

Chapter Three

Legal Discourse Characteristics

3.1. Preliminaries

In this chapter, the sub-language i.e. the legal discourse chosen in the assessment will be discussed. It is worth noting here that the current research does not opt for the legal language to be assessed haphazardly. In fact, the researcher favors to assess *Google Translate* on legal discourse for some valid facts. The foremost reason behind the selection is due to the formulaic nature, fixed terminology and the clear message such language usually possesses. Hatim (1997:38) states that “If Machine Translation is to be at all sustainable as a commercial enterprise, it will be in the area of restricted registers such as ‘initializing’ and ‘concluding’ legal documents.”

Therefore, it is supposed that MT researchers will easily avoid the different aforementioned ambiguities in automating the translation of legal texts. This fact is, however, considered to be over-tentative since it is based on theoretical reasoning rather than on solid facts and rigorous assessments.

The second reason for selecting legal language to be assessed is that up to the researcher’s knowledge, different assessments have been done on different MT systems where different sublanguages have been targeted (scientific, journalistic, weather reports, etc.) while no assessments have been executed on legal discourse in MT.

Finally, the demand for legal translation is on the increase around the world owing to globalization and the increased contact and exchange between peoples and states (Cao, 2007). The increasing international traffic of persons and goods as