

contrast, legal translation rarely requires such kind of creativity as Durieux (1991) maintains that translators can and should be creative in technical texts, but is more cautious when it comes to legal texts, acknowledging that they are subject to special restrictions.

Danet (1985:11) postulates that creativity manifests itself differently in various areas of translation, making creativity a domain-specific attribute. However, he admonishes the legal translator that as “even slight changes in language may affect the substance, translators must always take account of legal factors when making linguistic decisions”. Nida observes that “sociolinguistic constraints that significantly interfere with translators’ creativity occur primarily in religious, legal, and classical texts” (Nida, 1998:127).

Farghal and Shunnaq (1992:203) state that “the translation of technical materials requires special expertise in the relevant discipline on the top of the general language competence”. In addition, legal translation is considered one of the most challenging endeavors not only for lay people who are willing to translate legal texts from one language into another, but also translators who find it one of the most challenging tasks in the career field. Thus, when encountered with a legal document, lay people and non-professional translators attempt to use different aids to help them. Legal dictionaries, if found, are not as efficient as ordinary dictionaries due to their terminological incongruency (Sarcevic 1989).

Language is not the only aspect which makes the legal language different, legal archaisms, new terminology for new areas of law, and technical terms are other elements that exist in the legal discourse which are not found in any other discourse. The above characteristics of the legal discourse turn it to be one of the