

<https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-1864-2026-98-17>
УДК 81'255.2:82-1=111/=161.2

Typical Errors in Students' Ukrainian Translations of English-Language Poetry: The Case of Translating Louise Glück's "Poem"

Pavlo Shopin

*Doctor of Philosophy in German,
Associate Professor in the Department of Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies,
Faculty of Foreign Philology,
Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine;
(9 Pyrohova Str., Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine);
e-mail: p.yu.shopin@udu.edu.ua; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8022-5327>*

Student translation contests have become a productive form of training and assessment in Ukrainian translation programs: they combine clear rules, public discussion, and a strong motivational component, while also producing a corpus of comparable student translations for the same source text. In this sense, a poetic translation contest can be treated as an educational instrument that makes visible recurrent decision patterns, both successful and unsuccessful, across a cohort of student translators. This paper examines 21 English-Ukrainian translations produced in 2023 for a student translation contest, all based on Louise Glück's contemporary poem "Poem". The study applies qualitative error analysis supported by quantitative frequency counts of error types across the corpus of student translations. It proposes a heuristic typology, covering formal deviations, lexical-semantic errors, denotative errors, stylistic mismatch, unjustified gendering, and related shifts in voice and person, graphic-punctuation interventions, opposite-meaning shifts, interpretive additions, compression/omission, and cross-linguistic interference (Russianisms). The analysis indicates that the most recurrent problems cluster around lexical choice and collocation, interpretive changes that introduce meanings absent in the source, and formal domestication through rhyme, rhythm, and altered lineation that displaces the source text's poetics. On this basis, the article formulates practical recommendations for Ukrainian students preparing for poetry-translation contests, emphasizing contextual reading, register awareness, careful handling of ambiguity, form-sensitive decision-making, and systematic checks against cross-linguistic interference.

Keywords: poetic translation, translation contest, student translation, error analysis, domestication, interference, English-Ukrainian translation.

Problem Statement and Relevance. Poetry translation in the classroom usually takes place in a low-stakes setting: students can revise repeatedly, consult commentaries, and work through difficulties until the final version reads coherently. A contest setting raises the stakes by introducing public competition, thereby revealing students' key translation strategies for achieving high-quality results. Because a contest corpus offers multiple independent translations of the same source text, it makes recurring tendencies easier to observe. Thus, this article treats parallel student translations of one poem as a corpus for identifying recurring error patterns. This emphasis on situated translation tasks is consistent with recent work on authentic projects in translator training, which highlights gains in critical thinking, collaboration, and reflective decision-making [8].

The task of translating poetry is relevant to Ukrainian translation education. Students translate contemporary English-language texts while working with domestic poetic habits (rhyme and regular meter as a norm), cultural narratives in popular discourse, and cross-language interference shaped

by the long colonial pressure from Russian on Ukrainian language use. Another relevant factor is stylistic domestication through archaization and pseudo-folkloric tone. These strategies are widespread in Ukrainian popular culture and public genres and have been described as stable cultural patterns in Ukrainian advertising discourse, where "traditionalizing" language, retrospective stylization, and folkloric markers serve persuasive purposes [10]. Their transfer into poetry translation produces register shifts and tone mismatches with contemporary American poetics. Contest-based student corpora make these shifts observable.

In the Ukrainian university landscape, poetry-translation contests have become an institutionalized part of translator training. In 2023, numerous university-based competitions foregrounded the translation of foreign-language poetry into Ukrainian – for example, the international student competition at Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine; the literary translation competition run by the Mykola Lukash Department of Translation Studies at V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University; and Sumy State University's "Alter Ego-2023." A fine-grained

analysis of contest submissions is therefore important because it sheds light on an established translation practice in Ukrainian higher education.

In earlier publications, I described the format and assessment criteria of the Drahomanov University translation contest [12; 13]. In this article, I turn to a close analysis of error patterns in the 2023 corpus of English–Ukrainian student poetry translations. There is an additional methodological reason for choosing the 2023 corpus. All translations were submitted by 14 March 2023 (the contest deadline). The contest rules prohibited the use of computer-assisted translation tools, thereby enhancing the educational value of the corpus as evidence of students' own decisions. These parameters make the 2023 submissions a useful point of comparison for later studies, since they were produced before LLM-based assistance became routine in student translation practice.

Background and Previous Research. In Translation Studies, an “error” is treated as an analytical and pedagogical category that helps define translation competence in practical terms and identify vulnerable aspects of performance in evaluative settings, including lexical choice, collocation, pragmatic alignment, register choice, culture-specific reference, and the management of textual form [6; 14]. Recent work in translation education has argued for corpus-assisted, context-sensitive assessment feedback, using student translation corpora to track performance across tasks and time rather than treating each product in isolation [11]. Research on poetry translation foregrounds the special density of form–meaning coupling in verse, where small lexical or grammatical moves can restructure voice, ambiguity, rhythmic perception, and the poem's implied poetics [1; 5; 7; 9]. At the level of student performance, Chiara Astrid Gebbia shows that creative metaphors and metaphor clusters frequently push learners toward explicitation and omission, which can flatten figurative texture and weaken textual cohesion [2].

Earlier publications discuss the student translation contest at Drahomanov University from a macro-level perspective, outlining its format and jury criteria and framing it as a pedagogical and Translation Studies object [12; 13]. Building on these contextual studies, the present article shifts the lens to micro-analysis: it systematizes typical errors in Category 1 (translation of an English-language poem into Ukrainian) in the 2023 contest. A preliminary version of this analysis was presented at a faculty conference in Kyiv on 23 May 2024 (“Typical Errors in Students’ Translations of English Poetic Works into Ukrainian”).

Purpose, Research Questions, and Material. This paper aims to systematize typical errors in students’ Ukrainian translations of a contemporary English poem submitted to a translation contest and to formulate practical recommendations for future

participants. It addresses the following **research questions**: (1) Which types of errors recur most consistently across the corpus, and how can they be organized into a usable teaching typology? (2) Which errors are primarily linguistic, and which are textual or pragmatic? (3) How often do students depart from the source poem's formal organization, and what are the consequences of such departures? (4) Which features distinguish the winning translation?

The material consists of 21 Ukrainian student translations of Louise Glück's “Poem” submitted to a 2023 university translation contest. This source text is well suited to error analysis: it packs several translation challenges into a short free-verse lyric and gives a clear point of comparison. The poem has 16 lines organized into a 6–4–3–3 stanza structure, and in the present corpus only 6 of the 21 translations preserve this formal segmentation, while the remaining submissions reshape the line-and-stanza layout to varying degrees. This formal instability is analytically important because it correlates with broader domestication moves, especially when students impose rhyme or rhythmic regularity and reorganize the text to fit familiar Ukrainian verse norms.

Louise Glück (1943–2023) was an American poet whose writing is characterized by emotional intensity combined with formal restraint; her international standing was consolidated by the 2020 Nobel Prize in Literature awarded for a voice that renders individual experience universal. The lyric “Poem” [3], published in her early collection *The House on the Marshland* (1975), stages a quiet dusk scene (a man at a writing table, a woman with roses, a mirror surface, a gray house) and then pivots toward the speaker's self-imposed obligation to “enter their lives,” framing interpretation as a form of intrusion. Formally, the poem is free verse with no governing rhyme or regular meter; its compact lines and strong enjambment foreground line breaks as meaning-bearing units. The syntax remains largely plain and paratactic, yet it is destabilized by deictic compression (“in the early evening, a now”) and by the abrupt shift from a third-person tableau to first-person self-positioning. The lexicon is concrete and visual (mirror surface, green “spokes,” a transparent page with “veins”), while also metapoetic: writing appears as a “form of suffering,” and the closing participle “filming” exploits English polysemy to describe a pear tree covered in pale, delicate blossom. These features create recurring challenges for student translators: lexical-semantic choices in image-bearing words, management of deixis and voice, control of register, and formal discipline in reproducing free-verse poetics without converting the text into a rhymed or metrically regular Ukrainian lyric.

Louise Glück
Poem

In the early evening, a now, as man is bending
over his writing table.
Slowly he lifts his head; a woman

appears, carrying roses.
Her face floats to the surface of the mirror,
marked with the green spokes of rose stems.

It is a form
of suffering: then always the transparent page
raised to the window until its veins emerge
as words finally filled with ink.

And I am meant to understand
what binds them together
or to the gray house held firmly in place by dusk

because I must enter their lives:
it is spring, the pear tree
filming with weak, white blossoms.

The prize-winning translation, produced by Inna Omelchenko (Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv) and later selected for publication [4], is reproduced below as a reference point for the subsequent error analysis.

Луїза Глік

Поєзія

Раннього вечора, нині, чоловік схилився
над своїм робочим столом.
Він підводить голову тихо, з'являється
жінка, тримаючи руж пучок.
Її обличчя, сховане за зеленим плетивом
гілок,
виринає у дзеркальній поверхні трюмо.

Різновид
страждань: і знову прозорий листок
піднесений до посвіта аж допоки
він не сповниться чорнилом вен-думок.

Я мушу збагнути,
що тримає їх до купи
чи в сірому будинку зануреному у півморок.

Я ж маю увірватися у їхнє життя:
уже весна. І дерево груші
вкрите світлим, кволим квіттям.

Inna Omelchenko's winning version stands out for how consistently it recreates Glück's cool, observational free-verse voice while still sounding like composed Ukrainian poetry. It preserves the poem's formal structure and its temporal "now" ("Раннього вечора, нині"), while keeping the scene austere and cinematic, with clean syntax and controlled pacing. Her handling of the central image is especially effective: the woman's face is visually filtered ("сховане за зеленим плетивом гілок... у дзеркальній поверхні трюмо"), which convincingly translates the optical overlay of stems across the mirror. The middle movement condenses Glück's "veins/ink/words" nexus into a conceptually tight Ukrainian solution ("чорнилом вен-думок"),

sustaining the metaphor of writing as embodied suffering. In the closing lines, the translator avoids a literal calque of "filming" and opts for a natural, image-led ending ("дерево груші / вкрите світлим, кволим квіттям"), keeping the poem's quiet, springtime tone intact.

Competition Context and Corpus Description.

The International Student Translation Contest "Translation as a Key to Cultural and Linguistic Worldviews" was launched in 2017 by the Department of Applied Linguistics, Comparative Linguistics, and Translation at the Faculty of Foreign Philology of Mykhailo Drahomanov State University of Ukraine (then headed by Nataliya Lemish). The contest has been held annually as part of the linguocultural project "Intercultural Communication and Translation Studies: Points of Contact and Prospects for Development." The seventh competition was held on 23 March 2023 at the Faculty of Foreign Philology, organized by the same department, with the present author serving as jury chair. The 2023 edition included four categories: translation of an English poem into Ukrainian, translation of a Ukrainian poem into English, translation of a Ukrainian song into English, and translation of an English-language song into Ukrainian.

In 2023, the contest involved 51 participants (47 from Ukraine, three from the United Kingdom, and one from Lithuania) and received 61 applications in total. Participants represented 15 Ukrainian higher education institutions, as well as University College London and Kaunas University of Technology, and came from eight Ukrainian regions and multiple cities. Category 1 (translation of an English-language poem into Ukrainian), which constitutes the corpus for this article, received 21 applications. Category 1 participants represented ten tertiary education institutions (nine in Ukraine and one in Lithuania). The largest groups came from the National Transport University (6) and Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (4); the remaining participants were distributed across eight other institutions (1–2 each). The 2023 jury included five university instructors. In each category, the jury awarded one first prize, two to three second prizes, and three to four third prizes.

The contest evaluation criteria for Category 1 covered the originality of creative ideas underlying the translation, accuracy and faithfulness to the source text, linguistic intuition, appropriateness of lexical and grammatical resources, rendering of culture-specific references, content equivalence, style, quality of rhyme and rhythm, and aesthetic equivalence. These criteria are important for the present analysis because they make explicit the tension that students navigate in poetry translation contests: semantic accuracy, stylistic adequacy, and formal organization operate simultaneously as evaluation parameters, and they shape the range of translation strategies visible in the corpus.

Methodology. The analysis combines close reading of the source poem and each student translation with

systematic error annotation and simple prevalence counting. Each translation is examined line by line against the source, and clear deviations are coded using a heuristic typology. For the quantitative layer, I record category presence in a binary way: a category is counted for a translation if that translation contains at least one unambiguous instance of the error type. This produces a profile of category prevalence across the 21 texts.

Because student poetry translation frequently involves formal domestication into familiar Ukrainian verse norms, formal interventions are treated as a separate layer and recorded independently from semantic errors. Three indicators stand out in this corpus: changes in lineation and layout (15 of 21 translations reshape the poem's lineation), introduction of rhyme and/or regular rhythm (8 of 21 translations add rhyme or rhythmic regularity), and omission or non-provision of the title and/or the author's name (12 of 21 translations do not translate the title or provide the author's name). These indicators correlate with broader shifts in student translations: the imposition of rhyme can trigger compression, addition of evaluative metaphors, and syntactic rewrites designed to satisfy sound patterning, moving the target text toward a freer, adaptive mode.

The coding scheme defines key categories of typical errors, each illustrated and quantified in the Results section. The categories include lexical-semantic errors (wrong word choice, collocation problems, semantic drift); denotative errors; lexical-stylistic mismatch (register errors, inappropriate folklorisms or colloquialisms); unjustified gendering where the English source leaves gender unmarked; shifts of person, voice, or narrative perspective; graphic-punctuation interventions such as unmotivated quotation marks; opposite-meaning shifts; interpretive additions that introduce meanings absent in the source; compression or omission of textual material; and cross-linguistic interference in the form of Russianisms and calques that violate Ukrainian norms.

Results. Across the corpus, the most visible vulnerabilities concentrate in lexical choice/collocational control, interpretive overbuilding, and formal domestication; the remaining categories occur as recurring but less dominant deviations.

Formal Domestication. Formal decisions function as a sensitive indicator of how students position themselves between translation and free adaptation. The source text is a short free-verse lyric organized as a 16-line poem with a stable 6-4-3-3 stanzaic segmentation. Only six of the twenty-one translations preserve this sequence; most reshape lineation and/or stanza boundaries. Although lineation conveys meaning, this pattern underscores that it is commonly treated as open to change.

A second formal tendency is the introduction of rhyme and/or regular rhythm. Even when students do not explicitly declare an intention to "improve"

the poem, the turn toward rhyme or rhythmic regularity signals a default domestication into familiar Ukrainian verse norms. This move correlates with wider textual consequences: compression, syntactic reshaping, and the addition of evaluative or ornamental imagery to satisfy sound patterning. In such cases, the translation begins to function as an autonomous Ukrainian lyric generated from the source as a prompt.

A third indicator concerns paratextual discipline. A substantial proportion of submissions omit the translated title and/or the author's name (or leave them in the source-language form). In contest conditions, this omission is revealing: it suggests that some students treat the translation as a self-standing poetic artefact and deprioritize the conventions of presenting a translated work as a bibliographically and culturally located text.

Lexical-Semantic Errors. The most transparent lexical-semantic problems arise where a single English word activates competing senses and the translation locks onto an inappropriate one. A clear case is the participle "filming" in "the pear tree / filming with weak, white blossoms," which several students interpret through the cinematic semantic field ("кіно/кадр/зйомка"), producing variants such as "знімаються слабким білим цвітом," "білі квіточки суцвіття, / зафільмовані ними наче у раю," or "той нижній цвіт груші / ряхтить наче в сцені з кіно." The problem here is a disambiguation failure: the relevant sense of film in this context concerns a thin coating or veil-like layer, and the cinematic reading relocates the image into an external interpretive frame that the source text does not support.

A second lexical-semantic error type emerges from misreading English noun-noun attribution. In "rose stems," rose functions as a noun modifier ("stems of roses"), but one translation reads rose as the color adjective "рожевий," producing "зеленими спицями рожевих стебел." The error is instructive because it introduces an internal semantic contradiction with the explicit "green" in the source line: "зеленими спицями рожевих стебел" conflicts at the level of basic feature assignment and signals a failure to resolve the attributive construction as denoting material relation rather than color.

A third cluster concerns the verb "marked" in "marked with the green spokes of rose stems." In the source, "marked" describes an optical overlay in the mirror: the stems' green lines pattern the reflected face. Several translations shift this neutral visual marking into a more violent or concrete image by introducing "шипи/колючки" and, in the most extreme case, physical injury ("Обличчя, поколоте трояндами, всміхається"). Such renderings misrepresent the scene logic (reflection rather than contact) and add a semantic component absent from the original: pain, piercing, or tactile aggression. Within the typology, this is best treated as a lexical-semantic shift in the sense of "marked," frequently accompanied by intensification that pushes the target line toward interpretive overbuilding.

Denotative Errors. Some errors are denotative in a strict sense: the translation selects a different object (or a different part of an object) than the source text names. One example is the substitution of “stem” with “стовбур,” yielding phrases such as “стовбури троянд.” In Ukrainian, “стовбур” strongly evokes the trunk of a tree, and its use with roses reclassifies the plant into an implausible “tree-like” category, producing an erroneous mental image and violating collocational expectations.

Another denotative error is the replacement of “pear tree” with “персикове дерево.” This is a realia shift (a pear becomes a peach) that changes the botanical referent and, by extension, the sensory and cultural associations of the closing scene. Even though the broader “spring tree in bloom” frame remains, the lexical replacement constitutes a clear departure from the source text.

Lexical-Stylistic Mismatch. A recurrent category involves a stylistic register that conflicts with the source poem’s restrained contemporary lyric tone. One instructive instance is the translation of “house” as “будівля” (“сіра та будівля”). While referentially possible, “будівля” tends to sound technical or bureaucratically neutral in Ukrainian and reduces the domestic, lived-space resonance that “house” normally carries in lyric contexts. The result is a depersonalized architectural object where the source suggests a dwelling as existential space, which also weakens the link to the subsequent line about “entering their lives.”

More visibly, several translations introduce folklorizing or strongly colloquial lexemes and clichés that “Ukrainianize” the scene into a different cultural and stylistic key. Variants such as “woman” as “молодиця” or “дівча” import folk-poetic or conversational coloring and, in the case of “молодиця,” introduce a socially specific profile (a young married woman) absent from the neutral English woman. Similarly, “man” as “чолов’яга” adds evaluative, colloquial characterization (“a big burly guy”; “an uncouth guy”) that is not encoded in the source. At the level of poetic voice, these choices shift the tone from Glück’s cool, observational style to a more overtly expressive Ukrainian register.

Unjustified Gendering. A methodologically “clean” pragmatic-grammatical error in the corpus is the unjustified explicitation of the lyrical narrator’s gender. In the English source, the key first-person constructions (“I am meant to understand,” “because I must enter their lives”) do not mark grammatical gender, while Ukrainian offers fully natural non-gendered equivalents (“я мушу,” “я маю,” “мені треба,” “мені призначено”). Despite this, five translations introduce explicitly masculine predication and self-identification – most visibly through “повинен” and through the construction “я той, хто...,” as in “I я повинен зрозуміти,” “тому що я повинен увійти в їхнє життя,” “Я ж повинен

розібратись,” “повинен я увійти до їхнього життя,” or “я той, хто увійде в їх життя.” The core problem is potential gender mismatch (if the narrator is read as female in the contest interpretation) and, more generally, an over-translation effect: the target text adds information that the source does not encode, narrowing the interpretive openness of the English “I.” In addition, the “я той, хто...” variant goes beyond gender marking and shifts the speaker’s stance toward explicit self-definition, introducing a rhetorical frame that is absent from Glück’s restrained, observational first-person positioning.

Shifts of Person/Voice. A related set of deviations involves shifts of person, address, and narrative perspective that reconfigure the poem’s deictic and pragmatic structure. In some translations, the first-person “I” is replaced by direct address or a collective voice, producing formulations such as “Ти маєш...,” “що тримаємо...,” or “Не побачиш...”. Such moves rewrite the communicative situation of the poem by turning an inwardly registered obligation (“I must enter their lives”) into instruction, admonition, or shared experience. Even though the semantic content remains loosely related, the pragmatic force shifts: the poem’s self-positioning becomes an externally oriented directive or a generalizing statement. These deictic reframings are pedagogically important because they demonstrate how readily students treat lyric perspective as interchangeable and how quickly local choices in person and voice can transform a poem’s tone.

Graphic and Punctuation Interventions. A smaller but analytically clear category concerns purely graphic interventions that are not motivated by the source text. In this corpus, the primary marker is the introduction of quotation marks around ordinary referential items, for example “зайшла «вона»” or “її «вени».” In Ukrainian poetic usage, quotation marks commonly signal irony, distance, scepticism about reference, or a “so-called” effect. As a result, the intervention produces a pragmatic shift: “вона” becomes a labelled role, a questioned identity, or a quoted mask.

Opposite-Meaning Shifts. A rare but instructive phenomenon is the direct inversion of an attribute into its opposite. The clearest instance in the corpus is “transparent page” rendered as “затемнену сторінку,” which reverses transparency into darkening/obscuring. Because the source metaphor relies on visibility (the page held to the window until “its veins emerge”), the antonymic shift undermines the internal logic of the image and the poem’s writing-as-visibility motif.

Interpretive Additions. One of the most consequential tendencies in the corpus is the introduction of meanings not supported by the source text. These additions range from evaluative exclamations and romanticization to the importation of broader thematic frames such as war, morality, or “fairy-tale” poetics. The translations introduce lines like “Бує у душі війна...,” “Яка романтика!,” or “бо я – весна!,” as well as elaborated paraphrases of “It is a form of suffering” that add “порожнеча,” “стіна,” or

explicit moralizing and psychologizing. The pattern is best described as interpretive domestication: the translator fills perceived “gaps” with culturally legible scripts and emotive amplifiers, thereby replacing Glück’s restraint with a more declarative and rhetorically heightened lyric.

Compression and Omission. Another recurring strategy is significant compression. In these cases, the target text tends to lose the poem’s internal linkages – especially the chain that connects the visual scene, the writing metaphor (page/veins/ink), and the speaker’s obligation to “enter their lives.” The corpus includes translations where the poem is “folded” into a much shorter utterance, and this shortening typically results in the disappearance of minor images that, in Glück’s composition, function as structural hinges. From a pedagogical perspective, the key point is that compression here serves as a symptom of form-driven rewriting (for example, to fit rhyme/rhythm) or as an avoidance strategy for difficult language.

Cross-Linguistic Interference (Russianisms). The final category captures lexical interference shaped by Russian–Ukrainian contact, visible even in high-motivation contest writing. In the corpus, this includes direct Russianisms such as “впливає лице” (cf. Russian “всплывает”): while Ukrainian “спливати” is idiomatic in meanings like “time has elapsed” (“сплив час”) or, figuratively, “information/facts emerge/come to light” (“сплили факти”), the natural Ukrainian rendering for a face/image coming into view is “виринає (з’являється)”. The corpus also includes calqued collocations such as “письменний стіл” (“writing table”) under the influence of Russian “письменный стол,” where Ukrainian “письменний” exists but means “literate” and is non-normative in this object-denoting phrase. Such cases matter as evidence of unstable norms in the students’ language repertoire: even when source-text comprehension is adequate, cross-linguistic interference can surface at the level of phraseology and lexical selection.

Conclusion. This study treats twenty-one independent Ukrainian student translations of Louise Glück’s free-verse lyric “Poem” (submitted in 2023 for the contest and produced without CAT tools) as a parallel corpus for identifying typical translation challenges. Building on close reading and systematic annotation, the article proposes a heuristic typology of recurrent errors and uses simple prevalence counts to map where the cohort’s vulnerabilities cluster. The findings show persistent problems in lexical choice and collocational control, interpretive changes not supported by the source text, and formal domestication through rhyme, rhythm, and lineation. These tendencies suggest that under contest conditions many students default to culturally available expressive templates and to meaning-expansion strategies that overwrite Glück’s restrained observational poetics.

The answers to the research questions can be summarized as follows:

1. Which types of errors recur most consistently across the corpus, and how can they be organized into a usable teaching typology? The most recurrent problems are lexical choice/collocational control, interpretive additions, and formal domestication. These can be organized into a teaching typology including formal deviations, lexical-semantic and denotative errors, lexical-stylistic mismatch, unjustified gendering, person/voice shifts, graphic-punctuation interventions, opposite-meaning shifts, interpretive additions, compression/omission, and cross-linguistic interference.

2. Which errors are primarily linguistic, and which are textual or pragmatic? The primarily linguistic errors are lexical-semantic errors, collocational problems, denotative errors, and cross-linguistic interference. The mainly textual/pragmatic errors are lexical-stylistic mismatch, unjustified gendering, shifts of person/voice, graphic and punctuation interventions, interpretive additions, and opposite meanings.

3. How often do students depart from the source poem’s formal organization, and what are the consequences of such departures? Departures from the source poem’s formal organization are frequent: 15 of 21 translations reshape lineation/layout, 8 add rhyme and/or regular rhythm, and 12 omit or fail to translate the title and/or author’s name. These departures commonly result in domestication, recasting the poem into more familiar Ukrainian verse norms and sometimes moving from translation toward adaptation.

4. Which features distinguish the winning translation? The winning translation stands out because it preserves the formal structure, sustains Glück’s cool observational voice, respects ambiguity, handles the central images convincingly, avoids crude calques, and keeps the ending natural and image-led in idiomatic Ukrainian.

A central contribution of the analysis is to treat form as a meaning-bearing layer. Formal reshaping correlates with semantic compression, added ornamentation, and pragmatic reframing, moving the target text away from translation toward adaptation.

The typology can serve as a pedagogical tool. For contest preparation (and for poetry translation training more broadly), the findings point to several priorities: systematic contextual disambiguation of polysemous lexemes; deliberate collocational checking of noun phrases and modifiers; register awareness that prevents bureaucratic neutralization on the one hand and pseudo-folkloric or colloquial coloring on the other; and routine self-checks against cross-linguistic interference. Equally important is form sensitivity: students should treat line breaks, stanza boundaries, and the lack of regular meter as part of the poem’s semantics and pragmatics, since sound-patterning changes often carry hidden costs (forced paraphrase, additions, and perspective drift). Finally, the analysis underscores the value of preserving the source text’s interpretive openness by avoiding unnecessary gender explicitation,

person/voice shifts, and marked punctuation devices that introduce irony or distance absent from the original.

Future research can extend the typology across multiple source poems and contest editions, test the inter-rater reliability of the categories, and explore more fine-grained quantitative modeling of error density and co-occurrence, including

interactions between formal deviations and semantic/pragmatic shifts. A particularly useful next step follows from the fact that the corpus dates from 2023: the submissions were produced before LLM-assisted translation became routine, so later studies can compare them with post-LLM contest translations and track shifts in error profiles, formal discipline, and the balance between meaning expansion and omission.

References

1. Boase-Beier, J. (2014). *Stylistic approaches to translation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315759456>
2. Gebbia, C. A. (2023). Translator learners' strategies in local and textual metaphors. *Frontiers in Communication*, 8, 1177658. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2023.1177658>
3. Glück, L. (n.d.). Poem. *All Poetry*. Retrieved January 26, 2026, from <https://allpoetry.com/poem/14371698-Poem-by-Louise-Gluck>
4. Glück, L. (2023). Poeziia [Poem] (Trans. from English by I. Omelchenko). *Krytyka*. Retrieved January 26, 2026, from <https://www.krytyka.com/ua/articles/poeziia> [in Ukrainian]
5. Holmes, J. S. (1988). *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies*. Rodopi.
6. Hurtado Albir, A. (2015). The acquisition of translation competence: Competences, tasks, and assessment in translator training. *Meta*, 60(2), 256–280. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1032857ar>
7. Jones, F. R. (2011). Poetry translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 117–122). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hts.2.poe1>
8. Korda, D. (2023). Translation training: The use of authentic projects. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 10, 302–337. <https://doi.org/10.51287/cttl202310>
9. Lefevere, A. (1975). *Translating poetry: Seven strategies and a blueprint*. Van Gorcum.
10. Lugovyi, V. (2025). Kulturni stratehiyi v ukrayinskomu reklamnomu dyskursi: arkhayizatsiya, psevdonarodnist, henderne modelyuvannya [Cultural strategies in Ukrainian advertising discourse: Archaization, pseudo-folk style, and gender modeling]. *Artistic Culture. Topical Issues*, 21(2), 214–224. [https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.21\(2\).2025.345229](https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.21(2).2025.345229) [in Ukrainian]
11. Man, D., Zhu, C., Chau, M. H., & Maruthai, E. (2022). Contextualizing assessment feedback in translation education: A corpus-assisted ecological approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1057018. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1057018>
12. Shopin, P. (2025). Kulturnyi vplyv studentskykh perekkladatskykh konkursiv [The cultural impact of student translation competitions]. *Artistic Culture. Topical Issues*, 21(2), 209–213. [https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.21\(2\).2025.345228](https://doi.org/10.31500/1992-5514.21(2).2025.345228) [in Ukrainian]
13. Shopin, P. (2025). Student translation competitions as a form of intercultural communication. *Transcarpathian Philological Studies*, 44(2), 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.44.2.27>
14. Waddington, C. (2001). Different methods of evaluating student translations: The question of validity. *Meta*, 46(2), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.7202/004583ar>

Надійшла до редакції 27 січня 2026 р.

Прийнята до друку 25 березня 2026 р.

Опублікована 29 травня 2026 р.

Submitted January 27, 2026.

Accepted March 25, 2026.

Published May 29, 2026.

Павло Шопін, доктор філософії з германістики, доцент, доцент кафедри прикладної лінгвістики та перекладознавства, факультет іноземної філології, Український державний університет імені Михайла Драгоманова (вул. Пирогова, 9, Київ, 01601, Україна); e-mail: p.yu.shopin@udu.edu.ua; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8022-5327>

Типові помилки у студентських українських перекладах англomовної поезії (на матеріалі перекладів вірша Луїзи Глік «Роем»)

Студентські перекладацькі конкурси стали важливою формою навчання й оцінювання в українських програмах підготовки перекладачів: вони поєднують чіткі правила, публічне обговорення та потужний мотиваційний компонент, а також створюють корпус зіставних студентських перекладів одного вихідного тексту. У цьому сенсі конкурс поетичного перекладу можна розглядати як навчальний інструмент, що виявляє повторювані моделі перекладацьких рішень – як успішні, так і невдалі – серед студентів-перекладачів. У статті проаналізовано 21 англійсько-український переклад, виконаний у 2023 році для студентського перекладацького конкурсу на основі сучасного англomовного вірша Луїзи Глік «Роем». Дослідження застосовує якісний аналіз перекладацьких помилок, підкріплений кількісним підрахунком частоти різних типів помилок у корпусі. Запропоновано евристичну типологію, яка охоплює формальні відхилення, лексико-семантичні помилки, хибний вибір референта, стилістичну невідповідність, необґрунтоване уточнення ґендеру мовця та пов'язані з ним зсуви нарративної перспективи, прагматичні викривлення й зміну особи, графіко-пунктуаційні втручання, створення протилежного значення, інтерпретативні додавання, компресію/вилучення, а також міжмовну інтерференцію (русизми). Аналіз показує, що найчастотніші проблеми зосереджуються навколо лексичного вибору та сполучуваності, інтерпретативних змін, які вводять відсутні в оригіналі смисли, та формального одомашнення через риму, ритм і лініяцію, що змінює поетику вихідного тексту. Сформульовано практичні рекомендації для українських студентів, які готуються до конкурсів поетичного перекладу. Підкреслюється важливість уваги до контексту, чутливості до стилю, вміння відтворювати неоднозначність, урахування структури вихідного тексту та послідовного уникнення міжмовної інтерференції.

Ключові слова: поетичний переклад, перекладацький конкурс, студентський переклад, аналіз помилок, одомашнення, інтерференція, англійсько-український переклад.

Як цитувати: Шопін, П. (2026). Типові помилки у студентських українських перекладах англomовної поезії (на матеріалі перекладів вірша Луїзи Глік «Роем»). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія «Філологія»*, (98), 114-121. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-1864-2026-98-17>

Cite as: Shopin, P. (2026). Typical Errors in Students' Ukrainian Translations of English-Language Poetry: The Case of Translating Louise Glück's "Poem". *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series Philology*, (98), 114-121. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2227-1864-2026-98-17>