Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Humanities & Social Studies - No (66) – January 2025
https: //journals.qou.edu/index.php/jrresstudy
E-ISSN: 2616-9843/ P-ISSN: 2616-9835

The Impact of the Google Translate App on the Accuracy of Arabic-English Legal Translations: Lexical and Syntactic Errors

Rawan Raed Abdalmutee[1], Dr. Mohammed Farrah[2]

1Researcher, Graduate, English Department, Hebron University, Hebron, Palestine.
2Associate professor, English Department, Hebron University, Hebron, Palestine.

Oricd No: 0009-0006-7037-1191

Email: rawanabdalmutee@gmail.com

Oricd No: 0000-0002-9540-132X

Email: mfarrah@hebron.edu

• **Open Access**

Abstract

Objectives: This study aims to evaluate the precision of Google Translate (GT) in translating legal documents and to pinpoint the inaccuracies that may arise while using GT in translating legal documents.

Methods: To conduct the study, the researchers used five Arabic legal certificates taken from Dr. Adel Azzam's book, "The Reliable Guide to Legal Translation." To ensure reliability, the researchers inputted these legal certificate texts into GT and then compared the translation output to the model translation provided in the book.

Results: The results showed that there are two main errors: lexical and syntactic errors. The majority of these errors were lexical, including mistranslation and incorrect selection of words. Syntactic errors included errors in using pronouns, passivation, archaic terms, prepositional phrases, modal verbs, and references.

Conclusions: The researchers concluded that GT is not a reliable tool for legal translation. Errors from GT in legal documents can significantly affect their validity, with consequences depending on the nature and extent of the errors. Therefore, GT translation requires human editing.

Keywords: Machine translation, Google translate (GT), legal translation, lexical errors, syntactic errors.

أثر تطبيق ترجمة "جوجل" على دقة ترجمة النصوص القانونية من العربية إلى الإنجليزية: الأخطاء اللفظيّة والنحوية

أ. روان رائد عبد المعطي[1]، د. محمد عبد الحكيم فراح[2]

1باحثة، قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة الخليل، فلسطين.

2أستاذ مشارك، قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة الخليل، فلسطين.

الملخص

الأهداف: تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقييم مدى دقة استخدام تطبيق ترجمة جوجل (GT) في ترجمة الوثائق القانونية، وتحديد الأخطاء التي قد تنشأ في أثناء استخدام ترجمة جوجل في ترجمة هذه الوثائق.

المنهجية: لإجراء الدراسة استخدم الباحثان خمس وثائق قانونية عربية مأخوذة من كتاب الدكتور عادل عزام، بعنوان "الدليل المعتمَد للترجمة القانونية". ولضمان المصداقية، عمل الباحثان على ترجمة نصوص الوثائق القانونية عبر تطبيق ترجمة جوجل، ومن ثم مقارنة مخرجات الترجمة إلى الترجمة النموذجية المقدمة في كتاب الدكتور عادل عزام.

النتائج: أظهرت النتائج أن هناك نوعين رئيسيين من الأخطاء، وقد تمّ تصنيفهما على النحو الآتي: أخطاء معجمية (لَفظية)، وأخطاء نحوية، وكانت غالبية الأخطاء لفظية، بما في ذلك الترجمة الخاطئة، والاختيار غير الصحيح للكلمات. أما الأخطاء النحوية، فتمثلت بأخطاء في استخدام كل من الضمائر، والمبني للمجهول، والمصطلحات البائدة، وعبارات الجر، والأفعال الناقصة، والمراجع.

الخلاصة: خلص الباحثان إلى أن ترجمة جوجل، ليست مرجعاً موثوقاً للترجمة القانونية، كما أن الترجمة الناتجة عن هذا التطبيق غير دقيقة. ويمكن أن يكون للأخطاء الناتجة عن ترجمة جوجل في المستندات القانونية المترجمة تأثيرات كبيرة على صحتها القانونية، وتعتمد هذه التأثيرات على طبيعة الأخطاء ومداها؛ ولذلك فإن ترجمة جوجل تتطلب تحريراً وتدقيقاً بشرياً.

الكلمات الدالة: الترجمة الآلية، ترجمة جوجل، النصوص القانونية، الأخطاء المعجمية (اللفظية)، الأخطاء النحوية.

Introduction

Translation is a complicated process involving not only the transfer of words between languages but also the consideration of educational and cultural nuances, and the context that influences the selection of words in translation. Dingwaney and Maier (1995), (as cited in Bernacka, 2012). Šimurka (2020) stated that translation is not just limited to only rendering words between languages; it also functions as a cultural bridge that allows you to immerse yourself in new cultures that can't be seen from your cultural perspective. Building these cultural bridges requires competent translators who are almost proficient in both the source and the target languages and their corresponding cultures. Abbasi et al. (2012) said that since cultures and languages complement one another, and the characteristics of cultures vary between languages, translators should focus on expressing the exact meaning while also highlighting the differences between the two cultural viewpoints.

Many useful apps were created because of the rapid development of technology. Machine translation was one of these apps. Machine translation is regarded as one of the oldest and most interesting developments in the field of natural language processing. It is also a subset of artificial intelligence developed with the primary objective of overcoming language barriers, enabling the automatic translation of text between languages (Andrabi and Wahid, 2022). Wang, Wu, He, Huang, and Church (2022), Ismailia (2022), Andrabi and Wahid (2022), Chéragui, (2012), and Hadla, Hailat, and Al-Kabi (2014) defined machine translation as the practice of rendering words from one language to another utilizing computer. Warren Weaver was the first one who came up with the idea of machine translation in 1947, just one year after the creation of the first computer. Since then, MT has been viewed as one of the hardest tasks. Wang, Wu, He, Huang and Church (2022). This technology has been in existence since the 1950s. (Hadla, Hailat, and Al-Kabi, 2014). One of the machine translation tools is GT. GT was created in 2006 and is continuously being enhanced, (Jabak, 2019). Many researchers discussed the advantages of using MT in translation. Hadla, Hailat and Al-Kabi (2014) said that machine translation is used extensively because it is fast and free of charge. Similarly, Fitria (2021) indicated that a lot of people use MT because of its ease of use, low cost, quick outcomes, and ability to translate into many languages. Regarding the disadvantages, both researchers agreed that MT is not a reliable tool for an accurate translation.

Legal language is a specialized language with unique features and legalese. It is seen as a type of technical translation because legal texts typically use technical and specialized language. Malakhova, (2015), Cao (2007), and Trosborg (1997). Many researchers consider legal translation one of the most challenging tasks because it integrates the accuracy and creativity of literary translation with terminological precision (Hervey & Higgins, 1992). Sofyan and Rosa (2021) said that the translation of legal texts is thought to be highly challenging because it requires precise translation, and any small mistakes can lead to legal exposure and lawsuits. Hu and Cheng (2016) stated that since the majority of legal texts have legal purposes, any inaccuracy in the translation could result in legal consequences. Camelia and Chirilă (2014) said that it is crucial to accurately translate legal texts because any misinterpretation in a contract could result in financial loss and lawsuits. Therefore, translating legal texts into other languages is very challenging and should be done by skilled translators who are experts in the translation of legal texts. Yusran (2017) said that many errors arise in terms of word selection, grammar, and spelling when using GT. Unfortunately, few people are aware of this, particularly when it comes to legal translation. In translating legal terminology, many errors arise because GT provides suggested and additional translations, and people are not familiar with this terminology, so they are compelled to choose from these options at random without being aware of the accurate and proper translation. Legal terms should be rendered accurately because they contain critical information.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to
- evaluate the GT accuracy in translating legal documents.
- pinpoint the GT inaccuracies in translating legal documents.

Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following questions:
1. What types of errors commonly occur when using GT in translating legal documents?
2. What is the impact of errors made in the translated legal documents on the legal validity of such documents?

The Impact of the Google Translate App on the Accuracy of Arabic-English Legal Translations: Lexical and Syntactic Errors

Abdalmutee Farrah

Statement of the problem

The availability of mobile translation applications has resulted in an overreliance on GT among students. Nevertheless, the noteworthy implications of errors, particularly in critical situations such as legal translation, are frequently ignored by users. As a lot of students utilize mobile translation applications like GT for major tasks such as legal translation, the problem arises from the excessive dependence on them by translators who are not fully aware of potential inaccuracies and legal ramifications.

Significance of the study

This research aims to evaluate the precision of GT in translating legal documents and to pinpoint the inaccuracies that may arise while using GT in translating legal documents. The results of this research have the potential to help translators avoid excessive reliance on GT for legal translations. Additionally, the study may provide valuable perspectives, knowledge, and insights to students, translators, and researchers. This highlights the importance of exercising caution when employing GT to translate Arabic legal documents into English.

Literature Review

Since GT became a widely used tool, many studies have been conducted to assess its performance in translation. This section is divided into three parts. The first part discusses the advantages of using GT in translation; the second part discusses the disadvantages of using GT in translation; and the last part discusses various studies related to the current study.

Advantages of using GT in translation:

Several studies have discussed the advantages of using GT in translation. Jabak (2019) said that GT can translate various types of texts into over 100 languages. When tasked with translating expressions or words, GT quickly accumulates and retrieves this vocabulary. Consequently, it functions more effectively when it stores more vocabulary. Yusran (2017) opined that GT can translate not only paragraphs but even entire books. Amilia and Darmawan (2020) opined that GT can translate not only words but also sentences into hundreds of languages, and it can also translate texts printed on paper by snapping a picture of the paper. Putri (2021) concluded that students use GT because of its practicality, ease of use, time-saving, capacity to translate a large number of words, camera translation and offline translation features. Zafitri and Harida (2017) explained that GT can translate texts into over hundreds of languages, highlight words in both texts, figure out the language if it is unknown, and be used as a dictionary. They also concluded that GT can be a helpful tool for translation students, especially with regard to their math material.

Disadvantages of using GT in translation:

Many studies have discussed the disadvantages of using GT in translation. Hijazi (2013) and Alkatheery (2023), concluded that GT isn't reliable for precise translations of legal texts. Nevertheless, it can provide a general understanding of the texts, helping translators understand the main topic of the text. Yusran (2017) concluded that GT can't be relied on for translating legal terms because it is unable to distinguish between various legal systems. He also proposed that people should still revise the translations produced by GT. Güldal and İşisağ (2019) concluded that GT can't be relied on for translation. Despite accelerating the translation process, it still needs human editing. Al-Hamadi (2014) explored the use and challenges of GT, specifically focusin on its application for the Arabic language. She pointed out that translating Arabic can be quite challenging due to its complex grammar, rich morphology, and context-dependent meanings. Additionally, the researcher emphasized that this could impact the quality of translations, particularly when dealing with idiomatic expressions and culturally specific terms. Jabak (2019) concluded that texts produced by GT lack accuracy, so there is a need for human editing. Amilia and Darmawan (2020) said that translations produced by GT contain many errors and are not as proper as translations produced by skilled translators. Putri (2021) concluded that translations provided by GT often lack precision and occasionally contain inaccuracies. Therefore, he suggested that students should revise the translation produced by GT. Abu-Zahra and Shayeb (2022) suggested that translation instructors should restrict the use of mobile translation apps, particularly in EFL environments, in order to improve the aptitude and competency of students' translation. Alsalem (2019) recommended that students refrain from using GT during the initial phases of translation training, as it could significantly affect their performance.

Google Translate and Legal Text Translation:

Several studies have investigated the errors that resulted from the use of GT in the translation of various legal texts. Alkatheery (2023) investigated the errors that occur when translating Arabic legal texts into English using GT. The researcher used five legal texts taken from a reliable book, fed them into GT, and then compared the translation of GT with a model translation provided in the book. The findings indicated that there are four types of errors: lexical, syntactic, register-related errors, and omission errors. The most common errors were lexical ones, including incorrect word selection and mistranslation. Syntactic errors included errors like word order and inflectional errors. Register-related errors included the use of pronouns, models, archaic and deictic terms, and legal jargon. Omission had the lowest percentage of errors, including the deletion of an entire clause or a word. In a comparative study conducted on translation of legal texts from English into Arabic, Hijazi (2013) reported that the errors are both lexical and syntactic. He assessed the accuracy of GT in translating legal texts. The data included 14 articles, which were fed into GT. The results showed two main types of errors, including lexical and syntactic errors. Lexical errors included homonymy, polysemy, legal adverbs, and doublets. Syntactic errors included issues with modality, concord, and morphological parsing. Based on the result of his study, there is a need for expert translators to provide accurate translation of legal documents. Güldal and İşisağ (2019) investigated the errors resulting from the use of GT in translating various types of Turkish texts into English. The results showed that there are four main errors, and they can be classified as the following: semantic, pragmatic, morphological, and syntactic errors. Jabak (2019) assessed the precision of different types of Arabic texts translated into English using GT. The researcher inputted the texts into GT and then compared the output translation to a model translation. The results showed that there are two main types of errors: lexical and syntactic errors. Ubhayawardhana and Hansani (2023) evaluated the efficacy of using GT in rendering Sinhala legal jargon into English and vice versa. The data was collected from different types of legal certificates and documents. To conduct the study, the researcher inputted the texts into GT and then compared the translation output to a manual translation. The results showed that the translations produced by GT were incorrect in some cases. Killman (2014) investigated the precision of using GT in rendering Spanish legal jargon into English following the SMT system. The data was collected from a summary judgment text. To conduct the study, the researcher inputted the text into GT and then compared the translation output to a manual translation. The results showed that in approximately 64% of cases, the legal jargon was precisely translated. Cahyaningrum (2022) investigated the effectiveness of using GT in rendering English legal documents into Indonesian using a descriptive qualitative study. The results showed that GT can't be relied on for translating legal texts, and the translation provided by it is not accurate. Furthermore, the researcher advised the GT users to check and revise the translation produced with GT. Likewise, Giampieri (2023) investigated the effectiveness of using Deepl Translate in rendering Italian legal texts into English. The results showed that using MT in rendering legal formulas contains inaccuracies, including the wrong word order, inaccurately translating legal formulas, and not taking into account the features of the legal language. Wahler (2018) advised lawyers against over relying on MT in rendering legal texts and to check and revise translations produced by it. Legal experts believe that MT is not appropriate for translating legal documents due to the unique features the legal language has, which makes it harder for MT to process. Killman (2014), Ramos (2015), and Matthiesen (2017), (as cited in Sosoni, Stasimioti, and O'Shea, 2023).

Methodology

The objective of the study is to evaluate the precision of GT in translating legal documents and to pinpoint the inaccuracies that may arise while using GT in translating legal documents. To conduct the study, the researchers carefully researched a reliable legal book that includes Arabic legal texts and their corresponding translations as references. The researchers selected five legal certificates for the study. The data was collected from Dr. Adel Azzam's book "The Reliable Guide to Legal Translation" and consisted of five legal texts that covered various topics. To ensure reliability, the researchers inputted these legal certificate texts into GT and then compared the translation output to the model translation provided in the book. To analyze the data, the researchers used three tables: the original text, the model translation, and the GT translation. In this way, the reader will easily understand the errors that arise from GT translation.

Results and Discussion

Lexical and syntactic errors are the two main categories of errors that emerged while feeding the texts into GT. The following illustrates both categories.

The Impact of the Google Translate App on the Accuracy of Arabic-English Legal Translations:
Lexical and Syntactic Errors

Abdalmutee
Farrah

Lexical Errors:

Table (1):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
حجة عزوبة	The argument for celibacy	Bachelorhood Certificate

In Table (1), it can be observed that the term "حجة عزوبة" was incorrectly translated by GT as "The argument for celibacy." The word "عزوبة" refers to a person who is not married yet, whereas the word "celibacy" refers to a person who abstains from marriage. Therefore, the translation generated by GT is wrong and doesn't convey the intended meaning. The correct translation is"' bachelorhood," as seen in the model translation. In addition, the word "حجة" was literally translated by GT as "argument," whereas in this context, it means "certificate, "as seen in the model translation.

Table (2):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وذلك بناء على **تقريره** المؤيد ب	based on his **report** supported by	This is in accordance with his **testimony** supported by

In Table (2), it can be observed that GT made an error by translating the word "تقريره" as "report", while in the given legal context, "تقريره" refers to a spoken statement, not a written document. As a result, the GT translation is incorrect and fails to convey the intended meaning. The accurate translation of "تقريره" in this context is "testimony", which can be seen in the model translation provided.

Table (3):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
المكلفين شرعا	Legally responsible	Legally capable

In Table (3), it can be seen that GT inaccurately translated "المكلفين شرعا" as "legally responsible". However, in this context, "المكلفين شرعا" refers to a person who has the ability to actively engage in legal matters, as long as they are not underage or have any mental or physical conditions that restrict them from doing so. On the other hand, "legally responsible" refers to a person who is obligated to comply with the law. Therefore, the translation proposed by GT fails to convey the intended meaning of "المكلفين شرعا". The correct translation of "المكلفين شرعا" is "legally capable", as evident in the provided model translation.

Table (4):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
حجة خلو موانع	The argument of the absence of barriers	Certificate of Eligibility

As observed in Table (4), the legal expression "حجة خلو موانع" was literally translated by GT as " The argument of the absence of barriers." This translation can be deemed correct if we take each word alone out of context. However, given the legal context, this translation does not convey the intended meaning. The legal expression "حجة خلو موانع" refers to getting a declarative decision from a Sharia court confirming the absence of legal impediments to marriage. The correct translation is "Certificate of Eligibility," as seen in the model translation.

Table (5):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
حضرت المكلفة	The person in charge attended	received the legally capable

In Table (5), it can be seen that the word "المكلفة" was wrongly translated by GT as "the person in charge." The problem here is that instead of considering the specific legal context, GT relied on a common interpretation of the word. Although "المكلفة" usually refers to an individual in charge of something, in this instance, it refers to the

individual's ability to participate in legal matters with the availability of some conditions. The correct translation is "legally capable," as seen in the model translation.

Table (6):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
إنني خالية من أي **موانع** شرعية أو قانوني	I am free from any legal or legal **obstacles**	I am free of any shari'a or legal **impediments**

Table (6) demonstrates that the word "موانع" was imprecisely translated by GT as "obstacle". In a general context, "مـوانـع" could be translated as "obstacle". However, in this legal context, the word "impediments" is the proper translation because it accurately conveys the intended meaning.

Table (7):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وطلبت إعطاءها **إشهاداً** شرعياً بذلك	She requested that she be given a legal **certificate** to that effect	She asked to be given a shari'a **attestation** of this

Table (7) demonstrates that GT incorrectly rendered the word "إشـهادا" as "certificate." "إشـهادا" is usually used in the context of confirming something, so the word "attestation" is the appropriate translation, as seen in the model translation.

Table (8):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وأيدت **تقريرها** بإخبار المعرفين المذكورين أعلاه	She supported her **report** by informing the above-mentioned informants	and her **testimony** was supported by the testimony of the mentioned identifiers

Table (8) reveals that GT mistranslated the word "تقريره" as "report." In this context, "تقرير" refers to a spoken statement, not a written document. As a result, the GT translation is wrong and does not convey the intended meaning. The proper translation is "testimony," as seen in the model translation.

Table (9):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وليس بعصمته زوجات ولا **معتدات من طلاق رجعي**	and has no wives or waiting period from a revocable divorce	and has neither wives under his bond of marriage, nor **revocably divorced wives**

Table (9) indicates that GT provided a wrong translation for the word "معتدات", translating it as "waiting period from a revocable divorce. The word "مـعتـدات" refers to "revocably divorced wives," as seen in the model translation. Therefore, GT completely changed the meaning of the sentence.

Table (10):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
شهادة الدراسة الثانوية العامة	Secondary school certificate	General Certificate of Secondary Education

Table (10) highlights that GT inaccurately translated the phrase as "Secondary school certificate". However, the phrase actually refers to a specific certificate obtained by students who successfully pass an examination to be qualified for higher education. The proper term which is widely used and conveys the intended meaning is "General Certificate of Secondary Education" as can be seen in the model translation.

Table (11):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
حجة اسلام	Hojjat Islam	Certificate of Conversion to Islam

The Impact of the Google Translate App on the Accuracy of Arabic-English Legal Translations:
Lexical and Syntactic Errors

Abdalmutee
Farrah

Table (11) shows that GT made an error when translating the term "حجة إسلام" as "Hojjat Islam". This is problematic because the term "Hojjat Islam" is a term used to describe religious scholars. Therefore, the translation generated by GT doesn't convey the intended meaning. The proper translation is "Certificate of Conversation to Islam" which can be seen in the model translation.

Table (12):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
قررت قائلة: "إنني، عن عقيدة راسخة وإيمان بالله سبحانه وتعالى،	She decided, saying: "I, out of a firm belief and belief in God Almighty	On the basis of a firmly established conviction and belief in Allah, the Almighty

In Table (12), it can be seen that GT provided imprecise translation of the above sentence. The use of formal expressions is a common lexical feature in the legal text. However, GT didn't provide the right expression due to its literal translation of words instead of interpreting the formal expressions commonly used in legal texts.

Table (13):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وبرئت من كل دين يغاير دين الإسلام	I disavowed every religion other than the religion of Islam	I hereby renounce all religions other than the religion of Islam.

In Table (13), it can be seen that the word "برئت" was inaccurately translated by GT as "disavowed." The word "برئت" means to declare the abandonment of something, whereas the word "disavowed" means to deny something. Consequently, GT did not convey the intended meaning precisely. The proper translation is "renounce," as seen in the model translation.

Table (14):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وحيث صدر هذا الإقرار من...... المذكورة، وهي بالحالة المعتبرة شرعاً، أمام **المعرفين المذكورين**	since this acknowledgment was issued by the aforementioned....., while she was in the condition considered by Sharia, before the aforementioned **scholars**	and as this avowal was issued by the aforementioned **legally capable**......... before the aforementioned **identifiers**

In Table (14), it can be seen that GT incorrectly translated the phrase "الحالة المعتبرة شرعا" as "condition considered by Sharia." The expression "الحالة المعتبرة شرعا" means to be qualified to engage in legal issues. The proper translation should be "legally capable," as seen in the model translation. In addition, GT mistranslated the word "المعرفين" as "scholars." The legal term "المعرفين" refers to the people who identify something. The proper translation should be "identifier," as seen in the model translation.

Table (15):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
فقد أفهمتها أنها أصبحت من عباد الله المسلمين	, I understood her that she became a Muslim servant of God	, I have informed her that she has become a Muslim

In Table (15), it can be seen that GT literally translated the word "أفهمتها" as "understood," while in this context, it means "inform," as seen in the model translation. In addition, the phrase "من عباد الله" was literally translated by GT as "servant." The expression "من عباد الله" means the person who became a Muslim. Therefore, the GT translation is completely wrong and doesn't capture the intended meaning.

Syntactic Errors:

Table (16):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
في المجلس الشرعي المعقود لدي أنا .... قاضي	In the Sharia Council held by me,.......,the head	In the legal counsel convened in my presence, I,....., the Head

In Table (16), it can be seen that the pronoun "I" is missing from the translation generated by GT, which results in a less accurate translation. To ensure precision, the pronoun "I" should be inserted, as seen in the model translation.

Table (17):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وأيدت تقريرها بإخبار المعرفين المذكورين أعلاه	She supported her report by informing the above-mentioned informants	and her testimony was supported by the testimony of the mentioned identifiers

In Table (17), it can be seen that GT rendered the phrase "أيدت تقريرها" in the active voice as "she supported her report. This does not follow the standard structure found in legal texts. In legal language, passivation is widely used. Therefore, the accurate translation should be in the passive voice, as "her testimony was supported," as seen in the model translation.

Table (18):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
تشهد وزارة التربية والتعليم في المملكة الأردنية الهاشمية أن	The Ministry of Education in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan **certifies** that	The Ministry of Education in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan **hereby certifies** that

In Table (18), it can be seen that GT produced a less accurate translation. Its translation is not considered wrong, but it lacks a sense of legality. The use of archaic terms is a common feature in the legal language because it shows that the text is a legal one. The accurate translation should insert the archaic term "hereby," as seen in the model translation.

Table (19):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
من أجل البضائع الواردة في الصنف الدولي	**for** goods included in international category	**in respect of** the goods mentioned in the International Class

In Table (19), it can be seen that GT did not select an appropriate translation for the phrase "من أجل". The use of prepositional phrases is a common syntactic feature in legal texts. The appropriate translation that conveys the intended meaning would be "in respect of," as seen in the model translation.

Table (20):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وبرئت من كل دين يغاير دين الإسلام	I disavowed every religion other than the religion of Islam	I hereby renounce all religions other than the religion of Islam

Table (20) illustrates that GT produced a less accurate translation. Its translation is not considered wrong, but it lacks a sense of legality. The use of archaic terms is a common feature in the legal language because it shows that the text is a legal one. The accurate translation should insert the archaic term "hereby," as seen in the model translation.

Table (21):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وطلبت تسجيله للاعتماد عليه	and requested its registration in order to rely on it	She requested to register that to act by its virtue

The Impact of the Google Translate App on the Accuracy of Arabic-English Legal Translations:
Lexical and Syntactic Errors

Abdalmutee
Farrah

In Table (21), it can be seen that GT did not provide an appropriate translation for the phrase "عليه." The use of prepositional phrases is a common syntactic feature in legal texts. The appropriate translation that conveys the intended meaning would be "by its virtue," as seen in the model translation.

Table (22):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وأن **عليها** القيام بالواجبات الدينية والشـــعائر الإسلامية	and she **must** perform religious duties and Islamic rituals	and that she **shall** perform all her shari'a duties and Islamic rites

Table (22) indicates that GT failed to provide an appropriate legal translation for the phrase "وأن عليها". GT used the model "must" in rendering this phrase, while in the legal language, the model "must" is not used. To show obligation, the model "shall" is used. The correct translation should insert "shall" as seen in the model translation.

Table (23):

Original Text	GT	Model Translation
وبعد أن حلف الجميع اليمين الشـــرعية فقد تقرر تسجيله للاعتماد عليه والعمل بموجبه تحريراً في	and after everyone took the legal oath, it was decided to register it for reliance on it and to act upon it in writing	and after all have taken the legal oath, it has been decided to register this certificate to act by its virtue

Table (23) demonstrates that GT rendered the pronoun "it" to translate the word "تسجيله", resulting in ambiguity and inaccuracies due to the unclear referent of the pronoun "it". Therefore, an accurate translation should insert the corresponding reference to the pronoun. This was shown in the model translation when it used the word "certificate."

The impact of errors made in the translated legal documents on the legal validity of such documents:

Regarding the effect of errors made in the translated legal documents on their legal validity, it depends on the errors themselves and the document type. For example, in religious documents mentioned in the research, like bachelorhood certificate, certificate of conversion to Islam, and certificate of eligibility, the choice of accurate legal jargon is crucial. Therefore, any mistranslation would lead to the loss of the complete legal validity of the document as it completely changes the whole meaning of the legal document. When GT wrongly translated "حجة عزوبة" as a certificate of celibacy, which refers to a person who abstains from marriage for a religious vow, while "عزوبة" actually refers to a person who's not married yet, the whole meaning was completely changed. As a result, the translated document will not be valid, and it could also lead to legal exposure. In other types of certificates where syntactic errors occurred, the researchers believe that it could only affect the legal validity partially. When GT omits the archaic term "hereby" or uses the modal "must" instead of "shall," this does not affect the whole meaning of the document; rather, this leads to a lack of precision, professionalism, and the proper taste, texture, and color required for a legal product.

Discussion:

As shown by the results of the study, GT is not a reliable tool for legal translation, as the resulting product is not accurate, and thus it requires human editing and revision. This aligns with the findings of Alkatheery (2023), Hijazi (2013), Yusran (2017), Güldal and İşisağ (2019), Jabak (2019), Amilia and Darmawan (2020), and Putri (2021). The researchers conclude that GT is not a reliable tool for legal translation, and the translation provided by it is not accurate. This is consistent with other studies. Hijazi (2013) and Alkatheery (2023) concluded that GT is not reliable for precise translation of legal texts. Similarly, Yusran (2017) concluded that GT can't be relied on for translating legal terms. Putri (2021) concluded that translations provided by GT often lack accuracy.

The findings also reveal that GT translation requires human editing and revision. This is consistent with other studies. Yusran (2017) proposed that people should still revise the translations produced by GT. Similarly, Güldal and İşisağ (2019), and Jabak (2019) concluded that GT translation needs human editing. Amilia and Darmawan (2020) said that translations produced by GT contain many errors and are not as proper as translations produced by skilled translators.

Conclusion

The researchers conducted a descriptive analytical study to evaluate the precision of GT in translating legal documents and to pinpoint the inaccuracies that may arise while using GT in translating legal documents. The data included five Arabic legal certificates taken from Dr. Adel Azzam's book, "The Reliable Guide to Legal Translation." The researchers inputted these legal certificate texts into GT and then compared the translation output to the model translation provided in the book.

The results showed that there are two main errors: lexical and syntactic errors. Lexical errors got the highest percentage, including mistranslation and incorrect selection of words. Syntactic errors included errors in using pronouns, passivation, archaic terms, prepositional phrases, modals, and references. The inaccuracies in GT lead to ambiguity and misinterpretation. The mistranslation of the legal terms can compromise the enforceability of a legal document. Additionally, mistranslation may lead to one party losing their right due to errors in translated legal documents. It is evident that GT is not a reliable tool for legal translation. The translations it provides are often inaccurate, and errors in translated legal documents can have significant impacts on their validity and enforceability. This can lead to ambiguity, disputes, and potential legal and financial liabilities. Ensuring accuracy through professional translation and legal review is essential to avoid the above risks. Therefore, GT translation requires human editing and revision.

Recommendations

As evident in this study, legal translation must be accurate because any mistranslation could lead to legal consequences. Moreover, the research findings indicated that GT is not an accurate tool for legal translation, and its translation requires human revision and editing. Therefore, some recommendations must be taken into account, as follows:

1. Legal texts should be translated by expert translators who specialize in legal translation.
2. Translators should participate in training workshops in legal translation.
3. Translators should minimize the use of the GT app.
4. If GT is used, the translation should be edited and revised by legal expert translators.
5. Translators should refer to the specialized legal dictionaries.
6. Translators should verify the accuracy of legal translation by ensuring that it is in compliance with the legal requirements and the laws of the country.

References

- Abbasi, G., Saleh, S., Assemi, A., & Dehghan, S. S. (2012). Language, translation, and culture. *International Conference on Language, Medias and Culture. IPEDR. IACSIT Press, Singapore. Vol.33* ,83-87
- Abu-Zahra, M. J., & Shayeb, A. Sh. (2022). Do mobile translation apps enhance or hinder translation trainees' linguistic competence: The Case Study of Translation Students at Birzeit University. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 18*(4) 154-162.
- Alkatheery, E.R. (2023). Google Translate errors in legal texts: Machine translation quality assessment. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies 7* (1), 208- 219
- Alsalem, R. (2019). The effects of the use of Google Translate on translation students' learning outcomes. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies, 3(*4)46-60
- Al-Hamadi, F. (2014). Machine translation into arabic language...difficulties and challenges: "Google Translation" as a case study. *The Journal of Linguistic and Literary Studies (JLLS)*, 5(1), 17-38.
- Amilia, I. K., & Darmawan, E. Y (2020). A study of the translation of Google Translate. *Lengua Jurnal Ilmiah, 16*(2), 1-21.
- Andrabi, S. A. B., & Wahid, A. (2022). Machine translation system using deep learning for English to Urdu. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2023*, 1-11
- Bernacka, A. (2012). The importance of translation studies for development education. Policy & Practice: *A Development Education Review,* (14) 110-115.
- Cahyaningrum, I. O. (2022). Google Translate for legal document. In I. Suripto & N. Rianingrum (Eds.), Proceedings of the 10th UNNES Virtual International Conference on English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation, ELTLT 2021 (pp. 1-7). EAI.
- Camelia, C. (2014). Errors and difficulties in translating legal texts. *Management Strategies Journal, Constantin Brancoveanu University. 26*(4), 487-492.

- Cao, D. (2007). Translating law. *Multilingual Matters*
- Chéragui, M. A. (2012). Theoretical overview of machine translation. *Proceedings (ICWIT 2012)*. (P.160-169).
- Dingwaney, A., & Maier, C (eds) (1995). Between languages and cultures: translation and cross-cultural texts. *University of Pittsburgh Press.*
- Fitria, T. N. (2021). A review of Machine Translation tools: The translation's ability. LANGUAGE CIRCLE: *Journal of Language and Literature, 16*(1), 162-176.
- Giampieri, P. (2023). Is machine translation reliable in the legal field? A corpus-based critical comparative analysis for teaching ESP at tertiary level. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level, 11*(1), 119-137.
- Güldal, B. K, & İşisağ, K. U. (2019). A comparative study on Google Translate: An error analysis of Turkish-to-English translations in terms of the text typology of Katherina Reiss. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, (Ö5)*, 367-376.
- Hadla, L., S. Hailat, T. M., & Al-Kabi, M. N. (2014). Evaluating Arabic to English Machine Translation. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 5*(11) 68-73
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). Thinking translation: A course in translation method: French to English (1st ed.). *Routledge.*
- Hijazi, B. (2013). Assessment of Google's translation of legal texts, (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Petra. Amman, Jordan.
- Hu, P. C., & Cheng, L. (2016). A study of legal translation from the perspective of error analysis. *International Journal of Legal Discourse.1*(1), 235-252
- Ismailia, T. (2022). The analysis of errors on translating informative texts by Google Translate. *JETLEE, 2*(2), 123-132
- Jabak, O. O. (2019). Assessment of Arabic-English translation produced by Google Translate. *IJLLT, 2*(4) 238-247
- Killman, J. (2014). Vocabulary accuracy of statistical machine translation in the legal context. In Proceedings of the 11th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas (pp. 85-98). Vancouver, Canada: Association for Machine Translation in the Americas.
- Malakhova A, et al. (2015). Difficulties of legal translation. *In Young Scientist USA, Vol. 2* (p. 139). *Lulu Press.*
- Matthiesen, A. (2017). Maschinelle Übersetzung im Wandel. Die Auswirkungen von künstlicher Intelligenz auf maschinelle Übersetzungssysteme. Mit einer vergleichenden Untersuchung von Google Translate und Microsoft Translator, epubli
- Putri, A. E. (2021). Students' dependence on using Google Translate: a case study at three universities in Semarang. MA Thesis, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang.
- Ramos, F.P. (2015). Quality assurance in legal translation: Evaluating process, competence, and product in the pursuit of adequacy. *International Journal of Semiotics and Law, 28*, 11–30.
- Šimurka, M. (2020). The importance of translation. Retrieved on 20th Sep 2023. Retrieved from: https://www.lexika-translations.com/blog/the-importance-of-translation/
- Sofyan, R., & Rosa, R. N. (2021). Problems and strategies in translating legal. *Universitas Negeri Padang UNP, 20*(2), 221-232.
- Sosoni, V., O'Shea, J., & Stasimioti, M. (2023). Translating law: A comparison of human and post-edited translations from Greek to English. Revista de Llengua i Dret, *Journal of Language and Law*, 109-120.
- Trosborg, A. (1997). Rhetorical strategies in legal language: discourse analysis of statutes and contracts. *Narr*
- Ubhayawardhana, P., & Hansani, M. (2023). A Study on the effectiveness of Using Google Translate in legal translation: With special reference to selected legal documents of the registrar's department. *Sri Lanka Journal of Humanities and Language Studies, 1*(1), 168-190.
- Wahler, M. E. (2018). A word is worth a thousand words: Legal implications of relying on machine translation technology. *Stetson Law Review, 48*(1), 109-139.
- Wang, H., Wu, H., He, Z., Huang, L., & Church, K. W. (2022). Progress in machine translation. *Engineering, 18* (2022), 143-153

- Yusran, N. (2017). An error analysis of legal terminology translation using Google Translate from English to Indonesian. A thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Adab and Humanities in Partial Accomplishment of the Requirements for the Degree of Strata 1. State Islamic University of Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta
- Zafitri, L., & Harida, E. S. (2017). The effectiveness of using Google Translate on students' translation at Mathematic Faculty of Universitas Negeri Padang. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-5), 5(1), 80-85.