

**tenant shall use the premises (Article 11)**

As in Article 8, the system makes use of the verb “يجب” as an equivalent for “shall”. Nevertheless, the verb employed along with a preposition “على” followed by the subject should be used in order to form a well-formed syntactic phrase in Arabic “يجب على المستأجر”. *Google Translate* fails to construct such a phrase and instead utilizes an incomprehensible and ill-formed syntactic phrase “يجب استخدام المباني المستأجر”.

**subscriber shall credit any report (Article 12)**

*Google Translate* uses the verb “يقوم” as an equivalent to *shall* whereas the simple present of “credit” “ينسب” should be used.

**subscriber shall indemnify (Article 13)**

*Google Translate* chooses the verb “يجوز” which is considered a grave flaw in legal translation since the equivalent chosen does not hold the binding feature of the modal *shall*; yet it conveys the sense of possibility rather than obligation.

**reuters may terminate this agreement (Article 14)**

*Google Translate* opts for “قد” as an equivalent to the modal *may* in this context. The particle “قد” signifies a probability of something to happen. The system should opt for “يجوز” or “يحق” to indicate that it is legally permitted to do something.

After having examined *Google Translate* on the lexical and syntactic levels, one should be cognizant of the different errors that could occur in using the system in translating contracts. Such errors are systematic which entails that they are most probably imminent when end users choose *Google Translate* as an option in