Porta Universorum | Vol. 2 No. 6 (2026): Birželis | ISSN 3030-2234
https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.26060002

When Machines Translate: Artificial Intelligence, Human Judgment, and the Future of Translation

Hasan Alisoy
Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan

How to cite: Alisoy, H. (2026). When machines translate: Artificial intelligence, human judgment, and the future of translation. *Porta Universorum*, 2(6), 13-19. https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.26060003

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has profoundly reshaped the landscape of translation, shifting it from a craft practiced exclusively by human specialists to a hybrid domain where neural machine translation systems, large language models, and AI-assisted tools play increasingly central roles. This article critically examines the capabilities and limitations of contemporary AI translation systems, with particular attention to the Transformer architecture, neural machine translation, and large language models. It argues that while AI has achieved remarkable fluency at the level of sentence-level grammar and lexical accuracy, it continues to fall short in areas requiring cultural sensitivity, pragmatic awareness, and contextual judgment — precisely the domains where human translators remain indispensable. Drawing on research in translation studies, computational linguistics, cognitive science, and language education, the article develops a framework for understanding the complementary relationship between human and machine translation. It proposes a model of 'cognitive partnership' in which AI tools augment rather than replace human translators, and discusses the implications of this model for translator training, professional ethics, and the future of the translation industry. The article also addresses the emotional and cultural dimensions of language that resist algorithmic capture, and reflects on what the rise of AI translation reveals about the nature of human language itself.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; machine translation; neural machine translation; large language models; human–machine collaboration; translation studies; cognitive partnership; cultural competence; translator training

1. INTRODUCTION

Translation is one of humanity's oldest and most consequential intellectual practices. For millennia, the ability to move meaning across linguistic boundaries has shaped diplomacy, religion, science, and literature, enabling the transmission of knowledge between civilizations that might otherwise have remained impenetrable to one another. The translator's task has always been understood as something more than the mechanical substitution of words: it is an act of interpretation, of cultural mediation, of making choices under uncertainty in the service of communication (Baker, 2011; Munday, 2016). It is, in a profound sense, a human act.

Yet the twenty-first century has witnessed a radical transformation in the technological context of translation. The development of statistical machine translation in the 1990s, the neural turn of the 2010s, and most recently the emergence of large language models (LLMs) capable of producing fluent, contextually plausible text across dozens of languages have collectively produced systems of a quality that would have seemed impossible to researchers working only two decades ago. The introduction of the Transformer architecture by Vaswani et al. (2017) marked a decisive turning point: by replacing the sequential processing of recurrent neural networks with attention mechanisms capable of capturing long-range dependencies across entire sentences and paragraphs, the Transformer enabled a qualitative leap in machine translation output that brought AI-generated text close enough to human production to be practically useful in an expanding range of contexts.

This development has generated both excitement and anxiety within the translation community. For some, AI translation represents an unprecedented democratization of cross-linguistic communication, making translation accessible at scale and speed that no human workforce could match (Kenny, 2022; Gambier, 2016). For others, it represents an existential threat to the translation profession and a diminishment of the rich, nuanced human practice of meaning-making across languages (Babazade, 2026). Both responses, as this article argues, capture something real — but neither tells the whole story. The reality is more complex and more interesting: AI translation and human translation are not simply competing approaches to the same task, but complementary capabilities that excel in different dimensions of a fundamentally multidimensional activity.

This article examines the current state of AI translation, its genuine achievements and its persistent limitations, and the emerging model of human–machine collaboration that is reshaping professional translation practice. It draws on research in translation studies, computational linguistics, cognitive science, and language education to develop a conceptual framework for understanding the relationship between human and machine translators — a framework built around the concept of 'cognitive partnership.' It also reflects on what the rise of AI translation reveals about the irreducible complexity of human language, and on the implications for translator training and professional identity in an era of rapid technological change.

2. THE ARCHITECTURE OF MODERN AI TRANSLATION

2.1 From rule-based to neural systems

The history of machine translation can be divided into three broad phases, each reflecting a different theoretical assumption about how language works and how translation can be automated. Rule-based machine translation (RBMT) systems, which dominated from the 1950s through the 1980s, attempted to encode the grammatical rules of source and target languages explicitly, producing translations through the application of morphological analysis, syntactic parsing, and bilingual lexicons. While these systems could achieve acceptable results for narrow, highly constrained domains, they were brittle in the face of ambiguity, idiomatic language, and the sheer complexity of natural linguistic variation (Bowker & Ciro, 2019).

Statistical machine translation (SMT), which emerged in the 1990s and rose to dominance in the 2000s, took a radically different approach: rather than encoding rules explicitly, SMT systems learned probabilistic patterns from large bilingual corpora, identifying which target-language sequences were most likely to correspond to given source-language inputs. This approach was more flexible and scalable than RBMT, but it continued to struggle with long-range grammatical dependencies, coherence across sentence boundaries, and the translation of rare or domain-specific terminology (Chesterman, 2016). The critical breakthrough came with the neural turn. Neural machine translation (NMT) systems, particularly those built on the encoder-decoder architecture with attention mechanisms, learned to represent entire sentences as dense vectors in a continuous semantic space, capturing not just surface-level word correspondences but deeper structural and semantic relationships (Toral & Sánchez-Cartagena, 2017). The introduction of the Transformer architecture by Vaswani et al. (2017) represented the apex of this development, enabling the training of models of unprecedented scale and expressive power.

2.2 Large language models and translation

The most recent phase in the development of AI translation is defined by the emergence of large language models, pre-trained on vast multilingual corpora and capable of performing translation as one capability among many. Systems such as GPT-4, Claude, and Gemini have demonstrated remarkable translation ability across dozens of language pairs, including many low-resource languages for which specialized NMT systems perform poorly. Their performance on standard benchmarks has in some cases approached or matched that of professional human translators on sentence-level measures of adequacy and fluency (Bender et al., 2021). These systems have also shown the ability to adapt translation style to context, producing formal or informal, technical or literary translations depending on prompting, and to explain or justify their translation choices when asked.

Yet benchmark performance is a limited measure of translation quality. As researchers in translation studies have long argued, translation quality is not a single, context-independent attribute but a multidimensional judgment that depends on the purpose of the translation, the needs of the target audience, the norms of the target culture, and the specific communicative function of the source text (Moorkens et al., 2018; Doherty, 2016). A translation can be perfectly accurate at the sentence level while failing utterly at the level of register, cultural appropriateness, or communicative intent. These are precisely the dimensions on which AI systems most consistently underperform.

3. WHAT AI TRANSLATION GETS RIGHT AND WHERE IT FALLS SHORT

3.1 Genuine achievements

It would be both intellectually dishonest and practically unhelpful to minimize the genuine achievements of contemporary AI translation. For a wide range of text types — technical documentation, business correspondence, factual reporting, legal boilerplate — modern NMT systems and LLMs produce translations of sufficient quality to be practically useful with minimal or no post-editing (Kenny, 2022; Sánchez-Gijón et al., 2019). The speed and scalability advantages are dramatic: systems that can process millions of words per hour have made it possible to provide multilingual access to information at a scale and cost that no human workforce could match. In language pairs with large amounts of high-quality training data — particularly among major European languages and between English and Chinese, Japanese, or Korean — AI translation has dramatically narrowed the quality gap with human translation on standard measures.

AI translation tools have also proved particularly valuable as support for human translators rather than as replacements for them. Translation memory systems, AI-generated draft translations for post-editing, and automated terminology extraction and suggestion tools have substantially increased translator productivity, allowing skilled professionals to focus their cognitive resources on the most challenging and creative aspects of the work (Bowker & Ciro, 2019). In language education, AI translation tools have opened new possibilities for language learners, providing immediate access to comprehensible input across a wider range of languages and supporting the development of multilingual competence in ways that align with contemporary understanding of language acquisition (Alisoy & Sadiqzade, 2024; Alisoy, 2024).

3.2 Persistent limitations

Despite these achievements, AI translation systems exhibit persistent and characteristic limitations that reflect the fundamental differences between statistical pattern recognition and genuine linguistic understanding. The most significant of these is the system's inability to access the pragmatic and cultural knowledge that human translators draw on constantly and often unconsciously. Translation is not merely a mapping between linguistic codes; it is an act of communication situated in a cultural context, directed at an audience with specific expectations and background knowledge, and serving communicative purposes that may differ significantly between source and target cultures (Munday, 2016; Chesterman, 2016). A human translator who encounters a culturally specific allusion, a play on words, or a reference to a historically significant event brings to bear a wealth of extralinguistic knowledge that no current AI system possesses in anything like the same form.

The emotional and affective dimensions of language present a further challenge. As Sadiqzade (2025) demonstrates in a cross-cultural analysis of emotional expression, the ways in which emotions are encoded and communicated in language vary significantly across cultures in ways that resist systematic formalization. A translator rendering poetry, literary prose, or emotionally charged political speech must not only convey semantic content but recreate something of the affective impact of the original — a task that requires not just linguistic competence but empathy, cultural sensitivity, and aesthetic judgment. These are precisely the capacities that Babazade (2026) identifies as distinguishing human translators from their algorithmic counterparts in a detailed comparative analysis: while AI systems consistently outperform human translators on speed and basic accuracy metrics, human translators consistently outperform AI on measures of cultural appropriateness, naturalness of expression, and the handling of pragmatic complexity.

Cognitive dependency is an additional concern. Bender et al. (2021) warn that LLMs, despite their impressive surface fluency, are fundamentally 'stochastic parrots': they generate plausible-sounding text based on statistical patterns without genuine semantic understanding. This means that AI translations can contain errors that are superficially plausible but semantically or pragmatically wrong in ways that a reader without strong source-language competence may not detect. In high-stakes contexts — legal, medical, diplomatic — such errors can have serious consequences. Koehn and Knowles (2017) document a number of characteristic failure modes of NMT systems, including hallucination of content not present in the source text, unwarranted omission of source content, and systematic errors in the translation of numbers, proper names, and specialized terminology.

4. COGNITIVE PARTNERSHIP: A FRAMEWORK FOR HUMAN–MACHINE COLLABORATION

The most productive way to think about the relationship between AI and human translation is neither as competition nor as simple division of labor, but as what this article terms 'cognitive partnership.' In this model, AI translation systems are understood as powerful cognitive tools that extend and augment human translators' capabilities rather than replacing them — much as calculators extended mathematicians' capabilities without rendering mathematical understanding obsolete. The human translator brings to the partnership cultural knowledge, pragmatic competence, affective sensitivity, ethical judgment, and the capacity for creative problem-solving in the face of genuine communicative complexity. The AI system brings speed, consistency, access to vast multilingual data, and freedom from the cognitive fatigue that affects human performance over time.

This model has significant implications for how translation is practiced and taught. In professional contexts, the post-editing of machine translation output is increasingly the dominant mode of translation work for certain text types, requiring translators to develop new skills in identifying and correcting characteristic machine errors while preserving their ability to produce high-quality translation from scratch when the task demands it (Sánchez-Gijón et al., 2019; Doherty, 2016). The cognitive demands of post-editing are distinct from those of traditional translation: rather than generating target text, the post-editor evaluates and revises it, requiring a kind of critical reading that is in some ways more demanding than translation itself, since it requires the ability to detect errors that are grammatically and superficially plausible (Moorkens et al., 2018).

For translator education, the rise of AI translation raises fundamental questions about what skills and competencies are most valuable to develop. Mammadova (2025) argues that the cognitive and pedagogical dimensions of translation have become more rather than less important in the age of AI: as routine translation tasks are automated, the distinctively human capacities of cultural mediation, pragmatic judgment, and ethical reflection become the core of the translator's professional identity and value. This perspective suggests that translator training should give increased attention to cultural competence, critical thinking, and the development of what might be called 'meta-translational' awareness — the ability to reflect on and explain one's own translation choices and to evaluate the quality of AI-generated translations critically.

5. LANGUAGE, MEANING, AND THE LIMITS OF ALGORITHMS

The rise of AI translation also invites reflection on what it reveals about the nature of human language itself. The fact that AI systems can produce fluent, contextually plausible text without genuine understanding — the insight at the heart of Bender et al.'s (2021) 'stochastic parrots' critique — might seem to suggest that language is primarily a pattern-matching system rather than a vehicle for genuine meaning. But the persistent failures of AI translation in precisely the areas that matter most to human communicators — cultural nuance, pragmatic appropriateness, emotional resonance — suggest the opposite: that meaning is not fully encoded in the surface patterns of language but is co-constructed in the interaction between linguistic form, cultural context, and the shared knowledge and intentions of communicators.

This understanding has direct implications for language education. Alisoy (2024) demonstrates that multilingualism promotes cognitive flexibility by requiring speakers to navigate multiple linguistic and cultural systems simultaneously, developing the kind of perspective-taking and contextual sensitivity that AI systems lack. The value of deep multilingual competence is therefore not diminished but enhanced by the rise of AI translation: while AI tools can handle routine linguistic mediation, the cognitive and cultural capacities developed through deep engagement with multiple languages remain uniquely human and uniquely valuable. Cross-cultural understanding of the kind that Sadiqzade (2025) analyzes — the ability to recognize and navigate the different ways in which human experience is encoded across languages and cultures — is both resistant to algorithmic capture and increasingly important in a world where AI-mediated communication is ubiquitous.

6. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence has transformed translation from a practice conducted exclusively by human specialists into a hybrid domain where human expertise and machine capability interact in complex and rapidly evolving ways. The achievements of contemporary AI translation systems are genuine and significant: they have made translation faster, cheaper, and more accessible, and they have provided powerful tools that enhance human translator productivity and open new possibilities for language learning and cross-linguistic communication. Yet they have also revealed, through their characteristic limitations, the irreducible complexity of what human translators do.

The concept of cognitive partnership offers a framework for navigating this complexity. By understanding AI translation tools as augmentations of human capability rather than replacements for it, we can appreciate both their value and their limits without either uncritical enthusiasm or defensive resistance. The future of translation lies not in the replacement of human translators by machines, but in the development of new forms of collaboration in which human judgment, cultural sensitivity, and ethical awareness are brought to bear on AI-generated output to produce communication that is not merely accurate but genuinely meaningful.

For language educators, translation scholars, and translation professionals, the rise of AI translation is not a threat to be resisted but a challenge and an opportunity: an invitation to articulate more clearly than ever what is distinctively human about the work of translation, and to develop the competencies — cultural, cognitive, ethical, and reflective — that no algorithm can replicate. The machines have learned to translate. What remains is the human work of understanding.

DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in the conduct and reporting of this study.

Funding Statement: This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency.

Author's Contributions: Hasan Alisoy: conceptualization, literature review, analysis, writing – original draft, reviewing, and final editing.

REFERENCES

Alisoy, H. (2024). Multilingualism and cognitive flexibility: Insights from neuroscience and linguistics. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 1(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.024047

Alisoy, H., & Sadiqzade, Z. (2024). Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL): Revolutionizing language education. *Luminis Applied Science and Engineering*, 1(1), 60–72.

Babazade, Y. (2026). Between algorithm and artistry: A comparative analysis of AI translation tools and human translators. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 3(2), 223–232. https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2602026

Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Bowker, L., & Ciro, J. B. (2019). *Machine translation and global research: Towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community*. Emerald Publishing.

Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (2nd ed.). John Benjamins.

Doherty, S. (2016). The impact of translation technologies on the process and product of translation. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 947–969.

Gambier, Y. (2016). Rapid and radical changes in translation and translation studies. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 887–906.

Kenny, D. (2022). Machine translation for everyone: Empowering users in the age of artificial intelligence. *Language Science Press*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6653406

Koehn, P., & Knowles, R. (2017). Six challenges for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation* (pp. 28–39). ACL. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-3204

Mammadova, I. (2025). Cognitive and pedagogical dimensions of translation: A theoretical and practical exploration. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*, 2(1), 213–220. https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.02500127

Moorkens, J., Castilho, S., Gaspari, F., & Doherty, S. (Eds.). (2018). *Translation quality assessment: From principles to practice*. Springer.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Sadiqzade, Z. (2025). The linguistic expression of emotion: A cross-cultural analysis. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(3), 42–54. https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2500195

Sánchez-Gijón, P., Moorkens, J., & Way, A. (2019). Using augmented translation as a step towards a human-machine translation continuum. *Journal of Specialised Translation*, (31), 326–350.

Toral, A., & Sánchez-Cartagena, V. M. (2017). A multifaceted evaluation of neural versus phrase-based machine translation for 9 language directions. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 1063–1073). ACL.

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Hasan Alisoy Lecturer, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan.

https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0247-476X
Email: alisoyhasan@ndu.edu.az