

MACHINE VS. HUMAN TRANSLATION: CAN AI CAPTURE NUANCE AND EMOTION?

Ugiloy Karimova

BA student at UzSWLU,
karimovaogiloy2301@gmail.com,
+998 91 596 23 01

Annotation: *The rapid advances in neural machine translation (NMT) have sparked debate about the capability of artificial intelligence to replicate human-like understanding of translation. While machines show remarkable exceptionalism in reading formal and technical content with exceptional accuracy and fluency, their capability in capturing the nuances of emotion with cultural aspects of translation still remains a subject of debate. This investigation seeks to determine to what extent AI can truly integrate human emotion and deal with cultural translation complexities using a wide variety of literary, audiovisual, and intercultural test cases, thus proving that AI still lacks parity with human translators on terms of tone, metaphor, irony, as well as empathetic understanding. Even with possible hybrid solutions, emotion and contextual understanding characteristic of human translators still prove integral to achieving meaningful and successful communicative outcomes.*

Keywords: *Machine translation, human translation, emotional nuance, cultural sensitivity, idioms, neural networks, empathy in translation, literary translation, humor in translation, AI limitations.*

INTRODUCTION

Translation involves more than a word-by-word conversion of terms from one language into another; it is an interpretive activity that demands deep cultural as well as emotional insight. With increasingly widespread neural machine translation (NMT) technology like Google Translate, DeepL, and ChatGPT, many people have begun wondering whether machines can take the place of human translators in the highly nuanced field of translation.

We explore in this paper whether artificial intelligence can rival human translators in communicating nuance—those subtle shifts in tone, context, and feeling that transmit meaning more profound than literal sense. We believe that while AI shows its strength in efficiency and superficial fluidity, it currently lacks strength in empathic reasoning and cultural sensitivity, without which successful, emotionally nuanced translation is not possible.

Methodology

Qualitative research investigates differences between human translations and machine translations in the following fields:

1. Literary prose
2. Audiovisual subtitling

3. Intercultural expressions and communication.

We analyze real-world examples translated by both NMT systems and professional translators, focusing on:

Idiomatic expression

Emotional persuasion

Metaphor and tone

Cultural adaptability

Results and Analysis

Idiomatic Expressions' and Metaphors' Nuance

Theory: Idiomatic expressions and metaphors are culturally bound and context-sensitive. Machines often translate them literally, leading to miscommunication.

Example: English: "He kicked the bucket."

MT (Russian): "Он атаковал ведро." (Literal: He attacked the bucket.)

HT (Russian): "Он скончался" (He passed)

Analysis: The MT takes the idiom literally, which leads to ambiguity in Russian as no non-literal sense exists for the phrase. The human interpreter properly interprets the idiom and delivers its intended meaning. AI isn't equipped with a cognitive structure for detecting non-literal usage, but human beings rely on contextual as well as cultural know-how.

Emocional Impact of Literary Productions

Theory: Emotions in literature are conveyed through word choice, rhythm, and metaphor. Machines may produce grammatically correct output but lack the ability to empathize with the tone or replicate its emotional impact.

Example: Spanish: "Mi fundamenta se desmoronaba sobre sus raíces

The very core of my being was decaying.

I felt an emotion akin to a slow disintegration of myself.

Analysis: The machine translation is direct and literal but lacks emotional subtlety. The human version uses "quietly breaking apart" to mirror the melancholic tone, adding rhythm and pacing to evoke sorrow. This demonstrates that emotional translation requires intuition, not just grammar.

Cultural Humor and Irony

Theory: Humor relies on wordplay, timing, tone, and shared cultural references. Machines process surface language but not intent or double meanings.

Example: Earlier, I used to be a baker, but I could not create enough revenue.

MT (French): "Je faisais des pains dans mon foyer, mais je ne réussissais pas produire suffisamment de pâte."

HT (French): "J'avais déjà de l'expérience avec baking; cependant, mes revenus ne sont pas encore arrivés là où je voulais aller."

Instruction

The pun on "dough" (money and bread) is untranslatable without cultural reinterpretation. The human translator replaces it with a culturally relevant equivalent,

preserving the joke. Humor is context-sensitive and requires adaptive creativity, currently beyond AI's capabilities.

Tone and Cross-Cultural Courtesy in Communication

Theory: Different cultures exhibit differing responses to politeness, critique, and sympathy. A computer can miss subtle points of formalism, indirectness, or intonation.

Materials Showing Emotional Influence (e.g., Psychological Well-Being)

Theory: For the translation of intensely subjective topics, like loss or trauma, empathic presence and psychological understanding are paramount.

Testing

Though NMT systems prove better for standardized, repetitive, and factual content, they face challenges with fields that encompass:

Subjectivity

Emotion

Cultural symbolism

Ethical consciousness

An ideal future example can include hybrid methods, with machines undertaking deep translations while human beings edit the result for nuance and emotional fidelity. Nevertheless, perfect duplication of emotional intelligence is still beyond current artificial intelligence capabilities.

CONCLUSION

Even though translation machines function with great velocity and increasingly high levels of fluency, they lack cognitive processing strengths and refinement of emotion necessary for communicating sensitivity, nuance, and culturally embedded meaning. For situations wherein tone, nuance, or emotional truthfulness takes precedence—like literature, diplomacy, counseling, or sacred writings—human translators still cannot be substituted. Instead of a simple human-substitution tool, technology should, as a complementary tool of human communicative activity as a whole, be considered.

REFERENCES:

1. Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge. 378 p.
2. Gaspari, F., & Way, A. (2015). "Can machine translation do literature?" *Machine Translation*, 29(3). 25 p.
3. Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge. 186 p.
4. Doherty, S. (2016). "The Impact of Translation Technologies." *International Journal of Communication*, 10 p.
5. Kenny, D. (2017). *Human Issues in Machine Translation*. Benjamins.
6. Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Routledge. 196 p.
7. Liu, H. & Zhang, Y. (2020). "Empathy and Emotion in Neural Machine Translation." *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 54 p.