*Translation Technology – Week 1 – Assignment 1 (Part 2)*

DeepL successfully generated a basic translation of the original texts. However, the quality was quite lacking. At times, the machine translation copied the sentence structure of the original text quite literally, sacrificing flow for accuracy. Both the syntax and the descriptiveness of the words that were used were at times inadequate. For example, in text 3, the translation that was used for the English word ‘clipping’ was ‘knippen’. While this word is technically possible to use in this context, a word like ‘snoeien’ would be more evocative and specific.

For the translation and post-editing, online dictionaries like Linguee, were used. Being not very experienced with professional ways of translating, I did not use any parallel texts that applied to the texts in the assignment. This is because I was not entirely sure where to start finding these and how to apply them.

The post-editing translation was much faster to produce because the basic structure is laid out for the translator. Although the machine translation still has to be adjusted to fit the target language and culture, there is at least some groundwork. The first text however, which was translated without the help of machine translation, required a lot more conscious thinking about how to phrase every single sentence and which words to use. However, speed does not equal quality. Even after the post-edited machine translations have been edited, they still feel more rigid and unnatural than a translation that has been produced organically. Although I am not quite satisfied with either of the translations, I feel that I did a better job on text one. Even though the time to do the assignment was quite short and I am not very experienced with translating quite yet, I think that my translation of text one flows more naturally.