CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA:
EVALUATION OF MT AGAINST HT

CASE 1

Abstract 1.1

Source: Data Set 1 / 1st Paragraph; 1st Sentence

Somewhere in the midst of our memory is a Chinese curse that says: "May you live in interesting time."

2HT Version:

记忆中我曾在某个地方看过华人有这么一句咒人的话："去叹世界吧"。

MT Version:

某处在迷惑中的我们记忆是中文说的诅咒："五月你在从前活"。

'May you live in interesting time' is translated as '去叹世界吧' in HT and '五月你在从前活' in MT. Both the HT and MT products do not reflect the linguistic meaning of the said expression in the source sentence (source expression). The part of MT where 'may you' is translated as '五月你' is
clearly a case of literal translation. Here the machine translator obviously does not interpret the meaning of ‘may’ in this context correctly as an expression of a wish. Meanwhile, the HT product does not show any lexical equivalence of the word 'may' in Chinese. In fact, nowhere in the HT product is a single word found to be the equivalence of any word in the source expression. In other words, the sentence meaning of the HT product totally differs from that of the source expression. This discrepancy in sentence meaning between the source text and the HT product merits detailed discussion. So does the discrepancy between the HT product and the MT product.

'叹世界' is a Chinese (Cantonese) dialectal colloquialism which means 'to enjoy'. This has the same shade of meaning as 'to have an interesting or good time'. As such, the translation of the expression 'may you live in interesting times’ into ‘去叹世界吧’ in HT is deemed appropriate in this study. (This is notwithstanding the fact that the source text author, in originally expressing a Chinese saying in English, might have actually referred to a different Chinese
colloquialism which has the same connotation as '叹世界'.)

This case demonstrates that the human translator translates utterance meaning and not sentence meaning. It also indicates that the human translator interprets correctly and understands the utterance in the source sentence, thereby performing a good job as a speaker to the hearer (i.e. the translated text reader).

As the speaker in the second tier of communication in translation (based on the 'two-tier communication in translation' model proposed in this study), the human translator in this case successfully conveys the intended meaning of the source text author (i.e. the speaker in the first tier of communication in translation) to the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer in the second tier of communication in translation). This must be based on the awareness on the part of the human translator that what a hearer is interested in is the speaker's intended meaning. (Ref: Section 2.7) In the context of the 'two-tier communication in translation' model of this study, the hearer of the second tier of communication (i.e. the translated text reader) is interested to know the utterance meaning of the speaker of the first tier of
communication (i.e. the source text author). The translator as the speaker in the second tier of communication in translation has the role to fulfil this requirement of the translated text reader, who is the ultimate hearer. As indicated earlier, the human translator in this case fulfils this role successfully.

The two preceding paragraphs are the analysis of the discrepancy in sentence meaning between the source sentence and the HT product as well as the satisfactory outcome of HT. In the following paragraphs, a detailed analysis will be made on MT in this case, both as a product and a process.

By translating the expression 'May you live in interesting time' into '五月你在从前活', MT in this case does not exhibit the sentence meaning of the source expression. In fact, the literal translation of the word 'may' into '五月' shows that MT does not look beyond the lexical level. In addition, the literal translation is an indication that the machine translator does not even have sufficient linguistic knowledge to identify the correct meaning of the word 'may' in the context.
of the source sentence. Without even operating beyond the lexical and sentence levels, MT naturally does not look into the utterance meaning and hence the intended meaning of the source text author. This in turn means that the machine translator does not convey the source text author's intended meaning to the translated text reader. The absence of utterance meaning in the MT product is a testimony to this claim.

Because of the above-mentioned flaws, MT effectively conveys no semantic or utterance meaning in this case. This constitutes failure on the part of MT in fulfilling the basic purpose of communication which is to communicate meanings. (Ref: Section 2.7). In terms of translation, MT in this case fails to fulfil the main objective of translation which is to preserve the meanings of the source text. Also, since MT fails to convey the intended meaning of the source text author to the translated text reader, the machine translator fails in its role as the speaker to the hearer.

The above linguistic flaws of MT in turn reflect the flaws of MT in the cognitive sense. As discussed in the literature
review sections of this dissertation, 'understanding' is an indispensabel cognitive phenomenon in dealing with translation and with human language in general. This particular MT product's totally lack of utterance meaning suggests that the MT mechanism involved does not understand the source sentence at all before the translation is produced. This in turn is an indication that this MT product is not produced through any cognitive phenomenon at all.

To illustrate the above point, MT in this case will be analyzed based on Relevance Theory. The first part of the analysis will revolve around the first tier of communication in translation where the source text author is the speaker and the machine translator the hearer. As this study sees it, the flaws of MT definitely start in the first tier of communication in translation.

From the perspective of Relevance Theory the above flaws of MT undoubtedly negate cognitive phenomena. In the simplest explanation based on Relevance Theory, understanding of utterance requires that the source text author (i.e. the speaker) and the machine translator (i.e. the hearer) have a
shared cognitive environment -- called 'mutual cognitive environment' -- where both parties share the same mental representations and are both aware that the other party shares the said representations. The machine translator, as the hearer, must also be able to cognitively focus on the most relevant information to recover what the source text author (i.e. the speaker) intends to convey. In this case, judging from the total lack of sense and utterance meaning in the MT product, the above cognitive phenomena clearly do not exist between the machine translator and the source text author in the MT process; and there is clearly no shared mental representation between both parties. As such, the machine translator, as the hearer, is incapable of interpreting and thereby understanding the source text author's (i.e. the speaker's) intention; it is incapable of focusing on the most relevant information to achieve this end.

Probing further into the above-mentioned MT flaws from the perspective of Relevance Theory, it can even be said that communication never takes place between the source text author and the machine translator: according to Relevance Theory, communication takes place in the human mind,
specifically in the mutual cognitive environment of the speaker and the hearer.

In the context of this study, this particular case of communication failure is seen as two-fold. The first communication failure happens between the source text author and the machine translator, in the first tier of communication in translation. The second communication failure happens between the machine translator and the translated text reader, in the second tier of communication in translation. The communication failure in the first tier of communication in translation has just been briefly analyzed in the preceding paragraphs. The communication failure in the second tier of communication in translation will be analyzed in the following paragraphs.

As perceived in this study, communication failure in the second tier of communication in translation starts at the level of the speaker, that is the machine translator. By conveying a semantically and pragmatically meaningless linguistic string '五月你在从前活', the machine translator evidently does not fulfil the thesis of 'relevance' in Relevance Theory.
According to 'relevance', the human mind focuses on the most relevant information available; and hence to communicate is to claim an individual's attention by implying that the information communicated is relevant. In this case, the mind of the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer) is presumed to operate in the manner proposed in 'relevance', that is, it focuses on the most relevant information in an attempt to understand the linguistic string "某处在迷惑中我们的记忆是中文说的诅咒："五月你在从前活。" presented by the machine translator (i.e. the speaker). However, for a start, there is no meaningful intention on the part of the machine translator to enable the translated text reader to initiate such a role. Without an intention, the machine translator (as the speaker) naturally does not imply to the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer) that the information presented in the MT product is relevant to claim the latter's attention. When the machine translator fails to claim the translated text reader's attention, what it tries to communicate produces no cognitive effects in the mind of the latter, and is therefore not relevant.
More elaborately, from the perspective of Relevance Theory, there should be a set of assumptions, namely context, in the mind of the translated text hearer that necessarily interacts with 'information' presented by the machine translator in order to render the 'information' relevant. Within this interaction process, the translated text reader should be able to interpret and thereby understands the information. In this particular case under analysis, however, such a process does not take place at all. This is because there is no 'real information' presented by the machine translator to interact with the translated text reader's cognitive context, to achieve 'relevance in context' in the mind of the translated text reader; the translated text reader is therefore unable to interpret and understand the 'information'. The ultimate cause of this failure, as explained in the preceding paragraph, is the failure on the part of the speaker to present 'real information' that consists of intent for the hearer to process. The result, as identified in the very beginning of this analysis of CASE 1, is that the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer) finds no sense, utterance meaning and even sentence meaning in the MT product.
CASE 2

Abstract 1.2

Source: Data Set 1 / 14th Paragraph; 3rd Sentence

Now I've been offered two very affordable drivers and one of them currently drives my friend around in a Kancil!

HT Version:

现在，有人向我提议两位我请得起的司机，其中一个目前驾驶一辆
灵鹿载我的朋友！

MT Version:

现在我已经被提供他们的二个非常可提供的驾驶和一位Kancil
在附近现在驾驶我的朋友！

The MT product is obviously a semantically meaningless linguistic string. It has no semantic meaning, let alone utterance meaning or pragmatic meaning. Therefore MT in this case can be deduced to have the same defects as those in CASE 1, in both linguistic sense and cognitive sense.

One salient point to highlight here is that once again MT fails to effect 'relevance' in relation to 'context' as explicated in the last part of the analysis of CASE 1. For this case
(CASE 2) however, further analysis will be made on how the machine translator fails in the same regard as a speaker, in the second tier of communication in translation, that is, in the communication between the machine translator and the translated text reader.

First of all, the series of factors that lead to the failure in communication itself must be clarified. As this study sees it, the scenario of the failure can be depicted as follows:

['information' presented by the machine translator (i.e. the speaker) does not share any portion of the context of the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer)] \+ [no mutual cognitive environment exists between the machine translator and the translated text reader] \rightarrow no interaction takes place between the 'information' and the context of the translated text reader \rightarrow no contextual implication/cognitive effect is produced in the mind of the translated text reader \rightarrow no 'relevance' is achieved \rightarrow no interpretation of the intended meanings of the source text author \rightarrow no understanding of the utterance meanings of the source text.
Context, being a psychological construct in Relevance Theory, includes a host of cognitive elements. However, 'context of the translated text reader', as mentioned in the above explication, would, among other things, include the translated text reader's assumptions about language in general and the linguistic system/rules of the target language in particular. Being the hearer, the translated text reader would only begin to make sense of and understand the translated text if the following condition prevails: the linguistic strings in the translated text are in line with the translated text reader's knowledge about the way the target language is structured and used for the purposes of communication.

In this case, the linguistic string ‘现在我已经被提供他们的二个非常可提供的驾驶和一在Kanci1 在附近现在驾驶我的朋友！’ in MT is linguistically incomprehensible to the translated text reader. This is because it does not conform to the Chinese language structure and does not constitute meanings as a whole. (This is despite the fact that it contains some grammatical constructions which are meaningful by
themselves namely ‘现在我已经被提供’, ‘他们的’, ‘二个’, ‘非常’, ‘可提供’, ‘驾驶’, ‘在附近’, ‘现在’). More precisely, this linguistic string does not fulfil the translated text reader's knowledge and assumptions about the Chinese language. It is not relevant in the context of the Chinese language itself; it is also not relevant in the context of the translated text reader that pertains to the Chinese language.

In addition to the above, 'context of the translated text reader' would necessarily include the translated text reader's assumptions about the world around him. In other words, the said context encompasses the translated text reader's encyclopedic knowledge. This claim is only logical because, even if a certain linguistic string conforms perfectly to the linguistic rules or norms of a certain language concerned, a hearer would still need some prior knowledge about the world around him as a basis to interpret and understand the meaning of the utterance. This line of argument is in tandem with the following assertion in Relevance Theory: Encyclopedic knowledge (that appears in chunks in the cognitive environment of individuals) is necessary for the
inferencing process which, in turn, is essential for the understanding of utterances. (Ref: Section 2.4)

In this case under analysis, the meaninglessness of the linguistic string in the MT product deters the translated text reader from reaching the stage where he could apply his encyclopedic knowledge to understand the utterance meaning. What happens is, due to lack of 'relevance' in the linguistic context, the translated text reader is not even able to apply his linguistic knowledge to understand the sentence meaning. Without reaching the sentence meaning first, there is no way the translated text reader could apply his encyclopedic knowledge to reach the utterance meaning. The whole scenario could be more elaborately explained as follows: The translated text reader, being the hearer, must utilize his linguistic knowledge to arrive at the sentence meaning before utilizing his non-linguistic knowledge to uncover the utterance meaning. In other words, the translated text reader must understand the sentence meaning (i.e. first level of meaning) before he could understand the utterance meaning (i.e. second level of meaning). However, in this case under analysis, the process of uncovering even the first level of
meaning does not come into fruition. This naturally renders the process of uncovering the second level of meaning unattainable.

The above is an account of the failure on the part of the machine translator as the speaker in the second tier of communication in translation. For the rest of this analysis of CASE 2, the HT will be accounted for instead, with the focus on the role of the human translator, again as the speaker in the second tier of communication in translation.

It is interesting to note that, while 'Kancil' is not translated in MT, it is translated as '灵鹿' in HT. Also, the actual equivalence of 'kancil' (i.e. mousedeer) in the Chinese language is '鼠鹿' and not '灵鹿'. As regard the latter, it could be construed that the human translator's translation is inaccurate. On the other hand, both the above observations could be construed to indicate that the human translator knows something about 'Kancil' in the context concerned that the machine translator does not. In fact, based on the social context where the translated text is meant to be read, there is
every reason to believe that the translation is performed with rationale and understanding.

This study believes that the human translator not only knows that 'Kancil' is a local car in Malaysia, but also that it is named as '灵鹿' and not '鼠鹿' in the Chinese language. This study also deduces that, if the human translator has the above knowledge about the Kancil car, she must also know that Kancil is the most economical car in the Malaysian context. From here, it could be further deduced that the human translator's placement of an exclamation mark at the end of the target sentence is justified. This means that in the first place the human translator knows the rationale behind the exclamation mark in the source sentence: she knows why it is extraordinary and surprising for one to be driven around by a chauffeur in a Kancil car. In addition, the human translator's knowledge with regard to the said exclamation mark is believed to be substantiated by yet another set of encyclopedic knowledge, that is, the encyclopedic knowledge pertaining to the hiring of chauffeurs. One aspect of this latter set of encyclopedic knowledge that is particularly pertinent to this case would be as follows: those who can
afford to hire chauffeurs own big and expensive cars and not an economical car-like the Kancil. In other words, it is believed that the human translator applies her knowledge about the Kancil car and about the hiring of chauffeurs in the translation process; and such knowledge pertains to the Malaysian social context where the source text was produced and where the target text is read. In short, it is believed that in the HT process, the human translator takes into consideration and applies encyclopedic knowledge that is relevant to the context.

The above analysis of HT demonstrates how encyclopedic knowledge plays a part in the HT process. Nevertheless, just as translation is seen in this study as a two-tier communication process, the role of encyclopedic knowledge in HT is also seen to be twofold. The human translator is believed to first apply encyclopedic knowledge when she plays the role as the hearer in the first tier of communication in translation. At this stage, her encyclopedic knowledge enables her to infer, interpret and thereby understand the source text meanings. Thereafter, when the translator enters the second tier of communication in translation where she
acts as the speaker, the said encyclopedic knowledge -- coupled with the knowledge of the utterance meanings of the source text that she has acquired in the first tier of communication in translation -- makes it possible for her to convey the source text meanings accurately to the translated text reader.

The above explication of how encyclopedic knowledge is used in the HT process would not be complete without the inclusion of the place of mutual cognitive environment in the process. As mentioned in Section 1.2.3.1, in Relevance Theory verbal communication is claimed to take place in the mutual cognitive environment of the speaker and the hearer. As seen in this study, the mutual cognitive environment between the source text author (i.e. the speaker) and the human translator (i.e. the hearer) in the first tier of communication in translation, as well as the mutual cognitive environment between the human translator (i.e. the speaker) and the translated text reader (i.e. the hearer) in the second tier of communication in translation are closely associated with the encyclopedic knowledge of all the parties involved. The following two paragraphs will attempt to illustrate this
point, through the exposition of the scenario in the first tier of communication in translation.

In the first tier of communication in translation (i.e. the communication between the source text author and the human translator), the human translator and the source text author shares the same understanding and concepts about the Kancil car as well as the hiring of chauffeurs. Such shared understanding and concepts are only part of the encyclopedic knowledge of the source text author and the human translator respectively. This means that the source text author and the human translator each has a host of other knowledge pertaining to the Kancil car and to the hiring of chauffeurs that they previously acquired through their own experiences; but there is one part of their respective knowledge in this regard that is mutual. The context of the source sentence and the related contexts happen to fall within the domain of such mutual knowledge between the source text author and the human translator.

However, as seen in this study, mutual knowledge itself would not create the desired cognitive effects, namely
interpretation and understanding in the communication process between the source text author and the human translator: the mutual knowledge has to be cognitively processed in some cognitive environment. As discerned in this study, this 'cognitive environment' is none other than the minds of the source text author and the human translator -- specifically the part of their respective cognition that shares the same assumptions about the Kancil car and the hiring of chauffeurs. As this study relates it, this part of the mutual cognition constitutes the 'mutual cognitive environment' that Relevance Theory claims to be the venue of communication.

CASE 3

Abstract 2.1

Source: Data Set 2 / 8th Paragraph; Last Sentence & 9th Paragraph; 1st and 2nd Sentences

We like to think of ourselves as a developed society just because we can own every gadget conceivable.

The fact that our minds have been left behind in this race to get ahead has not bothered us a jot. When we examined how susceptible we still remain to all sorts of rumor and
superstition, it becomes clear that we haven't really come that far at all.

HT Version:

我们喜欢把自己看成是个先进的社会，只因为我们能够拥有每一个可以想得到的玩意。

虽然力争上游之中我们的思想落在后头，却一点也不令我们烦恼。当我们审视我们仍然那么容易受到各种谣言和迷信影响时，就能清楚知道我们并未真正这么先进。

MT Version:

我们自行喜欢想当做被发展的社会仅仅因为我们能拥有是想得到的每个机械的装置。

我们的思想已经被在这个种族在後地留下到达向前地的事实还没有烦恼我们一个少量。当我们检查的时候如何易受影响者我们仍然保持到谣言和迷信所有的种类，它变成清楚我们一点也不真地来那远的。

In this case, the MT product once again displays irrelevancy in that it makes no sense to a human reader. As in CASE1 and CASE 2, such irrelevancy on the part of MT is seen as a reflection of the absence of 'relevance' in the MT process.
As mentioned and explicated in earlier parts of this dissertation, 'relevance' in the translation process is achieved through a number of factors. As this study sees it, once 'relevance' is achieved, the hearer would be able to make 'inferences' and thereby be able to interpret and understand the speaker's intended meaning. As such, this study maintains that 'inferencing' is the bridge between 'relevance' and interpretation/understanding in the translation process. In other words, 'inferencing' is the pre-requisite for interpretation and understanding in the first stage of the translation process.

In this case (CASE 3), since MT has a flaw of not fulfilling 'relevance', the machine translator certainly cannot take the step of 'inferencing' before producing the translation. The following analysis with regard to the translation of the word 'gadget' in MT is hoped to illustrate this point.

The only referential meaning of 'gadget' is 'small mechanical device or tool'. The machine translator in this case translates 'gadget' into '机械' which accurately represents the referential meaning of the former. This situation is similar to
that in CASE 1 where the source word 'may' is translated into '五月', reflecting one of the referential meanings of the former. However, in both CASE 1 and CASE 2, the respective referential meanings are incompatible with the contexts of the source text and target text. In each case, the referential meaning is not the meaning intended by the source text author.

In terms of the code model of communication, it is evident that the machine translator decodes the word 'gadget' linguistically to recover its semantic representation. However, the word 'gadget' is just a lexeme, a linguistic form in which the source text author encodes her intended meaning; it does not represent the said intended meaning. (This is despite the fact that some authors do encode their intended meanings in linguistic forms that explicitly represent the intended meanings.) This means that at the stage of translation where the machine translator is a hearer, MT merely completes the first process of the overall communication process, namely coded communication process. It is unable to proceed to the second communication process, that is the inferential
communication process, to decipher the intended meaning of the source text author.

The non-fulfillment of the inferential communication process not only indicates that the machine translator does not know the intention of the source text author, but also that it does not take into consideration 'context' in the translation process. The rationale of this assertion is that without knowing both the intention of the source text author and the context, it is impossible for a translator to make inferences and thereby interprets and understands the source sentence. In addition, although the machine translator knows the semantic representation of the word 'gadget', without knowing the context it is unable to recover the explication, that is, the semantic representation which has been enriched with additional information. This inadequacy in terms of explication is yet another factor that impedes the machine translator from interpreting and understanding the source sentence. In summary, the machine translator is unable to make inferences in this case because it has no access to three elements relating to the source sentence, namely 1) the intention of the source text author, 2) the context of both the
source text and the source text author and 3) the explicature surrounding the source sentence.

The above analysis with regard to inferencing in the translation process is based on the thesis in Relevance Theory which maintains that verbal communication consists of two processes, namely coded communication process and inferential communication process. According to this thesis of Relevance Theory, inferencing is indispensable in the interpretation of meanings in verbal communication.

So far in this analysis, it has been claimed that the failure of MT in conveying the pragmatic meaning of the word 'gadget' in the context concerned is due to non-fulfillment of 'relevance' and 'inferencing'. An analysis has also been made as to how MT succeeds in the coded communication process but fails in the inferential communication process. In addition, three factors that constitute the causes of the MT failure have also been identified. In summary, so far it has been pointed out that the translation of 'gadget' into '机械' in MT is unsuitable; and the underlying faults in the MT process that lead to this translation flaw have been analyzed.
Nevertheless, the analysis of this case would not be complete without an explanation as to why the translation of 'gadget' into '机械' in MT is deemed unsuitable. To address this question, it is necessary to examine not only the context of the source sentence but also the contextual relations between the source sentence and the sentences before it and after it. In fact, to be more precise, it is necessary to examine the overall context of the entire source text or, at least, the parts of the source text that revolve around the same subject matter as the source sentence. Simply put, it is necessary to examine the source text 'in context'.

Through the interlinking of the source sentence with its surrounding sentences and the entire source text in the contextual sense, two aspects of the source text immediately become clear. Firstly, the theme of the source text is human mentality. Secondly, the subject matter of the source sentence and its surrounding sentences is mental maturity and quality of mentality. These two facts in turn imply that the word 'gadget' in the context does not specifically mean tools, machine parts or anything of this category only. Instead, it can be construed to mean anything that people are able to
create, purchase, own, enjoy, involve in or indulge in, with whatever means they have based on their supposedly 'developed' status. Simply put, the definition of 'gadget' in this context is very wide, covering a great variety of things and areas. In addition, the interlinking of the source sentence with the sentences before it and after it (Ref: Data Abstract 2.1) reveals that these sentences are put together by the source text author to bring across a point: that the maturity and mentality of the society concerned are not as impressive as the exterior sophistication that they can afford to have.

With the above conclusions about the context of the source text and the definition of the word 'gadget' in the context, this study has answered the question as to why the translation of the word 'gadget' into '机械' in MT is unsuitable. It is unsuitable simply because it confines the meaning of 'gadget' to the category of tools and mechanical devices, whereas, based on the context of the source text, a word with broader meanings is necessary.
Given the above, the challenge is to find a suitable translation for the word 'gadget' in the context of the source text and to explain its suitability.

Since the definition of the phrase 'every gadget conceivable' is wide-ranging, the word 'gadget' itself can be translated in more than one way. This is provided that the translation is consistent with the context of the source text. As this study sees it, in HT the translation of the word 'gadget' into '玩意' is a suitable option.

The referential meaning of '玩意' in English is 'toy' or 'plaything'. But '玩意' can also be used to connote things that are new, fresh or novel. Both these referential meaning and connotative meaning of '玩意' can be accepted to be part of the many possible meanings of the word 'gadget' in the context of the source text. This is because, as mentioned earlier, in the context of the source text, 'gadget' can be construed to mean a host of things, including things to enjoy and things that are newly created. Moreover, as the source sentence and the surrounding sentences revolve around the
topic of a society being developed and advanced, 'gadget' in this context includes things that are advanced, modern, up-to-date or sophisticated. Things with such characteristics fall under the category of '玩意' considering that '玩意' can be used to connote things that are new, fresh or novel. Another way where '玩意' is congruent with 'gadget' is with regard to the connotative meaning of 'gadget' which refers to things that are complicated and unnecessary (Ref: Collin Cobuild Dictionary). This is because 'playthings' as well as 'things that are new, fresh and novel' as referred to by the lexeme '玩意' can sometimes prove to be complicated and unnecessary in the practical sense.

Based on the above exploration of the source text context, the meanings of 'gadget' and '玩意' as well as the correlation between the meanings of these two lexemes, this study once again concludes that the translation of the word 'gadget' into '玩意' in HT is suitable. The human translator's cognition is believed to undergo an exploration of the meanings of 'gadget' and '玩意' before choosing '玩意' for the translation. The rationale behind her choice may or may
not be exactly the same as the rationale given above. However, the evident rationality of the choice suggests that some cognitive mechanism transpires in the translation process. Equally significant, the rationality suggests that this mechanism includes appreciation and consideration of the context involved. In other words, based on the rationality of the choice, it is believed that the choice is made not at random but based on contexts.

The translation of 'gadget' into '玩意' amid the many possible translations clearly indicates that a choice has been made during the HT process. In fact, based on Relevance Theory, the specific context on which the choice of translation is based is itself a choice. On this basis, this study believes that the human translator chooses the context before choosing the right lexical item for translation. Also, it is believed that the choosing of context takes place at the stage of utterance interpretation in the translation process (in the first tier of communication in translation where the translator is a hearer). Unlike conventional approaches to utterance interpretation that assume that a specific context is given by the speaker when communicating, Relevance Theory assumes
that the specific context must be actively searched for by the hearer in the interpreting process. Based on the above analysis, the human translator -- but not the machine translator -- is seen to have the ability to fulfil this requirement of context search in the interpreting process in the first tier of communication in translation.

CASE 4

Abstract 3.1

Source: Data Set 3 / 20th Paragraph ; 1st Sentence

Every human being deserves respect as a living human being created by God; those who do not respect other human beings, by treating them cruelly or by killing them, do not deserve that respect.

HT Version

每个人都应受到跟上苍创造的其他人一样的尊重。不尊重别人--残酷对待，或加以杀害 -- 的人，不应获得这种尊重。
MT Version

每个人类应得到尊敬当做被上帝创造活的人类；那些不尊敬其他人类的人，被注入他们残忍地或藉由杀害他们，不该得到那尊敬。

MT in this case is not as faulty as MT in the previous cases. It consists of more grammatical constructions. The phrase ‘那些不尊敬其他人类的人’ which supposedly represents ‘those who do not respect other human beings’ would be a perfect translation if the lexical item ‘人类’ (i.e. ‘human race’) were more aptly replaced with "人" (i.e. 'human beings'). Similarly, the translation of the clause ‘every human being deserves respect’ into ‘每个人类应得到尊敬’ would be a perfect translation if the machine translator have ‘人类’ in the translation substituted for by ‘人’. The phrase ‘不该得到那尊敬’ is also almost perfect; it would be perfect if the word ‘那’ were removed.

The above observations show that MT is able to translate rather well insofar as the lexical meaning and structural meaning of the source text are direct; however, it is unable to
recognize the subtlety or the delicate nuances of language behind the lexical and structural meanings. The flaws of MT mentioned in the preceding paragraph are some cases in point: the flaws in the MT phrases and clauses under analysis are subtle; so are the pragmatic meanings of the original lexical items for which the translation is done.

'Human beings' or '人' in Chinese means people, that is, women, men and children. On the other hand, 'human race' or '人类' in Chinese refers to humankind, that is, human beings as a group. There is effectively a subtle difference in meanings between these two lexical items. This difference becomes significant when the lexical items are used in a context. In this case, 'human beings' in the phrase 'those who do not respect other human beings' refers to people as individuals and not as a group against other life forms. So is the case with the 'human being' in 'every human being deserves respect'. As for the translation of the phrase 'do not deserve that respect' into '不该得到那尊敬', the word '那' is redundant because its presence does not conform to the Chinese language structure. This is despite the fact that
literally the Chinese word ‘那’ is the equivalence of the word ‘that’ in the phrase ‘do not deserve that respect’.

The above is an explication of how MT in this case fails to handle subtle nuances in language. The root of this inadequacy is again the lack of consideration of ‘context’ in MT. In the two cases involving the inappropriate use of the lexical item ‘人类’ (human race) instead of ‘人’ (human being), MT does not take into consideration the context of the source text. For the other case involving the unnecessary use of the redundant lexical item ‘那’, MT does not take into consideration the context of the target language, specifically the structure of the Chinese language it is dealing with.

A very significant flaw of MT in this case is the translation of the term ‘God’ into ‘上帝’ for the sentence ‘Every human being deserves respect as a living human being created by God’. This translation is not at all wrong because ‘God’ is indeed ‘上帝’ for countless number of people. However, when the social contexts of the source text author and the translated text author are taken into consideration, the said
translation is not appropriate. As the source text was produced in Malaysia and its target readers are Malaysians who are multi-cultural and multi-religious, the translator should be mindful of the fact that not everyone's god is '上帝'. '上帝' is specifically the God in Christianity while the God for every other religion is also specific. The machine translator should have the word 'God' translated into '上苍' as the human translator does in HT. Unlike '上帝' which is specific, '上苍' is generic, generally representing the Supreme Being of various religions respectively, especially Christianity, Islam and Judaism.

Just as the earlier cases in this analysis of CASE 4, the fact that MT fails to handle subtlety in meanings indicates that MT fails to take into consideration 'context' in the translation process. This further means that MT is incapable of making choices as to the actual context intended by the source text author.

In terms of Relevance Theory, the failure on the part of MT to handle subtlety in meanings indicates failure of
communication between the source text author and the machine translator. The reasoning behind this assertion is as follows: Even though the source text author does have intentions (i.e. ostensions) or rather, intended meanings to convey to the hearer, the intended meanings fail to claim the machine translator's attention simply because the latter is incapable of paying attention to the intended meanings. More elaborately, even though the source text author -- with intentions and through the means of semantic representations, explicatures, propositions and implicatures -- aims to imply to the hearer that the content of the source text is relevant, the machine translator, as the hearer, is unable to focus on the most relevant information to uncover the 'relevance' in the source text.

As this study sees it, there is a close connection between making choices regarding the intended context of the source text and 'relevance'. The machine translator's inability to choose the context intended by the source text author can be deduced to be the result of the machine translator's inability to focus on the most relevant information pertaining to the source text meanings.
In this case (CASE 4) under analysis, the inappropriate use of the lexical items ‘人’ and ‘上帝’ instead of ‘人类’ and ‘上苍’ respectively can be further explicated in terms of the above-mentioned correlation between making choices regarding context and 'relevance'. The following is the explication: The machine translator is unable to focus on the most relevant implicit/explicit information pertaining to the source text meanings in order to choose the context intended by the source text -- so as to proceed to choose the right lexical items, namely ‘人’ and ‘上帝’ instead of ‘人类’ and ‘上苍’ respectively. If only the machine translator is able to do this, it would be able to discover the 'relevance' of the information communicated by the source text author. When this happens, the greatest cognitive effects would have transpired in the 'mind' of the machine translator; and communication would have taken place between the minds of the machine translator and the source text author.

As evident from the above explication, 'relevance' is very closely related to 'context'. In fact, the failure on the part of the machine translator to achieve 'relevance' as hearer in this
case is attributed to its failure to address 'context'. In Relevance Theory; context is the subset of a hearer's assumptions about the world. As such, the failure on the part of machine translator to effect 'relevance' in this case reflects a few facts about the machine translator with regard to assumptions. Firstly, the machine translator does not have the necessary assumptions with regard to '人類', '人', '上帝' and '上苍'. Secondly, the machine translator does not have the necessary assumptions about the difference between '人類' and '人' as well as the difference between '上帝' and '上苍'. Thirdly, the machine translator does not have the assumptions about the human translator's assumptions in relation to the words 'human being' and 'God' in the source text. Fourthly, the machine translator does not have any shared assumptions with the source text author as far as 'human being' and 'God' are concerned.

The importance of a translator's assumptions in the interpretation of the source text author's intended meaning is reflected in the following claim in Relevance Theory: it is the hearer's assumptions about the world, rather than the
actual state of the world, that affect the interpretation of an utterance. In this case involving the word 'God', for example, it is understandable that the source text author does not refer specifically to the God in Christianity when she says 'Every human being deserves respect as a living human being created by God ... ... '. However, as the 'mind' of the machine translator lacks assumptions about the world, the machine translator is unable to carry out interpretation to discover the intended meaning of the source text author. The assumptions that are wanting, among other assumptions, are in relation to the world's religions, the politically correct manner of referring to religion, the nature of a multi-religious society and the sensitivity of people regarding their religions. On the other hand, supposing the machine translator does have assumptions of its own in relation to the above-mentioned aspects, the translation of 'God' into '上帝' instead of '上苍' shows that the machine translator's assumptions are not in accord with the reality of the world. This latter hypothetical circumstance is a case where the hearer's assumptions about the world, rather than the actual state of the world, determine the interpretation of an utterance.
The above analysis explicates how the totally lack of assumptions about the world or the assumptions that is not in line with the reality of the world may deter MT from interpreting the intended meaning of the source text author.

While this study identifies the former inadequacy as the causative factor of MT's failure in this case, in any circumstance, 'assumptions about the world', namely 'context' is the determinant of MT's successful interpretation of the intended meaning in the source text.

CASE 5

Abstract 3.2

Source: Data Set 3 / 24th Paragraph

It is easy if you don't think of people as completely human to not bother to lift a finger to help, because we believe that human beings are the highest order in life and we should help other humans, not these "sub-humans". (This attitude, by the way, also extends to relatives of "sub-humans").

HT Version

如果你不把人当成完整的人，连举手之劳的事也不屑去做，是不对的，因为我们相信人类是最高级的生命，我们应该帮助别的人
类，而不是“次人类”。（这种态度，也延伸到“次人类”的亲属。）

**MT Version**

如果你不想到人，它是容易的当做完全地人到不烦忧举起手指帮助，因为我们相信人类是生活里最高的次序，而且我们应该帮助其他的人，不这些“补充人员一人”（这"attitude",藉着方式，对“补充人员一人”的亲戚也扩充。）

**Similar to CASE 4, MT in this case exhibits some grammatical constructions.** The clauses ‘因为我们相信人类是生活里最高的次序’ and ‘而且我们应该帮助其他的人’ are both grammatically perfect. However, when their meanings are read 'in context', the flaw in MT immediately becomes obvious. The flaw, as identified in this study, is none other than the lack of consideration of context.

**In translating the clause ‘human beings are the highest order in life’ into ‘人类是生活里最高的次序’, the machine translator obviously does not understand the meanings of the word ‘life’ and the phrase ‘the highest order’ respectively in the**
context of the source sentence. On the other hand, the translation of the same clause into ‘最高级的生命’ in HT evidently indicates that the human translator interprets and understands correctly the pragmatic meanings of the word ‘life’ and the phrase ‘the highest order’ respectively in the source sentence. In the context of this source sentence, ‘life’ is definitely not intended to mean ‘a way of living’ as in ‘生活’ but ‘living things’ which can be represented by ‘生命’ in Chinese. It is also obvious that the intended meaning for the phrase ‘the highest order’ is ‘the highest class’, that is, ‘最高级’ as in HT and not ‘the highest level of the state where things are neatly and carefully arranged’ as conveyed by ‘最高的次序’ (Ref: Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary).

For the above-mentioned word and phrase, the difference between the intended meanings and the meanings of the translated versions can be deemed to be subtle. This situation is similar to the few cases highlighted in CASE 4. As perceived in this study, subtlety in meanings poses a great challenge to a translator. In order to meet this challenge, a translator must be very sensitive about the context involved.
Appreciation of and access to context in turn enable the translator to make 'informed interpretations' regarding the source text meanings. By 'informed interpretation', this study refers to interpretation that is made possible through inferencing. Based on the description given in Relevance Theory, 'inferences' are conclusions derived from context. The whole issue of dealing with subtle meanings in translation therefore boils down to the fact that context is indispensable in the translation process.

This study notes that in both the HT product and MT product under analysis, the translation is rather direct. This is particularly prominent in the translation of the second part of the source sentence: '... because we believe that human beings are the highest order in life and we should help other humans, not these "sub-humans."' This particular clause contains an implied meaning with regard to the first part of the sentence 'It is easy if you don’t think of people as completely human to not bother to lift a finger to help...'. The implied meaning is that we should help all humans, including disabled people and sick people. In translating both the above clauses directly, HT and MT do not convey
the implied meaning intended by the source text author. As this study sees it, for an ambiguous and satirical source text such as this one under analysis, direct translation should be avoided in order not to convey wrong or ambiguous meanings. As the speaker to the translated text reader, the translator's job is to reproduce the intended meaning of the source text author.

In respect of MT, its failure to convey the source text author's implied meaning in this case can be traced back to one of the following two flaws in MT: 1) no inferencing and interpretation transpires in the 'mind' of the machine translator; 2) the machine translator makes inaccurate inferences and interpretations about the intended meaning of the source text author.

As discerned in this study, the machine translator definitely does not gain access to the context, implicature and attitude intended by the source text author before performing the translation. The failure on the part of MT to access the context, implicature and attitude intended by the source text author is in effect a manifestation of MT's failure to effect
interpretation of the source text. This presumption is based on the concept of 'interpretation' in Relevance Theory where 'interpretation' accounts for not only what the speaker intends to express, but also the context, implicature and attitude intended by the speaker. With this train of presumptions, this study concludes that inferencing and interpretation never take place in the MT process in this case. In other words, in respect of the two hypothesized causes of MT's failure in this case, this study identifies the non-existence of inferencing and interpretation as the ultimate root of the failure.

Another way of probing into the origin of the MT failure in this case is by basing the analysis on the following assertion in Relevance Theory: the hearer entertains thoughts and not semantic representations. A comparison between the source sentence and the MT product shows that the latter contains merely some ungrammatical linguistic strings and some sentence meanings; it contains no pragmatic meanings. This suggests that the machine translator does not entertain thoughts but the semantic representations in the source text.
In entertaining just the semantic representations and not the thoughts in the source text, the machine translator's 'mind' only undertakes the process of linguistic decoding; it does not go beyond linguistic decoding to undertake the process of inferencing. Without reaching the stage of inferencing, it would not be able to infer one after another the propositional form, the explicatures and the implicatures of the source text. In effect, the machine translator falls short of turning the decoded semantic representations into mental representations that can later be used as assumption schemas for the inferencing process.

1 As the arrangement of paragraphs in the HT product and MT product sometimes differs from that in the source text, the sequence of paragraph quoted in the analysis refers to that of the latter.

2 HT/MT refers to Human Translation/Machine Translation as a process or an act of translating, depending on the circumstances.