

<Files\\R1CA> - § 15 references coded [4.62% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.61% Coverage

Maybe a machine translation could be useful in the sense that it could save time for those stretches in a text in a narrative text that are more or less mechanic.

Reference 2 - 0.20% Coverage

I don't think the the machine is prepared to to do right now.

Reference 3 - 0.27% Coverage

R1CA: I don't know how others but in my experience, I like to engage with the text into

Reference 4 - 0.40% Coverage

R1CA: To get into the world into the fictional world that I am reproducing and I like to have full control over what I'm producing

Reference 5 - 0.34% Coverage

R1CA: So I don't see. I don't see many ways in which the machine would help me apart from what i would i mentioned before. I mean, those, those stretches, which are

Reference 6 - 0.12% Coverage

R1CA: Which are straightforward, in the sense that

Reference 7 - 0.12% Coverage

R1CA: You can only imagine one way of translating them.

Reference 8 - 0.52% Coverage

if if there is no chance that it takes we be translated into catalan of course machine translation will be better

Reference 9 - 0.38% Coverage

if there is no chance that a publisher will be interested in in translating a text from, say, from

Reference 10 - 0.23% Coverage

R1CA: Or whatever, then, of course, yeah of course machine translation would be better than nothing.

Reference 11 - 0.32% Coverage

you could form a general idea if if I only had text B not C or A I could

Reference 12 - 0.22% Coverage

R1CA: Definitely know what this piece of fiction is about and

Reference 13 - 0.28% Coverage

The text was not the ideal one, but I could form an idea. I could read it more or less fluently and

Reference 14 - 0.30% Coverage

R1CA: Yeah, I mean it could it could work with all those limitations that I'm referring to. But it could work. Why not. Yeah.

Reference 15 - 0.31% Coverage

R1CA: We use of course that's a having a machine translation that then not having any translation at all. Definitely. Yeah, I have no doubt about it.

<Files\R2CA> - § 9 references coded [3.60% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.33% Coverage

A lot of need for creativity and the machine. In this case if it was a machine didn't fulfill

Reference 2 - 0.28% Coverage

R2CA: And or didn't solve those those problems. There were also a lot of ambiguities, which is on the original text that

Reference 3 - 0.59% Coverage

R2CA: Obviously, we're not we're not solved the song was also a little bit problematic and the names of the characters, then the address, between "vosté" and "tú" that was also problematic as well.

Reference 4 - 0.35% Coverage

R2CA: And I'm very close to the to the English phrasing and to the English syntax. So it was not a beautiful text to read it was not enjoyable.

Reference 5 - 0.76% Coverage

maybe in machine translation could be useful in some

Reference 6 - 0.86% Coverage

R2CA: In some other branches of the editorial world that are not that doesn't demand that

this creativity that literature does maybe for divulgative text for essays sometimes and or maybe in inside novel if we have, I don't know, long

Reference 7 - 0.13% Coverage

R2CA: Chapter that is more technical or more

Reference 8 - 0.20% Coverage

R2CA: With less orality and it's only describing, I don't know, a forest. I don't know.

Reference 9 - 0.08% Coverage

R2CA: Maybe there. It could be, it could be

<Files\R3CA> - § 11 references coded [4.35% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.60% Coverage

That was really surprising because some of the sentences didn't really look like if they had been just just machine translated and and never touched, but um but yeah yeah basically these things things that were not translated these inconsistencies.

Reference 2 - 0.46% Coverage

when I do post-editing, as I said, I don't really feel that free so.

Reference 3 - 0.45% Coverage

R3CA: I wouldn't use it right now what obviously depends on the on the on the engine...if the engine is very good and the corpus and whatever that you feed the machine with is very good, then, then you probably you think twice, but.

Reference 4 - 0.23% Coverage

I didn't really I didn't use a machine translation for.

Reference 5 - 0.25% Coverage

R3CA: For literary you or whatever, because well that's mainly that the field, I work with and I feel that.

Reference 6 - 0.47% Coverage

R3CA: It is very difficult to find something that works for you obviously the engines that you can find for free or or whatever they are not the same as you can develop in a university or or.

Reference 7 - 0.40% Coverage

i've tried sometimes, but I no because they're not really helpful some things I just try and it's like not really

Reference 8 - 0.42% Coverage

if that could make your work like faster than you say Okay, I can use that but for literary I didn't really I don't really see that i've tried like couple of times, some time ago, but I didn't really see that.

Reference 9 - 0.55% Coverage

R3CA: Sometimes it it really makes you go crazy so for literary that's why I don't I them use that just for like touristic kind of text or text which are like very simple, but not for novels not for books, because I feel like.

Reference 10 - 0.33% Coverage

R3CA: You really need to change lots of things and not just the not just the way the dialogues go and everything, but many other things.

Reference 11 - 0.20% Coverage

it's not very practical at the moment I don't know, maybe in the near future, but not right now.

<Files\R4NL> - § 26 references coded [7.61% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.59% Coverage

For for certain types of errors and things like that sometimes I found it quite difficult to select the right category and things like that, so that took quite a lot of time and especially with the machine translation, where there were a lot of errors

Reference 2 - 0.27% Coverage

it was quite obvious like with the machine translation that was just wrong, so it was quite easy to correct.

Reference 3 - 0.51% Coverage

machine translation text B I think if I were to get that like in a normal real life situation if that would be the text that I would get from like a client to correct, I would say i'm sorry, but this is.

Reference 4 - 0.38% Coverage

This is not going to work, I cannot make a functional text from this, it will be too much work, you can better just start from scratch and do it all over again.

Reference 5 - 0.72% Coverage

it was quite what I had expected actually a lot of literal translations and like, no, no, eye for context and things like that, and no eye for style and things like that which was kind of what I had expected from a machine translation so.

Reference 6 - 0.27% Coverage

Oh, not not as literal as it is now because right now machine translation is often very literal translation.

Reference 7 - 0.53% Coverage

in machine translations there's no real attention to style maybe like maybe there's sometimes a difference between formal and informal but that's about it, I think, right now.

Reference 8 - 0.37% Coverage

if you were like like you say if it were able to produce like a correct translation also stylistically then yeah sure, I think, then I would be

Reference 9 - 0.27% Coverage

if there were no specialists in the country to correct.

Reference 10 - 0.18% Coverage

R4NL: These errors would go unnoticed, so I think.

Reference 11 - 0.32% Coverage

R4NL: It kind of depends on how many errors, it makes maybe like like if it's just a few small errors that maybe wouldn't would like.

Reference 12 - 0.13% Coverage

R4NL: Outweigh like that you're at least bringing that book.

Reference 13 - 0.09% Coverage

R4NL: readers who would otherwise not have read it at all.

Reference 14 - 0.16% Coverage

R4NL: So I kind of depends on how good it is if it's okay.

Reference 15 - 0.39% Coverage

maybe like publishers are like it's better to at least have it published in other languages than to not have it published out there at all.

Reference 16 - 0.32% Coverage

Maybe that's what like if if it's an important book for their culture, it would think it's better to have something than nothing.

Reference 17 - 0.33% Coverage

if I were the author, what would, I think i'm not sure if I would be very happy with that because, maybe.

Reference 18 - 0.18% Coverage

R4NL: I wouldn't be sure if it will get my message across, in the way I would want it to get across.

Reference 19 - 0.14% Coverage

R4NL: i'm not sure if I would be happy with that.

Reference 20 - 0.05% Coverage

I would be quite worried.

Reference 21 - 0.27% Coverage

R4NL: What what it what it would be like, especially because I won't be able to check it of course because i'm assuming it will be language that I wouldn't know.

Reference 22 - 0.08% Coverage

R4NL: I would be worried if it were.

Reference 23 - 0.14% Coverage

R4NL: still getting cross matches I would want or if it had changed anything.

Reference 24 - 0.24% Coverage

R4NL: Well, A I wouldn't i'm not sure if I would publish A either actually because.

Reference 25 - 0.21% Coverage

R4NL: yeah I think it would be a bit lacking in style particularly.

Reference 26 - 0.45% Coverage

R4NL: I don't think I would publish either A or B, but C with editing I think would be able to get up to that level of being suitable for for publishing.

<Files\R5NL> - \$ 8 references coded [2.97% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.39% Coverage

R5NL: Well okay every now and then a few times i've tried to use a machine machine translation as a basis for my own translation, but in fact this takes up so much work.

Reference 2 - 0.37% Coverage

To do use this as a base that it's just it's faster if I do it myself actually because all of the work does not go into that first passage

Reference 3 - 0.23% Coverage

Google Translate would have been the one because it's easily available.

Reference 4 - 0.36% Coverage

R5NL: Okay i've tried it I think two times, or three times, just to take a look kind of never saved me any time

Reference 5 - 0.46% Coverage

so that this military thing I think was supposed to be in there, and none of the first the first two translations have picked up with that up.

Reference 6 - 0.30% Coverage

I noticed in the first translations was that in.

Reference 7 - 0.69% Coverage

R5NL: connections between sentences and, like the more the things that are literally translator will do will try to make the text into unity and have the person's react to each other, and that was sometimes missing, especially in the second text, of course, by the first one as well, sometimes.

Reference 8 - 0.17% Coverage

R5NL: Yeah, text A or B and well B definitely it's kind of absurd.

<Files\\T1CA> - § 50 references coded [14.36% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.26% Coverage

T1CA: Yeah, yeah, I usually work with no proposals because I don't really like working with

Reference 2 - 0.10% Coverage

T1CA: With automatic translations.

Reference 3 - 0.54% Coverage

T1CA: As a reviewer for for Google, where they do... There are some translator doing machine translator and then reviewers come and check it and I realized that

Reference 4 - 0.23% Coverage

T1CA: So I don't think it's good to work with machine translation. I sometimes work with...when I have

Reference 5 - 0.23% Coverage

T1CA: A difficult sentence and there is nothing coming up and I go to DeepL and say, oh, well, let's see what it says.

Reference 6 - 0.56% Coverage

T1CA: But it's just for many... so short things or particular sentences, not for a whole text and I just go there and I think mmm I don't like that. But sometimes it gives you ideas, but not as a general rule, using machine translated

Reference 7 - 0.13% Coverage

T1CA: So yeah, working with MT translation was okay.

Reference 8 - 0.16% Coverage

T1CA: They were more more useful than usual, I would say.

Reference 9 - 0.47% Coverage

T1CA: Some of them were very good avoiding some basic things. Or I don't remember exactly where but but I remember that I said, Oh, that's pretty good for being

Reference 10 - 0.39% Coverage

T1CA: Something automated. So yeah, it was better, but there were also some very basic errors that seemed to be like introduced

Reference 11 - 0.04% Coverage

Specially so not

Reference 12 - 0.20% Coverage

by a machine but by a human, I will try to trick the translator here or something like that.

Reference 13 - 0.09% Coverage

T1CA: I think it improves it but

Reference 14 - 0.20% Coverage

T1CA: See in this text, for instance, I remember I don't know exactly the word, but I remember that.

Reference 15 - 0.45% Coverage

T1CA: The, the proposal gave me an adjective, I wouldn't have thought of. And I thought, Oh, that's good, because I that that's really good one. I don't, I don't know why I remember it was one that was very good.

Reference 16 - 0.35% Coverage

T1CA: It would be probably difficult to come up with because the problem when you translate is that you have lots of words in your head on, you know them all, but

Reference 17 - 0.37% Coverage

T1CA: You don't know how to reach them, no? that's the problem with it's like they are in, I don't know, in cupboards and you have to find the cupboard, but you don't know in which cupboard they are so

Reference 18 - 0.48% Coverage

T1CA: So the problem is that yeah with with Machine Translation you get words that you would probably don't think of. I usually work with synonyms, with thesaurus

Reference 19 - 0.26% Coverage

T1CA: with synonyms dictionaries, just to follow the thread of a word and see all the branches it has.

Reference 20 - 0.12% Coverage

T1CA: Yeah, it's I think it's good for creativity when it's not.

Reference 21 - 0.15% Coverage

T1CA: When it's when it's something simple and basic

Reference 22 - 0.20% Coverage

T1CA: So if you have a pun, probably it won't work or if you have a

Reference 23 - 0.30% Coverage

T1CA: metaphor or something more complicated. You need a human there, but sometimes for very basic things.

Reference 24 - 0.51% Coverage

T1CA: It works. And it also works for structures which are different in one language and the other language, but which which have direct equivalence. Oh, I don't know. It's like

Reference 25 - 0.53% Coverage

T1CA: My name is XXX you would never say "El meu nom Ã©s XXX" You would say, "Em dic XXX". So the structure is different, but there's you know how to translate these because it's easy. So there are some expressions and some set expressions.

Reference 26 - 0.45% Coverage

T1CA: That have a direct line of direct translation and sometimes you don't think of it. So to find, oh yeah, of course, we said it the other way around, or with yeah

Reference 27 - 0.46% Coverage

T1CA: With prepositions. Sometimes I think that prepositions are really important in translation as the preposition is what makes that your translation sounds idiomatic and genuine or not.

Reference 28 - 0.37% Coverage

T1CA: Because it's, yeah, I really try to stick to the genuine preposition wouldn't say that way. So yeah, so I think that they are

Reference 29 - 0.15% Coverage

T1CA: useful for creativity, but you have to use them.

Reference 30 - 0.16% Coverage

T1CA: Moderately just not to intoxicate your brain with

Reference 31 - 0.59% Coverage

T1CA: Yeah. Yeah. So yeah. It's both. It's both. That's why I think it's good to use Machine Translation, but not always look like. Yeah, it's good using them just to check some things, but not being all day reading machine translation.

Reference 32 - 0.25% Coverage

T1CA: It was the I saw that the the it was already corrected the the the quotes for dialogues, that's

Reference 33 - 0.33% Coverage

T1CA: Okay, that's, that's good, because otherwise, you have to enter all the time, the dashes um but

Reference 34 - 0.37% Coverage

T1CA: I don't think so, because the other problem is that usually the machine translation works better with big languages.

Reference 35 - 0.05% Coverage

T1CA: So if you use

Reference 36 - 0.32% Coverage

T1CA: Spanish, English to Spanish that translation will be probably better that if you use Swedish to Catalan

Reference 37 - 0.29% Coverage

T1CA: So that I think in the end the language quality will be worse with small languages and

Reference 38 - 0.30% Coverage

T1CA: If an author or work that doesn't find someone to translate that wants to publish that.

Reference 39 - 0.13% Coverage

T1CA: I don't think machine translation would help because that would give a

Reference 40 - 0.43% Coverage

T1CA: mistaken idea of what the author and these work is. So in the end, it would be worse now. So, uh, I don't think so.

Reference 41 - 0.32% Coverage

T1CA: I would probably go for which I hate... translating a Swedish from English, which is what they made from

Reference 42 - 0.06% Coverage

T1CA: Scratch with you.

Reference 43 - 0.16% Coverage

T1CA: Which is not good because you have just bridges and bridges of languages.

Reference 44 - 0.10% Coverage

T1CA: But I would probably rely on that rather than on automatic translation.

Reference 45 - 0.22% Coverage

There are some so in literature there are some books which are

Reference 46 - 0.33% Coverage

T1CA: And I know which make culture, language, bigger, and there are some books that are just entertaining.

Reference 47 - 0.44% Coverage

T1CA: So like some best sellers doesn't mean that all best sellers are like this, but many of them. So I translated one woman who is bestselling and

Reference 48 - 0.58% Coverage

T1CA: her use of languages terrible... lots of repetition and cliches and "he bits his lip", I don't know, this sentence of biting the lip it was like 20 times in in in in 20 pages...so, oh, no, please....

Reference 49 - 0.11% Coverage

T1CA: So that you can translate with machine translation because

Reference 50 - 0.08% Coverage

T1CA: There's no creativity in the in the source text.

<Files\\T2CA> - § 13 references coded [100.00% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 100.00% Coverage

There is a moment in which you know you need to apply for certain stylistic variation whereas here the software already gave me a lot of variance and I had to gauge whether that's kind of diversity of synonyms was the right one for the text, that was not something I had done before. I usually don't proofread other people translations of literary texts so it's not the type of question that I have asked myself before.

Reference 2 - 100.00% Coverage

I mean it required different kinds of muscles from me to work on reviewing the suggestions from the software and that was interesting. I went back and forth from feeling that it was a nuisance that if they wasn't helping me as a tool and then sometimes I thought oh it came up with quite a nice proposal and maybe I wouldn't have thought of this myself so I'd say I'm on the fence about whether it's useful or not because it's there's nothing horrible about it as long as you know human eyes go over the text several times before it is handed down but at the same time I can see that there are benefits, there are certain things that can be eliminating for your own process, so I thought I was half convinced of the usefulness of this tool for literary translation.

Reference 3 - 100.00% Coverage

For me specifically I think it was useful for the segments of are not particularly creative, but when it required a higher degree of creativity, if I receive a first version, a first translation of the text I feel more limited, I think you're focused mainly on what you're being given and you're trying to decide whether it's appropriate or not but it's harder for you to then forget about this and think about all the other possibilities that you had whereas if it's blank you do that you initiate the process of okay how can I say this how can I phrase it and then you decide you're given a First Choice and then you end up just reviewing rather than translating, you end up saying okay it is

good or maybe you just change and I think there was an instruction somewhere that you gave me that don't just translate everything from scratch and say this is not good and erase everything, rather than try to say, save the things that are salvageable and that you think they'll be okay and because that was the instruction I didn't do more than I was expected if the sentence work and was reasonably phrased, I okayed it, so I think in a way it prevents you from being fully creative if you have something to base your decision on and if the text I mean there are a lot of novels and stories that don't have an inch of creativity in them meaning they're pretty straightforward, then this kind of process I think that MT could be very helpful but whenever there's a non-standard text and that deviates from the way that the majority of what describe a situation or a character then even though some proposals are decent and were good and I accepted them it didn't help me become creative because it was harder.

Reference 4 - 100.00% Coverage

I kept thinking and that is particularly applicable to this situation when you have words or concepts that are that have 121 translations this process is quite safe because if it can make mistakes but you spot them,

Reference 5 - 100.00% Coverage

I don't really recall other specific examples in which I thought hum, that was good, but I know there were some. The text is not old but it has this vintage tone in some of the words that they use right away they call one another and they say everything's swell and they call each other old duck or old fart, I don't know, but something a bit quaint, it is not city language, it is either from a small town or from the 50s and 60s I mean you can tell that the way they talk to one another is a bit oldish, and I thought that's something that a computer might not pick up but it did I remember I don't remember the word but I remember that what it gave me was adjusted to the time period. And I thought that was clever, I would expect a more I don't remember if it translated old duck literally probably to say a duck that was old but other things that were not phrases that were just single words, it did a good job. The one thing that really got on my nerves is what I told you orderly comes up five or six times and every time it came up it translated it differently, I couldn't understand why did that unless you know it was a new neural system and it had different texts where it extracted this word in different contexts, it said "infermer", it said...

Reference 6 - 100.00% Coverage

ideally if the book I am working has 300 pages and I am using this software, I want it to learn, I don't want to repeat the same kind of correction 300 times, so if there is a character that keeps cropping up all the time, I am willing to help the software understand that I want to call this character "celador" a couple times, maybe three, but that's it, because if I need to keep changing this through the 300 pages, this is a short story but it could be a novel, then what's the point.

Reference 7 - 100.00% Coverage

So I would expect the software to learn from what I tell it but that's for the first question, and then am I satisfied with the translation, I felt that it was a specific kind of translation experiment with very clear instructions so with that in mind and also because I was quite busy at the time I thought it was decent now for instance, now that I opened the whole PDF and I read that the story I realized that there were things I didn't have in mind because I was focusing on the sentence by sentence when it gives like 10 different names that this institution gets, the nicknames, now that I read it is obvious that they are said in alphabetical order, but when I was thinking of it, it was difficult enough to come up with a Catalan equivalent that I didn't I didn't notice that they were being offered in alphabetical order so now if I have the time and I could change the text again I would change the order of those nicknames so that in Catalan they are also alphabetical, these are things that probably take, that you spot in a second review or in a third reading, you know once you, this is a story collection, so maybe that's the time that I would go devote to this story but then I would go over all the others and once it's done I would read the whole thing and that's where I hope I would spot things like that and change them, so I didn't have that extra reading that I would normally have.

Reference 8 - 100.00% Coverage

I didn't think there was but in a very short period of time I find out that a colleague says it's quite useful for her, she even gave a seminar on it recently and then I get this opportunity to be part of an academic research project that deals with this. I don't know what the point is behind these, but it is out there and before it wasn't. I am not saying that things will change automatically, but with the Catalan and Spanish being so similar... So, with Catalan and Spanish we can see that there are attempts to translate with MT and just get the minimal human action on the text. For instance, newspapers... not books, but it will come a time, there are a lot of bilingual newspapers that just work like that, they have one version come and during the night a team of reviewers go over the translated text so I think it's a matter of time before we see this in books that are not specifically creative, nonfiction, the type of nonfiction that is highly informational, you know, mushrooms in Catalonia or, I don't know, sports, not yet with strong authorial presents like an author that has a particular style, not yet, but who knows, we didn't think this was even possible but MT systems are getting better and better.

Reference 9 - 100.00% Coverage

Is creativity reproducible? Why should we expect machines to carry out something that up to now has been considered exclusively human? The very existence of machines is based on the possibility to reproduce things and to replicate processes. If we are asking from them to do the opposite, it might be in vain not from the point of view that we won't get there but why should we? Why should we get there? What is the point? For us to become less creative I want a machine to help me do the stuff that I don't want to do that I cannot do at the same level, but I can focus on other stuff that only I can do. If we take that away from our intellectual capabilities it will only make us dumber and I don't see the point...

Reference 10 - 100.00% Coverage

That already exists, at least in Catalan literature, we publish hundreds and hundreds of books from other cultures, we just love, we are serial translation. Translators in this industry, we keep translating everything that's amazingly interesting what a farmer from a remote island of Scotland or a tribal leader from Samoa have said about their days and we keep translating that, we are a very porous culture, we don't come from the Anglo-Saxon world, where to translate or to publish a translated book is seen as something so bold did and they believe they are going to lose all their money because they are translating from German or from French, we are not talking about far away languages, we are talking about high cultural languages. It is difficult for them to publish any translation in the US in the UK in other English markets.

Reference 11 - 100.00% Coverage

Are you saying that the reason is that there is a lack of translators in those languages?

Reference 12 - 100.00% Coverage

Yes, but if you expect to use machine translation just to help that particular culture become better known. Does it have anything in particular that culture? Does it have anything unique? Because if it doesn't, it's going to go through a set of algorithms that will be less developed because most of the money goes to English related machine translation, so for this to work like for Catalan and I don't know...

Reference 13 - 100.00% Coverage

Macedonian to be a reality, it has to go through English, so it will be even worse because it will do Macedonian, English, English, Catalan, so you risk losing so much missing out on so much of the richness, what you expect to be unique about that original that the final result will not help you understand Macedonian culture. It will be a flat, dull product. It's like that game where you say one thing and then you keep repeating the message, and then towards the end... there is no relation to what it meant in the beginning, so this is what it will be if we favour this kind of techniques for far away languages. I don't think it will help. It helps to have Google Translator if you come up with... I don't know if you end up on a Macedonian website and you want to know what that is about, at least to get an idea but to appreciate literary genius, no. Please, no.

<Files\\T3NL> - § 37 references coded [9.76% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.31% Coverage

and it can it can be very helpful, but it can also be a very big trap I think so um.

Reference 2 - 0.09% Coverage

T3NL: Well What surprised me was that some in some.

Reference 3 - 0.08% Coverage

T3NL: Some of the machine translations that.

Reference 4 - 0.27% Coverage

T3NL: The syntax being completely turned around or a sentence had been made passive instead of active, where it was active in the source stack so I thought okay that.

Reference 5 - 0.26% Coverage

T3NL: The the corpus that this machine translation is sort of getting its information from his must be really, really wide if he knows how to.

Reference 6 - 0.42% Coverage

T3NL: I know what he means I know where what they trying to convey, but this is not completely to my liking in Dutch there's too much English sort of seeping through either in context or and syntax or in word choice or.

Reference 7 - 0.14% Coverage

T3NL: And what I also found surprising, was it wasn't consistent.

Reference 8 - 0.22% Coverage

Like, for instance triplets which is "drieling" in Dutch, it said triplets the first few times and then suddenly came up with "drieling".

Reference 9 - 0.35% Coverage

T3NL: And sometimes if it seemed like the machine translation use the right context to interpret and sometimes it completely miss context, so the meaning.

Reference 10 - 0.31% Coverage

T3NL: Isolated sentences, a lot of them do work, but in the contract as a story as a whole, it is there is not enough.

Reference 11 - 0.09% Coverage

T3NL: Coherence I think so.

Reference 12 - 0.22% Coverage

If you were to use this to translate a novel I think as opposed editor you would have a lot of work and think I wish I translate it myself.

Reference 13 - 0.24% Coverage

T3NL: I think it actually showed me things that I would never think of myself, because it always tend to think outside of the box, instead of inside the box.

Reference 14 - 0.21% Coverage

T3NL: But, for instance, the the name of the the painting of the mural the happy garden of life.

Reference 15 - 0.15% Coverage

T3NL: which I thought was surprising I didn't use the Dutch general word for garden and which is "tuin".

Reference 16 - 0.52% Coverage

T3NL: "tuin", but like both myself and then I found in translation, as well used "hof", which refers to the biblical garden sort of even if "hof" it's not biblical but it's the more archaic word of saying is and it and, in this context, I thought okay it's more "hof"

Reference 17 - 0.12% Coverage

T3NL: than "tuin" because so people will have this reference to this whole sort of paradise.

Reference 18 - 0.15% Coverage

T3NL: idea, so I was surprised that the translation actually came up with that.

Reference 19 - 0.29% Coverage

T3NL: So not the generic and much more often used word of "tuin", but the more specific and sort of archaic word "hof" so.

Reference 20 - 0.40% Coverage

T3NL: yeah yeah and I would have never thought that the machine translation would choose "hof" for that I would thought thing that they would use the ordinary words "huis", "tuin", "keuken", so house, kitchen, garden word for it so that's just generic.

Reference 21 - 0.11% Coverage

T3NL: The machine translation, it was a lot better than I had expected.

Reference 22 - 0.14% Coverage

I think that it misses the.

Reference 23 - 0.14% Coverage

T3NL: sort of the edge, we say "shoe" in Dutch, so the sort of.

Reference 24 - 0.07% Coverage

T3NL: Like give it a certain flow, I think.

Reference 25 - 0.39% Coverage

T3NL: And also, and that is one of the most the hardest things I think like it doesn't use these into these sort of meaningless words that we inject everywhere in Dutch.

Reference 26 - 0.07% Coverage

T3NL: So it becomes quite staccato.

Reference 27 - 0.38% Coverage

T3NL: We use like "hoor", "wel", "eigenlijk" completely meaningless words but we interject them in language, and that is what sort of gives it gives them more natural feel.

Reference 28 - 0.40% Coverage

T3NL: In the text was working with shingles and I was thinking Oh, do we use this word or this word or this word for shingles and then, I came across texts about roofs but then with the shingles as a rash.

Reference 29 - 0.22% Coverage

T3NL: insert into the text, and this was on Linguee or something like that so it's it's a lot of it has not been post edited I would think.

Reference 30 - 0.34% Coverage

T3NL: Good aid, and I mean i've used it for languages, I don't know and then to have a sort of first impression of the text to.

Reference 31 - 0.11% Coverage

T3NL: Because, sometimes I will I was translating something from.

Reference 32 - 0.26% Coverage

T3NL: Ukraine Ukrainian texts that have been translated into really poor English, and so I use a German translation.

Reference 33 - 0.57% Coverage

T3NL: Of the Ukrainian texts, and then I use Google translate to see if I understood the German translation correctly, because the English translator of the Ukrainian text her English was not good enough to come up with a good solution so and I found that really, really helpful so.

Reference 34 - 0.21% Coverage

T3NL: I think machine translations do help you understand the gist but I don't think they will help you understand the finesse of the writer.

Reference 35 - 0.49% Coverage

T3NL: yeah think more for yeah but that might be just my arrogance thinking, I know better, because they do believe that computers are capable of so many things much more than we we can ever imagine so.

Reference 36 - 0.41% Coverage

T3NL: To try and put every aspect of the source text into the into the translation, and if you can't to see if you if there's any way you can compensate somewhere else and i'm thinking would a machine ever try and compensate ...

Reference 37 - 0.63% Coverage

T3NL: Some sort of wordplay that he lost in in one place, because there is no double meaning or innuendo or there is no alliteration going on Will he will the computer than think Oh, but wait we're two paragraphs down, but here, this is a ideal place for a word play I don't know

<Files\\T4NL> - § 40 references coded [10.01% Coverage]

Reference 1 - 0.46% Coverage

T4NL: And the thing about translating or post-editing the other translation was it's quite a different issue because it's like you have to reason.

Reference 2 - 0.67% Coverage

T4NL: Upside down, you know, you have to correct the wrong text, which is not which is by far, which is something completely different and making your translation from the start. This is a different competence I would say

Reference 3 - 0.07% Coverage

T4NL: quite tricky. I would say

Reference 4 - 0.08% Coverage

T4NL: Because I don't think there was

Reference 5 - 0.19% Coverage

T4NL: There has not been one single unit on any of this idea in total 120

Reference 6 - 0.57% Coverage

T4NL: I don't think there was one single unit that that could pass by itself. Everything, everything has to be edited

Reference 7 - 0.18% Coverage

T4NL: Evaluate it as a translation, I would give it a very low point.

Reference 8 - 0.67% Coverage

T4NL: It's a very bad translation. There was some huge huge errors and mistakes and misunderstood something that the meaning was complete some some sentences are completely nonsense. That's a terrible, terrible kind of text.

Reference 9 - 0.24% Coverage

T4NL: Yeah, I would say. Sometimes I was surprised that there were some good things too.

Reference 10 - 0.13% Coverage

T4NL: I don't know 50% percent wrong

Reference 11 - 0.38% Coverage

T4NL: The right PARTS. PARTS OF phrase, some parts of some phrases were were okay so I didn't have to work on them. I just have to check them.

Reference 12 - 0.14% Coverage

T4NL: The machine doesn't catch idiomatic.

Reference 13 - 0.29% Coverage

T4NL: Parts of texts, you know, that doesn't give you a ride idiomatic equivalent in Dutch for this.

Reference 14 - 0.12% Coverage

T4NL: It is much too literary much too.

Reference 15 - 0.03% Coverage

T4NL: Simple

Reference 16 - 0.17% Coverage

T4NL: Mm hmm. So there lacks subtlety, I would say.

Reference 17 - 0.30% Coverage

T4NL: And then also, it doesn't get it doesn't. It goes from word to word or and then sometimes it's not bad.

Reference 18 - 0.77% Coverage

T4NL: But then there is no no relation between sentences. So it's only on a sentence level that something is down. But if the next sentence is translated and it's completely inconsistent with the previous one it's just there. And you have to change everything is terrible.

Reference 19 - 0.43% Coverage

T4NL: With you know i think it's in general that it's still very weak. I know it has improved a lot since a couple of years, and sometimes they even managed to make a correct sentence, but

Reference 20 - 0.10% Coverage

T4NL: It needs it still completely insufficient.

Reference 21 - 0.04% Coverage

T4NL: I have no idea.

Reference 22 - 0.38% Coverage

T4NL: I assume not, but even so... You mean like people who have a dialect. For example, if there is a dialect in English text.

Reference 23 - 0.10% Coverage

T4NL: I would not have been, I wouldn't trust it.

Reference 24 - 0.51% Coverage

T4NL: Because probably because I assume that if they go from Romanian to... for instance, the meaning that they go from Romanian to English and then from English to Dutch

Reference 25 - 0.13% Coverage

T4NL: It's like indirect translation. I mean,

Reference 26 - 0.21% Coverage

T4NL: Yeah, well, then it's in general in my circles.

Reference 27 - 0.36% Coverage

T4NL: People don't trust indirect translations and use of machines for any kind of literary translations.

Reference 28 - 0.22% Coverage

T4NL: No, sometimes I use on my telephone. I use Google Translate to find a specific words.

Reference 29 - 0.12% Coverage

T4NL: In Spanish, to have the translated into Dutch

Reference 30 - 0.15% Coverage

T4NL: And half of time doesn't make any sense either

Reference 31 - 0.07% Coverage

T4NL: Sometimes a little bit. Yes.

Reference 32 - 0.05% Coverage

T4NL: Not just for words.

Reference 33 - 0.63% Coverage

T4NL: The very, very minimal. And it did happen in this text in to be or not to be, it happens that sometimes I thought okay, this is acceptable. This is acceptable. This can pass without editing little parts were quite okay. Okay.

Reference 34 - 0.39% Coverage

T4NL: But that was only you can I don't know because you saw yourself all the differences I have made the changes I made from the

Reference 35 - 0.17% Coverage

T4NL: From the machine text and my post editing.

Reference 36 - 0.15% Coverage

T4NL: It's a lot. Now it's almost everywhere

Reference 37 - 0.13% Coverage

T4NL: See it. This is a lot. It's a lot of work.

Reference 38 - 0.12% Coverage

T4NL: So you mean all this extra work this

Reference 39 - 0.04% Coverage

T4NL: Is not so

Reference 40 - 0.08% Coverage

T4NL: For me it doesn't have much value.