I believe the quality of the DeepL output was reasonably well translated. The source text from Hemingway didn’t consist of too many complicated sentences, but rather short and relatively simple ones. DeepL did seem to translate rather literally, keeping with the same word order and straightforward translations. As this seemed to be Hemingway’s style, one could argue this works in its favor as the author’s original style could be maintained. However, when the source text’s phrasing gets more descriptive or tenses from certain verbs differ in meaning from English to Dutch, this could pose a problem.

Thus, the nature of changes I had to make were mostly grammatical. For example, “We talked (for a long time)…” was originally translated as “We praatten…” in DeepL’s output, but I changed it to “hebben gepraat” so that it’d display the passage of time within the verb better. Moreover, the occasional change of lexical nature, such as adding “moeilijk in de omgang” to DeepL’s translated phrase of the source text’s “difficult” so it would better fit as a descriptive term for a characteristic of the man to which it refers.

For the translation, I mainly used some online dictionary resources like [Linguee | Nederlands-Engels woordenboek (en andere talen)](https://www.linguee.nl/) and [Reverso | Free online translation, dictionary](https://www.reverso.net/text_translation.aspx?lang=EN). Since these translation excerpts were relatively short, none of them took more than 30 minutes to complete. In this case, the first translation may have taken me a bit longer since I had to translate it myself and occasionally look up some terms. But post-editing the other two segments, not only the target text but double checking with the source text as well, took me longer than expected. I’d say if a different kind of text, more descriptive or metaphorical, would be the source text,, post-editing from DeepL could have taken even longer.

I am rather satisfied with the final product. I did have a bit of trouble with keeping with Hemingway’s style, especially since some sentences in the first segment were a bit long and I ended up cutting them in more readable parts in the target text. For the post-editing segments, I was unsure whether the overly literal translation would break with Hemingway’s style, or work in his favor. I’d say I’m most satisfied with the second translation, as it took the least amount of editing, was readable in the target language and seemed to maintain the style of the original author.

I do like using MT as it can get larger translation projects done quicker, especially when its sentence structures and phrasings is more literal and simple – thus, easier to translate for MT. Though, double-checking and interpreting more metaphorical and descriptive language could still prove a challenge and more of a hassle when using MT. Post-editing definitely made me realize that it requires a lot more thinking about what makes the MT-generated translation work and what doesn’t. Thus making me think more about the way the source text could be most appropriately translated. For translation, it relies more on the translator themselves, rather than comparing an existing translation with expectations of how a segment from the source text could be appropriately translated.