



## Investigating the Strategies of Translating Culture-Specific Terms in Court Documents by Accredited Translators

دراسة استراتيجيات ترجمة المصطلحات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية في الوثائق القضائية من قبل المترجمين المعتمدين

**Abdulhameed Ashuja'a**

*Researcher, Department of Translation  
Faculty of Languages - Sana'a University -Yemen*

**عبد الحميد الشجاع**

باحث - قسم الترجمة  
كلية اللغات - جامعة صنعاء - اليمن

**Abdulwadood Ahmed Annuzaili**

*Researcher, Department of Translation  
Faculty of Languages - Sana'a University -Yemen*

**عبدالودود أحمد النزيلى**

باحث - قسم الترجمة  
كلية اللغات - جامعة صنعاء - اليمن

**Qaid Musar**

*Researcher, Center for Translation & Language Teaching,  
Sana'a University -Yemen*

**قائد معصار**

باحث - مركز خدمات المجتمع للترجمة وتعليم اللغات  
جامعة صنعاء - اليمن

## الملخص:

تُعد المصطلحات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية من أكثر القضايا تعقيداً في مجال الترجمة، لاسيما الترجمة القانونية؛ نظراً لتجذرها في الثقافة وارتباطها بدلالات ووظائف تقليدية محددة. ولذلك، فإن ترجمة هذه المصطلحات - لا سيما تلك المستخدمة في الوثائق القضائية- تتطلب مترجماً ليس فقط ثنائي اللغة وثنائي الثقافة، بل يتمتع أيضاً بمعرفة مهنية باستراتيجيات الترجمة التي تؤدي دوراً أساسياً في إيصال المعنى المقصود لهذه المصطلحات بدقة. هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى استكشاف وتحليل استراتيجيات الترجمة التي يتبعها المترجمون المعتمدون في اليمن عند ترجمة المصطلحات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية الواردة في الوثائق القضائية اليمنية. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف، اعتمدت الدراسة تصنيف غزاله (2015) لاستراتيجيات ترجمة المصطلحات الثقافية لتحليل وتقييم الاستراتيجيات التي طبقها المشاركون في الدراسة. وقد تم اختيار المشاركين عشوائياً من مكاتب الترجمة المعتمدة في صنعاء، حيث طُلب منهم ترجمة قائمة مُتحقق منها تم اختيارها عشوائياً من المصطلحات الثقافية المنتقاة من وثائق قانونية متنوعة في المحاكم اليمنية. أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن غالبية المشاركين (38%) اعتمدوا على استراتيجية الترجمة الحرفية، مما أسفر عن ترجمات غير مناسبة ومرتبطة بشكل كبير باللغة المصدر. في المقابل، استخدم عدد قليل جداً منهم (2%) استراتيجيات أفضت إلى ترجمات تتسم بالقبول الدلالي والوظيفي. وبناءً على هذه النتائج، توصي الدراسة بإدراج استراتيجيات ترجمة المصطلحات الثقافية التي اقترحها غزاله (2015) ضمن المناهج التعليمية في أقسام الترجمة، بهدف إعداد طلاب الترجمة بشكل أفضل لمتطلبات سوق العمل.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** المصطلحات ذات الخصوصية الثقافية، الوثائق القضائية اليمنية، المترجمون المعتمدون

## Abstract:

Culture-specific terms (CSTs) represent one of the thorniest issues in translation, particularly legal translation, as they are culturally rooted and heavily loaded with specific traditional connotations and functions. Thus, translating CSTs, particularly used in court documents, not only requires a bilingual and bicultural translator but also professional knowledge of translation strategies, which play an indispensable role in translating such terms. This study aimed to explore and examine translation strategies employed by Yemeni accredited translation offices when translating CSTs in Yemeni court documents. To achieve the study objective, Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of strategies for translating culture-specific terms was adopted to analyze and assess the strategies applied by the study participants who were randomly selected from Sana'a-based translation offices. They were requested to translate a validated list of CSTs randomly selected from various legal documents at Yemeni courts. The study results revealed that the majority of the study participants (38%) applied the literal translation strategy, which yielded inappropriate translations oriented towards the source language. Only a small number (2%) of them used strategies that led to semantically and functionally acceptable translations. Therefore, it is recommended that strategies for translating cultural items proposed by Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy be introduced to translation programs in departments of translation to prepare translation students for the labor market.

**Keywords:** culture-specific terms, Yemeni court documents, accredited translators.

## 1. Introduction

Translation is a task that requires the translator to possess knowledge, experience, and awareness of both the language and culture of the language pair without which the resulting translation product is likely to be unequivocally distorted, less adequate, and less acceptable. A more challenging type of translation is legal translation, which has been considered a cornerstone of linking nations and cultures together through bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties that regulate relations between such nations. The characteristic feature of any legal text is that it is largely culture-specific (Coa, 2007) and that cultural terms constitute an integral part of legal language (El-Farahaty, 2015). Culture-specific terms (CSTs) found in the source language (SL) may be linguistically or conceptually absent in the target language (TL), which also indicates the social and cultural reality of language in a given society. Therefore, the concept of CSTs refers to any word or expression restrictedly used by language users in a given society. These terms are loaded with cultural references and lexically and conceptually rooted in the culture and history of that society; besides, CSTs in one culture may not have a direct equivalent in another and are sometimes difficult to be properly expressed in the other culture.

To help overcome the challenges that may be imposed by CSTs across different cultures during the process of translation, several translation strategies have been proposed. To begin with, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) were concerned with the challenges of translating CSTs, and proposed a set of strategies for addressing the terms, taking the complexity and nuance of CSTs into account. They called their strategies: borrowing, calque, word-for-word translation, transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation. Newmark (1988), on the other hand, proposed strategies for rendering CSTs from one language to another as follows: "transference, cultural equivalent, neutralization (functional or descriptive equivalent), literal translation, label, naturalization, componential analysis, deletion, couplet, accepted standard translation, paraphrase (gloss, notes, etc.) and classifier"

(p.103). These strategies have been of help to many studies (e.g., Aljabri, 2020; Hassoon & Al-Dahwi, 2020; Makaoui, 2023). Venuti (1995), on the other side, has suggested a bridged version of strategies for translating CSTs which are classified broadly into two major categories: domestication and foreignization, where the former refers to several sub-categories such as substitution and adaptation, and the latter covers other sub-categories, such as borrowing and transferring. With regard to CSTs found in legal documents, Alibi and Ramos (2013) have proposed another group of strategies for translating CSTs in legal documents, namely, formal equivalent, functional equivalent, transcriptive translation, and descriptive translation (pp. 248-249). Annuzaili (2019) discusses a strategy for handling culture-specific terms in legal documents. He observes that "prudent translators usually sidestep religion-bound statements, particularly those that, if included in the translation, contribute nothing or have no relevance to the subject matter" (p. 130).

Though the above-discussed strategies seem to be well-established in the literature, which are also pertinent to the translation of CSTs, it seems that a special set of strategies for translating Arabic CSTs into English is imperative. Therefore, it can be observed that Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of strategies is apparently appropriate for translating Arabic CSTs into English. The taxonomy subsumes three major strategies: Acculturation (adoption), Cross-Culturalization (reconciliation of culture), and Anti-Culturalization (clash of cultures). Since Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy is adopted for the present study, it is spelled out in the next section.

## 2. Ghazala's (2015) Taxonomy of Translation Strategies

Due to the difficulties that encounter the translation of CSTs between Arabic and English and in view of the strategies and procedures suggested for bridging the cultural gap between SL and TL, Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy establishes a new framework of strategies that tackles the translation of cultural issues between Arabic and English, classifying these strategies into three categories as follows:

### 2.1. Acculturation

This category, which means the adoption of the foreign culture, is used to render non-equivalent and unexpressed or non-existing terms in TL by applying several translation strategies, such as transliteration, triplet, etc. (See Table 1) However, it contributes to the ambiguity of the translated text because it serves the required parameters of SL while neglecting the required parameters of TL. However, for Ghazala, there are several situations where acculturation is preferred to adopt the foreign source culture into the target culture so as to provide the target culture with modernized terms and ideas as well as to strongly link different cultures by rendering several foreign ideas, which may not harm the TL culture.

**Table (1) provides examples to clarify acculturation.**

SL	TL	SL	TL
hamburger	هامبورجر	كباب	Kabab
Bourgeoisie	البورجوازية	شريعة	Shari'a
UNESCO	اليونسكو	الشريعة الإسلامية	Islamic Shari'a Law

The procedures subsumed under the acculturation strategy can be employed to render the meaning of Arabic CSTs into English.

### 2.2. Cross-culturalization

This strategy is mainly used to bridge the gap between different cultures by adopting several procedures that link the SL with the TL to achieve an accurate and acceptable translation of CSTs, particularly collocations, similes, metaphors, proverbial expressions, etc. This strategy is usually used when both SL and TL texts include comparable cultural items in which the SL items can be translated into their identical, close/partial, favored, familiar, suggested, and approved cultural equivalences. 'Identical cultural equivalence' is similar to 'formal equivalent' suggested by Alibi and Ramos (2013), which is also defined by Nida (1964) as the strategy that focuses on the form

and content of a message, and it is usually used with terms that have comparable terms in the TL, such as "عجائب وغرائب" "wonderments and bewilderments" (Ghazala, 2015, p. 13).

On the other hand, the strategy of partial/close cultural equivalence is used when CSTs do not have identical equivalents. For example, "ابعد / من الثريا" (as remote as a dream) (Ghazala, 2015, p. 13) and "wooden talk" (لغة عقيمة) (Ghazala, 2015, p. 214). Culture-favored terms are preferred to adopt domestication and addition strategies in order to make the translation sound natural to the TL readers. For instance, when the word "God" is rendered into Arabic, it is preferred to be "الله جل جلاله" (Ghazala, 2015, p. 19). This strategy is similar to Aixela's (1996) substitution, which serves the parameters of TL.

New terms: there are suggested translations for new localized terms by a recognized body. This means to use the recognized translation of cultural terms if they are widely accepted and used. For example, the African country "Ivory Coast" is translated into Arabic as "ساحل العاج" (Ghazala, 2015, p. 20).

Moreover, Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy also suggests more translation strategies based on the problems encountered by translators in rendering cultural terms such as the translation of epithets, abbreviations, and other terms whose meaning may be distorted if translated inappropriately. For example, the translation of "الأمة العربية" into "Arab nations" is considered false translation, because Arab people are one nation, so it is preferred to be translated to "Arab Nation". Another example is the false reconciliation for "Israel militaries" instead of "Israel occupation militaries". Thus, if a reconciliation strategy is not employed when translating such terms, translation pitfalls may occur, resulting in distorted translations.

### 2.3. Anti-Culturalization

This strategy is applied when the basic linguistic or cultural principles are violated during the process of translation, particularly when a term is rendered directly ignoring the cultural aspects of TL. That is, translators will be highly alert not only to the linguistic components but also to extralinguistic determinants such as culture, religion, etc. Thus, there are several procedures to be

adopted so as to overcome such cultural clashes. An example of such strategies is neutralization (non-culturalization), which, according to Mughazy (2016), is suitable to overcome the lexical gap, particularly within CSTs, such as "كتب الكتاب" (*Katab Alketab*) in Egyptian Arabic dialect which means "got married".

In some other cases, more care should be taken to avoid any cultural clash by looking for an approved translation, such as "a dog's chance" (أمل ابليس بالجنة) (*amal iblees bil-jannah*) (Ghazala, 2015, p. 22). An approved cultural equivalent is a strategy that is used to deal with sensitive terms, which require special care in order not to cause any insult or hurt to the target readership.

Regarding empirical studies related to CSTs, a number of studies were conducted to investigate the strategies for translating CSTs (e.g., Albir & Molina, 2002; Alenezi & Alkhalifah, 2023; Alibi & Ramos, 2013; Aljabri, 2020; Fathi, 2012; Hassoon & Al-Dahwi, 2020; Makaoui, 2023; Lörscher, 1991). Fathi (2012) conducted a study to analyze translation strategies adopted by translation students when translating cultural terms in legal texts. Ten MA candidates were given eight legal terms at Mosul University to translate from English into Arabic. The translations were analyzed according to translation strategies suggested by Albir and Molina (2002) and Lörscher (1991). Besides, Alenezi and Alkhalifah (2023) have highlighted the difficulties and the strategies used by translation students when translating CSTs from English into Arabic. The findings showed that students encountered several challenges due to their incompetency and particularly to their unawareness of translation strategies. The most frequently used translation strategies were paraphrase, partial equivalent, omission, and identical equivalent.

In summary, Yemeni CSTs in court documents seem not to have received attention in the literature, which makes the present study imperative to be conducted. In order to investigate the strategies for translating such terms, it also seems that Ghazala's (20015) taxonomy is more appropriate than other

models, as it caters for the translation of CSTs from Arabic into English. Therefore, it is adopted in this study to analyze the data so as to answer the study question.

### 3. Statement of the Problem

The translation of CSTs in culture-specific genres, such as literature (Zagood, 2023) and law (Ghazala, 2022), remains challenging since each item represents a concept. CSTs frequently occur in documents of Yemeni courts seem to create a challenge for professional translators working in translation offices and companies due to the connotative and contextual shades of meaning implied in such CSTs. The terms are loaded with cultural and localized meaning components that are deeply rooted in the Yemeni culture. One example is the term "حي المورث" (*hai al-mawreth*) which is often mistranslated into "the location of inheritance" and "the location of the testator" by some Yemeni professional translators. However, the term refers to the lineal parentage of the testator whom he inherited as well as to the heirs of the testator. The standard Arabic equivalent of this term is "عمود النسب" (*amood annasb*), which can be translated into English as "the lineal descendant grandfather of the testator". This indicates that a literal strategy was opted for, causing a great meaning loss that distorts the intended meaning of the term. It has been noticed that translators face difficulties when producing culturally acceptable and adequate translations, which could be attributed to the inability to recognize and identify the connotative and contextual meanings associated with the CSTs. This necessitates investigating the translation of CSTs in legal documents from Arabic into English. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, the strategies for translating Yemeni CSTs have not been investigated yet. Therefore, the present study intends to answer the following question:

What are the translation strategies frequently used by professional translators to render CSTs found in Yemeni court documents from Arabic into English?

### 4. Significance of the Study



The significance of the present study stems from the importance of legal translation which raises serious difficulties due to legal language complexity and diversity. The significance of this study also emerges from the inadequate translation of some Yemeni culture-specific terms in court documents frequently reported by clientele and by high-profile, experienced translators and professors of translation. In addition, this study can be considered one of the rare ones that tackle such a complex type of legal text, i.e., legal court documents.

### 5. Scope and Limitation of the Study

This study is concerned with the investigation of translation strategies used by professional translators working in translation offices registered at the Ministry of Culture in Sana'a. Only 40 CSTs were selected for investigation, and Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of strategies for translating culture-specific terms was used to conduct the study.

### 6. Method

To answer the study question, this study followed a descriptive analytical method which made use of both qualitative and quantitative data in order to identify the type of translation strategies used and assess the quality of the translated Yemeni CSTs.

### 7. Population and Sample

Out of all translation offices registered in the Ministry of Culture (nearly 40), 30 accredited translation offices were randomly selected to translate CSTs used in Yemeni court documents. 30 copies of the test were then submitted to them. However, only 17 tests were returned, of which 15 were valid for analysis.

### 8. Research Tools and Materials

To answer the study question, a list of 40 Yemeni CSTs selected from court documents was developed and validated by a jury of lawyers (in Arabic) and experts in legal translation (in English). It was also prepared in the form of a translation test and distributed to the study participants.

### 10. Results and Discussion

To answer the study question, the study participants' translations of Yemeni CSTs from

Arabic into English were assessed based on Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of translation strategies for cultural terms, which are mainly divided into three categories: acculturation (adoption), cross-culturalization (reconciliation of cultures) and anti-culturalization (clash of cultures), which also subsume sub-strategies shown in table (1) below:

**Table (1): Ghazala's (2015) Major Translation Strategies and their Sub-Categories**

No.	Major Strategies	Sub-categories
1	acculturation (adoption)	Transliteration
		Transliteration+ explanation
		Transliteration+ classifier
		Triplet/couplet strategy
2	cross-culturalization (reconciliation of culture)	Identical cultural equivalent
		Close cultural equivalent
		Partial cultural equivalent
		Cultural favored/familiar equivalent
		New terms
		Neutralization
		Componential analysis
3	anti-culturalization (clash of cultures)	Literal translation
		Neutralization
		Euphemization
		Paraphrase
		Deletion

Based on these three major categories of strategies and their sub-strategies, the strategies used by the study participants were identified, classified, and then coded and entered into the SPSS program for statistical analysis.

**Table (2): Descriptive Statistics of Translation Strategies Used by the Study Participants**

Rank	Translation strategies	Freq.	Mean	%
------	------------------------	-------	------	---

1	Literal Translation	218	5.45	36.33
2	Neutralization	111	2.8	18.5
3	Transliteration + explanation	95	2.37	15.83
4	Transliteration	61	1.5	10%
5	Deletion	39	0.97	6.5
6	Partial cultural equivalent	26	0.65	4.33
7	Paraphrase	24	0.6	4
8	Close cultural equivalent	14	0.35	2.33
9	Triplet translation	12	0.3	2
	Total	600	1.66	100%

Table (2) illustrates the classification of translation strategies used by the study participants based on Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of translation strategies for CSTs. The literal translation strategy was used by the majority of the study participants (36.33) with an overall mean of (5.45), whereas the least used strategy was triplet translation, which was used by (2%) of the study participants. The use of other strategies ranged between these two extremes, as seen in the table. This result might suggest that the study participants were less aware of appropriate translation strategies that would lead to acceptable translations of Yemeni CSTs into English.

According to Table (2), it can be noted that the translations produced by the study participants indicated the use of translation strategies, which were in some cases appropriate, while they were not so in most cases. As shown in Table (1), which displays Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of translation strategies, there are (3) main categories and (16) subcategories. In the following paragraphs, the strategies used by the study participants are discussed with reference to Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy.

Transliteration strategy, for Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy, can be used in case the borrowed culture-specific term is culturally harmless and globally common. However, 10% of the study participants applied this strategy to CSTs, which do not have the description proposed by Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy. This led to wrong translations of some CSTs, which are localized

in some parts of Yemen. For example, "عبيلة" (*abyalah*), which refers to a property boundary made by piling soil up between the lands of different owners, was transliterated/translated into "Abeela, Abilah, part of land, Ubaylah, etc". Such borders are also called in other areas of Yemen "سوم" (*soom*), and "عریم" (*areem*), which indicates that the study participants were unfamiliar with such terms. Thus, using a transliteration strategy led to deviation from the intended meaning and produced translations that were not semantically and functionally acceptable. A better strategy could be transliteration + explanation which could lead to this translation: "property boundary made by piling soil up between the lands of different owners". The combination of transliteration with explanation strategies is used when the CSTs are lexically and conceptually absent in the TL. This is the second strategy in Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy, which was adopted by 15.83% of the study participants. They used it to deal with land measurement units, such as "Libnah Ushari" as  $44.44m^2$  for most types of "Libnah", which is semantically inappropriate. This area ( $44.44m^2$ ) is only for one type of "Libna", as there are other types that are used differently in different parts of the country. Therefore, a very small number of the study participants (2%) used the strategy of triplet translation, whereby they employed transliteration, explanation, and footnote. This was done to ensure the intended meaning was successfully transferred to the target language. This small percentage of the study participants translated the term "اثنان وعشرون لبنة عشاري" into "22 Libnah Ushari<sup>3</sup> (each libnah equals  $44.44m^2$ )" and in the footnote they added "a unit of measurement used in Sana'a Yemen, and the 22 libnahs equal  $977.68m^2$ ." Accordingly, a triplet translation strategy can be used with CSTs and is significantly required for translating Yemeni CSTs which do not exist lexically, semantically and culturally in the TL. Therefore, this strategy is so useful with Yemeni CSTs, but it was used by a small number of the participants, either because they were not familiar with the triplet strategy, or the intended meanings of CSTs were not clear to them.

The strategy of close cultural equivalent is, according to Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy,

suitable to address CSTs that have cultural equivalents in the TL, either by giving the identical/close cultural equivalent, partial cultural equivalent, favored cultural equivalent, or literal equivalent common to both SL and TL cultures. However, only (2.3%) of the study participants resorted to close cultural equivalents when translating CSTs, such as “*كحول قدم*” (*kholow qadem*) known also as “*نقل قدم*” (*naql qadem*), and “*حق المفتاح*” (*haq almftah*) into “key money”, which is loaded with the same legal function as the source CSTs. That is to say, regardless of the differences between both SL and TL in terms of lexical units, (2.3%) of the study participants successfully connected the SL to the TL by producing acceptable equivalents.

Regarding the strategy of partial cultural equivalent, (4.33%) of the study participants used this strategy appropriately. Although the participants used a partial equivalent for the CST “*فصل*” in English as “deed”, “title deed” commonly used in English is the close cultural equivalent. Thus, it was to some extent misunderstood, leading to a functionally less accurate translation as the word “*Deed*” has several legal functions.

The literal translation strategy is commonly appropriate for translating between languages of the same family, but for Arabic and English, which are of different origins, it is not usually preferred. It was used by the majority of the study participants (36.33) to produce unacceptable translations of Yemeni CSTs, which are culturally loaded with concepts not found in the TL, such as “*كرمة*” (*Kormah*) “the Capital Assets”, which was translated by the study participants as “*karma*, vineyard, vine, etc.”, which are not adequate. Another example is “*عزم محق على مبطل*” (costs follow the events), which was rendered as “rightful fine over wrongful ones, rightful against wrongful principle, costs of litigation”. These translations are not lexically adequate, as they do not adequately convey the intended meaning carried by these phrases. This clearly shows that this literal strategy is not applicable to Yemeni CSTs as it leads to wrong renderings. This also explains the serious challenges encountered by the translators when rendering Yemeni CSTs.

As for CSTs that carry anti-culturalization issues, either linguistic or cultural ones, it is preferred to compromise any sort of anti-culturalization through neutralization, paraphrase, euphemism, deletion, etc. Regarding the translation strategies used by the study participants when rendering Yemeni CSTs, three translation strategies which are subsumed under the category of anti-culturalization proposed by Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy were used. The neutralization strategy was used by 18.5% of the study participants. It is one of the most successful strategies that led to adequate translation at the semantic level. For example, the CST “*محرر*” (*النقل*) (deed of transfer) was translated as “exchange document” and “transferring document”, which are semantically adequate but not functionally appropriate. Apparently, it was inappropriately used, not because it is not the right strategy, but due to the participants' incompetency and limited knowledge to select the right equivalent of Yemeni CSTs in the TL. For example, the CST “*يمين الاستظهار*” (*yameen al-estithhar*) was translated into “exclusive oath” which is not adequate, as “exclusive oath” is the counterpart of “*اليمين الحاسمة*” (*al-yameen al-hasimah*) which is legally different from the intended meaning, which can be rendered as “authentication oath”. Therefore, though this strategy was very helpful in rendering the semantic meaning of CSTs, the study participants failed to keep the functional meaning of the term.

The paraphrase strategy is used for rendering the intended meaning of sensitive terms having no clash between the SL and TL. Table (1) shows that it was used by (4%) of the study participants to translate the CSTs, such as the “*شقية وسعابية*” (*shaqiah wa se'ayah*) paraphrased into “in return for their work”, “misfortune and covetousness”, “labor wages and care pay”, etc. Such translations are lexically inadequate compared to the validated translation “the right of toil and pursuit”. That is to say, the participants' translations are neither meaningful to the TL readers nor wholly loaded with the intended function of the Yemeni CST and subsequently lead to a loss of meaning due to wrong lexical selection, literal translation, and insufficient comprehension of both SL and



TL components on the part of the study participants.

Finally, the deletion strategy, according to Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy, can be employed in case the CSTs are seriously anti-culture or not necessary. However, 6.5% of the study participants applied this strategy, producing meaningless translations of terms, which almost represent the main ideas of legal documents. For example, the term "الإفعاد" (*aleqaad*) was translated as "the will, to leave a will and the transfer of inheritance". These translations do not convey the exact functional meaning in the TL, seemingly due to the participants' insufficient training in translation strategies and lack of cultural awareness. The validated translation is (the will per stripes), which no single participant provided.

To conclude, translations provided by the study participants were full of lexical, semantic, and cultural pitfalls. This reveals that there is a lack of professional knowledge and practice on the part of the study participants.

The results of the present study are consistent with the findings of previous studies, such as Banikalef & Naser (2019), Dweik & Suleiman (2013), Almubark & Al-Zubaid (2014), and Fathi (2012), which have indicated that literal translation, borrowing, equivalent and deletion strategies were mostly used by translators in rendering CSTs as a result of inadequate background of CSTs and translation strategies. Moreover, the results are consistent with Obeidat, Al-Harashseh, and Mahasneh (2016) and Huseen (2018) who have concluded that literal and deletion strategies were the most frequently used in rendering CSTs, which reflect the participants' unfamiliarity with CSTs. In addition, Taibi and Martin (2012) have indicated that the paraphrase strategy is used with CSTs, which have no lexical equivalent in the TL. Therefore, most of the used strategies are in line with previous studies. Besides, the results show the applicability of close or partial cultural equivalent, triplet translation strategy, and neutralization. However, apart from the applicability of such previous translation strategies, the results also indicate that using the right translation strategy without understanding the right meaning embedded in the SL CSTs does not free the

translated terms from deviation, inadequacy, and unacceptability.

## 11. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the frequency of using Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of translation strategies by professional translators to render CSTs found in Yemeni court documents from Arabic into English. The study findings revealed that the most frequent strategies used by the study participants when rendering CSTs were literal translation, neutralization, transliteration + explanation, and transliteration. On the other hand, the least frequently used translation strategies were triplet strategy, close cultural equivalent, paraphrase, partial cultural equivalent, and deletion. The study also revealed that using literal translation could justify the serious challenges encountered when rendering CSTs as they are loaded with connotative meanings. The study findings also revealed that the used translation strategies were adequate, but some participants opted for the wrong translation strategies, which justifies the insufficient exposure to CSTs, as well as the insufficient training and lack of experience in legal translation on the part of the study participants. Professional translators who participated in the present study seem to be unfamiliar with strategies for translating CSTs from Arabic into English. The strategies of acculturation, cross-culturalization, and anti-culturalization proposed by Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy were not fully considered when rendering CSTs. Therefore, it seems there is a need to introduce Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of strategies for translating culture-specific terms to the translation programs at Yemeni universities. Linking the teaching of translation courses to professional contexts in the translation Programs (Ashuja'a & Jibreel, 2024) can help mitigate the difficulties of translating CSTs. Moreover, Yemeni CSTs should also be highlighted and emphasized while teaching translation courses for students of translation at Yemeni universities. It is also suggested that Ghazala's (2015) taxonomy of translation strategies be applied to CSTs in other genres

and text types in order to investigate its applicability.

## 12. References

- [1] Aixela, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual.
- [2] Alibi, A. B., & Ramos, F. P. (2013). *Legal translation in context: Professional issues and prospects*. New York: Peter Lang.
- [3] Aljabri, S. (2020). Translation of culture-specific items from English into Arabic in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*. *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, 13(2), 1–21.
- [4] Almubark, A. A., & Al-Zubaid, K. T. (2014). The hindrances in translating specific cultural concepts from Arabic into English. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(3). <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-1932166173>
- [5] Annuzaili, A. A. (2019). *Towards theorizing the translation practices of legal and educational documents: A case study of CTLT (Center for Translation and Language Teaching), Yemen* (Doctoral dissertation). [https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30116.3904\\_9](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.30116.3904_9)
- [6] Ashuja'a, A., & Jibreel, I. (2024). Translator praxis: An investigation into the practical component in BA translation programs at Yemeni universities. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 6(3), 574–604.
- [7] Banikalef, A., & Naser, J. (2019). The difficulties in translating culture-specific expressions from Arabic into English. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(9). <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP>
- [8] Cambridge Dictionary. (2023). Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
- [9] Cao, D. (2007). *Translating law*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- [10] El-Farahaty, H. (2015). *Arabic-English-Arabic legal translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [11] Fathi, Y. S. (2012). Translation strategies of cultural specific terms in legal texts. *Adab Al-Rafidayn*, 62, 1–42.
- [12] Ghazala, H. (2008). *Translation as problems and solutions*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilma Lilmalayin.
- [13] Ghazala, H. (2015). *Translating culture: A textbook*. Umm Al-Qura University.
- [14] Ghazala, H. S. (2021). *A textbook of legal translation: Problems and solutions*. Saudi Arabia: Konooz Al-Marefa Company.
- [15] Ghazala, H. S. (2022). Cognitive stylistic conceptualization of legal translation. *Academic Journal of Research and Scientific Publishing*, 3(33), 86–110.
- [16] Hassoon, A. M., & Al-Dahwi, S. S. M. (2020). Translation assessment of cultural legal terms as translated from Arabic into English. *Al-Adab Journal*, 13(2), 13–26.
- [17] Huseen, Y. M. G. (2018). The problem of equivalence in translating English business contracts into Arabic [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Science and Technology, Sana'a University.
- [18] Makaoui, I. (2023). Translation of culture-specific terms from Arabic into English between loss and preservation. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 4(2), 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v4i3.361>
- [19] Mughazy, M. (2016). *The Georgetown guide to Arabic-English translation*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- [20] Newmark, P. (1988). *Textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- [21] Obeidat, M., Al-Harashsheh, A., & Mahasneh, A. (2016). Translating measure terms from Arabic into English: A sociolinguistic approach. *Yarmouk University*, 43(5), 2235–2244.
- [22] Suleiman, A. A. A. (2018). Significance of knowledge of the lexical and structural features of the legal language in translating English legal texts into Arabic. *University of Sinnar*. Retrieved from <http://repo.uofg.edu.sd/handle/123456789/3112>
- [23] Taibi, M., & Martin, A. (2012). Court translation and interpreting in times of “the war on terror”: The case of Taysir Alony. *International Journal for Translation & Interpreting Research*, 4(1), 77–98. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292485039>
- [24] Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [25] Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation* (Sager, J. C., & Hamel, M.-J., Trans.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [26] Zagood, M. J. (2023). An analysis of the Arabic-English translation of culture-specific items in Al-Shehhi's *Uncle Sam & Myself*. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 23(2), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v23i2.138>