


Man vs Machine: A Comparison of Linguistic, Cultural, and Stylistic Levels in Literary Translation

Mohammed Juma Zagood  ¹, Alya Al-Nuaimi ², Aysha Al-Blooshi ³

¹PhD in Translation Studies, Assistant Professor, Department of Languages and Literature, UAE University, UAE & Department of English, El-Mergib University, Libya

^{2,3}Undergraduate Student, Department of Languages and Literature, UAE University, UAE

 **Corresponding Author:** Mohammed Juma Zagood, E-mail: mjmzagood@uaeu.ac.ae

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: November 21, 2020

Accepted: February 14, 2021

Volume: 4

Issue: 2

DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.2.10

KEYWORDS

Culture, Human Translation, Linguistics, Machine Translation, Style

ABSTRACT

This study aims to remark the differences between human translation (HT) and machine translation (MT) on linguistic, cultural, and stylistic levels when translating English literary texts into Arabic. To accomplish the goal of this study, a comparison between the Arabic HT and MT of Saki's (1914) short story 'The Open Window' is conducted. The study focuses on comparing the two translations (HT and MT) on linguistic, cultural, and stylistic levels to identify the differences between HT and MT in translating literary texts. Throughout this comparison, it is found out that both HT and MT have their advantages and disadvantages on different levels. It has also been found out that MT is unable to identify cultural items and consequently mistranslate them. It is, therefore, concluded that MT can work proficiently on certain levels besides the intervention of the human mind. The findings of this study provide translators using MT with a clear vision on the points of strength and weaknesses in translating literary texts.

1. Introduction

Throughout history, technology has drastically developed in order to help people do their jobs, achieve their goals, and accomplish their tasks. Recently, with the fast advancement of technology and globalisation which led to more information spread around the world and need to be translated, translators are also in need of assistance. Therefore, MT came to existence. According to Irfan (2017), Machine Translation is a computer programme created to translate a text from one language into another without human mind integration. In contrast, human translation is about dealing with a text without fully depending on computer-assisted programmes or translation tools; and that is, in fact, the translator's job. MT is "a form of automatic translation which [...] is often unable to resolve transfer issues relating to language, grammar and syntax, even terminology, with any degree of success or reliability." (Craig & Pattison 2018, p. 10). Although the term machine translation refers to three types of computerized translation process: machine aids for translators, machine-aided translation, and machine translation (Blatt et al. quoted in Baker 1998, p. 134), this study uses the term to refer to the latter only, i.e. machine translation ('Google Translate' specifically).

Artificial intelligence might, someday, replace human intelligence. Therefore, this research is conducted to help detect whether we can fully depend on MT or not by comparing its output with that of HT. Moreover, the study intends to see if MT (Google Translate) can be relied upon when translating literary works from English into Arabic. 'Google Translate' is the tool used in this study to examine the feasibility and usefulness of MT. The comparison between the Arabic HT and MT of the English short story 'The Open Window' has been made on different levels: Linguistic, cultural, and stylistic. It has been hypothesized that HT and MT have advantages and disadvantages and their output is different, yet, they can fulfill each other. Therefore, MT can be used with the intervention of HT or human mind. This study targets readers who are interested in translation and technology as one of this research's objectives is to study how functional a machine can be when it comes to translation. Consequently, this study attempts to answer the following question: *what are the differences (if any) between HT and MT when translating English literary texts into*

Arabic? In addition, two other questions are also dealt with in this study, namely: *How effective MT is compared to HT? And to what extent can MT replace HT?*

To answer the above-mentioned questions, a contrastive analysis between the Arabic HT and MT of Saki's (1914) short story 'The Open Window' is conducted. This selection is based on the assumption that prose translation in general and short story translation in particular received less interest of studies compared to poetry translation. Bassnett (2014, p. 119) states that "Although a large body of work debating the issues that surround the translation of poetry, far less time has been spent studying specific problems of translating literary prose". Therefore, this study has been conducted to study some problems of translating literary prose (short story). The study comprises the analysis of both HT and MT of the selected corpus one three main areas namely; linguistics, culture, and style. These three areas are briefly discussed below:

1.1. Linguistics

Linguistics is the science of language that mainly deals with all the aspects of the language. Catford (1965: 1) defined translation as "an operation performed on languages". Based on this definition, translation can never be separated from linguistics as they are two interrelated disciplines. Translation theories and practices are set based on the theory of how languages work, which is basically what linguistics is about (Kolawole, 2013).

There are many rules in language that show you how to write specific words or put words together to make sense. Sometimes there is more than one meaning of a word, so both HT and MT have to decide which one is appropriate to be used in that context. By that, both of them will not lose the intended meaning of the ST. It is, therefore, assumed that MT is not as capable as HT when choosing words based on their specific contexts.

1.2. Culture

Culture is where a human being belongs. According to Newmark (1988, p. 94), culture is "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression". Newmark (1988) describes culture as a way of living considering its huge part in building up people's way of life and even the way they communicate within one community using a specific language to express themselves according to their culture. Similarly, Faiq (2008, p. 35) defines culture as "shared knowledge: what the members of a particular community ought to know to act or react in specific almost preformatted ways and interpret their experience, including contact with other cultures, in distinctive ways". Culture is, therefore, the identity of a particular group of people living all together in the same area, where they share knowledge, behaviour, and habits. They communicate using a specific language that represents their cultural identity. Besides, culture involves values, food, costumes, beliefs, codes, practices, etc.

Culture plays a vital role in translation as a text might be enriched with cultural items, norms, practices, and other cultural factors targeting specific readers. Some texts carry various cultural patterns and aesthetic features. Here comes the importance of translation, where the translator understands and, then, conveys the cultural devices used by the SL writers in the ST to the TL. This is due to the fact that "translation competence is essentially about mediating between two languages and cultures rather than simply knowing and being competent in two languages and cultures" (House, 2018, p. 25). That is a sort of challenge when it comes to MT, as machines do not have the capability of understanding cultures and mediating between them in such way. On the other hand, a human translator can consult, ask, and even search if they face vagueness or difficulties in translating cultural items.

1.3. Style

Style has been defined by Crystal (1989, p. 66) as "the (conscious or unconscious) selection of a set of linguistic features from all the possibilities in a language". In a similar vein, Lynch (2001, p. 24) defines style as "a way of writing or performing: the way in which something is written or performed as distinct from the content of the writing or performance". As far as translation is concerned, several attempts have also been made to define style from translation perspective (c.f. Nida 1964, Venuti 2004, Ghazala 2011, and Bassnett 2014). Style, thus, has to do with how you express yourself with words and the way you structure your texts. Sometimes, your writing style can be an indication of your identity and culture based on the word choices and the way of writing. This is because "in any language, the same idea can be expressed differently, thus creating various linguistic forms or styles." (Almanna, 2016, p. 180).

Some examples of stylistic devices are simile, metaphor, and personification, which are used to enhance the text and give it a more sophisticated feeling. Accordingly, translators need to understand why that specific metaphor has been used in a text, its purpose and meaning; otherwise, they might miss the ST writer's intention. In this case, it would be possible to see how different HT and MT are when producing the stylistic features in the TL.

2. Review of Literature

For the last two decades with the vast development of technology and artificial intelligence, MT has drawn the attention of translators and translation technology experts. Therefore, many studies on the usefulness of MT have been conducted to compare between HT and MT. For instance, a study comparing HT with MT has been conducted by Ahrenberg (2017). The study was highly concerned with investigating how useful MT tools are in producing an adequate translation. It also assessed the difference between HT and MT. The study was conducted by taking an English opinion article entitled *'Why I Left my Liberal London Tribe'*, written by David Goodhart and published by the Financial Times on March 17, 2017 and its two Swedish translations (HT and MT). The HT, which was published in the June issue of *Axess*, Swedish magazine, did not involve any use of tools other than dictionaries. The MT was produced by using 'Google Translate' in June 2017. It turned out that HT was longer than MT in terms of the number of words and length of sentences. MT had some changes in words, but the majority was correctly rendered with some mishaps in word order. In contrast, HT was not only concerned about the grammatical errors but the style of the source text, too. The final conclusion of the study was that MT can produce a text that is more similar to the ST than HT. However, it does not mean that it is on a par with the proficiency level of HT.

Another study about MT has been conducted by Zheng (2015) to assess the efficiency and feasibility of MT. Basically, a Chinese song entitled *'我的根在草原'* (My Root's in the Grassland), and sung by Dedema, a popular Mangolian singer was chosen as a case study. The lyrics were translated into English using 12 translation tools, such as Google Translate, Lingo Translator, Baidu, etc. Zheng assumed that MT of the lyric song was not fully clear because of the excessive occurrence of translation mistakes. Therefore, the translation needed to be refined and improved. Furthermore, Zheng noticed that MT missed the style and aesthetic features of the literary language that a song might carry adding that MT might be applicable in translating non-literary texts. Eventually, it turned out that MT was not highly appreciated to be used in translating that song because of the extensive use of expressive words and figurative language. Zheng highly recommended that the outcome MT needs to be improved by human mind for better results.

A study on MT was conducted by Stiegelbauer (2012). Throughout her study, Stiegelbauer compared between HT and MT discussing the limitations of computer or MT. She argued that computers do not translate as efficiently as humans. In order to support her argument, she selected several English texts taken from Dan Brown's (*Da Vinci Code*) and Romanian texts from Marin Sorescu's writings, a Romanian writer of prose and poetry. She chose to translate these texts from English into Romanian and vice versa using Google Translate to check the proficiency of MT and see if it needs human intervention or not. She realised that the MT of the prose resulted in various mistakes under linguistic and stylistic levels. The order of the words and the use of verb tenses did not logically make sense. Moreover, some words were missed in the translations because MT did not recognise them in the original texts. As for the poems, MT did not successfully deliver the poetic style of poetry. Poems include aesthetic qualities and sound patterns of rhythms and rhymes, but MT ignored these features and kept them away. Similarly, Google Translate did not detect the meaning of words and verb tenses as what happened in the previous case when it came to translating prose. Stiegelbauer concluded that MT has some limitations and works usefully to a certain extent. The poems and prose samples she worked on helped her decide that MT is far from being consistent and accurate. She added that MT can save time and process fast compared to HT, but it can never work efficiently without any assistance from the human mind.

Another study comparing HT to MT was conducted by Jebbar (2008). In his study, Jebbar focused on the translation concept and how translators were significant throughout the past years. He also highlighted the origin and evolution of MT. Jabbar, then, selected a text for comparison. The English source text was taken from *'My Son the Fanatic'* by Hanif Kureishi and translated into Arabic by both HT and MT. The study aimed to focus on both semantic and pragmatic differences in both translations. It was stated that a translator must have the knowledge and understanding of the intended meaning before translating any text. MT is said to have emerged in the 1950s, more specifically during the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union. By this way, it would save time and be less costly to translate large amounts of papers. Jebbar (2008, p. 5) stated that "replacing HT with MT would more than likely end in failure". One of his reasons was that it is sort of difficult for machines to keep the same effect of the ST in the TL. Human translators are the only ones who understand cultural, linguistic, and semantic differences to produce an equivalent TT. Jebbar (2008) added that human translators are more efficient when it comes to reading words with different vowels or diacritic marks. Sometimes, MT would not be able to provide an equivalent term, so it is left as it is (transliterated) in the TT.

The studies listed above have mainly dealt with general comparisons between HT and MT. The way the comparisons were conducted is similar to the current study as it is a comparison between HT and MT of a specific text type, i.e. literary text. However, this research is an attempt to assess the quality of MT compared to HT, specifically on the linguistic, cultural, and stylistic levels of

a short story. Moreover, this study is different as most of the studies mentioned dealt with languages other than Arabic, which is a gap this study tries to fulfill.

3. Research Methodology

'The Open Window' is a short story, written by the British author Hector Hugh Munro, pen named as Saki, and first published in the collection 'Beasts and Super-Beasts' in 1914. Saki has been considered by English teachers and scholars as a master of short story and he was known for his ironic style in writing. His style of writing matches the settings of his stories. Saki was familiar with his social environment and he conveyed that in his writings. He had no sentiments in his writing, so this makes his criticism more effective and strengthens his plot twists. He used his stories as a way to express his opinions on human behaviour. 'The Open Window' is short story whose purpose is to show that people can be deliberately malicious and cruel, especially to people who reveal their vulnerabilities. The main character of the story, Mr. Nuttel, shared his nerve disorder with his hosts who barely know him. The fifteen-year-old Vera, Mrs. Sappleton's niece, takes advantage of this information and deliberately frightened Mr. Nuttel with a false story. Vera lies and says that her aunt's husband and two children disappeared one day while hunting. She explains that Mrs. Sappleton keeps the window open hoping that they will come back through it one day. Of course, they are quite alive. When they came in, Mr. Nuttel runs off, thinking he has seen ghosts.

This study has been basically conducted to compare between a published HT and MT of this short story 'The Open Window' into Arabic. The HT was translated by Abdulqader (2011) and published by World Association of Arab Translators & Linguists (WATA) while the MT was produced by 'Google Translate'. Adopting the comparative approach, both HT and MT were compared linguistically, culturally, and stylistically to identify the similarities and differences between them in translating literary texts. The comparative approach has been adopted because it is easy and efficient as it deals with two parties, i.e. two different translations: human vs machine. The comparison is based on three levels: linguistic, cultural, and stylistic.

4. Data collection and Analysis

As it is mentioned earlier, a short story entitled 'The Open Window' has been selected as a case study for this research. The source text is in English and the target texts (HT and MT) are in Arabic. Williams and Chesterman (2002, pp. 48-57) mention three different models of research: comparative, process, and casual. The comparative model, which is a product-oriented one, is concerned with the relationship between the ST and the TTs. Therefore, some examples have been selected to accomplish the comparison and the following procedure is adopted:

1. Reading the ST and selecting some examples for comparison (Tables 1, 2, and 3).
2. Reading the TTs to see how the selected examples were translated by HT and MT (Tables 1, 2, and 3).
3. Classifying the selected examples based on the three levels: linguistic, cultural, and stylistic.
4. Identifying the differences between HT and MT.
5. Discussing the differences identified to see how HT and MT are different.

The comparison, which is tabulated below, is divided on three sections based on the three levels: linguistic, cultural, and stylistic. Each table is divided into three columns including the ST and both HT and MT. The HT was produced by Abdulqader and published online by WATA IN 2011 while the MT was produced by using 'Google Translate' in 2020. It is worth mentioning here that the examples of the cultural level below are based on two categories of Newmark's (1988) classification of cultural items namely: ecology and material culture.

Table 1: The Linguistic Level

ST	HT	MT
"my husband and brothers will be home directly from shooting"	"سيعود زوجي وأخواري إلى البيت مباشرة من الصيد"	"سيعود زوجي وإخوتي إلى المنزل مباشرة من إطلاق النار"
they'll make a fine mess	سيتسببون بفضوى عارمة.	سيحدثون فضوى جيدة.
Here the child's voice lost its self-possessed note and became falteringly human.	هنا افتقد صوت الطفلة نبرته الواثقة وغدا متلعثمًا بصورة آدمية.	هنا فقد صوت الطفل ملاحظته التي يمتلكها ذاتيًا وأصبح بشريًا متعثراً.
She broke off with a little shudder.	وتوقفت عن الكلام برجة خفيفة.	انفصلت بقليل من الارتجاف.
Framton grabbed wildly at his stick and hat.	باهتياج خطف فرامتون عصاه وقبعته.	أمسك فرامتون بعنف في عصاه وقبعته.

Table 2: The Cultural Level

ST	HT	MT
Mackintosh	معطف مطر	ماكنتوش
The French Window	الباب الخلفي	نافذة فرنسية
Little brown Spaniel	كلبهم البني الصغير	اللوح البني الصغير

Table 3: The Stylistic Level

ST	HT	MT
"A most extraordinary man, a Mr. Nuttel," said Mrs. Sappleton	"رجل شديد الغرابة! سيد يدعى نتل" قالت السيدة سابلتون	قالت السيدة سابلتون: "أعظم رجل هو السيد نوتيل".
"On the matter of diet they are not so much in agreement," he continued.	ثم أكمل حديثه "أما فيما يتعلق بالغذاء فإنهم لم يتفقوا بالقدر ذاته"	وتابع "فيما يتعلق بالنظام الغذائي ، فإنهم لا يتفقون كثيرا".
It was a relief to Framton when the aunt bustled into the room with a whirl of apologies for being late in making her appearance.	شعر فرامتون بالراحة والفرح عندما دخلت العممة بصخب إلى الغرفة بدوامة من الاعتذارات لتأخرها في هندمة مظهرها	كان من دواعي ارتياح فرامتون عندما دخلت العممة إلى الغرفة مع دوامة من الاعتذارات عن التأخر في ظهورها
Niece	بنت الأخ	ابنة الأخ / ابنة أخت

4. Findings

The findings are divided into the three levels: linguistic, cultural, and stylistic as follows:

4.1. Linguistic Level

- 1) MT adopted literal translation in translating the story. As a result, some words made no sense and led to vague sentences. Overall, HT reads more natural Arabic in terms of the smoothness of the language. That is due to the translator's full understanding of the ST and ability to produce smooth meaningful sentences, in addition to the translation procedures and techniques he opted for in translating the story.
- 2) MT picked words randomly, disregarding the original context of the ST. On the contrary, HT seems natural because of the suitable choice of words that fit into their contexts.
- 3) Various errors have been discovered in MT under the grammatical level, whereas HT has fewer grammatical mistakes.

4.2. Cultural Level

- 1) HT is closer to the target language (Arabic) than MT, as there are some cultural words and expressions that were localized in the TT.
- 2) HT was more concerned with cultural items translating them freely, while MT was based essentially on the literal translation. Therefore, some cultural items appeared in the ST have been neglected, translated literally, and/or transliterated so their meanings were lost in the TT.

4.3. Stylistic Level

- 1) MT followed the Arabic storytelling style, while HT did not use the narrative voice, but kept it as it was in the ST.
- 2) HT reads more literary because of the stylistic devices used, such as metaphors and literary words.
- 3) MT was not consistent in translating certain words, i.e. some words appeared several times in the ST were translated differently by MT each time.
- 4) Sentences in MT were not connected cohesively as in HT, which sounded weird in Arabic.

5. Discussion

5.1. Linguistic level

In some cases, MT produced was meaningless and unclear in terms of word selection. As a result of this, many sentences lost their meanings in the TT. However, HT was produced in a smooth language where the translator translated the text freely using literary devices, so the reader feels as it is an original text. If we take “**She broke off with a little shudder**” as an example, MT mistranslated it into انفصلت بقليل من الارتجاف, while HT translated it correctly into وتوقفت عن الكلام برجة خفيفة. According to Macmillan Dictionary (2020), the phrasal verb “**break off**” means “to stop doing something, especially in speaking”. Therefore, HT here succeeded in delivering the same meaning of the ST, while MT’s suggestion is not suitable at all, and instead, it refers to a totally different thing. The language of MT in the same example is not natural and makes no sense as it is literally translated. Another example of mistranslation is when MT translated “**a fine mess**” into فوضى جيدة. In that context, the writer meant an enormous mess by saying “**a fine mess**”. As a result of relying on literal translation, MT’s suggestion is not acceptable, as it means ‘a good mess’ which contradicts the original meaning of the ST. HT, in contrast, came up with a reliable and accurate collocation ‘فوضى عارمة’ which sounds natural Arabic and conveys the exact meaning. It can be seen here that MT does not consider the context and smoothness of language. In contrast, HT takes the context into consideration first and then translates according to it. Another example for adopting literal translation by MT is the translation of the word “**shooting**” into إطلاق النار which is inappropriate in this context. In contrast, HT, taking the context into consideration, translated it correctly into الصيد. It seems that MT opts for the first meaning option comes in a list of meanings in a dictionary while HT selects the appropriate meaning based on the context.

Because of the adoption of literal translation again, MT did not translate “**Here the child's voice lost its self-possessed note and became falteringly human**” properly. It changed the whole meaning by translating it into هنا فقد صوت الطفل ملاحظته التي يمتلكها ذاتياً وأصبح بشرياً متعزراً. It is vague and unaccepted translation because of the ambiguous and unnatural structure MT produced. In contrast, HT produced smooth and meaningful translation as هنا افتقد صوت الطفل نبرته الواثقة وغدا متلعثما بصورة آدمية. Moreover, MT contained many grammatical errors. For instance, “**Frampton grabbed wildly at his stick and hat**” was rendered into أمسك فرامتون بعنف في عصاه وقبعته. MT indeed followed the verbal style that reads more Arabic, but the grammatical mistake represented in adding the preposition في affected the entire meaning. The HT باهتياج خطف فرامتون بعنف عصاه وقبعته seemed more acceptable and grammatically correct. Sometimes a change in a letter or a word can affect and alter the complete meaning.

5.2. Cultural level

The examples presented previously under the cultural level are remarkable evidence of the poor translation quality MT can produce. The cultural terms in MT were mainly translated based on the word-for-word translation. This resulted in translating ST cultural terms into words that are not suitable for their specific context. In other words, the words chosen in the TT do not carry the same meaning of those in the ST. It is obvious that MT which adopted literal translation was incapable of understanding the context in which culture is represented. Although literal translation is an efficient procedure to use in translation, it sometimes does not work accurately, especially when it comes to translating literary works.

If we take “**French Window**” as an example to support the previous statement, HT translated it into الباب الخلفي, while MT translated it literally as نافذة فرنسية. In this case, it is clear that MT did not consider the importance of logical and contextual meaning. Generally speaking, people do not enter or get out of their houses from a window, but a door. Moreover; the Cambridge Dictionary (2020) defines French window as “a pair of glass doors, usually opening from the back of a house into its garden”. In this example, HT produced better translation than MT in terms of giving a logical and reliable translation that conveys the exact meaning. Accordingly, MT seemed unable to translate some cultural words, consider the word “**mackintosh**”. It is transliterated by MT in Arabic as ماكنتوش. In contrast, HT looked for the appropriate meaning translating it into معطف مطر, which is a good selection as ‘mackintosh’ means “raincoat, especially one made from a particular kind of waterproof cloth” (Collins Dictionary).

Another example is “**Spaniel**” which was translated into كلب by the HT, whereas MT translated it into اللوح. In fact, ‘Spaniel’ is a type of dogs, thus the HT transferred it into كلب which is an accurate translation as it preserves the meaning and presents the right picture of “**Spaniel**”. However, MT’s suggestion makes no sense and does not suit the context. All in all, it can be noticed that HT is more reliable and capable of translating cultural items where the translator can consult others and search for the right equivalent revealing any ambiguity with such cultural terms and contexts by adopting appropriate translation techniques.

5.3. Stylistic level

The examples provided for the stylistic level were meant to show how competent HT is compared to MT regarding the stylistic aspects. Obviously, HT takes TT culture, audience and text type into consideration when translating any text, because that can

help specify the text style. Taking style into account, it is noticed that MT followed the Arabic storytelling way more than HT with the use of the narrative voice. For example, “**A most extraordinary man, a Mr. Nuttel, said Mrs. Sappleton**” has been translated by HT into “*قالت السيدة سابلتون: “أعظم رجل هو السيد ، رجل شديد الغرابة! سيد يدعى نتل، قالت السيدة سابلتون”*” and by MT as “*قالت السيدة سابلتون: “أعظم رجل هو السيد*””. As we can see, both translations are acceptable, but the MT stuck to the original way of Arabic storytelling style, i.e. fronting the verb and using a verbal sentence. HT, in contrast, followed the same structure of the ST, which is fine as long as the meaning is there. If we look at the cohesiveness of the sentences “**an absence of mental excitement, and avoidance of anything in the nature of violent physical exercise**” which was translated by HT into “*والابتعاد الكامل عن الإثارة العصبية وتجنب أي شيء له طابع الرياضة البدنية العنيفة*” and into “*وتجنب أي شيء في طبيعة التمارين البدنية العنيفة*” by MT. HT is more meaningful because of the way the translator put words together and structured the sentence using a pronoun for back reference in *له*. On the other hand, in the MT, the choice of words made the sentence less cohesive and little confusing for the readers to understand. In addition, MT went for the literal translation, which was not a good choice in translating the word ‘appearance’ into *مظهرها*. HT, in contrast, translated it into *هندمة مظهرها*. Both translations were acceptable, but the addition of *هندمة* in the HT added a stylistic flavour to the text making it more literary rather than literal. In translating “**On the matter of diet they are not so much in agreement, he continued**”, the HT translated it into “*ثم أكمل حديثه “أما فيما يتعلق بالغذاء فإنهم لم يتفقوا بالقدر ذاته”*” while the MT translated it into “*وتابع “فيما يتعلق بالنظام الغذائي ، فإنهم لا يتفقون كثيرا”*”. It is clear that MT chose a more literal approach to translate the sentence, while HT went with how it would be written in Arabic. That is not to say that this is right or wrong, but rather which one sounds more natural and accurate when reading it in the TL. Moreover, it has been noticed that most sentences produced by MT were verbal, which is the typical style of writing in Arabic, as Arabic sentences usually begin with a verb. However, HT neglected the verbal style producing more nominal sentences as a result of following the ST style. In fact, this is quite unusual for an Arabic literary text. There are also some problems with consistency of word choice in translating the word **niece** into the TL. In the HT, it was translated into *بنت الأخ* for both times it appeared in the ST. However, in the MT, it was translated into *ابنة أخت* the first time and *ابنة الأخ* in the second. Sometimes a change in the choice of word is fine as long as the meaning is the same, but in this case, the change in words changes the meaning and confuses the reader. That also affects the consistency and coherence of the language which impacts the general style of the text.

6. Conclusion

Having compared between HT and MT (‘Google Translate’ in this study) on linguistic, cultural, and stylistic levels, it was found out that both HT and MT were not perfect and each had its own advantages and disadvantages. MT followed the Arabic storytelling style, but had some issues with cohesion, coherence, and the structure of the sentences. In contrast, HT was more cohesive, coherent, and sentence structure was more natural apart from being affected by the ST style in some cases. HT paid more attention to the cultural items and consequently produced more culturally acceptable translation. In contrast, MT ignored the cultural aspects in translating some items. Moreover, when it comes to word choice, HT adopted a more literary approach using some stylistic devices, e.g. collocations. Therefore, it sounded smoother and more natural Arabic. In answering the research questions stated earlier, the findings of this study have shown the differences between HT and MT and how effective MT is compared to HT. They have also shown that MT cannot replace HT completely but both can work together, i.e. MT can be used but with the intervention of HT/human mind

In conclusion, MT (‘Google Translate’ in this study) would never work professionally without the involvement of human mind. Both HT and MT are not flawless, yet this does not mean that either is bad or one is superior to the other. However, HT was more acceptable than MT in some cases although MT might work more efficiently with other types of texts than literary ones. Both HT and MT can be used together efficiently if done in the right way. If this research conducted again, it would be more efficient to choose various types of texts to see how different HT and MT are in translating various types of texts. This is because this study was limited to a literary text only. Perhaps the findings of HT and MT of other text types would be different than the findings here. It is, therefore, highly recommended that further investigations are needed particularly on the usefulness of MT in translating different types of texts from English into Arabic and/or vice versa.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: We acknowledge there was no external funding support; all authors contributed accordingly in every part of the paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Ahrenberg, L. (2017). Comparing Machine Translation and Human Translation: A Case Study. In: Temnikova I, et al. (eds). *The First Workshop on Human-Informed Translation and Interpreting Technology (HiT-IT) Proceedings of the Workshop*, 7 September 2017. Shoumen: Association for Computational Linguistics. Pp. 21-28.
- [2] Almanna, A. (2016). *The Routledge Course in Translation Annotation: Arabic-English-Arabic*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [3] Baker, M. (1998). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [4] Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation Studies*. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- [5] Break off. (2020). *Macmillan Dictionary*. Available at: <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/break-off>. (Retrieved April 9, 2020).
- [6] Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [7] Craig, S. & Ann, P. (2018). *Thinking English Translation: Analysing and Translating English Source Texts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [8] Crystal, D. (1989). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [9] Faiq, S. (2008). 'The Master Discourse of Translation from Arabic'. *STJ: Sayyab Translation Journal*, 1,27-36.
- [10] French Window. (2020). *Cambridge Dictionary*. Available at <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/french-windows>. (Retrieved April 8, 2020).
- [11] Gazala, H. (2011). *Cognitive Stylistics and the Translator*. London: Sayyab Books Ltd.
- [12] House, J. (2018). *Translation: The Basics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [13] Irfan, M. (2017). *Machine Translation*. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320730405_Machine_Translation (Retrieved February 14, 2020).
- [14] Jebbar, A. (2008). 'Machine Translation Vs. Human Translation'. *Translation Directory*. Available at <https://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article126.php> (Retrieved June 12, 2020).
- [15] Kolawole, S.O. (2013). Interdisciplinary in Language, Linguistics and Translation. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*. 2 (9), 7-12.
- [16] Lynch, J. (2001). *Guide to Grammar and Style*. Available at www.andromeda.rutgers.edu (Retrieved March 19, 2020).
- [17] Mackintosh. (2020). Collins Online Dictionary. Available at <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/mackintosh>. (Retrieved June 10, 2020).
- [18] Munro, H. H. (Saki). (1914). *Beasts and Super-Beasts*. Available at <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/269/269-h/269-h.htm> (Retrieved March 9, 2020).
- [19] Munro, H. H. (Saki). (1914). *The Open Window*. Translated by Mohammed Abdulqader .2011. and published online by World Association of Arab Translators & Linguists (WATA).
- [20] Nida, E. (1964). *Towards a Science of Translation with Special Reference to principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- [21] Shi, A. (2010). *Style and Stylistic Accommodation in Translation*. Xinzhou Teachers University. Shanxi, China.
- [22] Stiegelbauer, L. (2012). Automatic Translations Versus Human Translations in Nowadays World. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 1768-1777.
- [23] Valencia, O. & Asmarani, R. (2016). The Translation Procedures of Cultural Expressions Applied in "A Game of Thrones. *LITE: Journal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 12 (2).
- [24] Venuti, L. (eds). (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [25] Williams, J. & Chesterman, R. (2002). *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*. Manchester and New York: St Jerome Publishing.
- [26] Zheng, H. (2015). A Case Study of Machine Translation: Problems and Suggestions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(2), 92.