texts.

Explicitation is also evident in the cognitive domain. The category **insight**, which includes lexical items related to thinking, understanding, and realisation, shows a significant increase in the translations. This suggests that mental processes and internal reasoning are more frequently verbalised, making characters' thoughts and interpretative frameworks more explicit for the reader.

A similar pattern is observed in the perceptual domain. The category **percept**, along with its subcategories **see**, **hear**, and **feel**, demonstrates consistently higher frequencies in the translated texts. These markers indicate sensory perception and experiential awareness. Their increased use suggests that perceptual experiences are more often described explicitly rather than inferred, contributing to greater experiential vividness and interpretative guidance.

Taken together, the increased frequencies of **affect**, **posemo**, **negemo**, **anger**, **sad**, **insight**, **percept**, **see**, **hear**, and **feel** provide strong evidence of explicitation as a dominant translation tendency. By systematically verbalising emotional, cognitive, and perceptual content, translators reduce implicitness and guide interpretation more directly. This confirms that explicitation plays a central role in shaping the translated

texts and interacts closely with processes of normalisation and simplification, collectively contributing to increased transparency and reader accessibility.

Normalisation is understood as a translation tendency whereby the target text is adjusted to conform more closely to the dominant and conventional norms of the target language. This process is reflected in the preference for frequent, predictable, and structurally transparent linguistic forms, which reduce formal variability and increase the overall regularity of the translated text.

One of the clearest manifestations of normalisation is observed in the increased use of pronominal forms. The translated texts demonstrate significantly higher frequencies of **pronoun** and **personal pronouns (ppron)**, including first- and third-person forms such as **I**, **we**, **she/he**, and **they**. This pattern indicates a shift toward explicit grammatical reference that is characteristic of English discourse. Referential relations that may remain implicit or be encoded through nominal or inflectional means in the Ukrainian originals are more frequently realised through overt pronominal forms in translation. Such a strategy reflects a conventional English preference for explicit subject marking and regularised reference tracking.

Normalisation is further evidenced by the increased frequency of tense-related markers, specifically **focuspast** and **focuspresent**. Higher values of these categories in the translations indicate a stronger reliance on explicit verbal tense marking. Temporal relations that may be inferred from context in the source texts are rendered through clearly marked grammatical forms, aligning the translations with the normative requirements of the English tense system.

Additional evidence of normalisation is provided by the increased use of numerical expressions and quantifiers, as captured by the LIWC categories **number** and **quant**. These markers indicate a preference for explicit grammatical encoding of quantity. By rendering quantitative relations in a more overt and standardised manner, the translations reduce interpretative ambiguity and conform to conventional patterns of expression in the target language.

Alongside normalisation, the data reveal a clear tendency toward simplification at the stylistic level. Simplification manifests itself through a reduction in stylistic markedness, interactional complexity, and discursive irregularity. This tendency is evidenced by several LIWC markers whose frequencies are significantly lower in the translations than in the Ukrainian originals.

One of the most direct indicators of stylistic simplification is the category **informal**, which includes colloquial and conversational expressions typical of spoken or semi-spoken language. Higher values of this marker in the originals suggest a greater presence of stylistically marked and non-standard lexical choices. The reduced frequency of **informal** in the translations indicates that such elements are systematically toned down or removed, resulting in a more neutral and standardised stylistic profile.

Another statistically significant result concerns the LIWC2015 category **sixltr**, which shows lower frequencies in the translated texts. Since this category captures the proportion of words consisting of six or more letters, its reduction indicates a decrease in lexical density and lexical variety. According to established psycholinguistic principles, including Zipf's law, longer words tend to occur less frequently and contribute disproportionately to cognitive processing load. Their reduced presence in translation therefore suggests a shift toward shorter, more frequent, and cognitively accessible lexical items. This tendency points to **simplification**, as the translated texts rely on less lexically complex vocabulary, reducing processing effort and making the texts easier to read and interpret.

A similar effect is observed in the category **nonflu**, which captures nonfluencies such as hesitations, repetitions, and discourse fillers. These elements are commonly associated with spontaneity and oral discourse. Their significantly lower frequency in the translations suggests that such irregularities are eliminated in the translation process, producing a smoother, more controlled, and more linear discourse that conforms to norms of written language.

Further evidence of simplification is provided by the category **assent**, which includes expressions of agreement and confirmation such as *yes*, *okay*, or *right*. These markers play an important role in dialogic and interactional contexts by signalling alignment between speakers. Their reduced presence in the translations points to a weakening of interactional immediacy and pragmatic nuance, contributing to a simplified discourse structure.

The analysed data also demonstrate a tendency toward equalising, understood as the reduction of stylistic contrasts present in the source texts. Equalising involves the attenuation of extremes between colloquial and literary modes of expression, resulting in a more homogeneous level of stylistic formality in the translations.

Evidence of equalising is reflected in the same set of markers associated with spoken and interactional discourse. The reduced frequencies of **informal**, **nonflu**, and **assent** indicate that stylistic variation present in the originals is levelled out in translation. Informal and spontaneous features are systematically weakened, while more neutral and uniform stylistic choices are favoured. As a result, stylistic contrasts that are salient in the source texts are smoothed out, producing a more evenly regulated target text.

At the same time, the translations exhibit features of stylistic normalisation, reflected in the increased use of descriptive and modifying categories such as **adjectives** and **adverbs**. Higher frequencies of these markers indicate a preference for explicit modification and linear description, which are characteristic of conventional English narrative style. Rather than relying on implicit evaluation or compact constructions, translators employ standard descriptive patterns that contribute to stylistic regularity.

Further support for stylistic normalisation is provided by the increased frequency of **compare**, which captures comparative constructions. This suggests a tendency to express evaluation and contrast through explicit comparative forms, aligning the translations with typical English stylistic conventions. The higher use of

prepositions and **function words** likewise contributes to more analytically structured and explicitly connected discourse, enhancing cohesion and predictability.

Finally, the data reveal evidence of derationalisation, defined as a reduction in the explicit marking of logical relations within the text. This tendency is primarily reflected in the LIWC category '**cause**', which includes lexical markers of causality, such as '**because**', '**therefore**', '**so**', and '**as a result**'. The significantly lower frequency of **cause** in the translations indicates a reduced tendency to explicitly encode causal relations.

This decrease in causal marking suggests that logical connections between propositions are more often left implicit or are conveyed through narrative sequencing rather than overt syntactic signalling. As a result, the translated texts rely less on explicit rational structuring and more on linear progression, leading to a lower degree of logical cohesion. This pattern confirms that, alongside normalisation, simplification, and equalising, derationalisation constitutes a distinct translation tendency observed in the analysed corpus.

In conclusion, the analysis demonstrates that the observed regularities are not isolated phenomena but interconnected tendencies that affect different dimensions of the translated texts. Processes of normalisation, simplification, equalising, and derationalisation operate across morphological, stylistic, and syntactic levels, shaping the overall profile of the translations. At the morphological level, normalisation is reflected in the preference for explicit grammatical reference, regular tense marking, and standardised quantification. At the stylistic level, simplification and equalising reduce stylistic markedness and attenuate contrasts between informal and literary modes, while stylistic normalisation aligns descriptive strategies with conventional English discourse. At the syntactic and discourse levels, changes in the encoding of logical relations, particularly the reduced use of explicit causal markers, indicate a shift toward less overtly rational structuring. Taken as a whole, these tendencies suggest that translators consistently orient the target texts toward the dominant norms

of English by favouring explicit, regular, and predictable patterns of expression, thereby increasing readability and acceptability for the target audience.

2.4 Interpretation of the Results

The statistical results obtained in this study reveal a pattern of translation tendencies that is largely consistent with findings reported in previous research on translated texts. Many of the observed shifts reflect well-documented and expected translation-driven processes, such as normalisation and simplification, which aim to adapt the target text to the dominant norms of the target language and facilitate readability. These tendencies are evidenced by increased frequencies of functionally oriented and structurally explicit markers, including pronominal forms (*pronoun, ppron, I, we, she/he, they*), tense-related categories (*focuspast, focuspresent*), and quantificational markers (*number, quant*). Together, these markers indicate that translators systematically favour explicit grammatical encoding and conventional patterns of expression in order to produce texts that are more accessible and predictable for the target-language reader.

Against this background of expected translation behaviour, the most statistically salient finding of the analysis is the extent of stylistic explicitation. A large cluster of LIWC categories associated with emotional, cognitive, and perceptual content shows significantly higher frequencies in the translations. These include *affect, posemo, negemo, anger, sad, insight*, as well as perceptual markers such as *percept, see, hear, and feel*. The consistency and scope of these increases suggest that explicitation is not a marginal or secondary phenomenon in the analysed corpus, but rather a dominant translation strategy.

One possible interpretation of this tendency is offered by Zasiekin (2020), who describes explicitation as a “weakly controlled choice of the translator” aimed at reducing communicative risk. From this perspective, explicitation functions as a compensatory mechanism: by rendering emotions, perceptions, and cognitive states more explicit, translators seek to ensure that the intended meaning of the source text

is clearly understood by the target audience. This strategy becomes particularly relevant in texts that are politically sensitive or emotionally charged, such as testimonial and trauma-related narratives. In such contexts, translators may prioritise clarity and interpretative guidance over stylistic subtlety, even if this entails a partial loss of implicit cultural or stylistic meanings present in the original.

An additional statistically significant finding concerns the LIWC2015 category **interrog**, which shows lower frequencies in the translated texts compared to the Ukrainian originals. This indicates a reduction in the number of interrogative forms in translation, suggesting that authorial questions are less frequently preserved in the target texts. Interrogative structures in the originals often function not merely as requests for information, but as rhetorical devices that express uncertainty, doubt, or existential tension. Their reduced presence in translation points to a tendency to reformulate questions into declarative or implicitly resolved structures. This shift can be interpreted as a case of **normalisation**, as interrogative openness and rhetorical uncertainty are replaced with more stable and conventionally structured statements in the target language.

An important finding of the analysis concerns local cohesion and its distribution across originals and translations. Unlike many other statistically significant markers, indicators related to local cohesion display a distinctive pattern. Specifically, **lower frequencies of conjunctions (*conj*) and causal markers (*cause*) are observed in the translated texts**, suggesting a reduced degree of explicit logical linkage at the local level. In contrast, the Ukrainian originals demonstrate higher frequencies of these markers, which points to a more overt articulation of causal and conjunctive relations between adjacent segments of the text.

In the translations, local cohesion appears to be **less explicitly encoded**. The reduced use of conjunctions and causal markers indicates that logical relations are more frequently left implicit or distributed across broader contextual units rather than being signalled directly. This pattern results in a discourse structure that is locally

less cohesive, relying on inference and associative continuity rather than on explicit connective devices.

From an interpretative perspective, this shift suggests that translation may function as a form of **discursive adaptation to trauma-related patterns in the target language**. By reducing explicit local cohesion, translators appear to align the translated texts with discursive conventions commonly associated with trauma narratives in English-language poetry, prose, and testimonial writing. Such conventions are characterised by fragmentation, implicit causality, and weakened logical transitions, which are widely recognised as formal correlates of traumatic experience. In this sense, lower local cohesion in translation may facilitate reader empathy by activating familiar trauma-related discourse schemas in the target culture.

At the same time, the broader statistical results reveal a parallel tendency toward increased logical explicitness and interpretative guidance at other levels of the text. Processes of **explication**, reflected in higher frequencies of affective, cognitive, and perceptual markers, indicate that emotional and experiential content is more fully verbalised in translation. Together with tendencies toward **normalisation** and **equalising**, this results in texts that are more explanatory, more logically elaborated, and less resistant to interpretation.

This combination produces a complex and somewhat paradoxical effect. On the one hand, reduced local cohesion aligns the translations with the discourse of trauma familiar to the target reader, potentially enhancing emotional recognition and accessibility. On the other hand, increased explication and semantic expansion operate as a form of interpretative cushioning, limiting ambiguity and narrowing the reader's interpretive space. As a result, the translated texts often appear **less sharp, less abrupt, and more mediated**, providing the reader with a form of discursive safety.

Importantly, this safety comes at a cost. While the translations may be easier to process and emotionally recognisable, they risk distancing the reader from the unfiltered experiential voice of the poet. The rawness, tension, and unpredictability

that characterise the originals are partially absorbed into more conventional patterns of sense-making. In this way, translation functions not only as linguistic transfer, but also as a form of **discursive regulation**, balancing between empathy and protection, between access and attenuation.

In sum, the interpretation of the results suggests that translated texts are shaped by the interaction of several dominant translation regularities. Reduced local cohesion, combined with increased explicitation and normalisation, reflects an effort to situate the poems within target-language trauma discourse while simultaneously managing communicative risk. This tension highlights a central dilemma in the translation of traumatic poetry: while translation seeks to open a window onto another person's experience, it may also draw a curtain that softens the intensity of what is seen.

2.5 The Markan Verse

2.5.1 Introduction to the Markan Verse

In this section, we introduce and examine the concept of the **Markan Verse**, a term proposed in this study to account for the generative dynamics of poetic texts. The aim of this section is to explore how the Markan Verse operates in original poems and how it is transformed in translation, with particular attention to English translations.

The **Markan Verse** may therefore be defined as the initial generative line of a poetic text, understood as the first verbal articulation around which the poem develops, regardless of its final position within the text. Rather than functioning as a formally privileged line, the Markan Verse constitutes a conceptual and affective nucleus that initiates the poem's semantic, emotional, and imagistic unfolding.

At the same time, the concept of the Markan Verse entails important methodological limitations that must be acknowledged. First and most fundamentally, the Markan Verse is, in most cases, empirically inaccessible. Unless the author explicitly reflects on the process of composition through interviews, diaries, drafts, or

retrospective commentary, there is no reliable way to determine which line functioned as the generative nucleus of the poem. The finished text itself does not contain objective markers that would allow the researcher to identify the Markan Verse with certainty, which makes the concept dependent on interpretation rather than direct textual evidence. Moreover, even when extratextual testimony is available, it cannot be treated as fully reliable, as research in psychology and memory studies has demonstrated the inherent fallibility of retrospective self-reporting.

Due to these limitations, the Markan Verse cannot be approached using the statistical methods employed in the previous sections of this study. The size of the available corpus, as well as the limited number of poems for which Markan Verse reconstructions can be proposed, does not allow for quantitative generalisation. Instead, the present analysis adopts an **empirical qualitative approach** based on **linguostylistic comparison**.

This method makes it possible to examine how the generative impulse of a poem is realised and reshaped in translation by comparing original and translated texts at the level of imagery, emotional articulation, and discourse organisation. While the analysis does not claim statistical validity, it allows for the identification of recurring translation tendencies in the rendering of Markan Verses into English and provides a theoretical foundation for more extensive and systematic future research.

2.5.2 Empirical Analysis of Markan Verses in Translation

The following table presents the Markan Verses identified in a selected corpus of Ukrainian poems and their English translations. Due to the limited size of the dataset, the table is not intended to support statistical generalisation. Instead, it serves as empirical material for linguostylistic comparison, allowing for a qualitative examination of how generative poetic impulses are preserved, transformed, or stabilised in translation.

The Markan Verses presented in the following table were identified through direct communication with the authors. As part of the empirical stage of the study, the authors of the poems were contacted and asked to indicate which line they considered

to be the initial creative impulse or generative nucleus from which the poem developed. Due to practical limitations, only a subset of the fourteen authors included in the broader corpus was able to provide such information. Consequently, the table includes only those Markan Verses for which authorial confirmation was available. The table presents each Markan Verse in the original Ukrainian text alongside its English translation.

Table 2.3

Author Name of the poem	Markan Verse (Original)	Markan Verse (Translation)
Artur Dron “Перед межею збережи...”	Любов, яка стає твоєю	Love which becomes your own
Oleksandr Shakirov “Каштани у калюжах”	Ранковій осінні двори вздовж проспекту Поля Пахнуть прогулянними уроками в школі	September morning yards Along the Polia Avenue Smell like skipping school

<p>Yaryna Chornohuz</p> <p>“Створення Світу, яке не згадують”</p>	<p>Не треба багато розуму шоб плакати на могилах</p>	<p>it doesn't take a genius to cry over graves</p>
<p>Andrii Kuranov</p> <p>“Ми знайомі з часів”</p>	<p>ти нарешті повернешся</p>	<p>You'll lastly come back</p>
<p>Fedir Rudyi</p> <p>“Відлік”</p>	<p>важко писати епітафії для своїх</p>	<p>it's hard to write Epitaphs for your own</p>
<p>Pavlo Korobchuk</p> <p>“не можу говорити не хочу говорити”</p>	<p>бо нащо нам слова коли нема кому їх казати</p>	<p>after all what do we need words for if there is no one to speak to</p>

2.5.2.1 Linguostylistic Comparison: Lexical Level

At the **lexical level**, the analysis focuses on how denotative and connotative meanings of the Markan Verses are preserved or modified in translation, as well as on instances of amplification or omission. Since the Markan Verse functions as the initial generative impulse of the poem, even minor lexical shifts may significantly affect the subsequent poetic development.

In the poem “Перед межею збережи...” by Artur Dron, the original Markan Verse “Любов, яка стає твоєю” is rendered as “Love / which becomes your own”.

On the denotative level, the core meaning is preserved: both versions refer to love as something that is appropriated or internalised by the subject. However, the Ukrainian adjective “твоєю” carries a stronger sense of intimacy and personal attachment, whereas the English phrase “your own” slightly shifts the emphasis toward possession. The line break introduced in the translation amplifies the conceptual focus on Love as an abstract noun, resulting in a mild amplification rather than omission. This shift can be defined as a case of explicitation, as the conceptual and referential status of the key notion is made more explicit and cognitively salient in the target text.

In Oleksandr Shakirov’s poem “Каштани у калюжах”, the original Markan Verse “Ранковій осінні двори вздовж проспекту Поля / Пахнуть прогулянimi уроками в школі” is translated as “September morning yards / Along the Polia Avenue / Smell like skipping school”. The denotative meaning is largely preserved: spatial reference, temporal setting, and sensory perception remain intact. However, the Ukrainian phrase “прогулянimi уроками” carries a colloquial and experiential connotation associated with childhood transgression, which is partially neutralised in the English “skipping school”. The addition of an extra line in the translation constitutes amplification at the structural level, redistributing the generative impulse across a more linear descriptive sequence. This transformation can be classified as a case of explicitation, as implicit experiential and associative content is reorganised into a more explicit and sequential descriptive structure in the target text.

In Yaryna Chornohuz’s poem “Не треба багато розуму шоб плакати на могилах”, the Markan Verse “Не треба багато розуму шоб плакати на могилах” is translated as “it doesn’t take a genius to cry over graves”. The translation demonstrates a high degree of lexical equivalence: the denotative meaning is fully preserved, and the connotative sharpness of the original aphorism is maintained through the idiomatic expression “it doesn’t take a genius”. No significant amplification or omission is observed, suggesting an attempt to preserve the rhetorical force and compactness of the generative line. This case can therefore be

classified as an instance of translation equivalence with no dominant D-regularity, as neither explicitation, normalisation, nor equalising plays a decisive role in the lexical rendering of the Markan Verse.

In **Andrii Kuranov**'s poem “Ми знайомі з часів”, the Markan Verse “ти нарешті повернешся” is translated as “You'll lastly come back”. While the denotative meaning remains intact, the adverb “нарешті” implies emotional anticipation and relief, which is rendered somewhat awkwardly in English by “lastly”. This choice slightly weakens the connotative dimension of the original, indicating a partial loss of emotional nuance without explicit omission. This shift can be interpreted as a case of normalisation, as an emotionally loaded and context-sensitive adverb is replaced with a more neutral and structurally conventional target-language equivalent.

In **Fedir Rudyi**'s poem “відлік”, the fragmented Markan Verse “важко писати / епітафії / для своїх” is translated as “it's hard to write / epitaphs / for your own”. The translation preserves both denotative meaning and line structure. The lexical equivalence is high, and no additional information is introduced. However, the English phrase “your own” remains semantically vague, mirroring the intentional openness of the Ukrainian “своїх”. This suggests a conscious effort to maintain the generative ambiguity of the original impulse. This case can be classified as an instance of translation equivalence with a tendency toward equalising, as the translation preserves semantic openness while aligning the expression with a neutral and conventional target-language formulation.

Finally, in **Pavlo Korobchuk**'s Markan Verse “бо нащо нам слова / коли нема кому їх казати”, translated as “after all what do we need words for / if there is no one to speak to”, the denotative meaning is preserved, while the addition of “after all” constitutes a mild amplification. This addition increases discursive explicitness and rhetorical coherence, aligning the translation with conventional English argumentative structure while slightly reducing the abruptness of the original formulation.

Overall, the lexical analysis demonstrates that the translation of Markan Verses is characterised by a high degree of denotative equivalence, while connotative nuances are selectively reshaped. Minor instances of amplification, such as the addition of discourse markers or explanatory elements, indicate a tendency toward **explication**, aimed at increasing semantic transparency and reducing interpretative ambiguity. At the same time, the attenuation of colloquial or emotionally marked lexical items in several examples points to **normalisation**, whereby the generative impulse is adjusted to conventional English lexical patterns. Occasional smoothing of abrupt or condensed formulations further suggests elements of **equalising**, as stylistic contrasts present in the originals are softened in translation. Taken together, these tendencies confirm that the lexical rendering of Markan Verses reflects broader regularities identified earlier in the study, while preserving the core semantic nucleus of the original poetic impulse.

2.5.2.2. Linguostylistic Comparison: Grammatical Level

At the grammatical level, the analysis focuses on the preservation or modification of verbal categories such as tense, aspect, and voice, as well as on changes in syntactic organisation. Since the Markan Verse functions as a generative nucleus, grammatical restructuring at this level may affect not only local form, but also the dynamic unfolding of the poem.

In **Artur Dron**'s Markan Verse “Любов, яка стає твоєю”, the verb “*стає*” is rendered as “*becomes*”, preserving present tense and active voice. Grammatical equivalence is high, as both versions encode an ongoing process rather than a completed action. However, the syntactic structure shifts from a compact relative clause in Ukrainian to a more linearly segmented structure in English (“*Love / which becomes your own*”). This restructuring increases syntactic transparency and reflects a preference for explicit clause separation typical of English grammar.

In **Oleksandr Shakirov**'s example, the original construction “*Пахнуть прогулянами уроками*” employs an instrumental case without an explicit comparative marker. The English translation “*Smell like skipping school*” introduces

a comparative structure with *like*, making the relational meaning grammatically explicit. While tense and voice remain unchanged, the grammatical encoding of comparison represents a clear case of syntactic explicitation, transforming an implicit relation into an overt grammatical construction.

The Markan Verse by **Yaryna Chornohuz**, “*Не треба багато розуму щоб плакати на могилах*”, is translated as “*it doesn’t take a genius to cry over graves*”. Here, the Ukrainian impersonal construction “*не треба*” is rendered through a fixed English extraposition (“*it doesn’t take*”). Although the grammatical form changes significantly, the functional meaning is preserved. This shift illustrates grammatical normalisation, as the translation replaces a source-language-specific impersonal structure with a conventional English syntactic pattern.

A similar process can be observed in **Andrii Kuranov**’s line “*ми наречими поверненіся*”, translated as “*You’ll lastly come back*”. The future tense is preserved, as is the active voice. However, the Ukrainian aspectual nuance of anticipation encoded in “*наречими*” is not fully supported by the English adverb “*lastly*”, which is grammatically correct but pragmatically marked. This results in partial grammatical equivalence combined with a slight loss of aspectual and modal nuance.

In **Fedir Rudyi**’s fragmented Markan Verse “*важко писати / epitaphs / для своїх*”, the original employs an impersonal construction without an explicit subject. The English translation “*it’s hard to write / epitaphs / for your own*” introduces a dummy subject (*it*), a requirement of English grammar. This shift represents grammatical normalisation rather than amplification: the syntactic fragmentation is preserved through line breaks, but the clause structure is adjusted to conform to target-language norms.

Finally, in **Pavlo Korobchuk**’s poem “*не можу говорити не хочу говорити*”, the Markan Verse “*бо нащо нам слова / коли нема кому їх казати*” is translated as “*after all what do we need words for / if there is no one to speak to*”. The denotative meaning is preserved, while the addition of “*after all*” constitutes a mild amplification. This addition increases discursive explicitness and rhetorical

coherence, aligning the translation with conventional English argumentative structure while slightly reducing the abruptness of the original formulation. This transformation can be identified as a case of explication, as an implicit rhetorical relation is made explicit through the introduction of a discourse marker in the target text.

Overall, the grammatical analysis shows that tense and voice are largely preserved in translation, while source-language-specific constructions are frequently restructured. Impersonal forms, implicit relations, and condensed syntactic patterns tend to be replaced with more explicit and conventional English structures. These shifts point primarily to **normalisation** and **explication**, with elements of **equalising** evident in the smoothing of abrupt grammatical forms. As a result, grammatical clarity and target-language conformity are prioritised over the preservation of structural disruption present in the originals.

2.5.2.2. Linguostylistic Comparison: Stylistic Level

At the stylistic level, the analysis examines the presence and translation of figurative language, including metaphors, epithets, and implicit comparisons, as well as stylistic devices that contribute to the expressive force of the Markan Verse.

Although the corpus is limited and generally characterised by stylistic restraint, several examples nevertheless reveal stylistically relevant features.

In **Artur Dron**'s Markan Verse “*Любов, яка стає твоєю*”, the stylistic effect is primarily metaphorical. Love is conceptualised not as an abstract emotion, but as something that can *become* one's own, implying appropriation and internalisation. The translation “*Love / which becomes your own*” preserves this metaphorical framing. However, by isolating *Love* on a separate line, the translation amplifies its abstract quality, slightly shifting the stylistic focus from intimacy toward conceptual generalisation. While the metaphor itself is retained, its emotional immediacy is somewhat attenuated.

In **Oleksandr Shakirov**'s Markan Verse, “*Ранковій осінній двори вздовж проспекту Поля / Пахнуть прогуляними уроками в школі*”, stylistic

expressiveness is achieved through **synesthetic imagery**. The combination of spatial imagery (*yards along the avenue*) with olfactory perception (*smell*) and an abstract experiential concept (*skipped school lessons*) creates a layered associative effect. The translation “*September morning yards / Along the Polia Avenue / Smell like skipping school*” preserves the synesthetic structure but renders it in a more linear and explicit form. The implicit metaphor of *smell* as memory or experience remains, though the stylistic density of the original is slightly reduced through syntactic expansion.

In the Markan Verse by **Yaryna Chornohuz**, “*Не треба багато розуму щоб плакати на могилах*”, the stylistic force lies in **aphoristic compression and irony** rather than in metaphor. The translation “*it doesn’t take a genius to cry over graves*” successfully reproduces this effect by employing a conventional English idiom. While the stylistic device is different on the surface, the ironic understatement and rhetorical sharpness are preserved, resulting in a high degree of stylistic equivalence.

2.5.3 Systematisation of translation Regularities in the Markan Verse

The empirical analysis of the Markan Verses demonstrates that they exhibit the same core D-regularities as those identified in the large-scale corpus analysis of translated texts. In particular, the translation of Markan Verses shows clear tendencies toward **normalisation**, **explication**, and **equalising**, manifested through increased explicitness, grammatical and stylistic regularity, and the attenuation of abrupt or fragmented structures. These regularities align closely with the dominant patterns observed at the level of full poetic texts.

Given that the Markan Verse often functions as the emotional and conceptual nucleus of a poem, it may be hypothesised that the translation strategy applied to the Markan Verse plays a guiding role in shaping the translation of the poem as a whole. If the emotional core of the poem is rendered through explication or stabilisation, the translator may subsequently gravitate toward similar strategies throughout the rest of the text. In this sense, the treatment of the Markan Verse can be seen as indicative of the broader translation orientation adopted for the poem.

However, this interpretation remains a tentative hypothesis based on limited empirical evidence. The present analysis does not allow for definitive conclusions regarding causality or strategic consistency. To substantiate these observations, further research is required, involving a larger and more systematically compiled corpus of Markan Verses and the application of additional analytical methods. In particular, a large-scale statistical analysis of Markan Verses would constitute a promising direction for future research, enabling a more robust examination of their role in shaping translation regularities.

CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

The findings of the present study largely confirm the results of previous research on translation regularities, in particular those proposed by Zasiekin concerning recurrent tendencies in translated texts. The statistical analysis conducted using LIWC2015 reveals several consistent patterns that allow the results to be grouped into three interrelated clusters.

The first cluster includes translation regularities that are characteristic of a wide range of translated texts, not limited to poetry. The analysis demonstrates a clear tendency toward **normalisation**, whereby translators consciously or unconsciously adjust target texts to the dominant grammatical and stylistic norms of the target language in order to facilitate readability and interpretability. This tendency is reflected in a number of LIWC markers, most notably in the increased frequency of **pronoun** and **personal pronouns (ppron)**, including *I*, *we*, *she/he*, and *they*, which signal a preference for explicit grammatical reference. Additional evidence of normalisation is provided by higher values of **focuspast** and **focuspresent**, indicating more explicit tense marking, as well as by increased use of **number** and **quant**, which reflect standardised and overt encoding of quantity. Alongside normalisation, the results also point to processes of **equalising** and **simplification**, manifested in the reduction of stylistic markedness and the smoothing of condensed or highly compressed forms.

The second cluster of results highlights features that differentiate the Ukrainian originals from their translations and are relevant to trauma-related discourse. These features are most clearly visible in the LIWC categories **conj** and **cause**, which reflect the degree of explicit logical and causal linking at the local level. The statistically significant differences observed in these markers indicate that the translations exhibit **lower frequencies of explicit connective and causal devices** compared to the originals. Rather than signalling greater logical fragmentation, this pattern suggests a shift toward more implicit modes of cohesion, in which relations between propositions are inferred rather than overtly marked.

From an interpretative perspective, this shift may be understood as an unconscious alignment of the translations with **established patterns of trauma discourse in the target language**. In English-language poetry, prose, and testimonial writing, trauma is frequently encoded through reduced explicit cohesion, implicit causality, and associative rather than linearly articulated discourse. By lowering the degree of overt connective marking, translators appear to situate the translated texts within discursive frameworks that are familiar to the target reader and commonly associated with traumatic experience. This strategy may facilitate empathy and recognition by activating culturally available models of trauma narration.

At the same time, the analysis reveals a parallel and highly salient tendency toward **explication** in the translations. A large number of statistically significant markers point to increased verbalisation of emotional, cognitive, and perceptual content, including higher frequencies of **affect**, **posemo**, **negemo**, **anger**, **sad**, **insight**, as well as perceptual categories such as **percept**, **see**, **hear**, and **feel**. These markers indicate that emotional states, mental processes, and sensory experiences are rendered more explicit and less dependent on inference. While such explication may reduce communicative risk and enhance clarity, it also narrows the reader's interpretive space by guiding interpretation more directly.

Taken together, these findings suggest a complex translation dynamic. On the one hand, reduced explicit local cohesion aligns the translations with target-language

trauma discourse and may enhance emotional recognisability. On the other hand, increased explicitation, normalisation, and equalising contribute to texts that are more logically articulated, more explanatory, and less resistant to interpretation. As a result, the translated poems tend to be less abrupt and less disruptive than the originals, constructing a form of interpretive “safety buffer” for the reader. While this strategy facilitates access and comprehension, it may also distance the reader from the unmediated experiential intensity of the source texts, raising important questions about the balance between accessibility and authenticity in the translation of traumatic poetry.

The results of this chapter demonstrate that translation operates not only as a linguistic transfer but also as a form of discursive and emotional reconfiguration. While such reconfiguration enhances accessibility and reduces communicative risk, it simultaneously raises important ethical and aesthetic questions concerning the translation of trauma and the preservation of experiential intensity in poetic texts.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study has addressed the problem of translating contemporary Ukrainian war poetry into English by combining literary analysis with psycholinguistic and corpus-based methods. The research was grounded in the compilation of a bilingual corpus of Ukrainian war poems and their English translations, which enabled a systematic comparison of original and translated texts and ensured the empirical validity of the findings. This corpus served as the basis for both quantitative and qualitative analysis, allowing the study to move beyond impressionistic observations toward statistically supported conclusions.

Within the theoretical framework of trauma studies, it has been established that traumatic experience resists linear representation and is most clearly articulated through formal disruption, fragmentation, and semantic compression. Poetry, due to its condensed structure and heightened sensitivity to linguistic deviation, functions as a particularly effective medium for registering such experiences. War poetry, in turn, constitutes a distinct literary mode shaped by direct confrontation with violence, ethical urgency, and the imperative of witnessing. Contemporary Ukrainian war poetry exemplifies these features with particular intensity, as it emerges from an ongoing conflict and reflects collective as well as individual trauma.

The analysis has demonstrated that poetic translation in this context cannot be reduced to the transfer of propositional meaning. Instead, translation operates as a cognitively and emotionally driven process in which form, affect, and meaning are inseparable. Psycholinguistic approaches to translation have made it possible to conceptualise this process as one governed by recurrent tendencies rather than random variation. In this respect, the study confirms the relevance of translation regularities previously identified in psycholinguistic research, while also showing that their effects are amplified in the translation of emotionally charged poetic texts.

Special attention in the study has been given to the introduction and examination of the concept of the Markan verse, defined as the initial generative line of a poem that contains its semantic and emotional nucleus. It has been shown that

the Markan verse plays a crucial role in the formation of trauma poetry, where the originating impulse may be displaced, obscured, or reframed in the final textual structure. By distinguishing between poetic origin and textual position, this concept provides a more precise analytical tool for examining how traumatic experience enters language in a non-linear and belated manner. Although the identification of the Markan verse may depend on authorial testimony and retrospective reconstruction, these limitations do not undermine its heuristic value but rather highlight the processual nature of poetic creation.

The quantitative analysis conducted with the use of LIWC and an independent-samples t-test has revealed statistically significant differences between the Ukrainian originals and their English translations across a range of lexical, emotional, cognitive, and coherence-related categories. The results indicate a consistent tendency toward normalisation in translation, manifested in increased explicit grammatical reference, standardised temporal marking, and overt quantification. Alongside this, processes of simplification and equalisation contribute to the reduction of stylistic density and formal compression characteristic of the source texts.

At the same time, the analysis has shown that translations exhibit reduced explicit local cohesion, particularly in the use of connective and causal markers. Rather than signalling logical deficiency, this shift suggests an alignment with established patterns of trauma discourse in the target language, where associative and implicit modes of coherence are culturally recognisable. In parallel, a pronounced tendency toward explicitation has been observed, reflected in the increased verbalisation of emotional states, cognitive processes, and sensory perception. While this strategy enhances clarity and reduces communicative risk, it also narrows the reader's interpretive space and attenuates the disruptive experiential intensity encoded in the original poems.

Taken together, these findings indicate that translation functions as a form of emotional and discursive reconfiguration rather than neutral mediation. By balancing reduced cohesion with increased explicitation, translated texts construct a

comparatively safer and more accessible mode of reception for the target reader. However, this accessibility may come at the cost of distancing the reader from the raw immediacy of the traumatic experience conveyed in the source texts. This tension foregrounds the ethical dimension of translating war poetry and underscores the role of the translator as a secondary witness whose decisions shape the cross-cultural transmission of trauma.

The study is not without limitations. The size of the corpus, the focus on a single target language, and the constraints inherent in corpus-based tools may restrict the generalisability of the results. Nevertheless, the integration of quantitative analysis with qualitative interpretation has proven effective in identifying the main tendencies that govern the transformation of war poetry in translation. Further research may expand the corpus, incorporate additional languages, and apply the proposed framework to other forms of trauma-related literature. Such developments would contribute to a deeper understanding of poetic genesis, translation regularities, and the psycholinguistic mechanisms underlying the translation of traumatic texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Засєкін, С. В. *Психолінгвальні закономірності відтворення художнього тексту в перекладі*. Харків, 2020.
2. Adorno, Theodor W. *Cultural Criticism and Society*. In *Prisms*, translated by S. Weber and S. Weber. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.
3. Alexander, Jeffrey C. “Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Foundation of African American Identity.” In *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, edited by J. Alexander et al., 60–111. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
4. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed., text rev., 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787>.
5. Andrews, Charles E. *From the Front: Trench Poetry*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1918.
6. Baker, Mona, and Maeve Olohan. “Reporting That in Translated English: Evidence for Subconscious Processes of Explication?” *Across Languages and Cultures* 1, no. 2 (2000): 141–158. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.1.2000.2.1>.
7. Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” In *Illuminations*, translated by Harry Zohn, edited by Hannah Arendt, 69–82. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968. Reprinted in *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2000.
8. Berman, Antoine. *La traduction et la lettre ou l'Auberge du lointain*. Paris: Seuil, 1985.
9. Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
10. Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. “Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation.” In *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, edited by J. House and S. Blum-Kulka, 17–35. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1986.
11. Brodzki, Bella. *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival, and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.

12. Campbell, James S. “Combat Gnosticism: The Ideology of First World War Poetry Criticism.” *New Literary History* 30, no. 1 (1999): 203–215.

13. Caruth, Cathy. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

14. Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

15. Cavanagh, Clare. “The Art of Losing: Polish Poetry and Translation.” In *Translation: Translators on Their Own Work*, edited by E. Allen and S. Bernofsky, 234–244. New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

16. Celan, Paul. *Referenced via secondary sources*.

17. Charcot, Jean-Martin. *Leçons du mardi à la Salpêtrière*. Paris: Bureaux du Progrès Médical, 1889.

18. Chesterman, Andrew. “Hypotheses about Translation Universals.” In *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, edited by G. Hansen et al., 1–13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.50.02che>.

19. Chernetsky, Vitaly. “Ukrainian and Russian Wartime Poetry in the Age of Social Media.” *Slavic Review* 83, no. 3 (2024): 521–526. <https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2024.496>.

20. Cohen, Joshua. *Interrupting Auschwitz: Art, Religion, Philosophy*. New York and London, 2003.

21. Das, Santanu. *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

22. Das, Santanu. “War Poetry and the Realm of the Senses.” In *The Oxford Handbook of British and Irish War Poetry*, edited by T. Kendall, 73–99. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

23. Dean, C. J. “Witnessing.” In *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Trauma*, edited by C. Davis and H. Meretoja. New York: Routledge, 2020.

24. Derrida, Jacques. “Living on Border Lines.” In *Parages*, 103–191. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

25. Dragsted, Barbara. “Coordination of Reading and Writing Processes in Translation.” In *Translation and Cognition*, edited by G. M. Shreve and E. Angelone, 41–62. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ata.xv.04dra>.

26. Fassin, Didier, and Richard Rechtman. *The Empire of Trauma*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009 (orig. 2007).

27. Felman, Shoshana, and Dori Laub. *Testimony*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

28. Forché, Carolyn. “Introduction.” In *Against Forgetting: Twentieth-Century Poetry of Witness*, 29–47. New York: Norton, 1993.

29. Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Standard Edition, Vol. 18. London: Hogarth, 1920.

30. Goodacre, Mark S. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2001.

31. Halverson, Sandra L. “Translation Studies and Representative Corpora.” *Meta* 43, no. 4 (1998): 631–651. <https://doi.org/10.7202/003000ar>.

32. Hartman, Charles. *Free Verse: An Essay on Prosody*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

33. Janet, Pierre. *L'automatisme psychologique*. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1889.

34. Kazanova, Yelyzaveta. “A Solidarity Narrative: The Soft Power of Ukrainian Wartime Poetry.” *Czech Journal of International Relations* 59, no. 1 (2024): 127–152. <https://doi.org/10.32422/cjir.778>.

35. LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

36. Lamarque, Peter. “Poetry and Private Language.” University of Hull. <https://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Aest/AestLam2.htm>.

37. Laviosa-Braithwaite, Sara. *The English Comparable Corpus (ECC)*. Manchester: UMIST, 1996.

38. Longley, Edna. *Poetry in the Wars*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books, 1986.

39. Madigan, Timothy. “Theories of Cultural Trauma.” In *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

40. Morrissey, Thomas. *Trauma Theory as an Approach to Analyzing Literary Texts*. Twelve Winters Press, 2021.

41. Murav, Harriet. “Contemporary Ukrainian Poetry: Wartime and Poetic Time.” *Slavic Review* 83 (2024): 516–520. <https://doi.org/10.1017/slrv.2024.492>.

42. Nazarenko, Mykola. “Interview.” *Babel*. YouTube, 2024.

43. Oppenheim, Hermann. *Die traumatischen Neurosen*. Berlin: Hirschwald, 1889.

44. Owen, Wilfred. *Poems*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1920.

45. Owen, Wilfred. “Mental Cases.” <https://poets.org/poem/mental-cases>.

46. Paivio, Allan. *Imagery and Verbal Processes*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

47. Pignol, Pascal. “Prehistory of Psychotraumatology.” *Information Psychiatrique* 90 (2014): 415–425.

48. Ramazani, Jahan. *Poetry of Mourning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

49. Rewakowicz, Maria G. Article in *Slavic Review* 77, no. 4 (2018).

50. Riazantseva, Tetiana, and Yuliia Kanchura. “Poetic Reflections of War.” *World Literature Studies* 17, no. 3 (2025): 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.31577/WLS.2025.17.3.6>.

51. Ritivoi, Andreea Deciu. “Affect.” In *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

52. Roth, Philip. *Reading Myself and Others*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1975.

53. Sánchez-Pardo González, Esther. “On Poetry, War and Trauma.” In *At a Time of Crisis*. Barcelona: AEDEAN, 2012.

54. Sassoon, Siegfried. “Does It Matter.” 1920/2006. Various editions.

55. Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

56. Sowmya, A. M., and S. V. N. Murthy. “War and Witness.” *Shanlax International Journal* 12, suppl. 4 (2025).

57. Sütterlin, Nathalie A. “History of Trauma Theory.” In *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Trauma*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

58. Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies – And Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.

59. Turner, Brian. “Foreword.” In *Outside the Wire*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013.

60. Whitehead, Anne. *Trauma Fiction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

61. Wikipedia contributors. “Incipit.” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incipit>.

62. Wimsatt, W. K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. *The Verbal Icon*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1954/1989.

63. Zasiekin, Serhii. “Investigating Cognitive and Psycholinguistic Features of Translation Universals.” *Psycholinguistics* 26, no. 2 (2019): 114–134. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-26-2-114-134>.

64. Zasiekin, Serhii. “Translation as a Psycholinguistic Phenomenon.” *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* (November 2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-009-9134-2>.

65. Zasiekin, Serhii, Victor Kuperman, Iryna Hlova, and Larysa Zasiekin. “War Stories in Social Media: Personal Experience of Russia-Ukraine War.” *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics* 9, no. 2 (2022).

66. Zhadan, Serhiy. “Poetry After Bucha.” *Literary Hub*, 2022