

**Journal of African Languages and Literary Studies  
(JoALLS)**

ISSN 2633-2108 (Print) ISSN 2633-2116 (Online)

Accredited by DHET (the South African regulator of Higher Education) and is indexed by SCOPUS, IBSS, COPERNICUS, EBSCO and Sabinet

Volume 7, Number 1, March, 2026

Pp 351-366

**Translation in Emerging Technologies: Analysis of Text-Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Human Translation in *Half of a Yellow Sun***

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31920/2633-2116/2026/v7n1a18>

**Edirin Sylvester Otegbale, (Ph.D)**

*Department of Languages and Linguistics  
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria  
edirin.otegbale@delsu.edu.ng*



**Rita Ochuko Mebitaghan, (Ph.D)**

*Department of Languages and Linguistics  
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria  
romebitaghan@delsu.edu.ng*

---

**Abstract**

This study examines the relationship between translations and emerging technologies by analysing generative AI tools, including ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF, in the translation of excerpts from Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's *Half of a Yellow Sun* (2005), and compares these with the human translation *L'autre moitié du soleil*. Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory are applied to distinguish between human and AI translation approaches. The findings indicate that human translation predominantly favours domestication, adapting cultural and linguistic elements to improve readability and cultural integration for the target audience. In contrast, AI-generated translations tend to favour

foreignisation by preserving source-language features. The observed limitations in AI translations, particularly in domesticating certain cultural elements, underscore areas in which human translators continue to excel at conveying nuanced messages. Consequently, despite concerns regarding AI's potential to supplant human input, the results affirm the enduring significance of human translators, especially in contexts where domestication is critical, as is often the case in literary translation.

**Keywords:** *Artificial Intelligence, Domestication and Foreignisation, Socio-cultural and Political nuances, Nigerian Literature, Adichie*

## **I. Introduction**

The widespread adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed translation studies, contributing to the blurring of traditional linguistic and cultural divides (Zaki and Ahmed, 2024). Tasks once performed exclusively by humans are increasingly delegated to machines, enabled by advancements in machine learning and the development of human-like capabilities in AI systems. Dergaa et al. (2023) highlight that tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF are systematically designed to execute human-like tasks, including translation. ChatGPT and Gemini employ transformer-based large language model architectures trained on extensive multilingual datasets with broad cultural representation. ChatPDF, while leveraging OpenAI outputs, operates within the constraints of document-anchored retrieval. Factors such as token-probability optimisation, limited culture-specific semantic grounding, and patterns in the training data contribute to these models' inclination toward foreignisation.

ChatGPT, created by OpenAI, is a flexible conversational AI that can generate human-quality prose, translate languages, and write a wide range of creative material (Wu et al., 2023). Examining GPT in the translation of religious texts, Fadhel (2025) submits that whilst ChatGPT exhibits ability in simple translation tasks, it is limited in sophisticated religious statements, cultural sensitivity, and contextual interpretation. Panda (2023) reports that ChatPDF, based on OpenAI technology, specialises in interacting with PDF documents, summarising content, answering queries, and extracting information. Weighing in on the function of ChatPDF, Otegbale (2025) argues that it is a research analytical tool that helps researchers optimise time, particularly during literature reviews involving numerous documents. Gemini, Google's AI language model, excels at

multimodal processing, including text, voice, and visuals. Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2024) submit that ChatGPT and Gemini are general-purpose language models, whereas ChatPDF is a tool developed for a specific goal. All three models highlight AI's rapid growth, pushing the limits of what is feasible in natural language processing, including reading, writing, analysing, and translating.

Recent studies highlight the superior performance of neural machine translation (NMT) over traditional statistical methods, particularly in translating complex literary texts such as novels. Toral and Way (2018) assert that NMT progress underscores the continuous improvement of machine translation quality assessment, which tracks nuanced linguistic features in text. Vieira (2019) explains that the focus of translation tasks involving MT is shifting towards more integrated, human-centred environments.

Translation is the process of rendering text, speech, or other forms of communication from a source text to a target text while maintaining the semantic imports of the source language in the target language (Adeyefa, 2024). This process involves manipulating and translating specific linguistic lexicons, as well as adapting cultural realities, to ensure that the meaning of the original content is conveyed to the target audience. This is often referred to as the concept of 'equivalence' in translation studies. Adeyefa (2022) emphasises that "the idea of retaining the original meaning of communication is sometimes called equivalence." Thus, rendering intended meaning in the target language from a source language, especially with text, is the goal of translation.

Human translation and AI-generated translation are in a reciprocal relationship in conveying meaning from culturally rich texts. A series of AI-generated translations has been carried out by critics and proponents of AI in pedagogy and research, a trend that has become more pronounced since the advent of ChatGPT in November 2022. Expanding on the role of ChatGPT, Xue et al. (2023) posit that, as an advanced AI tool that began with version 3.5, followed by upgrades to 4.0 and currently 5.0, it not only can detect human language but also simulate human interactions. Roumeliotis and Tselikas (2023) consider ChatGPT as a groundbreaking AI technology in contemporary scholarship. On the contrary, Currie (2023) emphasises that these novel technologies pose significant threats to scholarship, particularly to academic integrity in scientific writing.

In translation studies, Karaban and Karaban (2024) expound on the role of GPT-3.5, positing that AI-driven translations can match human translations in quality and poetic characteristics, and suggest that

enhancing AI translation capabilities can promote greater accessibility to the poetic heritage of underrepresented languages. Lee (2024), discussing the implications of advances in artificial intelligence, argues that AI is merely a supportive tool for translators rather than a replacement for their roles. Lee's (2024) position is upheld in this paper and further expanded through an investigation of translations produced by the selected AI tools for the study and of human translation from English to French. This is carried out using Venuti's theories of domestication and foreignization. The analysis explores how AI balances accessibility and authenticity, assessing its ability to preserve the cultural and linguistic nuances that define these works. By placing side-by-side human and AI-generated translations, this study foregrounds major challenges, such as the potential loss of meaning and distortion of cultural realities, while treating AI as merely a complementary tool.

## **II. Literature Review**

In the past decade, there has been a plethora of research on artificial intelligence. Although the disciplines of translation and interpretation began with linguistic approaches, they have since expanded beyond their initial purview with globalisation and technological developments (Bassnett, 2013). Recalling the trajectory of translation studies, Folaron (2012) argues that, from a historical perspective, the concepts of language, society, and culture have been recurring dilemmas in translation studies. This submission underscores that the role of language difference is not only a possible challenge for translators but also a reflection of broader cultural and societal divergences. However, current technologies have proven highly beneficial in mitigating certain challenges, particularly at the linguistic level, while translators continue to seek further solutions to enrich the field of translation studies. Notable among technological revolutions are recent advances in Artificial Intelligence, including machine translation and generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, ChatPDF, and Gemini. Expanding on the benefits of current AI tools, Otegbale (2025), in his investigation of ChatPDF as a research tool, argues that generative AI accelerates academic work, including translation, in the context of this study.

Ongoing technological innovation has compelled academic disciplines, including translation studies, to adapt their methodologies. The field has transitioned from relying solely on human cognitive abilities to incorporating computational methods into translation. Venuti (1995)

underscores the importance of the translator's visibility, ethical representation, and acknowledgment of cultural otherness. Gaspari et al. (2014) highlight that conventional machine translation, including AI tools, struggles to accurately translate idiomatic expressions and cultural registers, particularly when translating from languages not encoded in European-centric machine languages. This limitation is especially pronounced in literary texts set outside Europe, such as African works, including the novel examined in this study by Adichie. While machine translation has achieved success in certain institutional contexts, its performance on African literary texts remains inadequate and requires further refinement.

Despite the difficulty posed by machine translations spearheaded by Google Translate at the commencement of the current millennium, the current advancement in technology and deployment of AI generative text tools has expanded the frontiers of machine translation with respect to the production of more suitable translations of linguistic elements and expressions other than the European language with which the machine is encoded. This innovation is largely due to the ability of the current Text-Generative AI tool to recognize patterns of previous entries and self-update over time (Bharti & Aggarwal, 2025). This underscores the ability of current AI generative tools human like ability to not only recognise texts but also localise and summarise texts in contrast with traditional machine translation. Brown et al. (2020) summarise current progress in machine translation, stating that the ability to recognise patterns and engage in deep learning that simulates human-like language output is a step toward opening new frontiers. This progress, however, is not without caution, as captured by Bawden et al. (2021), who note that AI-generated text tools primarily possess semantic competence. Hence, beyond the level of semantics, there is a tendency for a faulty translation when cultural context is brought to the fore, a reality in contemporary African texts.

African literary texts reflect not only sociocultural, sociolinguistic and philosophical realities. This is made possible by the deployment of a language deeply rooted in the culture of the particular milieu, as mirrored in a given text. With this reality in mind, Mebitagban (2013) states that when translating a novel, the translator must carefully analyse the geographical setting, as this level of analysis reveals aspects of the message that are not clear. This implies that the text's cultural dimension must be prioritized if meaning recovery is to be ensured in the target text during translation. This, therefore, casts doubt on the effectiveness of machine

translation, which this study investigates by juxtaposing different Text-generating AI translations with Human translation.

### **III. Theoretical framework and methodology**

This study adopts Venuti's theories of domestication and foreignization to evaluate the dichotomy between human- and AI-generated text tools, such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF. The study's design is interpretive, with data in the form of an excerpt drawn from the selected text are analysed linguistically. One important paradigm for examining translation procedures in literary texts is Venuti's theory of domestication and foreignization. Kuleli (2020) argues that, to make the original text more approachable and recognisable to the intended audience, domestication entails adapting it to the target culture. This method prioritises readability and fluency, often resulting in a loss of meaning and cultural distinctiveness. In contrast, An (2024) foregrounds that foreignization introduces the linguistic and cultural elements of the source material into the target language and culture. Venuti's binary is utilised heuristically; yet, translation techniques function along a continuum. AI outputs occasionally exhibit hybrid behaviours (e.g., Gemini domesticates idioms but foreignizes borrowed lexicon)

Despite the ability to maintain distinctions in voice and style with respect to the original content being translated, the reality of difficulties for unfamiliar readers of the source culture abounds. Hence, Venuti contends that domestication is a predominant method of rendering translation, given the cultural homogenization that ensues and the possible devaluation of the source text and culture in literary works. He advocates for a greater use of foreignization to promote cultural diversity and challenge dominant cultural norms. This study examines how translation with a generative AI tool differs from human translation with respect to domestication and foreignization, as used in the original human translations of the selected texts.

Accordingly, this study analyses three excerpts, each selected for its embedded cultural expressions relevant to debates on foreignization. These excerpts represent distinct cultural phenomena, including titles, idioms, and code-switching, as they appear in both the English source text and the official French translation. The research employs a qualitative dataset, and findings are limited to the selected excerpts, precluding statistical generalisation to the entire novel. Identical queries were used to evaluate all three AI technologies, with the same source text provided and

no additional context. The tools were tested using their February 2025 versions, and model variability is recognised as a limitation. Outputs may vary across model versions, training data updates, or different prompting conditions. To mitigate subjectivity, the researcher applied predefined coding criteria and repeated the process. Inter-rater triangulation was not feasible in this study, but may be considered in future research.

### 1. **Analysis of Text -generating AI and human translation of cultural nuances in *HYS***

This section examines dichotomies in selected translated excerpts, comparing human translations with AI-generated translations. Cultural nuances are foregrounded in the text, highlighting themes such as titles and respect, decolonisation of education, gender roles, cultural identity in relationships, culinary practices, superstitions, language and communication, family dynamics, war and survival, and marriage customs. Domestication is identified by the use of target-language equivalents, reordering for fluency, idiom substitution, cultural neutralisation, and localisation of corporate names. Foreignization is characterized by the retention of source-language terms, untranslated borrowings, calques, the preservation of source-language syntax, and the maintenance of cultural opacity. Each translation was systematically coded based on these features. The projection of the thematic thrust of the title and respect in the English original text and the French translated version, as well as the generative AI translations, are captured below:

**English:** Ugwu truly favoured Sah, appreciating the sharp authority in the term, and when two workers from the maintenance department arrived a few days later to fix shelves in the hallway, he informed them that they would need to wait until Sah returned; he was not authorised to sign the printed document himself. He pronounced Sah with pride. (*HYS*, p.27)

**Human :** En réalité, Ugwu aimait mieux le *patron* et le pouvoir qui claquait derrière le mot. Aussi, quand deux hommes du Service des Travaux vinrent, quelques jours plus tard, poser des étagères dans le couloir, il leur dit qu'ils allaient devoir attendre le retour du patron, qu'il ne pouvait pas, quant à lui, signer le papier blanc avec les mots tapés à la machine. Il prononça *patron* avec fierté. (LMDS, p.19)

**ChatGPT:**Ugwu préférerait vraiment le mot "Sah", avec la puissance nette qu'il dégageait, et lorsque deux hommes du département des travaux sont venus quelques jours plus tard pour installer des étagères dans le couloir, il leur a dit qu'ils devraient attendre que Sah rentre à la maison ; lui-même ne pouvait pas signer le papier blanc avec des mots dactylographiés. Il prononça "Sah" avec fierté.

**Gemini :**Ugwu préférerait vraiment "Sah", la puissance nette derrière le mot, et lorsque deux hommes du département des travaux sont venus quelques jours plus tard pour installer des étagères dans le couloir, il leur a dit qu'ils devraient attendre le retour de Sah ; il ne pouvait lui-même pas signer le papier blanc avec des mots dactylographiés. Il a dit « Sah » avec fierté.

**ChatPDF:** "Ugwu préférerait vraiment Sah, le pouvoir net derrière le mot, et quand deux hommes du département des travaux sont venus quelques jours plus tard pour installer des étagères dans le couloir, il leur a dit qu'ils devraient attendre que Sah rentre à la maison ; lui-même ne pouvait pas signer le papier blanc avec des mots dactylographiés. Il a dit « Sah, avec fierté »."

In the context above, the use of “sah” in English underscores respect and foregrounds social status and hierarchy. This captures the reality of cultural norms that dictate interaction and exchanges among people. The use of “sir” in the above context thus serves not only as a linguistic marker but also underscores power dynamics within African interpersonal relationships, as evident in Ugwu’s and Odenigbo’s interaction in the excerpt. Furthermore, the term “sir” reveals the African societal expectation of a servant-master relationship that has persisted from colonialism to the present. By contrast, Odenigbo's response to removing the societal divide created by the term "sir" portrays a more egalitarian relationship in which mutual respect between bosses and employees is embraced, rather than the norm of social hierarchy. From this character's position, the writer projects a unique, more inclusive society in which everyone is valued, and mutual respect is fostered, mirroring what could be found in a larger society of elites.

The translations of the source text above, both human and AI-generated, depict the interplay of linguistic choices through the lens of Lawrence Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory. By comparing the human translation with those of ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF, it is evident that human translation demonstrates a clear tendency toward domestication. By using the term “patron” in place of the original “sah”,

the translator, in the context of the text, transformed the original cultural and linguistic specificity into something the target audience is familiar with. The linguistic lexicon “patron” in the target language thus, does not only foregrounds the sense of authority in the initial usage of “sah” but situate the narrative in a context the target francophone audience is more familiar with. Additionally, rephrasing "the works department" as "Service des Travaux" aligns with the bureaucratic terminology used in French-speaking regions. This approach prioritises reader accessibility and cultural proximity, ensuring that the text feels natural and integrated into the target language, but at the potential cost of erasing the cultural nuances and sociolinguistic peculiarities of the original.

In contrast to the human domestication translation approach, the translations by ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF lean toward foreignization with subtle differences. Primus, all three AI versions retain the linguistic original lexicon "Sah." This preserves the term's cultural specificity and its unique sociopolitical connotations in the original context. The various AI translations foreground not only foreignisation, but also maintain linguistic and cultural integrity. Whereas ChatGPT and Gemini translation are more lucid and clearer in context, with an emphasis on the "crisp power" or "puissance nette" of "Sah," thereby ensuring reader understanding, there is a slight dichotomy and variation among the three translations in conveying the cultural nuances of the source text. Particularly in ChatPDF, literal translation is embraced to capture cultural nuances while maintaining a similar syntactic structure to the source text, enhancing the effect of foreignisation.

A careful examination of the AI tools' translations also reveals a dichotomy between foreignisation and domestication, with an emphasis on linguistic and cultural perspectives in the excerpt above. Whereas human translation emphasises domestication in the translated text, foregrounding cultural imports for the target audience's comprehension, this approach also risks losing the authenticity of the author's message on cultural realities in the target text. This rendition by the translator aligns with Venuti's submission, critiquing the possible erasure of pertinent information in pursuit of fluency in the target language for the target audience, through the assimilation of the message into the target culture. Conversely, the various AI translations maintained a foreignisation approach, preserving the cultural specificity of Adichie's original text. This approach, therefore, creates space for intercultural integration, as readers of the target culture are obliged to immerse themselves in the source text's cultural reality. This, therefore, promotes intercultural exchange as readers

engage with the text's foreign elements and foster intercultural dialogue. Additionally, it is evident that from the submission above, the choice of domestication and foreignisation is directly proportionate to the “vouloir dire” (intention) of the translator.

Another notable deployment of cultural nuances in the text is the incorporation of Igbo through stylistic code-mixing and code-switching. This is evident in the Igbo phrase "Nke a ka mma," which means "This one is better." The deployment in the source text reflects the preferences and cultural values that inform decision-making. It emphasises quality and suitability, often applied to choices like clothing or food, and highlights pride in Igbo heritage through the use of the native language. This is captured in the excerpt below.

**English:** “*Nke a ka mma,*” he said. It *was* prettier than the black dress on the bed, the one she had earlier picked out for her parents’ party. She bowed mockingly and sat down to put on her shoes. She looked almost pretty with her smoothing powder, red lipstick, and relaxed demeanour, not as knotted up as she had been lately, chasing a contract with Shell-BP

**Human:** « *Nke a ka mma* », dit-il. Elle était effectivement plus jolie que la robe noire posée sur le lit, celle qu'elle avait d'abord choisie pour la réception de ses parents. Kainene fit une révérence moqueuse et s'assit pour enfiler ses chaussures. Elle était presque jolie, avec sa poudre lissante, son rouge à lèvres rouge vif et son attitude décontractée, moins nouée qu'elle ne l'avait été ces derniers temps, à courir après un contrat avec BP-Shell

**ChatGPT:** *Nke a ka mma,* » dit-il. C'était plus joli que la robe noire posée sur le lit, celle qu'elle avait choisie plus tôt pour la fête de ses parents. Elle s'inclina de manière moqueuse et s'assit pour enfiler ses chaussures. Elle avait l'air presque jolie avec sa poudre lissante, son rouge à lèvres rouge et son attitude détendue, pas aussi tendue qu'elle l'avait été récemment, à courir après un contrat avec **Shell-BP**

**Gemini:** *Celle-ci est meilleure*”, dit-il. Elle était plus jolie que la robe noire sur le lit, celle qu'elle avait choisie plus tôt pour la fête de ses parents. Elle fit une révérence moqueuse et s'assit pour enfiler ses chaussures. Elle avait l'air presque jolie avec sa poudre et son rouge à lèvres rouge et son attitude détendue, pas aussi tendue qu'elle l'avait été récemment, en courant après un contrat avec **Shell-BP**

**ChatPDF:Nke a ka mma,"** dit-il. C'était plus joli que la robe noire sur le lit, celle qu'elle avait choisie plus tôt pour la fête de ses parents. Elle s'inclina moqueusement et s'assit pour mettre ses chaussures. Elle avait l'air presque jolie avec sa poudre de finition et son rouge à lèvres rouge, et son attitude détendue, pas aussi tendue qu'elle l'avait été dernièrement, à la recherche d'un contrat avec **Shell-BP**

The human translation opts for a strategy of domestication, adapting specific cultural elements to ensure smooth integration into the target language's cultural context. While it retains the Igbo phrase "*Nke a ka mma*," the choice to adapt "Shell-BP" to "BP-Shell" aligns with a more Francophone order of corporate nomenclature. This subtle domestication enhances reader familiarity with the target text by prioritising fluidity and accessibility, aiming to naturalise it for a French-speaking audience while softening the cultural distinctiveness of the source material. Additionally, domestication affects the text's readability, cultural proximity, and narrative assimilation, as observed in the translation of *Nke a ka mma*. Additionally, cultural education and the preservation of source identity are both affected by foreignization within the spectrum of authenticity. This underscores the risk that inaccurate cultural transfer in African literature can undermine native epistemologies.

In contrast to human translation, the translations by ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF exhibit varying degrees of foreignization, preserving more of the original's cultural and linguistic texture. ChatGPT and ChatPDF retain the phrase "*Nke a ka mma*" in its untranslated form, thereby embedding the cultural specificity of Igbo directly into the French text through borrowing. This decision aligns with foreignization by maintaining the linguistic otherness of the original, inviting readers to encounter and engage with its cultural context, thereby enhancing the text's aesthetic value through its stylistic presentation. Additionally, the retention of "Shell-BP" further underscores its foreignising tendencies, as the corporate name is left unchanged, thereby reflecting its global identity rather than adapting it for local resonance. However, Gemini's translation adopts a different approach, offering a slight domestication by rendering "*Nke a ka mma*" as "*Celle-ci est meilleure*." This choice eliminates the cultural particularity of the original Igbo phrase, replacing it with a fully domesticated French equivalent. Additionally, Gemini, using Shell-BP, retains the foreign elements in the translation while maintaining the original text's tone and message. Thus, a hybrid approach is adopted in the context above.

The various translations above highlight the inherent tension between domestication and foreignization in literary translation. By prioritising domestication, human translation creates a seamless reading experience for the target audience, enhancing readability while potentially diminishing the cultural specificity of the source text. On the other hand, AI-generated translations, particularly those from ChatGPT and ChatPDF, lean more toward foreignization. This method of presentation spotlights Venuti's theory regarding the dichotomy that arises in the reflection of authenticity in translation processes and cultural accessibility.

With regard to marriage and customs, idiomatic expressions foreground the value of male children in Africa, particularly in the Igbo milieu where the text is situated. This is evident in the pregnant character's remark in the excerpt below.

**English:** "I want to have a baby boy first, because **it will place my feet firmly in Onyeka's house,**" Anulika said.

**Human:** « Je veux avoir un garçon d'abord, parce que ça m'enracinera **des deux pieds dans la maison d'Onyeka** », dit Anulika.

**ChatGPT:** « Je veux avoir un garçon en premier, parce que **cela ancrera mes pieds fermement dans la maison d'Onyeka** », dit Anulika.

**Gemini:** « Je veux d'abord avoir un garçon, car **cela me permettra de m'installer fermement dans la maison d'Onyeka** », a déclaré Anulika.

**ChatPDF:** « Je veux d'abord avoir un garçon, parce que **cela me permettra de me positionner fermement dans la maison d'Onyeka** », dit Anulika."

Anulika's submission underscores the status of male children in the Igbo milieu, as reflected in the text. Emphasising that both feet were now planted in her matrimonial home reflects the special value attached to male offspring as carriers of their lineage in the African milieu. The woman is thus projected as one under pressure and in a state of dilemma, irrespective of her ability to procreate until she delivers a male offspring. The writer's projection presents the woman as unstable in her matrimonial home owing to the weight of cultural expectations. This reality is foregrounded through the idiomatic expression "it will place my feet firmly, translated differently in the different parameters discussed in this study through the lens of Venuti's domestication and foreignization theory.

The translations of the idiom "place my feet firmly in Onyeka's house" into French illustrate both points of convergence and divergence between human and generative AI translations, with all versions aiming to convey the core idea of establishing security and permanence in Onyeka's for the African woman. The human translation renders it as "ça m'enracinera des deux pieds," adapting the metaphor to "rooting with both feet," which resonates naturally with French idiomatic norms. This choice leans toward domestication, as it transforms the English expression into a culturally familiar phrase that aligns with the target language's sensibilities.

Conversely, the ChatGPT translation, unlike the human translation, more closely adheres to the source text, rendering "ancrera mes pieds fermement," a literal translation of "anchor my feet firmly." This retains the structural elements of the original idiom, reflecting a tendency toward foreignization by preserving the original metaphor. On the other hand, Gemini and ChatPDF favour domestication. By avoiding the "feet" metaphor entirely and opting for idiomatically fluent renderings like "me permettra de m'installer fermement" (Gemini) and "me permettra de me positionner fermement" (ChatPDF), both translations prioritise clarity and naturalness in the target language over strict fidelity to the English phrasing. Additionally, while human translations capture cultural nuances, AI translations tend to tilt towards domestication.

## **Conclusion**

The role of human translators is examined through the adoption of Venuti's double-edged theoretical framework of domestication and foreignisation, underscoring the intricacies of translation between human and AI text-generating tools. The study analysed data on the use of words that reflect the dynamic relationship between the domestic and their employers within a conventional societal division between the educated and the uneducated in postcolonial Africa. This reality is underscored by lexicons translated and analysed through the lens of Venuti's framework. It also addresses the role and place of stylistic figures such as code-mixing and code-switching, and how a human translator navigates these linguistic and cultural nuances, as well as the AI text-generating tool employed. Additionally, the data reveal a dichotomy in the translation of idiomatic expressions between human and AI-generated translation. The analysis indicates that AI text-generating tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and ChatPDF overwhelmingly favour the foreignisation of linguistic lexicons, thereby creating a lacuna that only human translators can fill by

domesticating writers' messages for their target audiences. Two extracts indicated substantial foreignization in the keeping of “Sah” and the Igbo lexicon “*Nke a ka mma*”. In contrast, the marriage-custom excerpt indicated that the AI preferred domestication. This implies that the pattern is not absolute, as AI behaviour varies across semantic domains.

In conclusion, the investigation in this study shows how certain datasets inform Half of a Yellow Sun, whereas the rendition in *L'autre moitié du soleil* highlights key contrasts in the translation choices made by generative AI systems and by the human translator across the English-French language pair. Additionally, whereas AI renditions often exhibit tendencies toward foreignisation, human translation projects a preference for domestication in the translation of culturally embedded expressions and stylistic nuances. This underscores that, within the language of fictional works, human translation remains effective and efficient at negotiating cultural nuances to make meaning comprehensible to the target audience. This study corrects the earlier overgeneralisation and presents a more nuanced picture. While no effort is made to emphasise the impossibility of human translators yielding to machine translation, this demonstrates, in line with Fadhel's (2025) submission, that human translators tend to produce translations that are not only more precise but also more readable and culturally acceptable. It therefore highlights the limitations of AI translations in specialised domains and the inconsistencies in handling cultural nuances, despite their effectiveness in translating information-based text. Further studies on this dataset could focus on collaborative translation workflows, employing AI to ensure consistency in simpler tasks while improving its capacity to adapt to cultural nuances and colloquial idioms.

## References

- Adeyefa, D. (2024). Towards a Methodology for Translating African Postproverbs. *Proverbium*, 119.
- Adeyefa, D. E. (2022). Translation, Stylistics and the Imperativeness of Transliteration in African Literary Translation. *Journal for Translation Studies in Nigeria*, 1(1).58-71
- An, G. (2024). Domestication and Foreignisation in Translation Studies: A Bibliometric Analysis of WoS Core Journal Articles. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 24(4), 13-22.

- Bandia, P. F. (2008). *Translation as Reparation: Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*. Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Bawden, R., et al. (2021). Evaluating AI's Translation of Creative Language: Challenges and Prospects. *Translation Spaces*.
- Bharti, I., Chauhan, K., & Aggarwal, P. (2025). Generative AI: Next Frontier for Competitive Advantage. In *Enhancing Communication and Decision-Making With AI* (pp. 1-36). IGI Global.
- Brown, T., et al. (2020). Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *NeurIPS*.
- Cronin, M. (2013). *Translation and globalisation*. Routledge.
- Currie, G. M. (2023). Academic integrity and artificial intelligence: is ChatGPT hype, hero or heresy? In *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine* (Vol. 53, No. 5, pp. 719-730). WB Saunders.
- Dergaa, I., Chamari, K., Zmijewski, P., & Saad, H. B. (2023). From human writing to artificial intelligence-generated text: Examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biology of sport*, 40(2), 615-622.
- Esselink, B. (2000). *A Practical Guide to Localisation*. John Benjamins.
- Fadhel, S. A. A. (2025). The Use of the AI Model ChatGPT in Translating Religious Texts and Comparing it with Expert Translation (Comparative Study). *Albaydha University Journal*, 7(1) 946-955
- Folaron, D. A. (2012). Digitalising translation. *Translation Spaces*, 1(1), 5-31.
- Gaspari, F., Toral, A., & Way, A. (2014). *Machine Translation for Literary Texts: Challenges and Solutions*. Springer.
- Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2024). Google Gemini as a next-generation AI educational tool: a review of emerging educational technology. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1), 22.
- Karaban, V., & Karaban, A. (2024). AI-translated poetry: Ivan Franko's poems in GPT-3.5-driven machine and human-produced translations. *Forum for Linguistic Studies (Transferred)*, 6(1), 1994. <https://doi.org/10.59400/FLS.v6i1.1994>
- Kuleli, M. (2020). Culture-specific items in literary texts and their translation based on “foreignization” and “domestication” strategies. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (Ö7), 617-653.
- Lee, T. (2024). Artificial intelligence and posthumanist translation: ChatGPT versus the translator. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(6), 2351-2372. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2023-0122>

- Mebitaghan, R. O (2013). La place de l'étude ethnographique dans la traduction littéraire. *Revue interlinguistique de littérature et linguistique appliquées (RILLA)*, Vol.1 No.4, pp. 35-54.
- Otegbale, E. S. (2023). Analyse de la traduction des éléments paratextuels dans *Le sanglot de l'homme noir* et quelques œuvres sélectionnées d'Alain Mabanckou., *Journal of Translation Studies in Nigeria (TJSN)*, pp.30-42
- Otegbale, E. S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Research Reporting in the Humanities: Problems and Prospects. *Abraka Humanities Review*. Vol. 15, No.2, Pp.19-26.
- Panda, S. (2023). Enhancing PDF interaction for a more engaging user experience in the library: Introducing ChatPDF. *IP Indian Journal of Library Science and Information Technology*, 8(1), 20-25.
- Roumeliotis, K. I., & Tselikas, N. D. (2023). ChatGPT and OpenAI models: A preliminary review. *Future Internet*, 15(6), 192.
- Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1993). *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. Routledge.
- Toral, A., & Way, A. (2018). What Level of Quality Can Neural Machine Translation Attain on Literary Text? *Translation Quality Assessment*, 12(1), 1–24.
- Toral, A., & Way, A. (2018). What Level of Quality Can Neural Machine Translation Attain on Literary Text?. In: Moorkens, J., Castilho, S., Gaspari, F., Doherty, S. (eds) *Translation Quality Assessment. Machine Translation: Technologies and Applications*, vol 1. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91241-7\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91241-7_12)
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.
- Vieira, L. N. (2019). Post-editing of machine translation. In *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology* (pp. 319-336). Routledge.
- Wu, T., He, S., Liu, J., Sun, S., Liu, K., Han, Q. L., & Tang, Y. (2023). A brief overview of ChatGPT: The history, status quo and potential future development. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(5), 1122-1136.
- Xue, V. W., Lei, P., & Cho, W. C. (2023). The potential impact of ChatGPT in clinical and translational medicine. *Clinical and Translational Medicine*, 13(3), 1-3
- Zaki, M. Z., & Ahmed, U. (2024). Bridging linguistic divides: The impact of AI-powered translation systems on communication equity and inclusion. *Journal of translation and language studies*, 5(2), 20-30.