Another distinction which should be brought to attention is the difference between the black box and the glass box evaluation. White (2003:241) states:

> The black-box view is a look at the input and output without taking into account the mechanics of the translation engine. The glass-box view looks inside the translation engine to see if each of its components did what was expected of them in the course of the translation process.

The advantage of the black box view in the current research resides in the fact that the evaluation will be able to determine better the language coverage of the system which will serve to either confirm or refute our hypotheses about how the system tries to handle legal language. Moreover, such evaluations could serve as important data as it is entirely reusable for other systems.

The current research adopts the black box evaluation since the mechanism which *Google Translate* adopts is statistical rather than traditional where definite rules and algorithms are furnished. Therefore, the output will be assessed against two levels, i.e. lexical and syntactic levels. Sub-categories will be furnished based on the results of the assessment and the errors *Google Translate* makes. Moreover, the evaluation purpose is to evaluate the language from a legal perspective since the language under assessment is restricted to the legal discourse where the hybrid, intricate nature of this type of language can hardly be subjected to simplistic sets of criteria or categories of assessment. Among the criteria on which the assessment will be made are precision and ambiguity, because ambiguity may result in serious legal consequences engendered by different possible interpretations.

To find out a way out of this dilemma, the researcher decides to adopt certain criteria from a more elaborate model of assessment to overcome the shortcomings in the previous model. As-Safi (1996) presents a tri-criterion assessment which is proposed to diagnose errors/losses which usually stem from