Reflective Essay

The quality of the overall existing output by DeepL was surprisingly adequate. I expected that I had to make numerous changes, but these were largely limited to some odd lexical choices. For example, in the DeepL translation of text 2, the translation of “there were puddles of rain on the ground” was “er waren regenplassen.” I changed this to “er lagen,” because this both maintains the repetition in the ST but also sounds more natural. Besides this, there were also a few spelling mistakes, such as “half zeven” instead of “halfzeven” that I had to edit.

The fastest to produce were the editing assignments, because I could compare them sentence by sentence and most of them seemed quite adequate already. However, despite the fact that these were faster, I feel more comfortable and satisfied with the first translation I did entirely by myself because I think it is easier overlook certain mistakes (such as strange colloquialisms) when the translated text is already before you instead of creating it from scratch. This makes translating mainly different from post-editing for me. Additionally, some word choices are not the ones I would choose but are not necessarily wrong (like “er goed aan gedaan”), which is why I have not altered them but I would have done this differently when translating it myself.

I do like using MT as a part of the translation process, but for literary translation I don’t think this is a great tool because some aspects can be overlooked by the machine and, therefore, also by the translator. It could be useful for other texts types, such as newspaper articles. Overall, this was a very interesting comparison.