THE ETHICS OF AI IN TRANSLATING OFFICIAL AND SENSITIVE DOCUMENTS: CAN THE SWORN TRANSLATOR BE REPLACED?

أخلاقيات الذكاء الاصطناعي في ترجمة الوثائق الرسمية والحساسة: هل يمكن الاستغناء عن المترجم المحلف؟

ROUABAH Rima * (1)
[1] Mohamed El Bachir El Ibrahimi University, Bordj Bou Arreridj, Algeria.
rima.rouabah_1@univ-bba.dz

submission date: 01/02/2026 acceptance date: 11/09/2026 published date 15/09/2026

****

Abstract:

The rapid advancement of Neural Machine Translation (NMT) and Large Language Models (LLMs) has disrupted the translation industry, offering unprecedented speed and fluency. However, the translation of official and sensitive documents- such as court judgments, civil registry certificates, and contracts- requires a level of accountability, confidentiality, and legal precision that current AI systems cannot guarantee. This paper examines the ethical and legal barriers preventing the total automation of sworn translation. It argues that while AI can serve as a drafting tool, the legal liability and ethical "duty of care" inherent in the role of the sworn translator render the human professional irreplaceable. The study proposes a shift in the translator's role from "producer" to "expert auditor," positioning the sworn translator as a guarantor of accuracy in an increasingly automated workflow.

***Key words**:* Sworn Translator; AI Systems; Expert Auditor; Automation; Ethical.

ملخص باللغة العربية:

أحدث التقدم المتسارع في الترجمة الآلية العصبية (NMT) والنماذج اللغوية الكبيرة (LLMs)تحولًا واضحًا في صناعة الترجمة، إذ أتاح سرعة وسلاسة غير مسبوقتين. غير أن ترجمة الوثائق الرسمية والحساسة- مثل الأحكام القضائية وشهادات الحالة المدنية والعقود- تستلزم مستوىً من المساءلة والسرية والدقة القانونية لا تستطيع أنظمة الذكاء الاصطناعي الحالية ضمانه بصورة موثوقة. تتناول هذه الورقة العوائق الأخلاقية والقانونية التي تحول دون الأتمتة الكاملة للترجمة المُحلَّفة، وتذهب إلى أن الذكاء الاصطناعي، وإن أمكن توظيفه أداةً للصياغة الأولية، لا يُغني عن المسؤولية القانونية و«واجب العناية» الأخلاقي الملازمين لدور المترجم المُحلَّف، بما يجعل تدخل المختص البشري أمرًا لا غنى عنه. وتقترح الدراسة إعادة تعريف دور المترجم من «منتِج» للنص إلى «مدقّق خبير»، بوصفه ضامنًا للدقة داخل سير عمل يتجه نحو مزيد من الأتمتة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المترجم المُحلَّف؛ أنظمة الذكاء الاصطناعي؛ مدقّق خبير؛ الأتمتة؛ الأخلاقي.

Introduction

In an increasingly globalized legal environment, the demand for translating official documents is higher than ever. Cross-border marriages, international adoptions, commercial litigation, and migration processes all require certified translations of legal instruments. Tools like DeepL, Google Translate, and ChatGPT have led some stakeholders—including cost-conscious clients and judicial administrators—to question the necessity of human intervention. The question appears economically rational: if a machine can produce a serviceable translation in seconds at minimal cost, why retain an expensive human expert?

However, official translation is not merely a linguistic transfer; it is a performative legal act. In civil law jurisdictions like Algeria and France, the sworn translator (*traducteur assermenté*) is an officer of the court with distinct responsibilities (Glanert, 2014). Unlike commercial translators who work under private contracts, sworn translators operate within the judicial framework, their signatures carrying the weight of legal certification. Their translations are not suggestions or approximations- they are legal equivalents that courts, notaries, and administrative bodies accept as authentic representations of foreign-language originals.

As technology advances, the central research question becomes critical: In high-stakes scenarios where errors can lead to loss of rights, denial of asylum, wrongful conviction, or liberty deprivation, can an algorithm ethically replace the sworn official? While AI offers efficiency and cost reduction, the ethical imperative suggests that human oversight remains fundamental to legal validity. This paper argues that the irreplaceability of the sworn translator stems not from technological limitations alone, but from fundamental questions of legal accountability, professional ethics, and the nature of certification itself.

The structure of this paper proceeds as follows: Section 1 examines the accuracy gap in machine translation, focusing on hallucinations and the mishandling of legal nuance. Section 2 addresses the confidentiality paradox created by data-hungry AI systems. Section 3 analyzes liability and accountability frameworks. Section 4 concludes by proposing a reconceptualization of the translator's role in the AI era.

1. The Accuracy Gap: Hallucinations and Legal Nuance

While NMT has achieved impressive fluency in general domains, it remains prone to "hallucinations"—generating text that sounds plausible but is factually incorrect (Koehn, 2020). In literary translation, an error might merely distort the author's intended meaning; in legal translation, it is potentially fatal. A mistranslated custody clause could award parental rights to the wrong party. A misrendered liability exclusion could expose a company to millions in damages. Research suggests that while NMT may appear state-of-the-art in general contexts, its reliability drops precipitously when confronting specialized domains without human review (Castilho et al., 2017).

1.1 Terminological Asymmetry and System-Bound Concepts

Legal terms are inherently system-bound, embedded in specific constitutional frameworks, procedural codes, and institutional hierarchies. Unlike scientific terminology, which aims for universality, legal lexicon is the product of a specific national history and jurisprudential evolution. Translation theorists refer to this phenomenon as "anisomorphism"—the lack of one-to-one correspondence between legal systems (de Groot, 1987; Šarčević, 1997).

Generative AI models, which operate on probabilistic word associations, frequently struggle with this asymmetry. They tend to default

to the most statistically probable target word rather than the legally accurate functional equivalent (Biel, 2017). This "statistical bias" creates false equivalences that distort institutional reality, often flattening complex jurisprudential distinctiveness into generic, and often misleading, terminology.

1.1.1 Institutional Hierarchies and False Friends

The danger of statistical translation is most evident in institutional designations where cognates exist but carry divergent legal authority. For instance, translating the English term "Magistrate" into French requires an understanding of the specific judicial hierarchy in both systems, which AI often lacks.

- In England and Wales, a magistrate is typically a lay volunteer (Justice of the Peace) handling summary offenses and minor criminal cases, often without formal legal training.

- In France, the term *magistrat* denotes a highly trained civil servant who has graduated from the *École Nationale de la Magistrature* (ENM). It encompasses both the *siège* (judges) and the *parquet* (prosecutors). An AI model translating a British news report about a "local magistrate" into French as *magistrat* elevates a lay volunteer to the status of a high-ranking professional judge, misrepresenting the nature of the judicial proceeding.

1.1.2 Procedural Asymmetry: The "Indictment" Trap

Nowhere is the risk of legal misinformation higher than in criminal procedure, where the adversarial (Common Law) and inquisitorial (Civil Law) traditions diverge fundamentally. Consider the French legal term "mise en examen." Statistical translation engines frequently render this as "indictment," a translation that is linguistically convenient but legally perilous.

- *Mise en examen* is a specific status in French pre-trial procedure (instruction), indicating that an investigating judge (*juge d'instruction*) has found "serious or consistent evidence" against a person. Crucially, the investigation is ongoing, and the person is not yet sent to trial.

- An *Indictment* in the Anglo-American system represents a formal accusation that initiates the trial phase, usually following a Grand Jury

decision or a preliminary hearing. By translating *mise en examen* as "indictment," an AI implies that a formal charge has been laid and a trial is imminent. For an English-speaking audience, this suggests a level of guilt and procedural progression that does not yet exist, potentially leading to libelous misinterpretations of a suspect's status.

1.1.3 Conceptual Voids: Equity and Contractual Validity

AI models also struggle with "conceptual voids"—concepts that exist in one legal system but have no existence in another. A prime example is the Common Law concept of "Consideration" in contract law. In English law, a contract is generally unenforceable without consideration (an exchange of value).

- When translating a contract into French (Civil Law), AI models often render "Consideration" as *considération* (esteem/regard) or *contrepartie* (counterpart).

- While *contrepartie* is closer, it fails to capture the doctrine of Consideration, which does not strictly exist in French law (historically relying on *cause*, and now *contenu licite* following the 2016 reform).

- Similarly, the concept of "Trust" (splitting legal and equitable title) is alien to the unitary concept of ownership in Civil Law. AI translations often render "Trust" as *fiducie* (a statutory instrument in France) or *confiance* (the emotion of trust), failing to convey the fiduciary duties and equitable remedies inherent in the English term.

1.1.4 Culturo-Legal Specificity: The Pattern-Matching Failure

Finally, the lack of conceptual mapping is acute in systems incorporating religious jurisprudence, where terms carry theological weight absent in secular systems. When an Algerian divorce judgment uses the term "Tatliq" (judicial divorce) or "Khul'" (redemption divorce), AI models often flatten these terms into the generic English word "Divorce."

- This obscures the legal mechanism: *Khul'*, for example, typically involves the wife returning her dower (*Mahr*) in exchange for dissolution, a financial nuance that "Divorce" deletes.

- Conversely, translating the English "Dowry" into Arabic as *Mahr* is a severe legal error. Historically, a "dowry" is brought by the bride to the marriage, whereas *Mahr* is a mandatory right paid by the groom *to* the bride.

• In the case of "Ta'liq" (suspended marriage or divorce contingent on a condition), pattern-matching algorithms miss the jurisprudential trigger entirely. The AI sees "dissolution" and outputs "divorce," blinding the target reader to the fact that the marriage remains technically valid until the specific condition (e.g., non-payment of maintenance) is legally proven.

1.2 Omission Risk and Structural Manipulation

Furthermore, AI has been documented to skip difficult clauses or negatives—such as omitting "not" in a liability clause—which fundamentally alters the document's legal effect (Koehn, 2020). A study by Läubli et al. (2018) found that NMT systems occasionally drop sentences entirely when they encounter complex syntactic structures. In contracts and statutes, where clauses often contain multiple embedded conditions and exceptions, such omissions can reverse obligations or eliminate crucial safeguards.

Consider a contractual clause stating: "The seller shall not be liable for any damages unless the buyer notifies the seller within 48 hours." An NMT system that drops the negative or the conditional could produce: "The seller shall be liable for any damages" or "The seller shall not be liable for any damages." Either error fundamentally transforms the risk allocation between parties.

Structural manipulation presents another challenge. Legal documents follow rigid formatting conventions—numbered articles, lettered subsections, indented paragraphs—that carry semantic weight. AI systems trained primarily on natural prose may restructure these elements, merging separate clauses or splitting single provisions. In jurisdictions where article numbering functions as a citation system, such restructuring creates ambiguity and potential misapplication.

1.3 Islamic Family Law: The Translation Minefield

The challenges of AI translation become particularly acute when confronting Islamic family law concepts that are deeply embedded in religious jurisprudence and have no direct equivalents in secular legal systems. Three areas illustrate this complexity: inheritance law (*mīrāth*), wife's rights, and the concept of male guardianship (*qiwāmah*) in marriage.

Inheritance: Beyond Mathematical Distribution

Islamic inheritance law (*'ilm al-farā'iḍ*) operates on a system of fixed shares (*farḍ*) determined by Quranic prescription and prophetic tradition. Terms like *'aṣaba* (agnatic heirs), *dhawū al-furūḍ* (fixed-share heirs), and *'awl* (proportional reduction) represent technical legal categories with precise mathematical and jurisprudential meanings. AI systems typically render these terms through direct transliteration or inappropriate analogies that obscure their legal significance.

Consider the term *ta'ṣīb*. Google Translate renders this as "nervousness" or "binding," while DeepL produces "agnation"—technically closer but meaningless to most legal practitioners unfamiliar with anthropological terminology. The sworn translator must recognize that *ta'ṣīb* refers to a residuary inheritance system where male agnates receive what remains after fixed shares are distributed—a concept requiring explanatory notes rather than single-word translation when the target audience lacks Islamic law literacy.

The term *ḥajb* (exclusion or veiling in inheritance) presents similar difficulties. AI systems often translate it as "barrier" or "veil," missing entirely its technical meaning: the legal mechanism by which certain heirs exclude others from inheritance or reduce their shares. A divorce judgment stating "*al-zawja maḥjūba min al-mīrāth*" (the wife is excluded from inheritance) could be mistranslated as "the wife is veiled from inheritance," creating confusion about whether this refers to Islamic dress codes rather than inheritance disqualification.

Wife's Rights: Contested Terminology

Translating women's rights in Islamic marriage contracts involves navigating contested ideological terrain. The term *ḥuqūq al-zawja* (wife's rights) encompasses maintenance (*nafaqa*), dower (*mahr*), housing (*sukna*), fair treatment (*ḥusn al-mu'āshara*), and sexual rights (*ḥaqq al-istimtā'*). Each term carries jurisprudential weight and interpretive traditions that AI cannot capture.

The concept of *nafaqa* illustrates this complexity. While AI typically translates it as "alimony" or "maintenance," *nafaqa* differs significantly from Western alimony concepts. It is an ongoing obligation during marriage based on the husband's duty to provide, not a post-divorce calculation based on lifestyle maintenance or earning capacity. Mistranslating *nafaqa* as

"alimony" in a marriage contract could lead French or English readers to believe it refers only to post-divorce support, fundamentally misrepresenting the wife's current entitlements.

Similarly, the term *mahr mu'ajjal* (deferred dower) versus *mahr muqaddam* (advance dower) requires understanding the temporal structure of Islamic marriage contracts. AI systems often confuse these terms or translate both as simply "dowry," erasing the crucial distinction between immediate payment and conditional deferred payment. In divorce proceedings, this distinction determines immediate financial obligations—a mistranslation could result in incorrect enforcement orders.

The concept of *tamkīn* (conjugal availability) presents particular translation difficulties because it intersects with contemporary debates about marital rights and consent. Classical jurisprudence defined *tamkīn* as the wife's obligation to be sexually available to her husband, linked to her entitlement to maintenance. Modern reformist interpretations emphasize mutuality and consent. AI systems typically produce literal translations like "enablement" or "empowerment" that obscure the term's specific juridical meaning. A sworn translator must navigate these sensitivities, potentially adding explanatory notes about interpretive debates rather than imposing a single translation that reflects particular ideological positions.

***Qiwāmah*: Guardianship, Authority, or Partnership?**

Perhaps no Islamic family law concept poses greater translation challenges than *qiwāmah*, often translated as "male guardianship," "male authority," or "male responsibility" in marriage. Derived from Quranic verse 4:34 (*al-rijālu qawwāmūna 'alā al-nisā'*), the term has generated extensive jurisprudential commentary and contemporary controversy.

Classical jurists understood *qiwāmah* as establishing male headship of the household, grounded in the husband's financial obligations and presumed greater rationality. Modern reformist scholars emphasize the term's root meaning of "standing up for" or "protecting," arguing it denotes responsibility rather than authority. Feminist interpreters contest traditional readings entirely, proposing egalitarian reinterpretations.

AI translation systems default to statistically probable renderings without acknowledging this interpretive complexity. Google Translate typically produces "guardianship" or "authority over women." DeepL generates "male guardianship" or "stewardship." ChatGPT, when prompted,

might produce "male responsibility for women." Each translation reflects particular jurisprudential and ideological positions, potentially misrepresenting the source document's intent.

The problem intensifies in legal documents where *qiwāmah* intersects with concrete rights and obligations. An Algerian marriage contract might reference the husband's *qiwāmah* in clauses addressing:

- Residence determination (*ikhtiyār maḥall al-suknā*)
- Permission for the wife's employment (*idhn al-zawja bi-l-'amal*)
- Decision-making authority regarding children's education
- Travel restrictions (*ḥaẓr al-safar*)

Each application of *qiwāmah* carries specific legal implications under Algerian Personal Status Law. Mistranslation could lead French or European courts applying conflict-of-laws rules to either over-enforce patriarchal authority not actually claimed in the document, or under-recognize legitimate contractual provisions, resulting in erroneous recognition or rejection of foreign judgments.

AI's Inability to Navigate Legal Pluralism

These examples demonstrate a fundamental limitation of current AI systems: they cannot navigate legal pluralism. Islamic family law operates within multiple, sometimes competing frameworks—classical *fiqh*, modern codified personal status laws, international human rights instruments, and local customary practices. The sworn translator must determine which framework governs the specific document, understand relevant interpretive traditions, and select terminology that accurately conveys meaning to the target legal system without imposing cultural distortion.

An Algerian divorce judgment citing *nushūz* (marital disobedience) requires the translator to understand how Algerian courts interpret this Quranic concept—which specific behaviors constitute *nushūz*, what procedural protections exist, and how it affects financial obligations. AI systems access only surface linguistic patterns, not the layered legal and cultural context that determines meaning.

Furthermore, sworn translators must often alert target audiences to interpretive gaps. When translating an Algerian marriage contract or judgment into French for a custody dispute in a French court, the translator might add a note clarifying the application of *wilāya* (guardianship) under Article 87 of the Algerian Family Code. Rather than implying absolute paternal authority, the translator would specify that the law explicitly empowers the judge to award guardianship to the parent holding custody (*hadana*) in cases of divorce, effectively transferring legal authority to the mother if she is the custodian. This meta-textual guidance—situating the document within its specific statutory context and preventing the misapplication of guardianship norms—lies entirely beyond AI capabilities.".

The translation of Islamic family law thus exemplifies why sworn translation cannot be automated. These documents don't simply transfer information between languages—they mediate between legal systems, religious traditions, and cultural worldviews. The accuracy required is not merely linguistic but jurisprudential, cultural, and ethical. An algorithm trained on statistical patterns cannot provide the contextual intelligence, comparative legal knowledge, and ethical judgment required to translate *mīrāth*, *ḥuqūq al-zawja*, and *qiwāmah* in ways that preserve legal meaning while remaining comprehensible to target audiences.

2. The Confidentiality Paradox

The ethics of sworn translation are built on strict confidentiality, a principle fundamentally challenged by the data-hungry nature of generative AI. Professional codes governing sworn translators explicitly require absolute discretion regarding the content of documents they handle. This obligation stems from their status as judicial auxiliaries bound by the same confidentiality rules that govern judges, lawyers, and court clerks.

2.1 Data Privacy and Protection Frameworks

Inputting sensitive data—such as names, financial details, medical records, or criminal histories—into public NMT engines often grants the service provider the right to use that data for model training (Bowker, 2021). Under frameworks like the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), this constitutes a significant breach of data privacy. Article 5 of the GDPR establishes principles of data minimization and purpose limitation, requiring that personal data be collected only for

specified purposes and not further processed in ways incompatible with those purposes.

When a translator inputs a court judgment containing personal information into a cloud-based translation service, several GDPR violations may occur. First, the data subject (the individual named in the document) has not consented to this processing. Second, the translator may lack a legal basis for the transfer, as most translation engines' terms of service reserve the right to retain and analyze user inputs. Third, data may be transferred to servers outside the EU without adequate safeguards, violating cross-border transfer restrictions.

The problem intensifies with documents subject to special protection. Family court judgments often contain information about minors, victims of domestic violence, or individuals with mental health conditions—categories afforded enhanced protection under GDPR Article 9. Criminal case files may include sensitive data about alleged victims of sexual offenses or information about ethnic origin and religious beliefs mentioned in hate crime prosecutions. Asylum applications frequently detail persecution based on political opinion, sexual orientation, or religious beliefs.

2.2 The Ethical Dilemma of Professional Secrecy

A sworn translator who pastes a client's divorce decree into a free AI tool has arguably committed professional misconduct by exposing privileged information to third-party servers. This creates a clear conflict between the efficiency of AI tools and the professional secrecy required of officers of the court (Bowker, 2021). In France, Article 226-13 of the Penal Code criminalizes the disclosure of confidential information by professionals bound by secrecy, with penalties including one-year imprisonment and €15,000 in fines.

The Italian case *Garante per la protezione dei dati personali v. OpenAI* (2023) illustrates these tensions. Italy's data protection authority temporarily banned ChatGPT over concerns about unlawful processing of personal data and lack of age verification. Though the ban was lifted after OpenAI implemented changes, the case highlighted regulatory uncertainties surrounding AI language models' handling of personal information.

Some jurisdictions have begun developing sector-specific guidelines. The International Federation of Translators (FIT) has issued

recommendations advising members to use only on-premise or contractually secure translation tools when handling confidential materials. However, enforcement remains inconsistent, and many translators lack access to enterprise-grade secure systems.

3. Liability and Accountability

The most significant barrier to replacing the sworn translator is liability. Legal systems require a liable entity to answer for accuracy—a requirement AI cannot meet. This accountability gap represents not merely a technical challenge but a fundamental incompatibility between algorithmic output and legal certification.

3.1 The "Human in the Loop" Necessity

One cannot sue an algorithm. If a mistranslation causes a company to lose a competitive tender, an individual to be denied asylum, or a criminal defendant to be wrongfully convicted, there must be a liable legal entity held accountable (Canavese, 2022). The sworn translator's stamp and signature represent a legal guarantee of accuracy that shifts liability from the machine to the expert.

This principle reflects centuries of legal development. Roman law recognized the need for personal accountability in testimonial functions—the *notarius* who recorded legal proceedings could be sanctioned for errors. Medieval Europe's development of the public notary extended this accountability to document authentication. The modern sworn translator inherits this tradition of personal liability for professional acts.

Consider a concrete scenario: An Algerian company submits a machine-translated bid document to a French procurement authority. The translation contains an error that misrepresents the company's technical qualifications, leading to bid rejection. Who bears liability? The company cannot sue Google or DeepL, as their terms of service explicitly disclaim liability for translation accuracy. The procurement authority suffers no loss—it simply selected another bidder. The company's recourse depends on having engaged a professional whose liability insurance and personal accountability provide a remedy.

The European Union's proposed AI Act (2021) attempts to address liability questions by categorizing AI systems according to risk levels and imposing conformity requirements. However, even high-risk AI applications

would not eliminate the need for human accountability in legal contexts. The Act's provisions regarding transparency and human oversight reinforce rather than replace professional liability frameworks.

3.2 Certification and Moral Agency

Sworn translation is a certification of truth. Pym (2012) argues that translation ethics fundamentally involve mediation and responsibility—the translator stands between cultures and legal systems, making judgment calls that affect human lives and legal outcomes. An AI cannot "swear" or "certify" because it lacks moral agency and legal personhood. Thus, the performative act of certification remains an exclusively human prerogative (Haldimann, 2020).

The oath taken by sworn translators in civil law jurisdictions typically includes phrases like "I swear to faithfully translate" or "I certify the accuracy of this translation." These formulations invoke personal honor and professional conscience. They create a bond of trust between the translator, the court, and society. An algorithm, lacking consciousness and moral capacity, cannot meaningfully take an oath or experience the ethical weight of certification.

This distinction matters in adversarial legal proceedings. When opposing counsel challenges a translation's accuracy, the sworn translator can be called to testify about their methodology, justify interpretive choices, and defend their professional judgment. An AI system offers no such accountability—it cannot explain why it selected one equivalent over another or acknowledge the limitations of its training data.

Furthermore, sworn translators exercise professional discretion in ways that transcend linguistic transfer. They may add translator's notes explaining untranslatable cultural concepts, alert courts to ambiguities in source texts, or refuse commissions that exceed their competence. These acts of professional judgment reflect ethical deliberation that AI cannot replicate.

4. Reconceptualizing Professional Identity: From Translator to Auditor

AI will not replace the sworn translator, but it will transform them. The workflow is shifting towards Post-Editing Machine Translation (PEMT), where the machine drafts and the human refines. The translator uses AI to generate a text but applies their legal expertise to verify, correct,

and certify the output. This transformation requires reconceptualizing the translator's professional identity and value proposition.

4.1 The Auditor Model

As automation increases, the value of the sworn translator lies no longer in their ability to type quickly, but in their ability to assume responsibility for the text. The emerging role resembles that of an auditor: someone who reviews, validates, and certifies the accuracy of outputs produced through partially automated processes. Just as financial auditors do not personally calculate every figure in a balance sheet but verify the calculations' accuracy and compliance with accounting standards, translation auditors would not personally draft every sentence but would guarantee the translation's legal accuracy and appropriate formulation.

This shift requires new competencies. Sworn translators must develop technical literacy to understand AI limitations, recognize hallucination patterns, and implement quality assurance protocols. They need enhanced comparative legal knowledge to catch systemic errors in term mapping. They must master post-editing techniques that go beyond linguistic correction to include legal validation.

Professional training programs are beginning to adapt. Some sworn translator certification courses now include modules on AI-assisted translation workflows, machine translation quality estimation, and technology-enhanced legal research. Professional associations are developing ethical guidelines for AI use in sworn translation contexts, emphasizing the translator's ultimate responsibility regardless of technological assistance.

4.2 Redefining Professional Value

This transformation challenges traditional pricing models. If machines produce draft translations in seconds, clients may resist paying for what they perceive as "mere proofreading." Translators must articulate their value in terms of risk mitigation, legal accountability, and expert validation rather than labor hours. The analogy to other legal professions proves instructive: lawyers charge not merely for typing briefs but for legal analysis; expert witnesses charge not merely for appearing in court but for professional credibility.

The future sworn translator's value proposition might emphasize: verified accuracy backed by professional liability insurance, compliance with confidentiality requirements through secure workflows, legal validity through certified authentication, and expert judgment in ambiguous or culturally complex cases. These services justify professional fees that reflect expertise rather than keystrokes.

5. Conclusion

The question posed by this paper's title—"Can the Sworn Translator Be Replaced?"—admits only one answer: No, but the profession will evolve. The irreplaceability of sworn translators stems from three insurmountable barriers: AI's inability to guarantee accuracy in high-stakes contexts, incompatibility with confidentiality requirements, and lack of legal personhood necessary for liability.

However, this conclusion should not breed complacency. Translators who merely type faster than machines will indeed become obsolete. The profession's future belongs to those who can leverage AI as a tool while providing the expert oversight, legal accountability, and ethical certification that machines cannot offer. The sworn translator's role is shifting from linguistic technician to legal guarantor—from producer to auditor.

This evolution mirrors broader transformations across professional services. Radiologists now interpret AI-assisted diagnoses; accountants verify algorithmically prepared financial statements; lawyers review contract clauses generated by predictive systems. In each case, technology augments but cannot replace professional judgment and accountability.

For the legal translation profession, the path forward requires embracing technological change while asserting irreplaceable human value. Professional associations must develop clear ethical guidelines for AI use. Training programs must integrate technological literacy with enhanced legal expertise. Regulatory frameworks must clarify liability in hybrid human-AI workflows. Above all, sworn translators must articulate their value proposition in terms that resonate with courts, clients, and policymakers: not as typists who happen to know two languages, but as legal professionals who guarantee the integrity of cross-linguistic legal communication.

References

1. **Books**

• Bowker, L., Translation Technologies and Ethics. In K. Koskinen & N. Pokorn (Eds.), The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Ethics, Routledge, 2021, (pp. 262–278).

• Glanert, S., Comparative Law- Engaging Translation, Routledge, 2014.

• Koehn, P., Neural Machine Translation, Cambridge University Press, 2020.

• Pym, A., On Translator Ethics: Principles for Mediation between Cultures, John Benjamins, 2012.

2. Journal articles

• Biel, Ł., Quality in Legal Translation from a Sworn Translator's Perspective, The Translator, Vol. 23, N. 1, 2017, pp. 66–82.

• Canavese, P., Machine Translation in the Legal Field: Implications for Liability, International Journal for the Semiotics of Law, 35, 2022, pp. 1513-1532.

• Castilho, S., Moorkens, J., Gaspari, F., Calixto, I., Tinsley, J., & Way, A., Is Neural Machine Translation the New State of the Art? The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics, 108, 2017, pp. 109–120.

• De Groot, G. R., The Point of View of a Comparative Lawyer, Les Cahiers de Droit, Vol. 28, N. 4, 1987, pp. 793- 812.

• Haldimann, E., The Sworn Translator in the Digital Age, Hieronymus, 1, 2020, pp. 22–34.

3. Seminar / conference articles

• Läubli, S., Sennrich, R., & Volk, M., Has Machine Translation Achieved Human Parity? A Case for Document-level Evaluation, In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018, (pp. 4791- 4796).

4. Websites / institutional documents online

• European Commission, Proposal for a Regulation Laying down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), Brussels: European Commission, 2021. (Available online).