Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The evaluation conducted on the legal discourse and more specifically contracts shows that *Google Translate* is not successful in producing outputs which are fully comprehensible to the target reader nor does it render the accurate legal sense exhibited in the inputs. The purpose of the evaluation is twofold. First of all, the main aim is to figure out whether the system is able to handle legal texts for different segments (feasibility test). The second aim is to furnish an error-analysis by determining the prominent drawbacks the system suffers from on two main levels, i.e. the lexical and syntactic levels (declarative evaluation).

From a feasibility test perspective, *Google Translate* does not perform well in translating legal discourse specifically contracts, regardless of the type of contracts under assessment. It is axiomatic to say, however, that legal translators, law librarians, and lay people have to reconsider their strategies should they decide to depend on *Google Translate* in translating legal documents. Because of the peculiarity and importance of precision the legal discourse has, people who are aiming at translating legal texts are cornered in an ultimate alternative which is "professional human translation".

In spite of the erroneous results *Google Translate* produces, it can still deliver the gist of the article. This could be helpful for lawyers and lay people who are willing to know the content of the text before paying a substantial amount to get it translated professionally.

Beyond the basic task of identifying the subject matter of a text, *Google Translate* is of little use in a law library. Law librarians and lawyers who use