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Abstract
In recent years, the need for Machine Translation (MT) has grown, especially for translating legal contracts between languages like Arabic and English. This study primarily investigates whether Google Translator can adequately replace human translation for legal documents. Utilizing a widely popular free web-based tool, Google Translate, the research method involved translating six segments from various legal contracts into Arabic and assessing the translations for lexical and syntactic accuracy. The findings show that although Google Translate can quickly produce English-Arabic translations, it falls short compared to professional translators, especially with complex legal terms and syntax. Errors can be categorized into: polysemy, homonymy, legal doublets, and adverbs at the linguistic level, and morphological parsing, concord, and modality at the syntactic level. The study concludes with recommendations for enhancing machine translation systems and suggests caution in using Google Translate for legal purposes, advocating for continued reliance on human expertise in legal settings.
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Introduction

Undoubtedly translation has a vital position in human communication. From ancient times up to now, there have been debates about translation processes. Some scholars opt for word-for-word translation, whereas others opt for sentence-for-sentence translation. The translators have an essential duty of conveying the sense of the text from one language to another. In social representation, people use linguistic codes, whether written or spoken, to represent, identify, and refer to things. (Ismail, 2023)

According to Galib, (2017) Legal language is defined as the language used in legal documents that exhibits specific characteristics or features. Instances of legal documents are contracts, agreements between individuals (groups, institutions, etc.), petitions, wills, insurance policies, etc. “To help the Internet users, recently there are various Websites provide an l / machine translate services, which translate not only the individual words, sentences or even whole documents, but complete websites ,and users of the Internet have a wide range of choices among several machine translation services” (Abdel Azim, 2012, p.1). Google Translation Service (GST) offers a state-of-the-art free translation service and works automatically without the intervention of human translators. Currently, the GTS supports translation between 103 languages. The GTS is a widely used service available to internet users directly, permitting them to translate text, documents, or complete websites into several languages.

Although, producing excellent MT is so hard to hit. The task has exhausted the best computing resources of every generation attempting it. Nevertheless, MT is going stronger than ever, fired up by the globalization of the Net. “Today, all over the world, software designers, programmers, hardware engineers, neural-network experts, AI specialists, linguists, and cognitive scientists are enlisted in the effort to teach computers how to port words and ideas from language to language” (Abu-Al-Sha’r & Zughoul, 2009). This research examines the legal translation of contracts by artificial intelligence, especially Google translation. It examines whether it can be relied upon in translating contracts or whether there are failures.

Literature review

Translation is a bridge between two cultures; most translation theorists agree that translation is recognized as a transfer process from a foreign language or a second language to the mother tongue. According to translators, they have acted to fill the gap in conveying knowledge and ideas between cultures and civilizations. (Tisgam, 2009)

Machine Translation (MT) has been defined by Trujillo (as cited in Shehap, 2013:18) “MT is the area of information technology and applied linguistics dealing with the translation of human languages. And MT has grown up duo globalization and expanding of trade”. People have applied it to increase and improve the speed of translation and to reduce the cost of translation.

There are many researches discussing various domains in Arabic-English systems. However, little effort has been made to develop Arabic-English MT systems. Few researchers have discussed MT such as (Al Barhamtoshy, 1995; Shaalan, 2000; Chalabi, 2001; Othman et al. 2003). They develop tools and a method for Arabic-English MT. Al Barhamtoshy proposes a translation method for compound verbs, while Shaalan focuses on translating the Arabic interrogative
sentence into English. Chalabi (2001) developed an engine of Arabic-English MT to search the Internet using the Arabic language. Othman et al. (2003) developed an adequate chart parser for translating Arabic sentences.

However, the majority of previous work has concentrated on developing tools, charts, and methods to assist users in utilizing MT systems. This helps in getting more information about MT. Although this is valuable information and helps in the continuous improvement of MT systems, MT researchers often try to add new information about their systems. Despite these improvements, researchers do not know the strengths of their systems and the situations of committing errors when translating between English and Arabic. Similarly, there is little empirical and practical research dealing with the application of MT in Arab countries. In addition, testing and examining its translation are ignored except for several studies scattering here and there, e.g., Alawneh et al. (2008) and Habash et al. (2010).

Alawneh, et al. (2008), conducted a study presenting an Arabic approach to translating well-structured English sentences into well-structured Arabic sentences. They utilized grammar-based and example-translation techniques to address issues related to ordering and agreement. In addition, Al-Dabbagh (2013) conducted an assessment of Google Translate by selecting four different text types: journalistic, economic, scientific, and technical. Two of these texts were extracted from web pages, and the other two from books. She has found that the system produces Arabic texts with lexical, grammatical, and textual flaws. The analysis shows that the errors persist irrespective of text type, length, difficulty, and input mode.

In another study, Al-Dabbagh (2010) conducted a questionnaire to investigate how readers rate the quality of translated texts by Google Translate. Her findings indicate that the system fails to provide users with a general idea about the translated texts.

Most of the above studies' findings confirm that MT still requires more time and effort from researchers and MT developers to produce acceptable translations. These findings are based on diligent research and assessment, regardless of the chosen text type. The conclusions of the current research align with these findings, as Google Translate fails to handle legal discourse.

**Types of Machine Translation**

According to Bunting (as cited in AL-Tamimi, 2018), technology can be defined as any electronic hardware or software that impacts language instruction or practice, building cultural awareness, classroom management and teacher development. For example, digital cameras, computers, websites, and chat rooms. The field of artificial intelligence is one of the sciences that simulate the human mind, and its applications have invaded human life. (Gizar, et al, 2022)

Two main systems divide Machine Translation:

1-Bilingual systems are designed for two particular languages. They could be unidirectional, operating in one direction, for example, from Arabic into English, or they could be bidirectional, operating in both directions.
2-Multilingual systems are designed for more than one pair of languages. These systems provide translations of one language to anyone or more languages within the same system.
3- Both of the systems mentioned above.

**Google Translation**

Google Translate is one of the most outstanding machine translation tools. It is out of many of online translation applications. “It is an online machine translation (MT) tool that serves multi-language translation” (Li, Graesser, & Cai, 2014). It earns the designation of a multi-language translation application due to its ability to translate text from approximately 90 languages. Moreover, Google Translate is considered the most popular online translation application, which began to garner attention in the early 2000s. Google Translate provides rapid translations and is accessible at any time on any electronic platform, as long as there is an internet connection available.

However, Google Translate has its disadvantages, just like any other Machine Translation system. Although it aids the reader in understanding the content of the source text, it typically does not generate accurate results. The accuracy depends on the language pair being used. For example, the accuracy of Google Translate increases seriously when translating a text from English into a European Language. Results of analyses, showing that French into English translation is very accurate (Shen, 2010). Another condition that could affect Google Translate’s accuracy is the length of the ST paragraph. The future is just as bright as the present for online translation systems as Hutchins (as cited in Hijazi, 2013) foresees that “Users of online translation systems (whether charged or free) will expect continued improvements, and this will be more likely with specialized services than with non-specialized ones.”(p.8)

**Google Translate Approach**

Despite Google winning first place in an international English-Arabic and English-Chinese Machine Translation competition, its translated texts often contain clear and apparent errors. Google Translate is a machine translation tool that translates words based on its database. This is due to the fact that Google Translate uses a Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) approach rather than a traditional approach. Fatah summarizes Google’s approach by saying “Direct translation is common with Google Translate and often results in nonsensical literal translations, particularly with long compound sentences. This is due to the fact that Google translation system uses a method based on language pair frequency that does not take into account grammatical rules which, in turn affects the quality of the translation. The complexity of the text, as well as any context which cannot be interpreted without a true knowledge of the language, makes the likelihood of errors greater.” (Fatah, 2021, p.303)

Language operates based on specific rules. The issue arises when Google Translate fails to adhere to the grammatical rules of a particular language, especially when translating between two languages from vastly different linguistic families and cultural backgrounds. In the level of text, when the machine requires a translated text, Google Translate searches any structure of written material found on the internet and looks for a similar pattern of text being translated. After that, the machine selects the most similar pattern and meaning and arranges it into sentences based on
the source text. Gestanti (2012) says that Google Translate can only translate patterns available on the internet.

Several studies have been conducted and proved that the level of its accuracy is still questionable. Even though Google cleared in (2016) that it has released a new system called as (Google Neural Machine Translation system), this system allows the machine to mimic the function of the human brain and provide a more accurate translation, it is not merely that it serves a better translation result than what human translation do. One of the reasons is because the different way Google Translate and human translate in working on translation. Hence, there are possibilities that the Google translation result in target language is significantly different with the source language.

**Legal Translation**

Legal translation involves translating various legal documents, such as texts, official papers issued by authorities, company contracts, and financial documents. Sworn translation, once certified by relevant authorities, becomes an approved official document recognized by the target country. The purpose of this is to find an appropriate, alternative and identical version of the document in terms of text and subject matter, in which the translator takes into account the conventions and terminology relevant to the topic and highlights the original concept without any difference or ambiguity, because if a ruler or judge is presented with a memorandum written in a foreign language that he knows but does not fully understand, he requests a legal translation. This document implies that a reliable certified translation must be provided to render judgment without incurring any liability unless proven incorrect. (Poshtkouhi, et al., 2023)

Since legal translation is a specialized area of translational activity, it involves not only linguistic equivalence but also legal impact and consequences, due to its association with the law. The translator has a great responsibility for understanding the nature of the text being translated and its impact.

**Salient Features of Legal Language**

The only language, which combines between originality and creativity is legal language. Legal language had some features make distinctions of it in the same time, they are considered as problems. Legal language sometimes incorporates words from other languages, such as ancient legal terms. Alcaraz & Brian (2002) states that the use of archaism (old term) is intentional. The reason behind this is to give a flavor of formality to the language to which they belong. Some lawyers and specialists prefer to use traditional terms instead of new ones. For example, they use (inquire) instead of (ask), (peruse) rather than (read), (forthwith) in place of (at once), etc. There also exist some archaic adverbs, they are a mixture of words, using compound words in legal documents to give new meanings, e.g., ‘here’ ‘there’ and ‘where’ with certain prepositions; of, after, by, under, etc. (Alcaraz & Brian, 2002), for example:

1. The parties **hereto** agree as follow.
2. **Hereinafter** referred to as wife.

تم اتفاق الطرفين بوجب هذا العقد على ما يلي.
المشار إليها فيما بعد في هذا العقد باسم الزوجة.
Conversely, sometimes legal language precedes ordinary language in creating modern vocabularies and terminology. It keeps up with the spirit of the time, putting itself in the foreground and the vanguard. These vocabularies give the law the ability to deal with new situations within legal developments. These words entered into global dictionaries such as the English term (Zoning) rather than (the administrative divisions of the regions), (Asylums) instead of (demanded political asylum), the term (Escapees) which means (Runaways) language will inevitably contribute bridging the linguistic gap that suffered by the English of those terms.

The second feature we observe it in legal language is the use of Long, Complex Sentences. Whereas, In legal writing, drafters should avoid using anaphoric devices or referential pronouns. For example, personal pronouns (he, she, it) or demonstrative ones (this, that, etc.), in addition to the verb ‘to do,’ may substitute a whole clause, as in the following example: He rents a car, and so does his brother. “Legal language is highly concerned with the exactness of reference; hence its tendency toward lexical repetition, and therefore to functional redundancy” (Sabra: 1995, p.36) For example, The Lessee shall pay to the Lessor at the office of the Lessor.

When translating legal texts, it is often recommended to maintain the same level of redundancy as the original text, as it serves a functional purpose. Therefore, the translator should ensure that the version proposed is without ambiguity as its original counterpart.

The third one is the use of ‘shall’. The modal ‘shall’ in legal texts carries an obligation or duty, as opposed to its standard function of expressing futurity. More importantly, Sabra (1995, p. 31) claims that any legal verb preceded by 'shall 'is typically translated into Arabic in the present form. For example:

**Husband shall pay to Wife spousal support in the sum of ______.  
يدفع الزوج للزوجة نفقة تقدر بقيمة________.**

As already stated, the modal ‘shall ’is used basically to demonstrate that the legal subject of a given sentence has a duty not to do something. However, specific sentences in which the modal “shall” carries a meaning different from that pretended in legal writing. ‘Shall ’ is sometimes used in a way that is genuinely confusing and causes a dilemma for the translator to assume definitively whether the modal ‘shall ’is being used for an obligation, futurity ,or a false imperative.

And last, but not least legal language tends to use passive rather than active form, that is because passive voice is an indirect and formal tone that lawyers feel comfortable with (Haigh 2004). “ In Arabic language there is a general tendency to minimize passive constructions in legal Arabic language, passives in Arabic legal register have a special form, where auxiliaries are not used”. (Emery 1989 p.10).

**Types Of Legal Translation**

In legal translation, many scholars focus on a technique of functional equivalence. by Newmark (1988) describes it as “a procedure that occupies the universal area between the SL and the TL.” He also suggests using functional equivalence for official translations because it ensures that the Target Text (TT) is both understandable to the target reader and faithful to the Source Text (ST).
Harvey (2002) indicates that linguistics experts such as (Newmark 1981; Trosborg 1994; Sarcevic 1997, 2000, 2003) have suggested a number of classifications to define the types of legal translation. These types seem to derive from their function. Hence, Trosborg (1994) classifies contract texts into three types: directive, commissive, and constitutive, which cannot be translated literally. She continues, "The word constitutive is used to denote sentences used to explain or define expressions and terms in the contract or to supply information concerning the application of the statute." This quotation is bear out by Harvey (2002) and Sarcevic (2000) who indicates that "legal text is mostly the informative and a special text, it provides the reader with some information". Sarcevic adds an expressive classification for the legal text. Hence, a legal text would fall under informative texts category. Earlier, Sarcevic (1997) argued that their primary function is normative or regulatory, as they typically prescribe how people should or should not behave through the use of imperatives. Newmark (as cited in Al Shehap, 2013: 20) aligns with Sarcevic's models in her classification. Newmark categorizes three text types based on the peculiarity of legal text function. These three types match a text function, informative, expressive and evocative or operative. It pertains to laws, regulations, contracts, codes, treaties, and conventions, in other words, documentary sources of law. Sarcevic (1997) observes that legal texts are categorized into regulatory and informative, prescriptive and descriptive. The first group includes the first documents that come to our minds when speaking about legal texts: legislative texts, that is to say, "regulatory instruments containing rules of conduct or norms" (p.11).

**Evaluation of Machine Translation Output**

**Methodology**

This study is exclusive to translating a several of legal articles from English into Arabic. The study examines six English legal sentences to be translated into Arabic only. It is also limited to Google Translate (GT) as one type of machine translation (MT) and its associated problems. This research adopts Šarčević (2000) functional equivalence that categorized into three levels:

a) **Near-equivalence (NE):** takes place when legal concepts of the two languages, i.e., English-Arabic share most of their primary and secondary characteristics or are the same, which is unusual. For example, (Office of the Attorney General) and (Power of Attorney), (laws of the Civil Code) have the same meaning in English and Arabic.

b) **Partial equivalence (PE):** takes place when the English-Arabic legal concepts are mainly similar, and the differences are clarified by i.e. lexical expansion. For example, (commercial practice) (الممارسة التجارية) that has another rendering in Arabic which is (العريف التجارية), (judicial interpretation) translated to (الإنتاج القضائي), and (Non-equivalence (NoE): take place when only few or none of the essential aspects of English-Arabic legal concepts correspond or if there is no functional equivalent in the target legal system for a specific ST concept. For example, Islamic terms and concepts such as (Al Ethm) (الاجتهاد) means (sin) in English, and (Fatwa) (فتوى) means (Verdict) in English. The English term (Home Office) means (وزارة الداخلية) (the Ministry of the Interior).
The Problem Of The Study

Based on the researcher's knowledge of using technological devices, machine translation (MT) is suitable for translating technical terms and expressions, such as those in scientific, legal, and medical contexts, between English and Arabic. Regrettably, few comparative studies between machine translation (MT) and human-Arabic translation have been conducted. Specifically, Google Translate's performance for English-Arabic translations has not been sufficiently investigated. The lack of studies regarding Google Translation (GT) between the two languages urges the researcher to investigate into this peculiar subject. The present study may shed light on the extent of Google translatability. Inasmuch, the gap of ignoring this form of research will be covered.

Data Collection

The data for this research is taken from "Al Muysar in Legal Translation: A Practical Journey into the World of Legal Translation" by Hamdia Hassan. It consists of six excerpts deduced from six contracts regulating different matters. And the author's translation is considered professional translation and named as 'proposed translation’. The discussion was made to gloss over any differences that may arise during the translation process. The current corpora aim to investigate the translatability of Google Translate (GT). Google translated the articles into Arabic. The chunks were translated, printed, and analyzed following Šarčević's (2000) framework. Table (1) shows the criteria adopted for checking up the translatability of GT into Arabic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NE)</td>
<td>(PE)</td>
<td>(NoE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is evident that when Google Translate produces English-language articles similar to those of professionals and the meaning in Arabic is correct, the translation of the articles falls within the "excellent" or (NE) level. When all the equivalents of legal lexical terms within the articles are correct, but the connotation differs from the Arabic meaning, this level is evaluated as "good" or (PE). If the translation of the legal lexical terms within the sentences is partially correct, and the meaning in Arabic is nearly right, (GT) will be within the "fair" or (NoE) level. Eventually, the researcher investigated some common errors and considered sentences with many errors, while leaving sentences with fewer errors.

Procedures

The researcher conducted a qualitative analysis, scrutinizing the Arabic translations generated by Google Translate for the English articles. She thoroughly applied the previously established
criteria. Correct translations for each English article were identified during the analysis. Justifications for errors made by Google Translate were provided from the researcher's perspective.

**Results**

Legal discourse in English as Farqhal and Shunnaq (1992) say that it is characterized by the excessive use of long and complicated sentences. Likewise, Arabic legal sentences are long and complex. In fact, this lengthiness causes difficulties in translation between English and Arabic languages. To achieve the purpose of this paper, six English language articles selected by the researcher; they were translated by Google into Arabic. As for a sentence with a complex structure, the researcher divided it into clauses or sentences to simplify the difficulty in checking their translatability. The following tables (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) show the translation of (GT) and the proposed translation. They were analyzed and investigated as follows:

**Firstly**, the English article “This contract is made of three copies; a copy for each party to work upon when necessary. The third copy shall be filed with Contracts Authentication Department at Abu Dhabi Municipality”, was translated by GT as in Table 2.

**Table 2. The Comparative between GT and PT for the ELA 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 1</th>
<th>Google translation</th>
<th>Proposed translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This contract is made of three copies; a copy for each party to work upon when necessary. | نسخة يتكون هذا العقد من ثلاث نسخ للأطراف  
كل طرف للعمل عند الضرورة | نسخة يتكون هذا العقد من ثلاث نسخ  
كل طرف للعمل عند الضرورة |
| The third copy shall be filed with Contracts Authentication Department at Abu Dhabi Municipality. | ترفق النسخة الثالثة بتقسيم توقيت العقود  
ببلدية أبو ظبي. | ترفق النسخة الثالثة تودع لدى قسم  
توثيق العقود ببلدية أبو ظبي. |

In Google's translation of the first sentence, the verb "يتكون" is incorrect, as the contract does not consist of three copies, but rather there are three copies of it. As in the case of the second sentence because the verb "ترفق" is not accurate.

**Secondly**, the English legal article “The parties agreed upon making a four-year lease contract. They shall be renewed on time under the terms and conditions thereof.” was translated by GT as shown in Table 3.
As we see in the first sentence, GT used the verb "أبرم" while PT used "تحرير". As legal information the verb "إيجار" used if the Notary make this contract, the notary is a public officer responsible for editing the contracts whose official form is defined by the law. A decree from the public authority shall appoint the notary, who must then be sworn in front of a properly formed judicial commission and deposit his signature with the court. Additionally, the notary must meet the qualifications specified in the contract’s conclusion to ensure competence. The Arabic verb "يبرم" is used if the person editing or making the contract is not a specialist, so it is assumed that both parties are specialists.

In the second sentence, the GT was an accurate hence, “The shall” is translated improperly as "يُجدد", while the correct Arabic rendering here is "على أن يجد". Googler Translate omitted the Arabic translation for the word "terms,” which means "أحكام" in legal language. However, "أحكام" is not equivalent to "شروط"; they express different concepts. Conditions are things that we agree to do or not do. They are things that must be satisfied before a transaction becomes binding on the parties, the seller and the buyer, for example. While “terms” mean to prevent, from that the judiciary is called a rule to prevent it from occurring and occurring disputes and disputes between individuals. So the whole meaning not delivered.

**Thirdly**, the English legal article “The director shall, within the following ten days after partners' approval of balance sheet and account of profits and losses, deposit the balance sheet at both the Ministry and Department of Economy”, was translated by GT as shown in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 3</th>
<th>Google translation</th>
<th>Proposed translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The managing director shall notify the competent official authority of the information noted in the register together with any amendments made thereto, in the first month of every calendar year.</td>
<td>يخطر العضو المنتدب الجهة الرسمية المختصة بالمعلومات الوداردة في السجل مع أي تعديلات تطرأ عليه في الشهر الأول من كل سنة تقويمية.</td>
<td>يخطر المدير الإداري السلطة الرسمية المختصة بالمعلومات المدرجة بالسجل وأي تعديلات عليها، في الشهر الأول من كل سنة ميلادية.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As previously mentioned, Google Translate renders the meaning of the archaic word "thereto" as "عليه" instead of "عليها" for "information." These archaic words should be understood conceptually rather than literally, as they do not have direct equivalents and thus pose difficulties in translating legal texts into Arabic. This translation is also incorrect because "عليه" is a masculine term, whereas "عليها" is the appropriate feminine form for "information" ("معلومات").

Fourthly, the English legal article “If the Project Agreement does not contain any provision concerning a given issue, the provisions set out in this Agreement shall be observed” was translated by GT as in table 5.

Table 5. The Comparative between GT and PT for the ELA4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 4</th>
<th>Google translation</th>
<th>Proposed translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the Project Agreement does not contain any provision concerning a given issue, the provisions set out in this Agreement shall be observed.</td>
<td>إذا كانت اتفاقية المشروع لا تحتوي على أي حكم يتعلق بمسألة معينة، يجب مراعاة الأحكام المنصوص عليها في هذه الاتفاقية.</td>
<td>يُطبق أحكام هذه الاتفاقية في كل ما لم يرد بشأنه نص باتفاقية المشروع، يُعدل بأحكام هذه الاتفاقية في كل ما لم يرد بشأنه نص في اتفاقية المشروع.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, it is a conditional sentence; the use of if in the first part of the sentence causes a difficulty in legal translation. It was translated literally that made GT vague and did not follow the specific grammatical rules in Arabic. The first phrase was translated by GT literally, while the better translation in Arabic is as, the case in the passive voice "تطبيق". 

Fifthly, the English legal article “The above preamble, the site plan approved by the Municipality and all attachments of this contract, as referred to below are deemed part and parcel of this contract. Any other contract signed by the parties in this regard shall be canceled” was translated by GT as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The Comparative between GT and PT for the ELA5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 5</th>
<th>Google translation</th>
<th>Proposed translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above preamble, the site plan approved by the Municipality and all attachments of this contract, referred to below are deemed part and parcel of this contract,</td>
<td>الديباجة أعلاه وخطه الموقع التي وافقت عليها البلدية وجميع المرفقات هذا العقد، المشار إليها أدناه تعتبر جزءًا لا يتجزأ من هذا العقد.</td>
<td>بعد التمهيد السابق وخطة الموقع المعتمدة من التصحيح، البلدية وجميع المرفقات بهذا العقد، المشار إليها أدناه جزء لا يتجزأ من هذا العقد.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any other contract signed by the parties in this regard shall be cancelled.

In the above GT, the English sentence was translated literally into Arabic, but the Arabic language prefers verbal sentences. It means that GT does not follow the Arabic rules and subject-verb agreement VSO in Arabic. It gives the Arabic rendering without a helpful meaning. Furthermore, the verb in the second sentence "تعتبر" is a common mistake; it means "take a lesson" and does not fit here.

**Sixthly**, the English legal article “RoadPlan wishes to appoint the Agent as its agent for the provision of management and IT consultancy services” was translated GT as shown in table 7. Table 7. *The Comparative between GT and PT for the ELA6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 6</th>
<th>Google translation</th>
<th>Proposed translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RoadPlan wishes to appoint the Agent as its agent for the provision of management and IT consultancy services.</td>
<td>ترغب RoadPlan في تعيين الوكيل وكيل لها لتقديم خدمات استشارية في مجال الإدارة وتقنية المعلومات</td>
<td>ترغب شركة رودبلان في تعيين الوكيل وكيل لها لتقديم خدمات الإدارة والاستشارات تقنية المعلومات.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GT in the above legal article didn’t translate (Roadplane) at all this is the first mistake. The second mistake is the use of "وكيل" in "وكيل" because "وكيل" is used for simile, and its usage in "وكيل" is foreign to the Arabic language.

**Last** but not least, GT for most of ELAs is partially correct with a good level; it does not reach the excellent level. Although the meaning is understood, but the literal translation by Google causes some of linguistic problems.

Google Translate has been chosen for this research because I agree with Aiken, and others on many aspects. First, it is used more frequently, provides more language-pair combinations, and is probably more accurate overall (Aiken & Ghosh, 2009; Och, 2009). In addition, one study (Aiken, et al., 2009) compared four systems and found that Google Translate was best, followed by Yahoo, X10, and Applied Language.

**Discussion**

The exploration of Google Translate's (GT) capabilities in translating English legal sentences into Arabic underscores the ongoing development of machine translation (MT) technologies. This discussion focuses on key aspects: GT's performance in handling complex legal language, the challenges presented by the unique linguistic features of legal texts, and the implications for future...
research and applications. Despite these challenges, the study acknowledges GT's utility in providing quick translations for English-Arabic language pairs, highlighting the balance between speed and accuracy in MT applications. This acknowledgment opens up discussions on the role of MT in professional settings, suggesting that while GT may not replace human translators, it can serve as a valuable tool for initial translations or for individuals requiring an immediate understanding of foreign legal texts.

The study's findings reveal that Google Translate (GT) achieves only "partial equivalence" when translating English legal sentences into Arabic. This highlights a significant challenge in machine translation: achieving full equivalence is difficult, especially in fields requiring high precision, such as legal language. This partial equivalence suggests that while GT can grasp and convey the general meaning of the source text, nuances and specific legal terminologies may not be accurately rendered.

For future research, this study suggests a broader analysis of English legal sentences and their translation into Arabic by GT, indicating the need for comprehensive evaluations covering various legal documents and contexts. Additionally, there's an implicit call for continuous improvement in MT technologies, emphasizing the importance of developing models that can better handle the linguistic intricacies of legal language and other specialized domains.

**Conclusion**

Google translation shares many features with other machine translation (MT) system. In general, the evaluation of GT is not fixed; it frequently enhances its systems by adding new languages and concepts. Using Google Translate for translating English legal sentences into Arabic represents a new trend in empirical research. In this respect, six English legal chunks were validated, and entered into Google to be translated into Arabic. The analysis of Google Translate shows that the translation of English legal sentences into Arabic achieves a level of partial equivalence. It poses some problems in translating archaic English terms, dealing with passive voice, and, as previously mentioned, translating the modal "shall".

While Google Translate's performance is unlikely to match that of professionals, it can still offer a speedy translation for English-Arabic languages. This study has not managed to analyze more English legal sentences, the evaluation done has been indicative and suggestive.
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