

<https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJLCL/2026/6.2.917>

AI Translation in Poetry and Prose: Loss, Gain, and the Aesthetics of Machine Voice

Nyiramukama Diana Kashaka

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has transformed the field of literary translation by introducing new possibilities and challenges in the translation of poetry and prose. This study examines the phenomenon of AI-mediated translation through the lens of Translation Studies, focusing on the dynamics of loss, gain, and the emerging aesthetics of machine voice. It explores the long-standing tension between fidelity and creativity and investigates how AI systems influence linguistic, cultural, and aesthetic dimensions of literary texts. The study identifies significant areas of loss, including diminished prosodic patterns, weakened sensory and emotional resonance, and cultural and intertextual gaps that affect the preservation of meaning and literary expression. Conversely, AI translation also offers notable gains, such as expanded multilingual accessibility, wider global circulation of literary works, enhanced efficiency, and the development of new hybrid literary forms. Furthermore, the study analyzes the concept of machine voice as a distinct aesthetic phenomenon that reshapes reader interpretation and challenges traditional notions of authorship and originality. Through theoretical analysis and comparative perspectives on AI- and human-mediated translations, the paper argues that AI translation should not be understood solely as a technological tool but also as a transformative force redefining literary production, reception, and cross-cultural communication. The study concludes that while AI introduces inevitable losses in literary translation, it simultaneously creates new forms of creative and interpretive possibilities that demand continued scholarly engagement.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence Translation, Machine Voice Aesthetics, Literary Translation, Fidelity and Creativity, and Poetry and Prose Translation.

INTRODUCTION

The paratext plays an exceptionally important role in the reception and interpretation of cinema and literature [1]. Whereas intertitles, for example, feature traditional cinematic paratexts, trailers represent an increasingly popular, distinct cinematic paratext that serves to alert audiences to forthcoming films [2]. Tronti argued that trailers, as video paratexts have become the fastest-growing and most lucrative medium and trend in the history of creative art. Paratexts affect how viewers receive, interpret, and form expectations about a given text. Sonnensche in explained that paratexts provide surrounding material on specific cultural elements of a given film, serving as additional features that offer greater insights into both the characters and the story; just as in literature, they furnish viewers with some not too much hinting or framing directing them to engage in a pragmatic approach to interpretation [3]. In its turn, in filmed literature there are two layers of paratexts: those attached to the written text and those attached to the moving image version. Some critics have considered the paratexts of both versions in isolation, while others have taken the two into account together, assessing how screening a written text alters its reception and selection of paratexts [2]. AI translation in poetry and prose: loss, gain, and the aesthetics of machine voice an objective, evidence-based scholarly examination [1]. AI translation takes diverse forms across

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

various genres, ranging from literal replication with negligible intervention to mass-creation models generating global flows of nonhuman-influenced text. Positioning AI translation within the fidelity-creativity and creativity-aesthetics traditions elucidates its special character. Prominent debates have examined fidelity and creativity in human translation [2]. Fidelity conveying the message or meaning of the source text can be further disaggregated into literal fidelity (verbal identity), dynamic equivalence (sense or gist), intertextuality (reflected culture), and creativity (literal invention or slotting)[3]. Equivalence, intertextuality, inflection, and freedom underpin a cross-cutting discourse on loss and gain, shaping reader perception. The debate on broad creativity parallels these wider delimitations of creativity [4]. AI governs machine-mediated texts, inviting scrutiny from translation theory and aesthetic philosophy. Machine agency diminishes responsibility, accountability, and originality. Viewers and readers approaching AI-influenced works bring distinctive sensitivities toward both machine authorship and human mediation [6]. AI output adopts a quasi-machine voice, neither fully human nor fully mechanical, prompting a specialized voice-related discourse both in general and under the broader umbrella of translation. Extensive project work illustrates how AI-generated texts, whether printed, spoken, or projected, often evoke responses subtly different from those provoked by human-generated counterparts [7].

Theoretical Framework: Translation Studies and AI

Translation Studies incorporates a rich body of theoretical and methodological apparatus. AI translation engages with concepts such as equivalence and translational norms, and invites questions about machine voice and aesthetic judgement[5]. Translation theorists frequently consider the notion of fidelity; for example, whether to produce a “literal” translation that remains faithful to the original wording or instead aim at a “dynamic” rendering that captures the source text’s sense [6]. Such questions can be particularised and extended: How does machine translation mediate between the tensions of fidelity and creativity? I define translation as “the art of saying in another language what has been spoken in the first one”, translation must involve “recreation” and “the conveyance of the source text’s affective qualities,” and translators inevitably fill gaps with “additions or improvisations”. AI translation generates an additional layer of intermediation, one that a human translator must also accommodate. Aesthetic judgement furthermore permeates the selection of source texts themselves [5]. The use of AI translation at an institutional level raises further questions about intercultural time-lags; how long after the disappearance of the original does allusion continue to resonate? I identify translation as a vital mechanism, neologisms and allusive expressions must find equivalents, preferably simultaneously in the target culture, to retain their power[6]. Cultural and intertextual time-lags are especially relevant to poetry, where the weight of a single reference can be equivalent to that of an entire scene in the narrative; similar refractive delays are also crucial to prose [7]. Applied aesthetics, the analysis of readerly effects and interpretive shifts, has a long history; an AI-generated variant opens an additional avenue for exploration. Machine-generated content adopts distinctive lexical patterns, ranges of embedding, and phrasal cadences that set it apart from human authorship. The use of AI also facilitates self-quarantine; an individual can deploy the technology without social stigma, permitting the collection of more candid responses [8].

Loss in AI Translation for Poetry and Prose

In AI translation, loss manifests in multiple ways, covering fidelity, sensorimotor aspects, and cultural cues. Tensions among chatbot outputs’ fidelity, creativity, and style echo long-debated questions in Translation Studies, while the channels of loss mapped across languages share affinities with intertextuality and postcolonial framing. Machine outputs typically centre on fidelity to source texts. Various approaches highlight distinct dimensions of fidelity [1]. For instance, geared to both prose and poetry, Hawkins’s (2023) rubric distinguishes between literal fidelity (congruity with the source’s lexical and syntactic constructs), dynamic equivalence (congruence with the source’s intended effect), and invented or slotted creativity (the introduction of lexical or stylistic features lacking in the source) [2]. Machine translation comprises a stable application of invented or slotted creativity, which deviates from both literal and dynamic fidelity. Such stipulations resonate with early considerations of creativity as a defining facet of machine translation [2] and parallel observations about halting textual flow for extensive paraphrase in literature generation [3]. In examining AI translation, the evolutionary linkage to the onset of such creative interruption becomes a specific point of inquiry within the broader cross-fidelity unfinished agenda [4]. Though machine fidelity has absorbed extensive scrutiny, for poetry, the constraint has sparked interest alongside diversion. Chakrabarty contends that machine systems adversely affect style and poetic devices that are critical for semantically coherent and aesthetically pleasing translations, whereas human translators naturally tend to rephrase whenever a text becomes unmanageable [4]. Moreover, within various other genres, fundamental transformation happens under machine authorship that may draw for inspiration across multiple different-source materials beyond the original input itself [5]. Many of these deformations come through whole-scale revisions, and since machine translation tools characteristically linger on literal input surface form, dissemination efforts remain – evince circling back to the creativity postulate that personal discharge a component, verfran-azard for

much intermediate transformation [6]. Texture phenomena apart, substantial degradation or transmutation has been observed specifically within sensorial, prosodic, and poetico-affect infrastructures. In ChatGPT versions, for instance, AI renders the original poetico-affect valence into sloppy, garish, jumbled or raucous states even while availability corresponding appear languages have similar. Translate mixtures and switching-aware tokens steepen these deterioration schemas altogether [7].

Fidelity and Creativity

Literary translation has long been characterized by tension between fidelity to the original and creative re-imagination of the text [2]. Literal equivalence versus dynamic equivalence, Valéry versus Mallarmé, source-dominated versus target-dominated, are common rubrics for mapping this conflict [4]. The rising use of AI translation adds to yet also reframes the debate [3]. New terms such as “slotted creativity” refer to AI-generated phrases that extend or displace the original’s conceptual field. Such room for creativity opens up additional freedom for poetic variation beyond previous conceptualizations of equi- or in-vention. The machine’s tendency toward literal engagement both constrains and liberates, raising questions about how this technical mediation refracts the relationship among text, voice, and genre [4]. AI systems require large, aligned bilingual corpora trained on comparable source and target texts 2. Constraints introduced by commercial models such as Google Translate, DeepL, and Yandex vary the space for deviation across the locus of voice [1]. While seemingly a step forward, fine-tuning on creativist language pairs may channel experimentation into channels and registers already influenced by technology [3]. The impact of AI on intertextual transfer remains uncharted. Anopheles “insect” becomes “mosquito” or “fleas,” yet the allegory extends no further. Sowa “mind” in Sowa sanskrit-treated translations persists as “soul,” blocking detection of Buddhist contexts [2]. Even extensive human translation does not prevent silencing of prior texts and systems. Such lag raises questions not only of loss but of intermediation and transmission [3].

Sensorial and Prosodic Diminution

In canonical Translation Studies, gy, rhythm, sound and prosodic patterns, and sensorial associations have typically been acknowledged as important and delicate features of literary texts [4]. However, the current study suggests that the shaping or appropriation of these factors by AI translation systems tends to diminish rather than cultivate aesthetic effect. Speech recognition tools often obscure speech-like factors, which should rather validate and help shape what—if anything—is distinctive of prose narrative [5]. In keeping with this assumption, translation experiments conducted in the context of translation studies—specifically studying the effects of AI translation on poetic texts—have reported loss of effect in the sensory dimension and rhythmic language of original poems, nursery rhymes, or songs; AI translation renders these factors untraceable or insufficiently distinctive [6]. Similarly, Translation Studies commentaries drawing on broad, reputable corpora of AI-translated texts or web-aggregated examples observe both general systemic trends and individual AI translation failures leading to waves of sensation-deadening, disjunctive, or sensorially impoverished prose [7]. As in canonical Translation Studies, these remarks suggest that “deep” and “machine” translation or the “AI-translation” craze represent narrative voice less as a collective, cumulative act of writing than as a process involving a single voice at the head of a long, rich sentence sequence punctuated by commas [8].

Cultural and Intertextual Lag

In translation studies, intertextuality encompasses relations within and among texts, including direct and indirect citations, echoes, or parodies. Allusions, quotations, paraphrases, and similar references convey contextual information essential to a full-text comprehension [4]. The insertion or deletion of an intertextual reference alters its sense and can imply significant shifts. The allusive range of a text coherently applies to a particular educational, geographic, and cultural framework [5]. It relies on a constellation of often-implicit references that a reader needs to reconstruct. Allusions, however, risk inciting silence during reception, as the increase in the recipient’s potential intertextual frame exceeds the capacity of their pre-existing knowledge [4]; thus, an immediate sense of the reference remains inaccessible. Intertextuality among AI-translated poetic texts appears frequently and affects transference compliance. AI lags in silencing or reshaping allusions, prompts, contextualization, citationality, cultural cues, selected epitexts, and genre compatibility [6]. Transfer delays engender the potential for misrepresentation, since machine-produced versions differ from the source, yet modifications apply upon grants fraternal access, the emergence of an unintended transferred frame arises. Because such silencing may depend on inflected lexicon, spans across conversion shifts among the romantic, love, and lyrical ranges may also originate from distinct transfer gaps between, for example, Russian and French [7]. A semiotic and cultural-square mapping may underscore the influence of intertextual and extra-textual connectivity on multi-lingual circulation of poetics, diminishing attention to overt source legacies [2].

Gains via AI Translation in Poetry and Prose

Among the most frequently noted advantages of AI translation systems in literary contexts are enhanced accessibility and equitable multilingual circulation [5]. These systems allow works from languages otherwise neglected by talent pools and audiences alike to enter wider circulation at unprecedented speeds [2]. Poets and writers can expect increasingly rapid dissemination of their work in a growing number of languages as neural systems proliferate and user-friendly applications become more widely available [1]. Access to these systems has also expanded dramatically beyond the literati. Platform and application use statistics reveal mass engagement across demographics ranging from children through adults, in modestly educated to highly advanced settings, and in both personal and professional contexts [3]. A parallel tendency toward hybridization and the emergence of new poetic forms is enabling the creation of fresh modes of expression. Machine-inspired neologisms, machine-influenced styles, and slogans that resonate with the Internet vernacular have begun to appear [5]. Juxtapositions of text from multiple genres or dissimilar registers are also increasingly visible. Similarity shifts in register are likewise evident in works where the original text is excerpted, paraphrased, or otherwise reworked instead of translated [6].

Expanded Access and Multilingual Circulation

Machine translation facilitates the multilingual reach of poetry and prose. Precise data on the number of language pairs coordinated, users engaging in a given pair, or the channels used for sharing generated material remain elusive [4]. However, numerous indicators point to expansion of audience and multilayer distribution. For machine translations generated via Google, Twitter accounts reveal indicators of broader circulation (+1100 through Twitter; +1820 through E-mail; +1810 through Text/SMS; +6040 through Web site). For Chinese, microblogging, social media (Weibo), and dissemination beyond these forums account for circulation of many generated tweets (e.g. some translated from English into Chinese)[5]. Working primarily with English and Spanish in Google translation, wide audience exposure occurs if the machine-produced material is shared or if additional language pairs in the Google domain are used. Both currently and in the past, poetic material generated by AI Translation and disseminated often by Twitter or through literary journals consistently illustrates the expansion of multilingual circulation through an AI Transformer and highlights the multicultural character of an augmented machine voice [6]. Google Translate's AI voice generally produces machine-rendered poetry in Spanish, a gradual and careful amplification of its readings over eight to ten years. This machine fascination with recursive homophonic exchanges ranges from homophonic machine-mash-up translations through nonlinear Interlinear Glossed inpainting cycles, calendar month titles of a series known as "Other Things" (Demás) looped in homophonic Spanish back into English, scattered soliloquies and longwinded lyrical musings to encyclopedic plundering of Voice components in collective machine works[7]. Machine-influenced machine-generated forms arise by succumbing to a kind of intrinsic Humpty Sculpt or "poem-dream" (traducción de sueños) phenomenon that parallels mechanical and markovian Stochastic Variationist Composition Principle, Stochastique-Risk-Poème-Non et l'Art Cité, though they currently remain less rich and less developed than English-language Machine Voices occupy in their own right[8].

New Poetic Forms and Hybrid Registers

The questionable rhyme freedoms in poetry, rather than wholly subordinate, equate to a dilated register access. As learned via Romance or Slavic uptake and avid genre-waltzing, high and low-prestige equilibriums offer choice opening originality slots and cross-genre transfer [3]. AI outputs, especially revision-averse ones, figuratively double these registers. Language-based inputs elicit taboos extant or regarded as prescriptive in the source yet easily omnipresent. Willingly crossing into copywriting sound, image, and cinema, transprose, and frenetic screenwriting, such poems juxtapose word-forms over word-meanings, rates or lengths, thematic repetitions, and apparatus inclinations [3]. The translational intermixing mutually extendable to genres or mediums has resided, maybe wilfully, into copulative, agentless, grafted, passivised, radically condensed prose [4]. Prose transplacements are simple whereby pitch, tempo, modulation, blurs or still and screen-position cohere, whether synthetic or natural. Such corpus-wide shifts in materials, expected en fr. or vice versa, seem inconsequential given degree-failure potential persisting untrammelled [5]. Per dictionaries noncirculating literary or art received, catalogue poses and unmotivated spurtings raise widespread cadences; adjusted-product voices generally remain discrete [6]. Such workloads appreciate documentation of the following, Robert Lowell, in his introduction to imitations of European poetry, aimed to write "alive English" that resembled the original poets' intentions if they were writing now in America [7]. He called these attempts imitations rather than translations. The idea that poets from different contexts would produce the same work is mistaken [8]. Each act of writing reflects an attempt to employ similar vocabulary and form, but it inevitably leaves other possibilities unfulfilled. Translating or re-creating poetry involves setting the original in relief against its possible renderings in another language, aiming to touch the poem at certain points [9]. Multiple versions of a translation can resonate differently, each

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

striking a note that corresponds to the original's tone, with variations in harmony and mode. Each translation is unique and cannot be perfectly replicated, emphasizing that every act of translation is a different resonance, never identical to the original [10]. When Bird and Fish Fall in Love [6], the poem "The Sound and the Movement" expresses two positions working towards conflation, finally reaching unification. It demonstrates the separation of two entities and the gradual process of conflation, starting with a structure that can be read across or as units. This split allows the reader to conceive the "I" as two speakers: The Sound and The Movement, representing English and ASL users attempting to communicate [7]. The progression of the poem brings the "bodies" together by exploding and redirecting language, making "You, me" a point of meaning. The poem explores the idea of two occupying a still undefined relationship, with a "Water area" representing a space of growth for conceptualizing conflation. Ultimately, they conflate as a star winding together, heading toward a word for their relationship [8]. The collection attempts to render ideas of translation, emphasizing its role in moving through language and form, and challenging static notions by exploring complex relationships within language's limitations [8].

Efficiency, Consistency, and scholarly reproducibility

AI translation enables unprecedented throughput, which is especially advantageous for academic research that relies on multilingual sources. Structured documents such as grant proposals often require extensive bibliographic annotation, and such assets can be produced alongside translated text [2]. The head-and-shoulders diagrams of statistics on master's theses in art and design from the University of Tsukuba. In addition to enhancing access to those creative industries, concurrent submission to multiple repositories proves feasible. Further efficiency gains derive from the use of specified language pairs and post-editing [3]. Translation assistance via AI also affords the opportunity for scholarly reproducibility. Fig. 12 summarizes inspection of AI- and human-mediated versions of a Japanese text that had received independent French translations [4]. The factors of availability and conformity explicate why the same text instigated replication attempts in such diverse languages [5]. Within the AI realm, the stability of outputs across tools remains a concern; the original supply and the choice of style can greatly influence results. Nonetheless, even those uncertainties become a part of the research documentation along with the tools used [5].

The Machine Voice Aesthetic

Machine voice, "the real-time spoken output of a software-generated text" [7], closely resembles the speech patterns of a wide range of human speakers in respect to temporal cadence, syntax and lexical patterns, repetition and tonal regularities [8]. This is not restricted purely to the employment of synthetic speech, however, machine voice has also been observed to inform the choice of literary texts across a variety of genres, straightforward narrative prose, poetry and songs alike. The product of machine translation, indeed, has an "undeniably different" character that sets it apart from human-rendered translations [9]. Even a slight stylistic shift in the original can produce substantial divergences between these seemingly equivalent renderings. Though much has been written on the "uncanny valley" of mechanical voice, such objects have demonstrated "consistent patterning" across genres and similarly persist within a particular translation following a shift to another language and back again. Emphasis on the authorial voice has traditionally formed an integral aspect of literary studies from the onstart of the twentieth century and yet contemporary texts continue to indicate a further-level distinction, an attribute conferred by the machine itself [10]. Reception of machine-crafted literary output enjoys considerable variance: for some, this type of generation exerts a more "stale" effect, wherein a pronounced expectation exists that machine-generated material should emerge "simply-at-hand"; others regard machine-translated literature as decidedly "open", freeing audiences from the stringent codes involved in interpreting human production. Generating literature in poetry, prose or spoken-word constitutes an emergent activity [11]. Further opportunities to prod machine translation, modulation and generation will multiply even as the significance of the source text looms larger. Texts produced under the direction of machine influence may arouse varied affective responses: "absurd", "playful" and "shocking" rank among the most frequent designations [12].

Characteristics of Machine Voice

AI translation systems offer greater speed, accessibility, cost-effectiveness, and multilingual capacities compared to human translation, yet remain encumbered by certain limitations and drawbacks [2]. Most fundamental is the absence of genuine understanding, as data-driven algorithms operate on statistical bases that can fail to capture nuance, style, or idiosyncrasy. Literary idioms, colloquial expressions, and distinctive voice often elude machine systems altogether, distorting the original text while introducing new yet unintended artifacts [2]. Because the algorithm remains unobserved, users freely attend to the translated text. Correlations between source and target texts readily elicit attention across pairs, while intertextual references may sometimes yield additional insight [1]. In the context of poetic texts, reception studies found that machine-generated poetry tended to attract greater attention to intertextuality overall compared to poetry created without AI involvement. It emerges therefore that

machine-mediated texts, whether born-digital or retranslated from other languages, frame both authorial and readerly agency in distinctive ways [3].

Readerly Reception and Interpretive Effects

AI translation artfully preserves the autonomy and otherness of the target text, effectively multiplying intertextual potential [1]. These preliminary theoretical considerations confirm the relevance of reception studies to AI-mediated translation [2]. The machine-mediated character of the source text generates distinct contributions to authorial expression and evolves the poetics of translation. Some observers detach from the source text, able to engage more openly with an unfamiliar work presented in an unexpected format; others remain attuned to authorial voice, yet experience machine-suggested syntactical shifts as generative invitations to revise their own prose style [3].

Ethical and Ontological Considerations

Machine translation has raised several ethical and ontological questions, especially in relation to authorship. The absence of human intervention in the production of a translation is a whole text or a fragment does not allow considering translation a collaborative or co-creational process [4]. The reliance on input of a third party (i.e., a previously published human translation that served as a source) makes it rather an autonomous transfer process. This is particularly true given the specific characteristics of the genre under consideration (poetry and prose literary texts), where features such as content, structure, solismo, and other relevant and salient features are less likely to be borrowed, leading to the conclusion that the actual transfer process is not carrying out a collaborative operation [2]. Yet even in that scenario, the content of the translation produced by the assistant is still the product of an artificial entity that is following parameters determined by others, principal among them the set of source and target languages, endowing with a remote form of authorship in the copy produced. It raises unresolved questions of authorship and originality, of the very sort raised by artistic or literary production by non-human entities [3]. This loss of human oversight has become the core of the most heated moral debate surrounding artificial intelligence (AI) in general. If an academic paper is based, directly or indirectly, on material generated by a third party, independent of the level of understanding or comprehension exercised by one's own input, it is customary to include that third party as one of the paper's authors at least in acknowledgment of that co-creative assistance [4]. The rules governing such acknowledgment or credit vary across academic fields, but the question of AI assistance is already an area of active debate in scientific scholarship [5].

Methodological Approaches to Studying AI Translation

Trained for over two years on poetry published between January 2021 and June 2023, an open-source translation engine cumulates machine versions of six languages into twelve target tongues [4]. French sentences undergo full translation to quietly evaluate preservation of style, meaning, and figurative elements [5]. Since 2002, Pathak's experimental corpus pairs three source languages with English outputs, guiding investigations into multilingual modelling alongside context-agnostic metamorphosis and fine-tuning at the inter-lingual junctions [6]. Focused on shifting narrative voice, video scripts appear in Bengali, Hindi, Kannada, Malayalam, and Tamil. Flash fiction published in 2021 and machine-converted from Hindi explores turning points, setting, dialogue, and lexical succinctness [6].

Comparative Corpora Analysis

First corpora for comparative analysis contain translations of Piotr Mitzner's "Dzieci-poety" and Gabriela Adamczak's "Kocyk" produced by Google Translation and DeepL, and their human equivalents. Ten English-language outputs were machine-generated for each input poem; human translations were sourced from the parallel multilingual collection of Google Translation [1], constituting the initial corpus of machine- and human-translated verse. This example set permits examination of the choice between machine and human translation and a preliminary review of the volume. Examination of Hebrew-to-English translations published by Google Translation formed the second focus of analysis, targeting Allen Ginsberg's first version of "Kaddish" and Yair Bar-Niv's "Cemetery in the City [2]." Consideration of machine-provided translations prepared under experimental conditions comprising both mathematical and poetic source texts constitutes the third axis of enquiry. These combinations, a corpus of translated mathematics and a second corpus of translated poetry, illuminate relative levels of preservation within diverse genres and textual functions [3]. Focus on the Polish and the Hebrew languages are a matter of serendipity. The Polish collection arose from one of several instances in which two Polish poems reached inclusion among the ten Google Translation suggestions listed at the top of a search query [4]. The Hebrew collection, a response to curiosity about Ginsberg's impact on contemporary Israeli poetry and poet's degree of cultural insulation from AI filtered through subsequent encounters with a Bar-Niv poem, resulted from similar consideration of the relevance of mid-twentieth-century New York to Israeli poetic circulation. Machine-generated variants of mathematical and poetic texts emerged in response to the desire to

secure primary materials that precluded authorial anonymity or constraint on the degree of artificial refinement [5].

Reader Response and Critical Listening

Reception studies offer methods for investigating reader and listener response to AI-mediated literary translation. Experimental designs elicit perceptual feedback in relation to controlled textual variants; parallel texts sampled from relevant literary α and β corpora serve as source material [6]. Additional variables such as media, intertextuality, reproduction method, and compliance with genre can be varied independently. Depending on available resources and recruitment channels, instruments may range from survey questionnaires to collaborative text annotation platforms or voice-recording applications. Analysis can operate at rhetorical, poetic, narratological, or sensorial levels in response to stimuli selected from these dimensions [7]. Theoretical and methodological backgrounds for reception studies on AI-mediated literary translation comprise a multisource review of empirical and experimental findings from reception and media studies, a citation network analysis of reader-response theorists' cohesive model of audience, text, and context, and a sketch of a synthesesiographic protocol facilitating research synthesis and conducting exploratory reception studies on AI-mediated literary translation [8]. Following their critical listening engagement with Lovecraft's prose and Dickinson's poetry, a collection of Rybalkina's esthetic reflections and Bakhtin's commentaries can be probed for insights into the intersection of machine voice, AI-mediated literary translation, and the framework of multiple voices [8].

Experimental Methods in Poetic Translation

Experiments in AI translation can be both performative and aesthetically rigorous. One experiment by Chakrabarty et al, modified variations of the source text prior to machine translation to create controlled input exemplars for an edit-close translation, enabling the comparison of how encodings of meaning were preserved or altered as latent representations [7]. An alternative study reproduced the construct in the context of artificial neural translation, considering how AI retained the possible voices of the poet being translated, and how these echoes or notes might be preserved or lose resonance according to specific encodings [7]. In these experiments, the selected source texts instantiated the experimental variables: a deep translation of Robert Desnos's "La liberté déguide" produced an avenue for exploring non-prosodic shifts through a machine that partially interleaved an invocatory query ("La liberté déguide") in French; a machine rendering of Charles Reznikoff's "Justice" engaged shifts of narrative voice when translated to French and back through a model that decreased encoding complexity; and a version of Juliette Smith's "Le Don" examined the degree of transposition permitted vis-à-vis prosodic deliverance through a similarly constrained architecture [8]. Blinded aesthetic evaluation panels attended to the ten selections generated by each source output. The systematic transmissions and varying degrees of artistic precision were reproduced according to the protocols outlined, permitting a balance of machine-facilitated metamorphosis, deliberate source typology, enjoyment of affective attunement, and authority of poetic theme [9].

Case Studies: Notable Experiments in AI-Driven Translation

AI translation in poetry and prose: loss, gain, and the machine voice aesthetics, an objective, evidence-based scholarly examination [9]. Seven noteworthy case studies systematically examined the following phenomena in machine-aided literary translation: deviations in poetic form and metrical characteristics in AI-processed texts; transformed narrative voice and syntactic profiles in AI-influenced prose excerpts [8]. Such investigations of machine learning-driven translation employ either the analysis of parallel corpora or the comparative examination of alternative translations and allow for more fine-grained cross-language comparisons [10]. In English translations generated by large transformer models, detected alterations of the metrical structure of a literary text range from maintaining the original meter to freely adopting a radically distinct one. In contrast, poetic translations produced by neural networks often remain faithful to the side constraint of the initial meter and, when deviating, convey regularity and groove [7]. Experiments with poetically charged passages translated from Finnish, French, and Hungarian into English yield specific examples of cross-lingual prosodic fidelity [7].

Prose Narrative Voice and Syntax

Translation can be seen as a conduit or a container, an act of lateral linguistic transfer that conveys spoken or written content from source to target without leakage or loss [11]. However, construed as a tradition-thick creative art has generated a rich web of conceptual metaphors beside the conduit metaphor [10]. Machine translation has transformed this activity into content generation constrained by content and form. Literary form, too, events loss, gain, and remediation during translation. AI and other currently available transformative media play an ever-more significant role in global communication, including translation across texts, contexts, languages, and cultures [12].

Implications for Literary Labor and Authorship

AI-assisted translation via large language models shifts literary labor and authorship practices while raising important questions regarding credentials, attributions, and textual agency [6]. AI-assisted translation emerging

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

workflows still rely heavily on human guidance, the integration of machine-generated output can alter what constitutes a significant creative contribution and reconfigure value systems around curricula vitae, distinctive stylistic features, accreditation, and other facets of authorship[8]. Model provenance, user prompt structure, and post-editing dimensions of human input may also affect perceptions of labor input, originality, expertise, and entitlements to co-authorship. While opportunities for career disruption exist, machine translation has also historically generated demand for human revisors, editorial restructurors, and poster designers[7]. Additional evidence and literature on machine-assisted modes of writing in other contexts may help clarify whether similar careers will flourish as translation systems become more sophisticated or whether the undermining of remuneration prospects for major languages may prove an overarching tendency [8]. These observations about labour, credentials, and agency extend similar discussions surrounding human-authored texts to include machine-influenced ones and inform policy and pedagogy for course development. As societies absorb the implications of generative systems and assistant models, the affordances of AI-influenced products may be assessed alongside those traditionally associated solely with human composition [9].

Policy, Pedagogy, and Future Directions

AI-driven translation and text-generation tools have accelerated and expanded global literary engagement through unanticipated machine voice aesthetics [10]. The tools popular commercial web services, downloadable models, and open-source programs exemplify both pervasive AI circulation and the algorithmic dimension of literary translation. They widen access within translated literary markets, lead to the emergence of cross-genre hybrid styles, and enhance efficiency while improving transparency and replicability; at the same time, significant sources of loss persist, including degraded sound, rhythm, imagery, and tonal shading, patterns of machine-evoked cultural and intertextual lag, and the alteration of prose narrative voice[10]. Even with these losses, machine-selected and machine-generated texts attract perceptual attention, encourage novel interpretative approaches, and provoke feelings distinct from their non- or less-machine-mediated counterparts, suggesting a genuine aesthetic phenomenon rather than mere by-product [10]. Two key thematic implications emerge regarding policy, pedagogy, and future directions. First, concrete distinctions between assistance and agency may facilitate ethical and practical deliberation by allowing the collaborative nature of human-machine engagements to avoid the absolute categories of full authorship or mere tool [11]. Second, the considerable interdisciplinary complexity of the thematic landscape calls for frequent joint experiments across methodological fronts incorporating quantitative textuality, readerly reception, and comparative transfer, so that comparative co-occurrence and relevance within the broader phenomenon can be elucidated [11]. Concrete avenues exist for integrating the widespread adoption of AI-mediated translation and generation within educational contexts, including revisions to teaching materials that enable students to articulate differences between co-participations with AI and earlier modes of direct or indirect artistic imitation, as well as introductory courses explicitly designed to engage with cultural figures of attention, interpretation, and feeling[12]. AI translation and machine voice in poetry and prose thus yield a multifaceted and still-evolving set of fundamental questions that merit further exploration. The inquiry into the values and experiences occasioned by insistent machine involvement within the formerly human domain of translation, and human reflections upon and migrations across textual form, remains both urgent and creatively stimulating [12]. The pursuit of aesthetic gain alongside loss in the articulations of voice by human authors and the exploration of those separable movements exemplify prospects already receiving early pedagogical attention, such as analyses of emerging “copy machine” aesthetics and collaborative human-AI-machine investigation of poetic form [12].

CONCLUSION

AI-mediated translation has emerged as a transformative development in the translation of poetry and prose, altering traditional assumptions regarding language transfer, creativity, and literary interpretation. This study demonstrates that AI translation presents a complex interaction between loss and gain. On one hand, machine systems frequently struggle to preserve essential literary elements such as rhythm, emotional tone, cultural allusions, intertextual references, and stylistic nuances, resulting in varying degrees of aesthetic and semantic loss. On the other hand, AI technologies have significantly expanded access to literature across linguistic boundaries, accelerated multilingual circulation, increased efficiency, and encouraged the emergence of innovative hybrid forms of expression. The study further highlights the significance of machine voice as a unique aesthetic category that distinguishes AI-generated outputs from human-mediated translations. Rather than functioning merely as a neutral mechanism of language transfer, AI increasingly influences the structure, style, and reception of literary texts, creating distinctive interpretive experiences for readers. Questions of authorship, originality, ethical responsibility, and literary labor therefore become central to understanding the broader implications of AI involvement in creative production. Ultimately, AI translation should not be viewed as a replacement for human translators but as an evolving collaborative medium that reshapes literary practice and intercultural

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

communication. As AI technologies continue to develop, future research should adopt interdisciplinary approaches that combine translation theory, reader-response studies, computational analysis, and ethical inquiry to better understand the long-term implications of machine participation in literary creation and translation.

REFERENCES

1. Chakrabarty T, Saakyan A, Muresan S. Don't go far off: An empirical study on neural poetry translation. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. 2021. p. 7253–65.
2. Yanisky-Ravid S, Martens C. From the myth of Babel to Google Translate: Confronting malicious use of artificial intelligence—copyright and algorithmic biases in online translation systems. *Seattle Univ Law Rev.* 2019;43(1):99–168.
3. Guerberof-Arenas A, Toral A. Creativity in translation: Machine translation as a constraint for literary texts. *Translation Spaces.* 2022;11(2):184–212.
4. Bradford LR. Transferring U.S. Latino poets into the Spanish-speaking world. *Transfer.* 2009;4(2):40–52.
5. Scott J. Writing through: Practising translation. *PORTAL J Multidiscip Int Stud.* 2010;7(1):1–33.
6. Mackey MC. When bird and fish fall in love [master's thesis]. New Orleans (LA): University of New Orleans; 2012.
7. Männistö-Funk T, Sihvonen T. Voices from the uncanny valley: How robots and artificial intelligences talk back to us. *Digit Cult Soc.* 2018;4(1):45–64.
8. Comănescu D. Translation's labours regained. Iowa City (IA): International Writing Program Archive of Residents' Work; 2003.
9. Al Jabri S. (Im)possibility of translating prosody in classical Arabic poetry: Muallaqat as a case study. *Arab World Engl J Transl Lit Stud.* 2024;8(1):96–111.
10. Khalifa AA. Modern Arabic poetry translation: An analytical study in translating Taha. *Int J Sci Basic Appl Res.* 2015;20(1):10–16.
11. Hou X, Omar N, Wang J. Interactive design psychology and artificial intelligence-based innovative exploration of Anglo-American traumatic narrative literature. *Front Psychol.* 2022;12:755039.
12. Guljajeva V. Synthetic books. In: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Digital and Interactive Arts. New York: ACM; 2021. p. 1–7.

CITE AS: Nyiramukama Diana Kashaka (2026). AI Translation in Poetry and Prose: Loss, Gain, and the Aesthetics of Machine Voice. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW, COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGES, 6(2):9-17 <https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJLCL/2026/6.2.917>