could be translated as a ‘lawsuit’ or ‘set of garments’. In order to render the right sense, one needs to examine the context larger than individual words.

Another challenge for the direct approach is that languages have different word orders. English favors the SVO sentential word order while Arabic prefers the VSO. A simple word-for-word translation will get the word order in the TL wrong.

The latter problem is addressed by the transfer approach which draws on parsing the ST, and then it transfers the parse tree of ST into a syntactic tree in the TT using proper rules. Finally it generates the translation from this syntactic tree. Still, we are faced with syntactic ambiguity. The example of ‘اطال النوم’ could be translated as ‘he prolonged sleep’ instead of ‘he slept for a long time’. It is evident here that syntactically correct translation often has inappropriate semantics. Lederer (2003) contributed to the grammatical ambiguity by giving the example of the sentence “gas pump prices rose last time oil stocks fell.” Each word in this sentence can be either a noun or a verb. She adds that “one can imagine the number of instructions which must be given to the machine so that it can disambiguate each word and place it in its correct grammatical category.”

At last, the Interlingua approach (which does not rely on literal translations) has the advantage of translating into a large number of languages. However, the disadvantage of such approach is the complex process of designing efficient and comprehensive knowledge representation formalisms. This is due to the amount of ambiguity that has to be resolved to translate from a natural language to a knowledge representation language (Manning & Shutze, 2002).

The need for a new approach has surfaced after many years of research and development on the previous approaches without achieving the ultimate goal of