Cultural and Religious Studies, October 2026, Vol. 14, No. 10, 623-636
doi: 10.17265/2328-2177/2026.10.001

Confucian-Daoist Ideas of *Zhongyong* with Man-Nature Unity Based on Post Editing of *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law*[*]

Wang Tongjun
Beijing International Studies University, Beijing, China

AI-driven machine translation has been widely adopted in the academic output of humanities, social sciences and legal studies. Yet, human post-editing, nowadays, is of great necessity to reconcile machine-generated texts with academic values. As risks of AI-aided translation manifest not merely in technical defects like erroneous terminology and logical fragmentation in target discourses, but also go into real-world academic-ethical spheres including project application, publishing performance and allocation of research resources. Current domestic studies on AI-translation ethics mostly center on technical dimensions such as algorithmic bias, copyright protection and translation quality. Few integrated researches are based on traditional Chinese Confucian-Daoist philosophical points, practical sector-specific legal-translation operations, and tangible risks implanted in the academic ecosystem of research projects. This paper introduces Confucian-Daoist doctrines of *Zhongyong* (the Golden Mean) and the Unity of Man and Nature to construct a local ethical analytical framework for human-machine collaborative translation. Along with ten parallel AI-drafted and human-revised translation cases from Zhang Mingkai's *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law*, it systematically dissects inherent limitations of AI when translating legal-academic texts and elaborates the logic of professional creative translation in post-editing. It further sorts out academic-ecology risks in translation-related research programs, including contract-performance defaults, nominal authorship and biased resource allocation. A multi-layer governance system for AI-translation ethics is built from three dimensions: value orientation, practical translation norms, and institutional supervision over research projects. This study presents solutions rooted in traditional wisdom and practical experience for the sound AI's application in legal-academic translation.

Keywords: AI post-editing, Confucian-Daoist *Zhongyong*, the Unity of Man and Nature, legal translation, academic ethics

Introduction

Generative large-language models (GLLM) have substantially lowered the time cost of cross-lingual academic production. In humanities and social-science disciplines like legal studies and philosophy, AI-generated draft versions are commonly produced, followed by human post-editing to polish for formal publication. With mathematical-logical operations, machine translation (MT) pursues output efficiency and formal optimality, which tends to adopt binary judgements, homogenized sentence patterns and mechanical literal rendering. When

[*] **Funding:** This paper is sponsored by the Undergraduate Education and Teaching Research Project of Beijing International Studies University-Teaching Team for the Course of Highlights of Chinese Culture (Financial Code: 3007/111100290106).
Wang Tongjun, Associate Professor, School of English Studies, Beijing International Studies University, Beijing, China.

confronted with normative doctrines, theoretical controversies and local legal metaphors rooted in legal texts, it frequently produces distorted terminology, broken logical chains and dissipated cultural connotations. This phenomenon essentially stems from the one-sided expansion of instrumental rationality: technological iteration advances rapidly, whereas constraints of humanistic values and supporting academic institutions lag behind.

Scholars in China have yielded rich findings on ethics for AI-assisted translation. Zhao Lingcen (2025) points out that merit-driven worship of efficiency, erosion of cultural autonomy by digital power, and human-machine responsibility imbalance lead to translator identity burnout. She advocates reviving the humanistic core of translation with the notion of "slow translation" and clarifying human-machine accountability contracts. Tan Zaixi (2026) puts forward the "variable-constant" dialectic for translation: translation efficiency and human-machine collaboration patterns constitute variables evolving with technology; faithfulness, equivalence and human-interpretive creativity represent invariable constants of translation. He calls for overcoming technology worship and realizing dynamic human-machine balance. Lu Yan (2024) constructs a three-tier "value-norm-criterion" framework for translation-technology ethics, identifying foresighted technology application, human-machine collaboration and sustainable development as core values. Targeting legal-translation scenarios, Wang Huashu (2025) categorizes ethical risks into translation-ethics, data-ethics, technology-ethics and responsibility-ethics dimensions, and proposes countermeasures ranging from translator competence building and interdisciplinary research to external supervision. Based on Chesterman's translation ethics, Chen Lixia (2025) exposes three ethical dilemmas: blurred accountability subjects, dissipation of cultural information and declining translator subjectivity. Feng Quangong and Liu Ming (2018) establish a three-dimensional "cognition-knowledge-skill" competence model for post-editing, offering references for auditing AI-generated translations. Hu Bing (2026) introduces the traditional "Unity of Man and Nature" philosophy into AI governance, advocating reconciliation of instrumental rationality and construction of an ecological-rational governance paradigm.

Existing scholarship mostly stays confined to technical dimensions covering textual output, algorithms and intellectual property rights. Seldom do studies integrate indigenous philosophical thoughts, sector-specific translation cases, and real-world academic-ecology problems including project application, publishing-party contractual performance and research-resource distribution. *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law* by Zhang Mingkai is a representative work of Chinese criminal-law dogmatics. Filled with theoretical controversies, legal metaphors and indigenous judicial practice, its workflow of AI-drafted translation plus human post-editing vividly reveals GLLM's limitations when processing specialized legal texts. Confucian Doctrine of Mean and Daoist Unity of Heaven-like and Humanities provide evaluative criteria of "moderation-balance-boundaries". Also, cross-disciplinary AI-translation projects witness institutional risks such as hollow contracts, nominal research participation and resource allocation driven by personal connections. This paper attempts to incorporate traditional-philosophy values, post-editing cases of a criminal-law monograph, and institutional-ethical risks in research projects, so as to establish a holistic ethical system for AI-aided translating.

Ethical Guiding of Confucian-Daoist Ideas of *Zhongyong* and Harmonizing for AI-Aided Translation

The internal conflicts of contemporary AI ethics are resulting from the unlimited expansion of instrumental rationality. Algorithms go for standardized optimal outputs, resorting to binary yes-or-no judgements and quantifying pluralistic human-social values while ignoring contextual differences. Contrary to Western

technology-centrism, Confucian critical limitedness and Daoist holistic oneness of man and nature supply indigenous ideological resources for AI-translation ethics from the perspectives of practical human conduct and holistic symbiotic order respectively.

Confucian Moderation for Translation—So Far So Good for Timely Appropriateness

Far from unprincipled compromise, the Confucian Golden Mean embodies dynamic practical wisdom with three connotations: *going too far is as bad as not going far enough*, *holding the properness between extremes*, and *timely appropriateness*. These correspond precisely to typical contradictions in AI-assisted translation practice.

The first principle suggests rejecting polarizations. Two extremes prevail in translation practice: complete reliance on machine outputs directly treated as academic deliverables without revision, and total rejection of large-language models as auxiliary tools. No extreme norm establishes an instrumental-rational stance: AI being an auxiliary rather than a translating subject. Machine-generated academic translations shall never be accepted uncritically, nor shall efficiency gains brought by technology be dismissed.

Second, *tiptoeing extremes* requires balancing conflicting priorities. Legal translation must weigh rigorous terminology with diversified foreign-language expression, translation efficiency with academic quality, and machine-drafted output with human translators' creativity. Neither should professional accuracy be sacrificed for speed, nor should auxiliary technological values be disregarded in pursuit of absolute perfection. Dynamic equilibrium shall be achieved amid conflicting objectives.

Third, *timely appropriateness* invites ethical standards adapting dynamically to contexts. Popular-science translation, journal English abstracts and full-length academic monographs differ drastically in required terminological precision, rhetorical style and strictness. Uniform machine-translation templates cannot be applied indiscriminately; differentiated post-editing shall be implemented for distinct usage scenarios.

Such Golden Mean-like approaches mainly regulate practical dimensions, governing relations between humans and tools as well as between researchers and collaborating institutions. It answers the question of how to tackle AI-assisted translation.

Daoist Holism of Man and Nature: Keeping as self-soing, Equality of All Beings, Non-Coercive acting, Bottom-Line Boundaries for AI-Aided Translating

Daoist Entirety of Human and Nature dissolves subject-object dualism and advocates organic symbiosis among humans, technology and the academic community, furnishing bottom-line ethical constraints.

First, *self-so keeping* admits technology shall comply with inherent disciplinary laws. Legal-academic translation follows its own disciplinary logic. Computational power shall not be used to produce formally acceptable translations contradicting legal doctrines; technological operations ought to conform to intrinsic rules of translation and legal research.

Second, *equality of all beings*: dismantling technological hegemony. AI should neither be deified as a professional translator replacing human experts, nor should human translators be degraded to mere proofreaders. Machines and humans each have their respective functional placements.

Third, *non-coercive acting* permits no reckless abuse. This does not mean abandoning technology, but rejecting unbounded misuse. AI shall not be utilized to mass-produce translations for research-project applications; invalid AI renderings shall not be procured to consume research funds; raw machine outputs shall

not be passed off as expert translations.

While the Confucian Golden Doctrine addresses practical-scale issues in translation, the Daoist wholeness clarifies ethical bottom lines by defining what must not be done. Jointly they construct a value framework of "moderate society, bounded academia, human-machine symbiosis", serving as evaluative standard for subsequent case analyses and project-ethics discussions.

Sector-Specific Legal-Translation Cases: Reflections on AI-Generated Translations and Human Post-editing of Critical Positions in Criminal Doctrine

Zhang Mingkai's *work* presents a concentrated account of criminal law school debates, theories of criminal law interpretation, and arguments grounded in native legal norms. Its text abounds with specialized legal concepts, reflective long sentences, and literary jurisprudential metaphors. This study uses a general large language model to produce initial English drafts, followed by systematic human post-editing. Ten paired case studies clearly demonstrate the inherent limitations of AI translation and verify the guiding power of the *Doctrine of the Mean* and the idea of the *Unity of Heaven and Humanity* for translation practice. The paper conducts granular analysis across multiple dimensions: creative rendering of terminology, handling of literary metaphors, syntactic parallelism, transference of jurisprudential concepts, intellectual-historical paraphrasing, translation of criminal law doctrine, and comparative-law informational compensation. Each case comprises the Chinese source text, AI initial draft, human revised version, AI defect diagnosis, post-editing strategy, and dual insights covering both jurisprudence and translation. The paper concludes by summarizing the shared patterns emerging from the cases.

Ten Paired Cases Illuminating the Handlings of AI and Humans

Case 1 Professional Creative Rendering of Book Titles: Balancing Doctrinal Substance and Overseas Publishing Dissemination

The source text: <刑法的基本立场>

AI version: The Basic Stances of Criminal Law

Human-revised version: The Critical Positions of Criminal Doctrine

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI relied rigidly on literal dictionary matching. The term *stances* mostly refers to individual subjective positions and is unsuitable for the title of an academic monograph. *Basic* is a generic modifier and fails to capture the core content of the book. Centered on debates among competing criminal law theories, the work is far more than a simple enumeration of elementary viewpoints. A literal translation strips away the book's essence of "critical contention between schools of thought" and would fail to engage overseas legal readers.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Discard *stances* and adopt *Positions* to represent the substantive connotation of "doctrines and clusters of school theories" running through the book. Abandon *basic* in favour of *critical*. The word *critical* carries dual meanings of "critical examination" and "argumentative contestation": it restores the textual core where different doctrines refute one another, while conforming to the stylistic conventions of academic publishing in target-language contexts. This balances academic rigour and communicative impact.

Insight (Appropriateness in the *Doctrine of the Mean*: *Timely Equilibrium*). Monograph title translation must not be confined to dictionary definitions. It ought to return to the work's central thesis, accommodate the academic context of the target language and the goals of international communication, striking a balance between

fidelity to the original text and receptivity among overseas readers. Sure, there are plenty of other options, such as *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law*, *the Basic Positions in Criminal Law*, *Criminal Critical Cores*, *Criminal Critical Theories*. These can be better renderings for the editors to deal with.

Case 2 Translating Literary Intertextuality: When the Preface "Bumps Into" Pop Lyrics (Transference of Textual Cultural Allusions)

The source text：不知道因为什么 ，也不知道为了什么，从开始接触刑法的那一刻起 ，我便对学派之争兴趣浓厚。

AI version: I cannot say why, or even for what reason, but from the moment I first encountered criminal law I was captivated by debates between rival schools of thought.

Human-revised version: I cannot say why, or even for what type of guy, but from the right tie I first cried for the criminal lies I was captivated by debates between rival schools of thought.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI accomplished basic semantic conversion yet completely failed to recognize the cultural intertextuality embedded in the Chinese text. This passage by chance partly agrees to Teresa Teng's *A Thousand Words*: "I do not know why, nor do I know for what, sorrow keeps surrounding me." Drawing on the lyrical phrasing of this popular song, the author uses an implicit, emotive approach to introduce the dry debates among criminal law schools, creating a rhetorical effect of juxtaposing refined scholarship and popular culture. Lacking associative access to a cultural knowledge base, the machine cannot detect this literary allusion beneath the text. It merely produces plain, factual statements, erasing the original's witty literary rhetoric.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. "I do not know why, sorrow keeps surrounding me" is the opening and recurring refrain of Teresa Teng's *A Thousand Words*. The six-bar phrase appears three times in the song. Emotionally, it names no specific cause, depicting vague, lingering melancholy in love—sorrow restrained rather than excessive, in keeping with the implicit aesthetic of the East. Narratively, it builds suspense, leading into the promise "to love me forever", revealing sorrow hidden beneath sweet vows. Structurally, its repetition echoes the closing line "A thousand words and ten thousand phrases drift past like floating clouds", tying back to the title's core sentiment of "wanting to speak yet holding back". As a film insert song, it mirrors the characters' tangled emotional predicament in the movie. Cast as an inner monologue suited to Teresa Teng's vocal delivery, it evokes empathy even detached from the original plot and stands as the song's most iconic motif.

The legal author himself is fond of Teresa Teng's lyrics. He fortunately "borrows" this line and adds a hypothetical clause — "I do not know why" — to reflect the state of criminal law theory. The adaptation brings delightful wit: it uses a famous line from popular music to frame cumbersome legal-philosophical realities and foreground the core theme. The translation ought to mirror this effect as far as possible.

Insight. Legal monographs are not composed solely of doctrinal argumentation; they frequently contain literary quotations and intertextual rhetoric. AI only processes surface-level semantics and lacks the capacity to identify literary and cultural allusions. Human post-editing must attend to both legal doctrine and literary rhetoric, achieving the ideal of "preserving the meaning without losing the literary grace".

Case 3 Metaphorical Parallel Sentences: Syntactic Parallelism and the Selection of Established Jurisprudential Terms

The source text：刑法是时代文化的一面镜子 ，是社会道德的晴雨表 ，是社会意识的忠实反映。刑法总是紧跟时代的步伐 ，敏感地反映着社会结构以及国民价值观的变化。

AI version: Criminal law is a mirror of the culture of its time, a barometer of social morality, and faithfully reflects social values. It keeps pace with the times and sensitively reflects shifts in social structure and people's

values.

Human-revised version: Criminal law is a mirror of the culture of its time, a barometer of social morality, and a faithful reflection of social values. It keeps pace with the times and sensitively reflects shifts in social structure and public values.

AI Defect Diagnosis. First, imbalanced sentence structure. The three sets of Chinese parallelism all employ nominal predicates. In the AI-generated translation, while the first two items are nouns, the third shifts to a predicate verb construction, breaking the parallel rhetoric highly valued in English academic writing. Second, inappropriate terminology. *people's values* leans toward colloquial usage and carries ambiguity in jurisprudential contexts, failing to precisely refer to public values at the societal level.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. At the grammatical level, unify all elements into a nominal parallel structure: *a faithful reflection of social values*, to achieve rhetorical parallelism. At the terminological level, replace *people's values* with *public values*—a fixed term in Anglo-American jurisprudence denoting societal public values. This avoids ambiguity and aligns with the publishing context of overseas legal scholarship.

Insight. Legal monographs contain abundant parallel rhetoric, which AI tends to overlook when meeting English syntactic requirements for parallelism. Meanwhile, it is essential to distinguish everyday vocabulary from established academic terms in specific branches of law, rather than resorting to simplistic literal substitution.

Case 4 Jurisprudential Personification Metaphors: Preserving Ontological Rhetoric and Rejecting Excessively Flattened Domestication

The source text：但是，正义的脸变幻无常，要彻底认清和精确描绘刑法这张脸确实太难，要完全看清和准确领会刑法这张脸上的各种表情、感情与心情委实不易。

AI version: However, justice always changes its appearance; it is really hard to clearly capture its look and mood.

Human-revised version: However, the face of justice is ever-shifting, and it is genuinely difficult to see clearly and precisely capture the expressions, feelings, and moods on that face.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI flattens and simplifies Chinese metaphors, condensing the original coherent personification of "justice's face, expressions, feelings and moods" into the plain phrases *appearance, look and mood*. This erodes the text's literary and speculative quality. The Chinese text employs anthropomorphic metaphor to unpack the complexity of justice, yet the machine tends to strip away rhetoric in favour of plain, simplified expression—a typical case of excessive domestication.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Retain the root metaphor of "the face of justice" in full, and restore the complete set of imagery: *expressions, feelings, and moods on that face*. Anthropomorphic rhetoric is permissible in English academic writing for humanities and social sciences. The speculative metaphor from the source text need not be removed for the sake of supposed "objectivity".

Insight. Jurisprudential metaphors cannot be simplistically flattened by AI. Post-editors must strike a measured balance: neither resorting to rigid literal translation that renders English obscure, nor over-domesticating to lose the original root metaphor. This embodies the *holding the middle between two extremes* of the Doctrine of the Mean.

Case 5 Multiple Coordinate Concepts: Distinguishing Neutral Contested Notions and Avoiding Negative Connotations

The source text：事实上，正是因为有两个队伍、 有两种声音、有强弱相撞、有相互批判，才使刑

法学得以繁荣和发展。

AI version: It is the conflict between two camps and opinions that makes criminal law research flourish and develop.

Human-revised version: In fact, it is precisely the existence of two camps, two voices, vigorous clashes between stronger and weaker arguments, and mutual critique that allows criminal law scholarship to flourish and develop.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI condenses multi-layered parallel connotations into the single noun *conflict*, which carries the negative semantic load of confrontation and strife. The original text, however, aims to affirm the scholarly value of doctrinal debates rather than criticize antagonistic struggle. The machine collapses the multi-tiered meanings (different camps, divergent voices, the interplay of strong and weak arguments, and mutual critique), losing the original text's layered semantic richness.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Restore the multi-noun parallel structure. Replace the negatively charged *conflict* with *vigorous clashes between stronger and weaker arguments, and mutual critique* to preserve the original affirmative stance toward academic debate. Deploy *scholarship* instead of the generic term *research* to match the stylistic register of a criminal law monograph.

Insight. Chinese employs parallel imagery to express academic pluralism, yet AI frequently suffers from semantic compression. Translators must screen words for emotional connotations and restore the value stance of the source text instead of merely relying on dictionary definitions.

Case 6 Doctrinal Critique Passages: Trimming Redundancy and Preserving Chains of Logical Deduction

The source text: 所以，二重性说是一种不可思议的学说。不能不认为，所谓的二重性说，其实就是一种独立性说，并没有调和主观主义与客观主义，实际上是主观主义的观点。

AI version: Hence the duality theory is logically untenable. The so-called duality theory is, in effect, nothing more than an autonomous liability theory in disguise; far from reconciling objectivism and subjectivism, it simply adopts a subjectivist position.

Human-revised version: Duality is logically untenable. It is, in effect, far from reconciling objectivism and subjectivism, it simply adopts a subjectivist position.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI introduces a redundant derived concept, *autonomous liability theory in disguise*. The original text merely points out that the duality theory in essence slides toward subjectivism; it does not propose any "disguised autonomous liability theory". This constitutes a typical case of large-language-model hallucination, inventing conceptual constructs absent from the source. Meanwhile, the repetitive use of *duality theory* results in cumbersome sentence construction.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Remove the extraneous concept made up by AI, streamline repeated nouns, and preserve the core logical chain: the duality theory is logically untenable, fails to reconcile subjectivism and objectivism, and inherently adopts a subjectivist stance.

Insight. Large language models are prone to conceptual devising in doctrinal commentary passages, autonomously generating theoretical terms that do not exist in the original text. Post-editors must examine every concept against the Chinese source, excise AI-invented additions, and uphold the baseline of fidelity. This aligns with the idea of "non-coercive acting and maintaining boundaries" under the unity of heaven-like and humanity, rather than allowing the machine to arbitrarily add information.

Case 7 Citations in German and Japanese Criminal Law Intellectual History: Sentential Cohesion, Preservation of Original Concepts, and Resolution of Referential Ambiguity

The source text: 如上所述，德国学者李斯特认为，实质的违法性是指行为“对社会有害（反社会的或非社会的）”、是“侵害社会的举动”、是“对法益的侵害或者威胁”。麦茨格认为，违法性的实质是对一定的生活利益的侵害或者有侵害的危险（威胁）。日本学者泷川幸辰认为，违法性的实质是对“被害人利益”的侵害。

AI version: As noted, Liszt regarded substantive illegality as conduct “harmful to society (antisocial or asocial)” and as “an infringement or threat to legal interests”, while Mezger argued that it consists in the infringement of certain livelihood benefits or threat thereof. Japanese scholar Takigawa Yukitoshi held that this entails an infringement of the “victim’s interest.”

Human-revised version: As noted, Liszt regarded substantive illegality as conduct “harmful to society (antisocial or asocial)” and as “an infringement or threat to legal interests”, while Mezger argued that it consists in the infringement of certain livelihood benefits or threat thereof. Japanese scholar Takigawa Yukitoshi held that this entails an infringement of the “victim’s interest.”

AI Defect Diagnosis. First, the AI strings together short quotations from multiple scholars in intellectual history without transitional conjunctions, yielding loosely structured paragraphs. Second, it replaces the original Japanese criminal law concept of “livelihood benefits” with the later term *legally protected interests* (legal good), obscuring the historical evolution of the concept. Third, the noun phrases of “the substance of illegality” and “substantive illegality” are repetitious, which are typically word for word translating.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Add the conjunction *While* to establish contrast and continuity between scholars’ viewpoints. Retain *livelihood benefits* as the rendering for “生活利益” to preserve the concept’s original meaning in intellectual history, rather than equating it directly with legal good. Deploy *it* and *this* to precisely anchor the core antecedent *substantive illegality* from the preceding text and eliminate confusion in pronominal reference.

Insight. When translating comparative criminal law and intellectual-historical materials, AI tends to flatten historical distinctions between concepts and conflate cognate yet non-identical notions. Human editors must attend to paragraph cohesion and the historical origins of concepts while employing pronominal reference in long sentences.

Case 8 Opening Formulations in Doctrinal History: Removing Colloquialism and Offering Alternative Academic Variants

The source text: 从学说发展史来看，关于未遂犯的处罚根据，刑法理论上存在着客观的未遂论与主观的未遂论之争；对未遂犯处罚根据的认识不同，必然影响对未遂犯相关问题的看法。

AI version: Looking at the development of legal doctrine, criminal-law theory has long been divided between an objective theory of attempt and a subjective theory of attempt regarding the basis for punishing attempted offenses; differing views about the basis for punishing attempts inevitably affect how related issues are approached.

Human-revised version: Historically, criminal-law doctrines have witnessed the divide between subjectivist and objectivist accounts of punishment for attempt offenses, and distinct understandings of punishment grounds inevitably shape approaches to attendant questions.

AI Defect Diagnosis. *Looking at the development of legal doctrine* carries a strong colloquial register and fails to match the concise style expected for the opening of an English intellectual history text. The noun phrases are lengthy and repetitive, with no shorthand anaphoric references available. While the semantic meaning is broadly correct, the register and textual economy are inadequate.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Offer alternative phrasing suited to intellectual-historical prose while retaining the raw AI translation as a reference version. Trim redundant long nominal groups and supply abbreviated anaphoric references to meet the stylistic diversity requirements for monograph publication, without simply overwriting the AI draft. The wordings underlined, in particular, reconstruct the passage, more meaningful and eye catching than the AI expressions.

Insight. A single source text may admit multiple valid translations. Versions intended for formally published monographs require register refinement. Post-editing is not merely error correction; it also encompasses stylistic upgrading and the provision of alternative renderings.

Case 9 Translation of Complicity Doctrine: Deleting AI-Generated Filler and Explicating Implicit Chinese Logical Relations

The source text: 只要以正犯为中心认定共犯，就可以采取以下路径：但是，由于甲没有抢劫的故意，只有盗窃的故意，所以，对甲只能按盗窃罪论处。

AI version: By centering the analysis on the principal offender, we proceed as follows: But because A lacked the intent to commit robbery and intended only theft, A can be convicted only of theft.

Human-revised version: We proceed as follows: But because A lacked the intent to commit robbery and intended only theft, A can be convicted only of theft, for the mens rea of theft alone yields a conviction for theft.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The generated filler phrase *By centering the analysis on the principal offender* contains no substantive legal information, representing a typical case of large-language-model "padding verbiage". The Chinese text relies on contextual implication to convey the causal logic that subjective intent determines conviction outcomes, yet the AI translation fails to render this criminal-law reasoning explicitly.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. Delete legally meaningless filler phrases. Add subordinate clauses to articulate the implicit causal chain of "subjective mental state – conviction consequences", the addition underlined conforming to the writing conventions of English criminal law texts.

Insight. A great deal of reasoning in Chinese criminal-law texts remains contextually implicit. AI cannot proactively supply logical chains missing for readers from different legal traditions. Post-editors need to identify redundant padding text produced by the machine and appropriately explicate the underlying jurisprudential logic.

Case 10 Comparative-Law External Translation: Supplementing Institutional Context and Bridging Legal-System Information Gaps

The source text: 我国刑法虽然没有使用正犯与狭义的共犯概念，但必须肯定的是，刑法分则就单独犯罪的规定，实际上是关于正犯的规定。

AI version: Although China's Criminal Law does not explicitly adopt the labels "principal offender" and "accomplice" in name, the provisions in the special part regulating individual offenses are, in effect, rules concerning principals.

Human-revised version: Although China's Criminal Law does not deploy explicit statutory labels for principal offenders and narrow-sense accomplices, provisions governing solo offenses within the Special Part effectively embody the normative regime for principals.

AI Defect Diagnosis. The AI merely produces a literal translation, which may mislead English readers into believing that the system of principal offenders is entirely absent from Chinese criminal law and that only the technical label is missing. The sentence also suffers from lengthy and repetitive subjects. In comparative-law translation, literal fidelity does not equate to cross-cultural comprehension.

Post-editing Translation Strategy. The wording of the translation distinguishes between "absence of a statutory label" and "non-existence of the institution". It clarifies that the institution objectively exists, even though no statutory term designates it. Employ the superordinate noun *regime* to streamline sentence structure and bridge the informational gap between Chinese and foreign criminal-law institutions.

Insight. When translating Chinese legal texts where a concept is not used in statutory provisions yet the corresponding institution exists in substance, mechanical literal rendering must be avoided. Translators should adopt a comparative-law perspective to eliminate institutional misinterpretation among overseas readers.

Synthesis of Cases: Common Defects in AI Translation of Legal Texts and Operational Guidelines for Post-Editing

Relying on the ten case studies, four inherent weaknesses of general large language models when processing criminal law academic texts can be summarized:

Semantics and Rhetoric: Mechanical literal translation, failure to detect literary intertextuality and jurisprudential metaphors, and compression or flattening of Chinese rhetorical imagery. Model context-unfounded outputs occur, with unsubstantiated proliferation of theoretical concepts, alongside the generation of substantial empty filler phrases carrying no informational value.

Terminology and Intellectual History: Confusion between everyday vocabulary and specialist legal terminology; erasure of historical origins of German and Japanese criminal law concepts, treating similar notions as directly equivalent; ambiguous pronominal reference.

Discourse Logic: Neglect of parallel rhetorical structures required in English syntax; mere concatenation of quotations from multiple scholars without logical connections; inability to unpack jurisprudential causal chains implicit in Chinese context, failing to explicate such logic for non-local readers.

Cross-Cultural Comparative Law: Mere surface conversion of words without comparative-law awareness, inability to proactively bridge informational gaps between Chinese and foreign legal systems, and tendency to trigger institutional misinterpretation among overseas readers.

Building upon Confucian and Daoist thought of *the Doctrine of the Mean* and the *Unity of Heaven and Humanity*, practical guidelines for AI post-editing of legal texts are formulated:

Going too far is as bad as not going far enough: Neither fully trust AI output nor discard it entirely for complete rewriting. Retain sound segments of the machine draft and revise only its defective parts. Holding properly between two extremes: Strike a balance between fidelity to the source text and target-language conventions; attend to both doctrinal accuracy and literary rhetoric; reconcile literal rendering with the cognitive needs of comparative-law readers. Timely Appropriateness: Differentiate contexts such as abstracts, monographs and popular scholarly writing, match the appropriate register, and allow multiple alternative translations.

Non-Coercive Acting and Maintaining Boundaries (Baseline Principle): Translators must not arbitrarily add concepts or distort the original meaning of doctrines with the aid of AI, upholding the ethical baseline of textual fidelity.

Real-World Ethical Dilemmas of AI-Translation-Related Projects: Publishing Collaboration, Contractual Integrity and Risks of Academic Corruption

Interdisciplinary legal- and foreign-language projects on AI-aided translation frequently involve multi-party collaboration among universities, publishing houses and research institutes. Publishing houses may participate as project collaborators or undertake resultant publication tasks. Most existing ethical studies concentrate on

technical dimensions like algorithms and copyrights. Nevertheless, institutional ethics involving contract performance, authorship and resource allocation in project implementation deserve equal attention. Violations against the Golden Mean's "holding the appropriateness between extremes" and the Unity of Man and Nature's "non-coercive acting as boundary-setting" directly impair project deliverables and waste research resources. Four major categories of risks are summarized below.

First, collaborating institutions hold weak contractual awareness, leading to hollow rights-and-obligation arrangements. Some projects list publishing houses as participants without formal cooperation agreements signed prior to project approval. Project application documents only state in general terms that the press will undertake publication, without written stipulations on acceptance criteria for AI-translated deliverables, delivery schedules, copyright ownership, scope of fund expenditure and actual research tasks undertaken by press staff. Certain publishing institutions give oral commitments yet refuse publication obligations after project approval; they are also granted nominal project participation and award eligibility without substantive research work, giving rise to authorship-ethics problems. The Golden-Mean precept of *going too far is as bad as not going far enough* suggests that project collaboration shall neither exclude reasonable participation by publishing houses nor tolerate speculative nominal-participation without substantive duties.

Second, academic-integrity lapses occur in project application and execution. Some research proposals overstate expected outputs of AI-translation projects, promising high-quality translated treatises while actually submitting unedited raw machine outputs to secure research funding. In other scenarios, the publishers leverage their publication resources to collude with review procedures and exert covert interference over project approval.

Third, research-resource allocation subject to personal connections breeds risks of academic corruption. Horizontal and vertical AI-translation projects ought to be awarded to teams with interdisciplinary competence covering legal studies, translation and artificial intelligence. In practice, projects are sometimes assigned to personal acquaintances. Recipient teams lack post-editing expertise and submit unpolished machine-translated drafts; research funds are diverted for irrelevant expenditures, resulting in wasted academic resources. The Daoist precept of *managing through wu-wei as boundary-setting* warns that personal connections must not sway research-resource distribution; projects shall never be treated as instruments for personal-favour exchange.

Fourth, inadequate procedural supervision of research projects. Mid-term inspections and final-project evaluations mainly assess paper quantity and concluding reports. Seldom do inspectors verify raw AI translations, post-editing revision trails, cooperation contracts or performance evidence for collaborating parties, creating space for ethical misconduct.

These are institutional-ethics issues within the academic community and cannot be resolved merely by algorithmic improvements. Value guidance and institutional constraints must be implemented simultaneously. The Confucian Properness requires project administration to strike a balance between encouraging technological innovation and supervising academic integrity. The Daoist holism of keeping it self-soing demands stakeholders across the academic ecosystem observe behavioural boundaries and resist reckless technology-driven or favour-driven practices.

Multi-Dimensional Collaborative Governance: Building a Comprehensive Ethical System for AI-Aided Translation

With the critical norms of the Confucianism and Daoism mentioned as above, practical post-editing experience from the criminal-law scholar studies, real-world ethical risks of research projects, as well as

absorbing findings from existing scholarship, this paper creates a complete ethical system for AI-aided translation at three levels: value orientation, translation practice, and institutional supervision of research projects.

Value Level: Establishing Underlying Consensus for AI-Translation Ethics via the Golden Mean-the Unity of Man and Nature

Indigenous traditional-philosophy thinking shall build consensus within the academic community. First, uphold the instrumental-tool stance for AI: reject the two extremes of total machine dependence and complete technological rejection, complying with *going too far is as bad as not going far enough*. Second, *hold the harmony between extremes*: balance translation efficiency against academic quality, technological convenience against humanistic rigour. Third, follow *timely appropriateness*: formulate differentiated post-editing standards for popular-science materials, journal abstracts and scholarly studies translations. Fourth, set behavioural bottom lines informed by the Oneness of Man and Nature: researchers and publishing collaborators must refrain from project speculation enabled by AI and safeguard the overall health of the academic ecosystem. Meanwhile, draw upon Tan Zaixi's (2026) "variable-constant" dialectic: preserve invariable translation principles including faithfulness, equivalence and humanistic interpretation, while rationally treating efficiency gains brought by technological "variables", so as to reconcile instrumental rationality and value rationality.

Practical Translation Level: Formulating Standardized Workflows for Legal AI-Translation Post-editing

Drawing upon post-editing practices of *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law* and implementing the three-dimensional "cognition-knowledge-skill" post-editing competence model proposed by Feng Quangong and Liu Ming (2018), norms for academic translation shall be, firstly, established to distinguish explicitly raw AI drafts from final publishable outputs. Recognize human post-editing, terminological correction, logical reconstruction and rhetorical revision as core creative labour performed by translators.

Plus, there should be to preserve complete post-editing documentation, including original AI translations and revision trails, furnishing source materials for mid-term inspections and final-project assessments. And terminological work must never be fully delegated to large-language models. Manual cross-checking against disciplinary terminological repositories is mandatory to guard against concept-hallucination outputs from AI.

Moreover, Implement the principle of *timely appropriateness*. Differentiated translation standards shall be defined for distinct text genres and publication objectives; one-size-fits-all AI templates must be avoided.

Finally, trans-jurisdictional legal translation shall adopt a comparative-law awareness. Information gaps between legal systems ought to be appropriately bridged to prevent misunderstandings among foreign readers caused by mechanical literal rendering.

Institutional Level for Projects and Publishing Collaboration: Minimizing Contract Risks and Curbing Academic Corruption

Rigid institutional constraints shall be introduced to address agencies' loopholes uncovered in AI-translation projects.

First, strengthen contractual enforceability. For projects with academic publisher as formal participants, official cooperation contracts must be signed prior to approval, specifying research obligations for each party, authorship rules, copyright arrangements and deliverable-acceptance criteria. Projects lacking complete contracts shall receive heightened scrutiny during mid-term evaluations.

Second, ensure transparent selection procedures for research-resource allocation. Evaluation of interdisciplinary AI-translation projects shall prioritize teams' interdisciplinary competence and post-editing capacity. Program

awarding undergoing purely with personal social ties shall be prohibited.

Third, optimize indicators for final-project assessment. Besides finished deliverables, inspectors may verify raw AI-translation outputs, post-editing revision records and performance certificates for parties in question to identify cases where unprocessed MTs are provided for formal project outcomes.

Fourth, enforce sanctions for breaches of academic integrity. Misconduct including nominal participation without substantive duties, fabricating translation outputs to obtain research funds, and gains-driven project allocation shall be recorded in academic-integrity files, tackling in accordance with *Rules for Investigation and Handling of Research-Integrity Cases (Trial Implementation)*.

Governance insights from Lu Yan (2024), Chen Lixia (2025) and Wang Huashu (2025) shall also be taken seriously. Algorithm-risk prevention, multi-stakeholder accountability and protection of cultural diversity shall be addressed to accomplish the "value-criterion-norm" managing chain.

Conclusion

Ethics for AI-assisted translation revolve fundamentally around tensions between instrumental rationality and humanistic values. Algorithmic upgradings alone cannot resolve all relevant risks. Indigenous Confucian-Daoist philosophy furnishes value guidance, sector-specific translation cases supplying operational references, and institutional construction for research projects addressing real-world flaws within academic ecosystems. All three components are indispensable.

The Golden Mean in Confucianism furnishes practical principles of moderation, balance and dynamic adaptability for translation practice, defining proper relations between machines and human translators and easing efficiency-quality tensions. The Daoist Wholeness of Man and Nature sets bottom-line ethics of holistic symbiosis and bounded non-interference with no sound reason, warning technology practitioners, researchers and collaborating institutions against overstepping legitimate boundaries. The ten paired translation cases from *The Critical Cores of Criminal Law* demonstrate that high-quality legal-academic translation benefits from AI-generated drafts yet hinges more on human translators' professional judgement, logical reconstruction, rhetorical refinement, doctrinal-historical discrimination and comparative-law information compensation. For project administration, contractual discipline, transparent resource allocation and research-integrity auditing must be enforced to resist academic corruption stemming from personal-connection interference.

The notion of slow-pacing translation put forward by Zhao Lingcen (2025), Tan Zaixi's (2026) dialectic balance between humans and machines, and Hu Bing's (2026) ecological-rational interpretation of the agreement of Man and Nature resonate with indigenous Confucian-Daoist philosophy. Together they caution against the uncurbed expansion of instrumental rationality. Technology constitutes merely a means, while ethics illustrates its soul. Incorporating traditional-philosophy wisdom, practical-translation norms and institutional supervision over research projects enables sound and sustainable deployment of AI translation within humanities and social-science research, particularly legal scholarship.

References

Chen, L. X. (2025). Ethical puzzles and governance breakthroughs for Generative-AI-Powered translation. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies,* (06), 134-141.

Feng, Q. G., & Liu, M. (2018). Construction of the Three-Dimensional Competence Model for translation post-editing. *Foreign Language World,* (03), 55-61.

Hu, B. (2026). Reconciliation between “the Unity of Man and Nature” and instrumental rationality: Constructing a green-cultural dimension for AI governance. *Journal of South China Normal University (Social Science Edition),* (01), 31-42.

Lu, Y. (2024). Construction of ethics for translation technology in the Artificial-Intelligence era. *Chinese Translators Journal, 45*(01), 117-125.

Ministry of Science and Technology et al. (2019). *Rules for Investigation and Handling of Research-Integrity Cases (Trial Implementation)*. Document No. Guo Ke Fa Jian〔2019〕No.323.

Tan, Z. X. (2026). Dialectical reflections on translation in the AI era—Dynamic balance between technology worship and pursuit of translation essence. *Chinese Translators Journal, 47*(03), 113-122.

Wang, H. S. (2025). Research on ethical risks of Generative-AI translation technology in legal translation. *Journal of Gansu University of Political Science and Law,* (01), 1-12.

Zhao, L. C. (2025). Ethical crises and reflections on translation in the age of intelligence. *Foreign Languages, 48*(06), 115-121.