

Yapay Zekâ Destekli Çeviride Dilsel ve Kültürel Sadakat: İngilizce-Türkçe Edebi Kısa Öykülerde DeepL ve İnsan Çevirilerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi*

Mustafa DOLMACI¹

Geliş Tarihi: 22.03.2025
Kabul Tarihi: 29.05.2025
Yayın Tarihi: 24.06.2025
Değerlendirme: İki Dış Hakem /
Çift Taraflı Körleme
Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Atıf Bilgisi:

Dolmacı, Mustafa (2025). Yapay Zekâ Destekli Çeviride Dilsel ve Kültürel Sadakat: İngilizce-Türkçe Edebi Kısa Öykülerde DeepL ve İnsan Çevirilerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi. *International Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, 5/1, 92-109.

Benzerlik Taraması: Yapıldı –
iThenticate

Etik Bildirim:
lotusjournal@selcuk.edu.tr

Çıkar Çatışması: Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.

Finansman: Bu araştırmayı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.

Telif Hakkı & Lisans Yazarlar: Dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmaları CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.

Öz

Bu çalışmada, İngilizceden Türkçeye çevrilen kurgusal kısa öykülerde DeepL'in makine çevirileri ile insan çevirileri arasındaki farkları, Katharina Reiss'in çeviri eleştirisi modeli kullanılarak dilbilimsel bileşenler açısından incelenmektedir. Beş edebi eserden alınan ve DeepL ile profesyonel insan çevirmenler tarafından çevrilen 381 cümle karşılaştırılmış ve farklılıklar belirlenmiştir. En yaygın farklılık türü sözcüksel farklılık olup (%33,86), ardından anlamsal farklılık (%22,05), yakın anlamlılık (%20,73), dilbilgisel farklılık (%9,16), mantıksız (yanlış çeviri) olma durumu (%8,40) ve üslup açısından farklılık (%5,77) olarak sıralanmıştır. DeepL, basit ve doğrudan kelimeleri başarıyla çevirirken kültürel nüanslı ifadeler, mecazi dil ve bağlamsal uyarlamalarda zorlanmıştır. İnsan çevirmenler hedef kültür odaklı yöntemlerle edebi estetiği korurken, DeepL kaynak metne bağlı kelimesi kelimesine çeviri stratejileri kullanmış, bu da karmaşık anlatsal tutarsızlıklara yol açmıştır. Çalışmada 32 hatalı DeepL çevirisi tespit edilerek edebi metinler için son düzenleme gerekliliği vurgulanmıştır. Sonuçlar, DeepL'in üslup inceliklerini ve kültürel göndermeleri aktarmadaki sınırlarını ortaya koyarken, edebi metinlerin sanatsal ve duygusal zenginliğini korumada insan çevirmenlerin vazgeçilmez rolünü pekiştirmektedir. Bu çalışma, yapay zekâ destekli çeviri araçlarını edebi bağlamda değerlendirmekte ve yapay zekânın verimliliği ile insanın kültürel-yaratıcı deneyimini birleştiren hibrit modeller önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: makine çevirisi, insan çevirisi, kısa hikâye, dilsel bileşen

* Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.

¹ Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, Konya, Türkiye, dolmaci@selcuk.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2503-6072>

Linguistic and Cultural Fidelity in AI-Driven Translation: A Comparative Analysis of DeepL and Human Translations in English-Turkish Literary Short Stories *

Mustafa DOLMACI²

Date of Submission: 22.03.2025

Date of Acceptance: 29.05.2025

Date of Publication: 24.06.2025

Review: Double-blind peer review

Article Type: Research Article

Citation:

Dolmaci, Mustafa (2025). Linguistic and Cultural Fidelity in AI-Driven Translation: A Comparative Analysis of DeepL and Human Translations in English-Turkish Literary Short Stories. *International Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, 5/1, 92-109.

Plagiarism Check: Yes - iThenticate

Complaints: lotusjournal@selcuk.edu.tr

Conflict of Interest: The author(s) has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author(s) acknowledges that they received no external funding to support this research.

Copyright & License: Authors publishing in the journal retain the copyright to their work and their work is licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.

Abstract

This study investigates the differences between DeepL's machine translations and human translations of English-to-Turkish fictional short stories, utilizing Katharina Reiss' translation criticism model to analyze linguistic components. The study compares 381 sentences translated by DeepL with professional human translators from five literary works, identifying semantic, lexical, grammatical, stylistic, and nonsensical differences. Lexical differences are most common (33.86%), followed by semantic (22.05%), near-synonymous (20.73%), grammatical (9.16%), nonsensical (8.40%), and stylistic (5.77%). DeepL translated simple, straightforward words well but struggled with culturally nuanced expressions, figurative language, and contextual adjustments. While human translators utilized target-culture-focused procedures to retain literary aesthetics, DeepL used literal, source-text-focused methods, resulting in complex narrative incoherencies. The investigation found 32 incorrect DeepL translations, highlighting the need for literary post-editing. The results underscore DeepL's limitations in conveying stylistic nuances and cultural allusions, reinforcing the indispensable function of human translators in preserving the artistic and emotional richness of literary texts. This study evaluates AI-driven translation tools in literary contexts and recommends hybrid models that combine AI supported machine translation efficiency with human cultural and creative experience.

Keywords: machine translation, human translation, short story, linguistic component

* It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited.

² Assistant Prof. Dr., Selçuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Translation and Interpretation, Konya, Türkiye, dolmaci@selcuk.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2503-6072>

Introduction

Translation is one of the most important components of communication between individuals from different cultures; this communication is of great importance in interactions between cultures belonging to different societies. Translation which is not simply a matter of seeking other words with similar meaning tries to find appropriate ways of saying things in another language (Thriven, 2002). With the extraordinary rapid development of technology, artificial intelligence, which plays an important role in many fields, is becoming increasingly involved in the translation process day by day. At the same time, unlike traditional computer-assisted translation tools that serve only as aids to human translators, artificial intelligence has emerged as a competitor to human intelligence in the field of translation. Rivera-Trigueros (2022) asserts that machine translation has become a crucial asset capable of meeting translation needs and facilitating professional processes within the translation sector. However, machine translation still has difficulties when it comes to comprehending creative writings that include cultural references, such as literary works (Guerberos-Arenas & Toral, 2022). Literary works function as a vessel of cultural identity and creative expression, using language in a manner that goes beyond simple communication (Rahman & Rahman, 2020). The complexities of storytelling, cultural references, and the subtle nuances of expression present a significant challenge for automated systems aiming to accurately convey the essence of these works (Toral & Way, 2015). The main aim of this study is to classify and examine the differences between artificial intelligence-supported translation engine DeepL's translation and human translation in terms of linguistic components addressed in Katharina Reiss' translation criticism model within the context of translating fictional short stories. The study also tries to determine the extent to which DeepL's translation differs from human translation and to identify which linguistic components account for these differences. The study aimed to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent does DeepL generate translations that are comparable to human translations when translating short stories?
2. To what degree does DeepL generate translations that are semantically accurate but differ from human translations?
3. In which particular linguistic components do the translations generated by DeepL differ from those of human translation?
4. Is DeepL capable of producing nonsensical translations?

Katharina Reiss' Approach to Translation Criticism

In her book "Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations (2000)", Katharina Reiss introduces her method for translation criticism. She explores three distinct categories to assess the potential for objective criticism by examining the outcomes of the translation process. Katharina Reiss argues that the evaluation of a translation should begin with determining the genre of the text. This is an important step in enabling the translator to choose the appropriate strategies correctly while translating. Reiss had developed this typology building upon the categorization of the functions of language proposed by the German linguist Karl Bühler. According to Reiss, there are five categories of translation criticism:

- 1) Literary category concerns the selection of the text.
- 2) Language category conducts research on the linguistic structure of the source text.
- 3) Pragmatic category takes into account extra-linguistic factors.
- 4) Functional category is the category of choice for translation critics if the translator or his client specifies a more restricted group of readers for the target language.
- 5) Personal category is related to the personality of the translator (Reiss, 2000).

The first part of translation criticism falls under the literary category, where the critic should be aware of the genre of the source text. After determining the literary nature or genre of the text, one transitions to the language category to identify linguistic elements. Under the linguistic category, both the semantic elements, lexical elements, grammatical elements, and stylistic elements in both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) are examined as linguistic components. Semantic elements are quite essential for preserving the content and meaning of a text. To determine semantic equivalence, the linguistic context must be examined, because this is where it can be seen most clearly what the author intends by what is said (Reiss, 2000: 53). If full equivalence with the source text is the criterion by which the semantic components of the target text are to be judged, the standard for the lexical components must be adequacy (Reiss, 2000: 57). The examination of lexical elements is related to how the translator deals with technical terms, homonyms, wordplay, idioms and proverbs, and untranslatable words.

Another factor considered in the language category is grammatical elements. In a translation criticism, grammatical correctness is a criterion for the successful transfer of the semantic and stylistic aspects of the target text's grammatical structure.

The last element examined in the language category is stylistic elements. It should be determined whether the translation takes into account the stylistic components of the source text with regard to standard, individual, and contemporary usage, and whether in particular stylistic aspects the author's creative expressions deviate from normal language usage (Reiss, 2000: 63).

Methodology

In this study, five fictional short stories and their translations from English to Turkish by professional translators were used to compare the translation performance of DeepL with human translator. The selection process for the short stories included in this study took into account the literary and fictional nature, the inclusion of exclamation expressions, their length, and the availability of their Turkish translations. The Linguistic Component strategies employed by Katharina Reiss in the category of literary texts were employed in the analysis. The names of these stories and their translators are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. List of the Short Stories

Source Text	Target Text
Kate CHOPIN- The Story of an Hour	Asena TUNALI- Bir Saatin Öyküsü
Saki- The Open Window	Müjde DURAL- Açık Kapı
Shirley JACKSON- Charles	Zübeyde DEMİR- Charles
Oscar WILDE- Selfish Giant	Süleyman KARA- Bencil Dev
Ernest HEMINGWAY- Cat in the Rain	Behlül DÜNDAR- Yağmur Altındaki Kedi

In the following phase, DeepL, which is an artificial intelligence supported machine translation engine, was run on a CAT software. The sentences translated by DeepL kept intact, and translated texts were transferred to an excel file. The first column on the Excel spreadsheet included target texts, second column included human translations and the third column had the DeepL's translations. Each line had one sentence or expression, so the analysis was conducted on a sentence and/or phrase level manually.

During this comparison, the differences between the two texts were classified in terms of Linguistic Components, as addressed in Katherina Reiss's Translation Criticism approach, and numbered in the Excel spreadsheet. As a result of this examination, conclusions were drawn regarding the extent of differences in each linguistic component. When conducting the analysis of the research, a classification system was established to show in what ways the two translation texts differ. These classifications are numbered as follows: 0-Near-synonymous, 1-Semantic

difference, 2-Lexical difference, 3-Grammatical difference, 4-Stylistic difference, 5-Nonsensical.

Quantitative Research Findings

Table 1 shows the total number of sentences in which differences, identified as part of the research method, appear throughout the entire texts during the comparison of DeepL to human translations of the five short stories. Additionally, it shows the percentage of the total results found throughout the entire texts. Analyzing the numerical data reveals the distinct ways in which DeepL translates literary texts in contrast to human translation, as well as the linguistic causes underlying these discrepancies.

Table 2. The Total Distribution and Percentages of the Differences

	Difference Types	Total numbers of occurrence	%
0	Near-synonym	79	20.73
1	Semantic	84	22.05
2	Lexical	129	33.86
3	Grammatical	35	9.16
4	Stylistic	22	5.77
5	Nonsensical	32	8.40
	Total	381	100.00

The table above shows the distributions of distinguishing factors. According to this table, it is understood that the primary reason for the greatest difference between sentences produced by DeepL and human translation is lexical, meaning that different words are used to convey the same meaning in the sentence. Lexical discrepancies are the most prevalent, as human translators frequently possess multiple equally valid word options. While literary translation necessitates nuanced expression, DeepL may prioritize statistically common yet less contextually sensitive language. After lexical differences, the most common difference encountered is semantic. DeepL has made semantically different translations from human translation in a total of 84 sentences. Following semantic differences, the classification of near-synonymous results with nearly equivalent outcomes emerges. This classification indicates that DeepL translates to a level that is quite similar or entirely identical to human translation. It is observed that a total of 35 sentences translated by DeepL are grammatically different from human translation. In the 5th classification, which serves as an answer to the research question 'Does DeepL make nonsensical translations?', it has been found that a total of 32 sentences translated by DeepL are nonsensical or incorrect/meaningless. The least observed difference is stylistic. It has been concluded that in only 22 sentences, the stylistic value present in the human translator's version is different.

Qualitative Research Findings

Near Synonym (0)

In this section, identical sentences are also added to near-synonymous sentences. The common feature of the identical sentences found in the target texts is that they have been translated in exactly the same way by both DeepL and the human translator. Upon examining the sentences, it is evident that DeepL produced the same translations as the human translator mostly in simple structured declarative and interrogative sentences composed of just a subject, verb, and object. Additionally, it is observed that DeepL produced the same translation results as the human translator for exclamatory expressions.

Table 3. Identical Sentences

		Source Text (ST)	DeepL Translation (DT)	Human translator (HT)
1	S.1	I beg; open the door-- you will make yourself ill.	Yalvarırım, kapıyı aç. Kendini hasta edeceksin.	Yalvarırım, kapıyı aç. Kendini hasta edeceksin.
2	S.2	"He is too selfish," she said.	"O çok bencil," dedi.	"O çok bencil," dedi.
3	S.3	His father's eyes widened.	Babasının gözleri büyüdü.	Babasının gözleri büyüdü.
4	S.5	The maid stayed outside to close the umbrella.	Hizmetçi şemsiyeyi kapatmak için dışarıda kaldı.	Hizmetçi şemsiyeyi kapatmak için dışarıda kaldı.
5	S.5	I wanted that poor kitty.	O zavallı kediciği istiyordum.	O zavallı kediciği istiyordum.

Near-synonymous

The general characteristic of the sentences provided in Table 4 is that the translations by DeepL and human translators are very close in meaning, with minor differences that do not alter the overall meaning. The translation of prepositions is a good starting point for elucidating these distinctions. As seen in the first example, the preposition "near" in the first sentence is translated in both versions with the Turkish words "yanında" and "yakınında" which both convey the meaning of "near." Thus, the meaning of the sentence remains similar in both translations. The same situation is observed in sentence four. In this sentence, the adjective "very" is translated into Turkish with the words "pek" and "çok," both of which carry the same meaning. This again shows that both translations convey the same meaning as the source text.

Table 4. Near-synonymous Sentences

		ST	DT	HT
1	S.1	Her husband's friend Richards was there, too, near her.	Kocasının arkadaşı Richards da oradaydı, onun yanındaydı.	Kocasının arkadaşı Richards da orada, yakınındaydı.

2	S.1	There was something coming to her and she was waiting for it, fearfully.	Ona doğru gelen bir şey vardı ve korkuyla onu bekliyordu.	Korku içinde, kendisine doğru gelmekte olan bir şeyi bekliyordu.
3	S.2	The poor children had now nowhere to play.	Zavallı çocukların artık oynayacak yerleri yoktu.	Artık zavallı çocukların oynayacak yerleri yoktu.
4	S.2	They tried to play on the road, but the road was very dusty and full of hard stones, and they did not like it.	Yolda oynamaya çalıştılar ama yol çok tozluysa ve sert taşlarla doluydu ve bundan hoşlanmadılar.	Yolun üstünde oynamayı denediler, ama yol pek tozlu hem de sert taşlarla doluydu. Bu da hiç hoşlarına gitmedi.
5	S.3	Some of them, as far as I can remember, were quite nice."	Hatırlayabildiğim kadarıyla bazıları oldukça iyiydi."	Hatırladığım kadarıyla bazıları çok iyi insanlardı."
6	S.4	"Nothing," Laurie said. "He was passing out the crayons."	"Hiçbir şey," dedi Laurie. "Boya kalemlerini dağıtıyordu."	"Hiçbir şey o sadece boya kalemlerini dağıtıyordu."
7	S.5	The rain dripped from the palm trees.	Palmiye ağaçlarından yağmur damlıyordu.	Palmiye ağaçlarından damlıyordu yağmur.
8	S.5	She went on up the stairs.	Merdivenlerden yukarı çıktı.	Merdivenleri çıktı.
9	S.5	He hadn't looked away from her since she started to speak.	Konuşmaya başladığından beri gözlerini ondan ayırmamıştı.	Kadın konuşmaya başladığından beri gözlerini ondan ayırmamıştı.
10	S.5	In the doorway stood the maid.	Kapının girişinde hizmetçi duruyordu.	Hizmetçi kadın kapının önünde duruyordu.
11	S.5	she said, "the padrone asked is for the Signora."	"Affedersiniz," dedi, "Padrone bunu Sinyora için getirmemi istedi."	"Affedersiniz" dedi; "Padrone bunu Sinyora'ya getirmemi istedi."

In sentence two, it is observed that the meaning in the source text is conveyed with the same meaning in both the DeepL and human translations, but the emphasis is placed on different words. Since the source text is English, it is known that the emphasized word in English should be placed at the beginning or the end of the sentence. In the DeepL translation, the emphasis is on the first word of the source text, while the human translator emphasizes the last word of the source text. Therefore, both sentences can be considered accurate translations according to the source text.

In sentence nine, it is observed that the subject in the source text is given as an implicit subject in the DeepL translation, whereas the human translation uses an explicit subject. In this case, the meaning remains the same between both sentences.

Semantic Difference (1)

This section will present examples of sentences where the translations by DeepL and humans are internally coherent, yet their interpretations diverge.

Table 5. Semantically Different Sentences

ST	DT	HT
----	----	----

1	S.1	She would have no one follow her.	Kimsenin onu takip etmesine izin vermezdi.	Peşinden hiç kimse gitmedi.
2	S.1	In the street below a peddler was crying his wares.	Aşağıdaki sokakta bir seyyar satıcı mallarını ağlayarak satıyordu.	Bir alt sokakta bulunan seyyar satıcı feryat feryat haykırıyordu.
3	S.1	She said it over and over under the breath: “free, free, free!”	Nefesinin altında tekrar tekrar söyledi: “Özgür, özgür, özgür!”	Duyulmayacak bir sesle tekrar tekrar söyledi. “Özgürüm, özgürüm, özgürüm!”
4	S.1	There would be no one to live for during those coming years; she would live for herself.	Önümüzdeki yıllarda uğruna yaşayacak kimse olmayacaktı; kendisi için yaşayacaktı.	Gelecek yıllarda kimse olmayacaktı ve sadece kendisi için yaşayacaktı.
5	S.1	A kind intention or a cruel intention made the act seem no less a crime as she looked upon it in that brief moment of illumination.	İyi niyetli ya da zalimce bir niyet, o kısa aydınlanma anına baktığında eylemi daha az suç gibi göstermiyordu.	Aydınlanma yaşadığı kısacık anda, iyi niyet ya da kötü niyet fark etmeksizin bunun bir suç olduğunu anladı.
6	S.1	She breathed a quick prayer that life might be long.	Hayatının uzun olması için hızlı bir dua etti.	Ömrünün uzun olabileceğini umarak bir dua okudu hızlıca.
7	S.1	It was only yesterday she had thought with a shudder that life might be long.	Daha dün hayatın uzun olabileceğini ürpererek düşünmüştü.	Henüz dün, ömrünün uzun olabileceğini düşünerek ürperiyordu.

When looking at the examples given in the table above, it can be seen that DeepL's translation of first sentence are literal translations of the source text. However, the human translator has not conveyed the exact meaning of the source text, instead employing a translation method by adapting it to the overall context of the text. In the second sentence, however, it can be seen that a completely different translation is made.

The phrase “Özgür, özgür, özgür!” in DeepL's third translation sentence emphasizes freedom as a concept. This might be said to express a person's longing for freedom or to highlight the importance of freedom. On the other hand, the phrase “Özgürüm, özgürüm, özgürüm!” in the human translation indicates that the person is free, signifying a change in circumstances or the state of having attained freedom. Therefore, they are different from each other.

When looking at DeepL's translation of the fourth sentence in the source text, the phrase "uğruna yaşayacağı kimse olmayacaktı" indicates the absence of someone who gives meaning to the person's life, whereas the phrase "kimse olmayacak" in the human translation is more general and abstract, indicating that there will generally be no one in the person's life.

In the source text, while DeepL's translation of the sentence "She breathed a quick prayer that life might be long" emphasizes a direct wish, the human translator conveyed it with a sentence that includes a broader emotional scope, encompassing hope and expectation. In the last

sentence, it is seen that DeepL made a literal translation, but the human translator changed the meaning in the source text and conveyed it in a more literary discourse.

Lexical Difference (2)

This section will present examples demonstrating how DeepL and human translation express same meanings using varied terminology.

Table 6. Lexically Different Sentences

		ST	DT	HT
1	S.1	It was her sister Josephine who told her, in broken sentences; veiled hints that revealed in half concealing.	Bunu ona kırık dökük cümlelerle anlatan kız kardeşi Josephine'di; yarı gizli yarı açık üstü örtülü ipuçları.	Ona bu haberi kız kardeşi Josephine, parça parça cümlelerle halinde, yarısını gizli tutan üstü kapalı ipuçlarıyla verdi.
2	S.1	She did not know; it was too subtle and elusive to name.	Bilmiyordu; adlandıramayacak kadar ince ve anlaşılmazdı.	Üstü kapalı ve anlaşılması zor bir şey olduğundan ne olduğunu bilmiyordu.
3	S.1	A clear and exalted perception enabled her to dismiss the suggestion as trivial.	Berrak ve yüce bir algı, bu öneriyi önemsiz bularak reddetmesini sağlamıştır.	Açık ve asil bir algı yeteneği bu bayağı fikri görmezden gelmesini sağladı.
4	S.1	Her fancy was running riot along those days ahead of her.	Önündeki günler boyunca hayalleri coşuyordu.	Düşleri, kendisini bekleyen günler boyunca coşuyordu.
5	S.1	There was a feverish triumph in her eyes, and she carried herself unwittingly like a goddess of Victory.	Gözlerinde ateşli bir zafer vardı ve kendini farkında olmadan bir Zafer Tanrıçası gibi taşıyordu.	Gözlerinde hummalı bir galibiyet vardı ve farkında olmadan bir zafer tanrıçası gibi yürüyordu.
6	S.1	He had been far from the scene of the accident, and did not even know there had been one.	Kaza yerinden çok uzaktaydı ve bir kaza olduğunu bile bilmiyordu.	Olay yerinden oldukça uzaktaydı ve bir kaza olduğundan bile haberi yoktu.
7	S.1	He stood amazed at Josephine's piercing cry; at Richards' quick motion to screen him from the view of his wife.	Josephine'in canhıraş haykırışına, Richards'ın onu karısının gözünden kaçırmak için yaptığı hızlı harekete hayretle baktı.	Josephine'in güçlü ağlayışı ve Richards'ın karısını kendisinden saklama girişimi karşısında şaşkına kaldı.
8	S.2	The birds sat on the trees and sang so sweetly that the children used to stop their games in order to listen to them.	Kuşlar ağaçlara konar ve o kadar tatlı ötelerdi ki çocuklar oyunlarını bırakıp onları dinlerdi.	Kuşlar ağaçlara dizilir, tatlı tatlı ötelerdi ki çocuklar dinlemek için oyunlarını bırakırlardı.
9	S.5	He had been to visit his friend the Cornish ogre, and had stayed with him for seven years.	Arkadaşı Cornish devini ziyarete gitmiş ve yedi yıl onun yanında kalmıştı.	Arkadaşı Kornval Umacısı'nı ziyarete gitmişti.

10	S.5	Trespassers will be prosecuted	İzinsiz girenler kovuşturulacak	Duvarı aşanlar cezalandırılacaktır.
----	-----	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------------

In the comparison of the first sentence translations provided above, both the DeepL and the human translator's versions generally convey the original sentence's meaning accurately. However, there are differences in word choices. The phrase “broken sentences” in the source sentence is translated as “kırık dökük cümleler” by DeepL, while the human translator renders it as “parça parça cümleler.” In a comparable manner, the phrase “veiled hints that revealed in half concealing” is translated by DeepL as “yarı gizli yarı açık üstü örtülü ipuçları,” whereas the human translator provides a more refined version: “yarısını gizli tutan üstü kapalı ipuçlarıyla.”

When the translations of the second sentence are examined, it is evident that DeepL adopted a clearer expression with direct word choices, whereas the human translator chose more indirect words to provide a more explanatory and detailed rendition.

The phrase “her fancy was running riot” in the fourth sentence is translated by DeepL as “hayalleri coşuyordu,” while the human translator rendered it as “düşleri koşturuyordu.” Although both translations accurately convey the meaning, the word choices differ. Compared to DeepL, the translator adopted a more descriptive approach.

In the sixth sentence, the phrase “the scene of the accident” is translated by DeepL as “kaza yeri,” while the human translator rendered it as “olay yeri.” Both translations are correct, but due to its more common usage in the target language, the human translator's version is more appropriate.

In the seventh sentence, the phrase “piercing cry” is translated by DeepL as “canhıraş haykırış,” while the human translator uses “güçlü ağlayış.” The DeepL translation better conveys the emotional intensity and amazement of the original sentence, whereas the human translation provides a softer expression. When comparing the translations of the eighth sentence, the difference is seen to arise from the human translator's use of a tautology.

In the ninth sentence, the phrase “Cornish ogre” is translated by DeepL as “Cornish devi,” maintaining the proper noun from the source text. However, the human translator rendered it as “Kornval umacısı,” adapting the expression to the target language. In the translation of the tenth sentence, the word “kovuşturmak” used by DeepL is a difficult expression to understand as it is not commonly used in the target language. The human translator, on the other hand, opted to change the original meaning of the sentence and derive a meaning from the overall story.

Grammatical Difference (3)

This section will elucidate the grammatical distinctions between DeepL and human translation, accompanied by examples for clarification.

In the first sentence of the table below, comparing the grammatical variations between the DeepL and human translations reveals a disagreement in tense usage. DeepL translated it in the past tense, while the human translator used the present tense.

Upon analyzing the second sentence, it is evident that DeepL's translation is only rendered in the past tense, whereas human translator's rendition employs a blend of present and past tenses to emphasize the order and immediacy of the events.

In the translation of the fifth sentence, DeepL uses the verb "görülmedi" to emphasize the certainty of the event, while the translator uses the verb "görünmüyordu" to indicate that the event was an ongoing process and emphasizes the continuity from the past.

Table 7. Grammatically Different Sentences

	ST	DT	HT
1	S.1 And yet she had loved him-- sometimes.	Yine de onu sevmişti, bazen.	Ama yine de bazı zamanlar, kocasını severdi.
2	S.2 When he arrived, he saw the children playing in the garden.	Oraya vardığında bahçede oynayan çocukları gördü.	Gelir gelmez de çocukların bahçede oynadıklarını gördü.
3	S.2 I will put that poor little boy on the top of the tree, and then I will knock down the wall, and my garden shall be the children's playground for ever and ever.	O zavallı küçük çocuğu ağacın tepesine koyacağım, sonra da duvarı yıkacağım ve bahçem sonsuza dek çocukların oyun alanı olacak.	Şu zavallı yavrucağı ağacın üstüne çıkarayım; sonra da duvarı yıkarım, bahçem artık sonsuz dek çocukların oyun yeri olur.
4	S.2 And the tree broke at once into blossom, and the birds came and sang on it, and the little boy stretched out his two arms and flung them round the Giant's neck, and kissed him.	Ağaç hemen çiçek açmış, kuşlar gelip üzerinde ötmeye başlamış ve küçük çocuk iki kolunu uzatıp Dev'in boynuna dolamış ve onu öpmüş.	Ağaç hemen çiçekler açtı, kuşlar gelip üzerine öttü. Çocuk iki kolunu Dev'in boynuna sarıp onu öptü.
5	S.2 But the little boy whom the Giant loved was never seen again.	Ama Dev'in sevdiği küçük çocuk bir daha hiç görülmedi.	Ancak Dev'in sevdiği küçük çocuk artık hiç görünmüyordu.
6	S.2 For on the palms of the child's hands were the prints of two nails, and the prints of two nails were on the little feet.	Çünkü çocuğun ellerinin avuçlarında iki çivi izi vardı ve küçük ayaklarında da iki çivi izi vardı.	Çünkü çocuğun avuçlarında ikişer tane çivi izi vardı, iki çivi izi de ayaklarında.
7	S.3 It was a relief to Frampton when the aunt bustled into the room with a whirl of	Teyzenin geç kaldığı için özürler dileyerek telaşla odaya girmesi Frampton'u rahatlattı.	Teyzesi geç kaldığı için özürler dileyerek içeri girince Frampton rahatladı.

		apologies for being late in making her appearance.		
8	S.4	Friday Charles was deprived of blackboard privileges because he threw chalk.	Cuma Charles tebeşir fırlattığı için kara tahta ayrıcalıklarından mahrum bırakıldı.	Cuma yazı tahtasının ayrıcalıklarından tebeşir fırlattığı için mahrum edildi.

Stylistic Difference (4)

In this section, sentences where the stylistic differs between DeepL and human translation will be explained.

Table 8. Stylistically Different Sentences

		ST	DT	HT
1	S.1	The delicious breath of rain was in the air.	Havada yağmurun nefis nefesi vardı.	Yağmurun hoş esintisi havaya dağılmış haldeydi.
2	S.1	“Go away.”	“Git başımdan.”	“Git.”
3	S.2	One day the Giant came back.	Bir gün dev geri geldi.	Bir gün Dev dönüverdi.
4	S.2	He was dressed in grey, and his breath was like ice.	Gri giysiler içindeydi ve nefesi buz gibiydi.	Kurşuniler giyinmişti; soluğu da buz gibiydi.
5	S.2	And the Giant’s heart melted as he looked out.	Ve Dev’in kalbi dışarı bakarken eridi.	Dev dışarıya bakarken yüreği için için eridi.
6	S.3	An undefinable something about the room seemed to suggest masculine habitation.	Odadaki tanımlanamayan bir şey erkeklerin yaşadığını düşündürüyordu.	Ama odada erkeksi bir hava vardı.
7	S.4	He came home the same way, the front door slamming open, his cap on the floor, and the voice suddenly become raucous shouting, “Isn’t anybody <i>here</i> ?”	Eve aynı şekilde geldi, ön kapı çarparak açıldı, kasketi yere düştü ve sesi aniden gürleyerek “Kimse yok mu?” diye bağırdı.	Eve aynı yoldan döndü. Gürültüyle çarpan ön kapı, döşemenin üzerinde şapkasıyla sesi aniden yüksek ve nahoş bir haykırışa dönüştü; “Evde kimse yok mu?”
8	S.4	Italians came from a long way off to look up at the war monument.	İtalyanlar savaş anıtına bakmak için çok uzaklardan geldiler.	İtalyanlar savaş anıtını görmek için ta uzaklardan geliyordu.
9	S.4	If I can’t have long hair or any fun, I can have a cat.	Eğer uzun saçım ya da eğlencem yoksa, bir kedim olabilir.”	Saçlarımı uzatamasam da, eğlencem yoksa bile bir kedim pekâlâ olabilir.”

Looking at the example sentences provided above to examine the stylistic difference, it can be observed that DeepL's translation has a more poetic and literary style, while HT's provides a more descriptive and direct narrative. Upon analyzing the second sentence, it is evident that DeepL employs a longer and more explicit expression, whereas human translation is more direct and expeditious in delivering the command. In the translation of the third sentence, while DeepL adopts a simpler and more direct narrative style, HT has added a touch of mystery and surprise with a more literary expression.

DeepL translated the fourth sentence in a more colloquial and explanatory tone, while HT aimed to leave a strong impression on the reader's mind by using a more literary and poetic tone. In the translation of the fifth sentence, DeepL provided a literal translation, while HT used the idiom "yüreği için için erimek" to give the sentence a more literary and impactful tone. In the translation of the sixth sentence, while DeepL once again provided a literal translation, HT used an expression specific to the target culture to convey the meaning more clearly to the reader.

In the translation of the eighth sentence, DeepL translated "long way off" as "çok uzaklardan," while HT rendered it as "ta uzaklardan," using a tone closer to the everyday speech of the target language. In the translation of the ninth sentence, DeepL once again provided a literal translation with a simpler and more straightforward expression, whereas HT adopted a more complex and emphatic conditional structure.

Nonsensical (5)

This section will elucidate instances where DeepL's translations are so illogical and erroneous that they cannot be compared to human translations.

Table 9. Nonsensical Sentences

		ST	DeepL Translation	Human Translation (HT)
1	S.1	"Free!"	"Bedava!"	"Özgürüm!"
2	S.1	Every day for three hours he rattled on the roof of the castle till he broke most of the slates, and then he ran round and round the garden as fast as he could go.	Selam geldi. Her gün üç saat boyunca, kiremitlerin çoğunu kırana kadar şatonun çatısında takırdadı ve sonra bahçenin etrafında gidebildiği kadar hızlı koştu.	Dolu da geldi; o da her gün üç saat kalenin damının üstündeki arduvaz kiremitlerden birçoğunu kırıncaya dek takırdayıp durdu.
3	S.2	What did he see?	Ne görmüş?	Ne görsün?
4	S.2	Here the child's voice lost its self-possessed note and became falteringly human.	Burada çocuğun sesi kendine hakim notasını kaybetti ve titrek bir şekilde insana dönüştü.	Tam burada kızın sesindeki kendine güven kayboldu, daha mütevazileşti.

When the first sentence provided as an example of meaningless translation in the above table is examined, it is observed that DeepL, which translates with the primary meaning of the word "free," has made a translation that does not fit the flow of the text. This translation is a meaningless expression for the target reader.

The interrogative form in the third sentence is often used to emphasize the surprising or unexpected aspect of an event or situation in stories. By translating this expression literally, DeepL has made a meaningless translation for the sentence and the flow of the story.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Upon examining some of the results derived from quantitative data, it was found that out of the total 381 sentences from five stories, 129 sentences, or 33.86%, exhibited lexical differences between the translations by DeepL and human translators. In the sentences examined for lexical differences, it was observed that both DeepL and human translators accurately conveyed the meaning of the source text into the target language. However, they achieved this by using different words in the target language that conveyed the same or similar meaning. According to Ibáñez Moreno and Domínguez Mora (2025), DeepL's translation is more natural and fluid than Google Translate's, focusing on contextual efficacy rather than literary accuracy.

After lexical differences, the most frequently encountered differences are semantic. Out of the 381 sentences, 84 sentences exhibit semantic differences between the DeepL translation and the human translator. When compared to a human translator, DeepL is able to convey distinct meanings in the target text. This is especially true when translating idiomatic or sophisticated language. However, DeepL translated 79 out of the 381 sentences with the exact same or very similar meaning as the human translator. Furthermore, the emergence of a total of 32 nonsensical and erroneous sentences in DeepL's translations led to the conclusion that translations done by DeepL must be carefully post-edited and proofread by a human translator. As Karabayeva and Kalizhanova (2024) concluded, "ChatGPT and DeepL are useful but imperfect tools for translating literature, and they require human review and improvement."

The most frequent semantic discrepancies between DeepL and the human translator (HT) were the result of HT's adaptation of the words to the target language through the modification of specific components during translation, while DeepL conducted a literal translation. Kolb et al. (2023) highlighted that machine translation systems "generated a number of viable new coinages... most of them by literal translation procedures." Furthermore, it was noted that the human translator articulated certain complicated and challenging sentences from the source text to the target text by elaborating on the meaning, incorporating additional words, or eliminating specific terms to enhance clarity for the reader. Noriega-Santiáñez and Corpas Pastor (2023) highlighted the significance of creativity and adaptability in human translation, attributes that contemporary machine translation systems find challenging to replicate. DeepL interpreted short sentences, including exclamatory phrases, similarly to a human translator. DeepL rendered proper names and brand names exactly as they were, without adaptation for the target language, akin to human translators. In instances where lexical discrepancies existed between DeepL's translation and HT, it was typically seen that figurative language, adjectival phrases, and reduplications were rendered differently. Finally, the most prevalent discrepancy between

DeepL's translation and HT in sentences with grammatical discrepancies was that of tenses. In a similar study conducted by researcher Zihan Ke (2024), error types in human and machine translation comparisons were categorized into the ten categories outlined by Matusov's theory. In their study, it was observed that errors in machine translation predominantly focused on semantic aspects, while linguistic accuracy was comparatively better.

It has been concluded that DeepL employs a source-text-focused approach using literal translation methods, whereas human translators utilize a translation strategy oriented towards the target text and culture. Because human translators focus on the target language, they adapt elements from the source language and culture to fit the target language and culture. This approach results in lexical differences compared to DeepL. Due to the literary nature of the stories selected for analysis in this study, the texts frequently featured literary terms and effects. Preserving the aesthetic effect in translating such texts is of paramount importance. It was concluded that DeepL, which employs a literal translation method, is inadequate in conveying the literary and poetic nuances into the target language. Sarhsian and Zinchenko (2024) concluded that the use of machine translation for the translation of literary works, particularly short prose, is potentially practical and efficient, as the translated text is subsequently edited by a human translator. This reinforces the notion that DeepL functions optimally as an auxiliary tool rather than a standalone solution in literary translation.

It is important to note that DeepL employed a sentence-level translation methodology with segmented text, resulting in coherence solely at the sentence level. This study will contribute to identifying the linguistic differences and similarities between DeepL and human translations, thus aiding in assessing the current state and areas of improvement for artificial intelligence translation tools. Additionally, it provides a general overview of the adequacy of such tools in literary translation compared to human translation and suggests strategies for their more effective utilization.

References

- Chopin, K., The story of an hour, Full Text - The Story of an Hour - Owl Eyes. Available at: <https://www.owleyes.org/text/the-story-of-an-hour/read/chopins-short-story>
- Chopin, K. (1894/2018). *The story of an hour* | *Bir saatin öyküsü* (A. Tunalı, Trans.). Mütercim. <https://mutercumanblog.wordpress.com/2018/12/06/the-story-of-an-hour-bir-saatin-oykusu-1894/>
- Deacon, A. and Wilde, O. (2015) *The selfish giant*. London: Red Fox. Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York:
- Guerberos-Arenas, A., & Toral, A. (2022). Creativity in Translation: Machine Translation As a Constraint for Literary Texts. *Translation Spaces*, 11(2), 184–212.
- Ibáñez Moreno, A., & Esther Domínguez Mora, M. (2025). Google Translate versus DeepL in Spanish to English translation of Don Quixote. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 11(1), 65-87.
- Jackson, S. (1991) Charles. Mankato, MN: Creative Education.
- Ke, Z. (2024) ‘Comparison between human translation and machine translation take Lolita as an example’, *Communications in Humanities Research*, 32(1), pp. 58–64.
- Karabayeva, Irina & Kalizhanova, Anna. (2024). Evaluating machine translation of literature through rhetorical analysis. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*. 5. 1-9. 10.48185/jtls.v5i1.962.
- Kolb, W., Dressler, W. U., & Mattiello, E. (2023). Human and machine translation of occasionalisms in literary texts: Johann Nestroy’s *Der Talisman* and its English translations. *Target*, 35(4), 540-572.
- Noriega-Santiáñez, Laura & Corpas Pastor, Gloria. (2023). Machine vs Human Translation of Formal Neologisms in Literature: Exploring E-tools and Creativity in Students. *Tradumàtica tecnologies de la traducció*. 233-264. 10.5565/rev/tradumatica.338.
- Reiss K. (2000) *Translation Criticism - The Potential & Limitations. Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*. Transl. by E.F.Rhodes, Manchester/New York, St. Jerome/American Bible Society.

Rivera-Trigueros, I. (2022). *Machine translation systems and quality assessment: A systematic review*. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 56, 593–619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-021-09537-5>

Sarhsian, Evelina & Zinchenko, Olha. (2024). Utilizing Machine Translation Technology for Reproducing Short Prose Literary Texts. *Studia Linguistica*. 101-110. 10.17721/StudLing2024.24.101-110.

Short stories: The open window by Saki (no date) East of the Web. Available at: <https://www.eastoftheweb.com/short-stories/UBooks/OpeWin.shtml>

Thriven, C. 2002. Cultural Elements in Translation. The Indian Perspective. *Translation Journal*. Volume 6, No. 1 January 2002

Toral, A., & Way, A. (2015). Machine-assisted Translation of Literary Text. *Translation Spaces*, 4(2), 240–267.

Wilde, O. (1986) *Bencil Dev*. Istanbul: Esin Yayınevi.