

The Jurisprudential Logic and Institutional Boundaries of AI-Empowered Creative Transformation of China's Fine Traditional Legal Culture

Yuxin Zhang*

Beijing Normal University Law School, Beijing, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) provides novel technological conditions for the creative transformation and innovative development of China's fine traditional legal culture. However, its significance extends far beyond instrumental applications such as artifact restoration, digital preservation, knowledge dissemination, and international communication. The core issue of AI's involvement in the inheritance of traditional legal culture lies in how to translate its institutional experiences, value systems, and governance wisdom into knowledge resources that contemporary rule of law construction can comprehend, verify, and utilize. This requires reliable data, systematic organization of legal knowledge, and standardized dissemination. Concurrently, the generative mechanisms of AI may introduce risks, including historical distortion, algorithmic bias, cultural misinterpretation, ambiguous rights attribution, and threats to personal information and data security. Therefore, empowering the inheritance of China's fine traditional legal culture through AI necessitates not only functional construction across scenarios such as inheritance, translation, education, and communication, but also the establishment of fundamental boundaries grounded in authenticity, legality, explainability, traceability, and human agency. Moving forward, institutional synergy should be forged in data governance, expert review, generated content labeling, intellectual property protection, public cultural platform development, and ethical regulation. Ultimately, this will facilitate the transition of AI from a mere technological tool to a standardized mechanism serving the inheritance of legal civilization and the advancement of digital rule of law.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence; China's fine traditional legal culture; Digital rule of law; Creative Transformation; Generative AI; Algorithmic governance

Online publication: August 14, 2026

1. Introduction

China's fine traditional legal culture is an integral part of Chinese legal civilization, encompassing the

institutional experiences, value systems, and practical wisdom formed in traditional China in areas such as state governance, social order, dispute resolution, power restraint, and ethical education ^[1]. It is manifested not only in legal historical materials such as written codes (e.g., Tang Code with Commentary), case files, contracts, judicial precedents, and official admonition literature, but also in legally normative concepts like “virtue as primary, punishment as supplementary,” “the people as the foundation of the state,” “illuminating virtue and exercising caution in punishment,” “mediation to resolve disputes and prevent litigation,” and “the law makes no concessions to the noble” ^[2-4]. How to endow these historical resources with new explanatory power within the contemporary rule of law context has long been a critical issue in the study of traditional legal culture.

At present, people need to answer more fundamentally the following questions: Why can artificial intelligence become a jurisprudential tool for the creative transformation of traditional legal culture? What normative principles should it follow when intervening in the production and dissemination of traditional legal culture? And how should institutional boundaries be drawn with respect to the authenticity of historical materials, intellectual property rights, data security, personal information protection, algorithmic bias, and cultural misinterpretation?

Therefore, this article does not simply understand artificial intelligence as a technology for cultural dissemination, but examines it within the intersecting structure of digital rule of law and the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization. The creative transformation of fine traditional Chinese legal culture empowered by artificial intelligence refers to the use of technologies such as machine learning, natural language processing, knowledge graphs, image recognition, generative artificial intelligence, and virtual reality, on the premise of respecting the authenticity of historical materials, the logic of legal interpretation, and cultural subjectivity, to digitally preserve, structurally organize, semantically interpret, publicly disseminate, and normatively govern traditional legal-cultural resources, so that they may play a positive role in contemporary rule-of-law construction, legal education, public legal services, and international exchanges on the rule of law ^[1].

On this basis, the focus of this article is not to describe technological applications in a general sense, but to advance the issue of artificial intelligence empowering the creative transformation of fine traditional Chinese legal culture from a proposition of cultural dissemination to a proposition of jurisprudence. Traditional legal culture possesses the dual attributes of a public cultural resource and a resource of rule-of-law civilization, and its digital use should be premised on the authenticity of historical materials, the logic of legal interpretation, and cultural subjectivity ^[1-2]. Artificial intelligence can assist in the organization of historical materials, knowledge production, rule-of-law education, and international communication. However, its involvement in the interpretation and dissemination of traditional legal culture should be placed within a normative framework that gives equal weight to development and security and combines the promotion of innovation with law-based governance ^[5]. Therefore, this article mainly addresses three questions: first, what is the jurisprudential legitimacy of artificial intelligence’s involvement in the inheritance of traditional legal culture; second, what auxiliary functions artificial intelligence can perform in the protection of historical materials, knowledge organization, rule-of-law education, and international communication; and third, how institutional boundaries should be drawn in relation to the authenticity of generated content, algorithmic bias, intellectual property rights, personal information protection, data security, and responsibility tracing. This article will proceed by discussing four aspects in turn: jurisprudential foundations, application scenarios, risk examination, and institutional construction.

2. The jurisprudential basis for artificial intelligence empowering the creative transformation of traditional legal culture

2.1. The public foundation of the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization

Traditional legal culture does not belong solely to a small number of researchers or collecting institutions; rather, it possesses the attributes of a public cultural resource ^[1]. The protection, organization, and dissemination of traditional legal culture concern the public's understanding of the historical foundations of its own rule-of-law civilization, as well as the cultural identity underlying contemporary rule-of-law construction. By expanding the accessibility of traditional legal-cultural resources through digital preservation and open utilization, artificial intelligence helps promote the equalization of public cultural services, enabling more members of society to access, understand, and discuss traditional legal culture.

From a jurisprudential perspective, the public nature of the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization means that the application of artificial intelligence should not merely pursue traffic, efficiency, and commercial monetization, but should serve public knowledge production and public rule-of-law education. The construction of digital platforms for traditional legal-cultural resources should establish collaborative mechanisms among governments, courts, archives, museums, universities, research institutions, and social organizations. With respect to legal historical materials that possess public value, reasonable openness and orderly sharing should be promoted on the premise of ensuring the safety of cultural relics, data security, and the attribution of rights.

This public foundation also determines the role of the state in artificial intelligence's empowerment of traditional legal culture: the state is neither merely a regulator nor a monopolist of all resources. Rather, through the provision of rules, the formulation of standards, the construction of public platforms, and risk regulation, it should provide an institutional environment for the lawful use of traditional legal-cultural resources.

2.2. The technological rationality foundation of digital rule-of-law construction

Digital rule of law emphasizes the standardized application of data, algorithms, platforms, and intelligent technologies in rule-of-law construction (The term "Digital rule of law" as used in this article mainly refers to the standardized application of data, algorithms, and platform technologies in rule-of-law construction. Its institutional background may be understood with reference to the Data Security Law, the Personal Information Protection Law, and the regulatory norms governing generative artificial intelligence). Artificial intelligence's empowerment of traditional legal culture represents a concrete manifestation of digital rule-of-law construction in the field of the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization. Its basic logic lies in enhancing the capacity to preserve, retrieve, interpret, and disseminate legal-cultural resources through digital technologies, while using legal rules to constrain technological risks, so that technological rationality serves rule-of-law rationality.

The technological rationality of artificial intelligence is mainly reflected in three aspects. First, it has the capacity for large-scale processing. In the face of massive collections of ancient books, archives, and excavated documents, artificial intelligence can undertake basic tasks such as OCR recognition, image enhancement, textual collation, version comparison, and thematic classification. Second, it has the capacity for structured association. Through knowledge graphs and semantic networks, artificial intelligence can connect elements such as institutions, concepts, figures, cases, regions, and historical periods, thereby forming a knowledge system of traditional legal culture. Third, it has the capacity for interactive expression.

Generative artificial intelligence can provide differentiated forms of expression according to the knowledge levels of different audiences, using text, images, audio, video, virtual scenes, and other formats.

However, technological rationality must be subject to the constraints of rule-of-law rationality. The speed of algorithms cannot replace the authenticity of historical materials; the fluency of generated content cannot replace the accuracy of legal concepts; and personalized recommendations cannot replace the value orientation of public rule-of-law education. The stronger the generative capacity of artificial intelligence becomes, the more it must be constrained by legal norms and academic norms.

2.3. The value foundation of cultural subjectivity and autonomy in legal interpretation

Fine traditional Chinese legal culture is marked by a distinct Chinese context. Many traditional legal concepts cannot simply be incorporated into Western conceptual systems of jurisprudence. For example, concepts such as “the joint governance of rites and law,” “morality as primary and punishment as supplementary,” “mutual concealment among close relatives,” and “mediation and dispute cessation” contain not only institutional arrangements, but also ethical structures and experiences of social governance ^[3–4]. When artificial intelligence is used for translation, interpretation, and dissemination, reliance solely on general corpora or conceptual correspondences from foreign legal systems may easily lead to semantic compression or even misinterpretation.

Therefore, artificial intelligence’s empowerment of traditional legal culture should adhere to cultural subjectivity and autonomy in legal interpretation. Cultural subjectivity does not mean rejecting international exchange; rather, it requires respect for the historical context, institutional logic, and value structure of traditional legal culture itself when interpreting it. Autonomy in legal interpretation does not mean rejecting modern rule-of-law principles; rather, it emphasizes that the modern transformation of traditional legal culture must be grounded in jurisprudential argumentation, and that value judgments cannot be completed automatically by algorithms.

This point is particularly important in the context of international communication. The international communication of traditional legal culture should not be merely a matter of linguistic translation, but a translation of legal contexts ^[6]. Artificial intelligence can help identify the linguistic habits and comprehension barriers of audiences in target countries. However, how to ultimately explain traditional Chinese legal institutions, how to handle cultural differences, and how to avoid simply equating historical institutions with contemporary institutions still require the joint participation of legal scholars, historians, and translators.

2.4. The normative basis for balancing development and security

The application of artificial intelligence in the field of traditional legal culture should both encourage innovation and attach importance to security. China’s Interim Measures for the Administration of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services have established the basic approach of combining innovation promotion with law-based governance, and of giving equal weight to development and security ^[5]. The Measures for the Identification of Artificial Intelligence-Generated and Synthetic Content further respond to issues concerning the authenticity and traceability of generated content through explicit identification, implicit identification, and the responsibilities of dissemination platforms ^[7]. At the same time, laws such as the Data Security Law and the Personal Information Protection Law provide a basic normative framework for data processing,

personal information protection, and security assessment in the digital utilization of traditional legal-cultural resources ^[8-9].

Although these norms were not formulated specifically for the field of traditional legal culture, the principles they embody—legality, legitimacy, necessity, security, transparency, and accountability—are equally applicable to the use of artificial intelligence in traditional legal culture ^[5, 8-9]. Specifically, the digitization of legal historical materials should comply with data security requirements; when generative question-and-answer services, virtual interpretation, and personalized recommendation services are provided to the public, false and misleading content should be prevented; where personal information, family documents, private contracts, local archives, and image materials are involved, necessary desensitization and access control should be carried out; and when data, images, translations, or research results protected by others' copyright are used to train models, the boundaries of rights should be respected.

It can therefore be seen that the empowerment of traditional legal culture by artificial intelligence is not merely a technical project, but a composite rule-of-law project requiring the joint participation of data law, intellectual property law, personal information protection law, rules of cyberspace governance, and cultural law.

3. Reconstructing the application scenarios of AI-Empowered traditional legal culture

3.1. Preservation of legal historical materials: From digital preservation to trustworthy restoration

The preservation of legal historical materials constitutes a foundational scenario for the application of artificial intelligence to traditional legal culture ^[2]. Due to their age and complex preservation conditions, materials such as ancient books, bamboo and wooden slips, silk manuscripts, inscriptions on steles, archives, and contractual documents often suffer from damage, contamination, blurred writing, and incomplete versions. Traditional restoration relies heavily on human expertise; it is costly, time-consuming, and susceptible to subjective judgment. Artificial intelligence can provide technical assistance for the preservation of legal historical materials through high-resolution scanning, image enhancement, multispectral recognition, character recognition, reconstruction of missing characters, and three-dimensional modeling.

However, in the legal sense, “restoration” does not mean “rewriting.” With respect to incomplete legal documents, artificial intelligence may make probabilistic inferences on the basis of character forms, contextual structures, institutional settings, and comparable documents. Yet such inferred results must be clearly distinguished and labeled separately from the original materials, traces of restoration, and expert opinions. This is particularly important where the content concerns legal provisions, judicial reasoning, and institutional terminology, because any supplementation may affect subsequent research conclusions. Therefore, a layered display mechanism should be established, consisting of “images of the original materials—machine-recognized texts—manually corrected texts—inferred supplementary texts,” so as to clarify the reliability of texts at different levels.

On this basis, the preservation of legal historical materials should move beyond mere digital preservation toward trustworthy restoration. Trustworthy restoration means that records of the restoration process, explanations of model parameters, expert review opinions, and version-change records are preserved throughout the technical processing, so that subsequent researchers can trace the source of every restoration

and supplementation. Only in this way can AI-assisted restoration results become reliable materials for legal research.

3.2. Legal knowledge production: From data aggregation to knowledge graphs

The study of traditional legal culture has long faced the problems of dispersed materials and insufficient knowledge linkage. When researching a particular institutional theme, relevant materials may be scattered across legal codes, judicial records, memorials to the throne, contracts, local gazetteers, genealogies, and literary works. On the basis of digitization, artificial intelligence can further conduct entity recognition, thematic classification, semantic annotation, and relationship extraction, thereby connecting information such as legal concepts, institutional types, case facts, adjudicative bodies, applicable rules, regional contexts, and historical changes.

The construction of knowledge graphs is the path with the greatest jurisprudential value in this process. Taking the marriage legal system in ancient China as an example, nodes such as marriage agreements, betrothal gifts, divorce, remarriage, family responsibility, official intervention, and folk customs can be used to link legal provisions, contractual documents, and judicial cases from different dynasties. Taking the ancient system of judicial responsibility as another example, nodes such as the appointment of officials, performance evaluation, wrongful conviction and acquittal, liability for miscarriages of justice, and review procedures can be used to form a map of institutional evolution. In this way, traditional legal culture is no longer a collection of fragmented pieces of knowledge, but can be transformed into a searchable, comparable, and expandable legal knowledge system.

It should be noted that a knowledge graph is not a neutral accumulation of materials. How nodes are established, how relationships are named, and how concepts are classified all involve the theoretical judgments of researchers. Therefore, the construction of knowledge graphs for traditional legal culture should adhere to the principle of “expert leadership and algorithmic assistance,” with experts in legal history, legal culture, data law, and information technology jointly determining classification standards and annotation rules.

3.3. Legal education and public legal education: From knowledge transmission to interactive understanding

Traditional legal culture contains a large number of ancient characters, classical Chinese expressions, and historical institutional contexts, which often create barriers to understanding for the general public and students. Artificial intelligence can reduce such barriers through plain-language translation, case-based explanation, interactive question-and-answer functions, virtual scenarios, and multimodal presentation, thereby enabling traditional legal culture to enter the contexts of legal education and public legal education.

For example, when explaining the principle in *The Tang Code with Commentaries* that one may “cite the heavier offense to clarify the lighter one, and cite the lighter offense to clarify the heavier one,” artificial intelligence can generate teaching materials in combination with modern case scenarios, helping students understand analogy, interpretation, and sentencing logic in ancient legal reasoning ^[2]. When explaining “mediating disputes and preventing litigation,” virtual scenarios can be used to present the process of grassroots dispute mediation, while also illustrating the continuity and differences between traditional mediation and mediation systems under the modern rule of law. In this way, traditional legal culture is no

longer merely an abstract slogan, but becomes an educational resource for understanding the developmental trajectory of the rule of law in China.

However, legal education must not sacrifice accuracy for the sake of interest or appeal. AI-generated teaching content should be reviewed by teachers or experts so as to avoid romanticizing or oversimplifying ancient institutions, and also to avoid presenting, without distinction, elements of traditional legal culture that no longer conform to modern rule-of-law principles in an affirmative light. The educational transformation of traditional legal culture should combine historical understanding with modern evaluation, recognizing both its rule-of-law wisdom and its limitations of the times.

3.4. International communication: From linguistic translation to legal-contextual transposition

The international communication of fine traditional Chinese legal culture involves not only linguistic conversion, but also conceptual explanation and contextual reconstruction. Many traditional legal concepts have no exact equivalents in foreign languages, and simple literal translation may easily lead to misunderstanding. For example, translating “wuxing” as “five punishments” does not fully reveal its institutional structure ^[2]; simply understanding “qinqin xiangyin” as relatives shielding one another may overlook the family ethics and litigation structure behind it ^[3]; and directly translating “lifa hezhi” as the combination of law and ritual can hardly present its governance logic in a complete manner.

Artificial intelligence can provide technical support for the international communication of traditional legal culture through multilingual corpus analysis, terminology database construction, cross-cultural case matching, and audience profiling. More importantly, it can provide layered explanations for different audiences: for the general public, it can offer concise narratives and case-based explanations; for legal researchers, it can provide institutional background, documentary sources, and comparative-law interpretations; and for international communication platforms, it can generate short-video scripts, exhibition texts, and multilingual explanatory materials.

However, the application of artificial intelligence in international communication must avoid “decontextualization.” The external expression of traditional legal culture should emphasize historicity, comparability, and interpretability, rather than compressing complex institutions into labels designed merely to suit communication effects. It is advisable to build a terminology database of traditional Chinese legal culture for international communication, setting out, for core concepts, the original Chinese terms, pinyin, translated terms, explanations, examples, and comparative notes, so that artificial intelligence can draw upon them in translation and content generation.

4. Risk assessment of AI’s engagement with traditional legal culture

4.1. Authenticity of historical materials and the risk of generative AI hallucination

Generative artificial intelligence possesses powerful language-generation capabilities, but its outputs are not naturally equivalent to authentic knowledge. In the context of traditional legal culture, if a model generates content on the basis of incomplete corpora or probabilistic associations, it may fabricate documentary sources, misquote legal provisions, invent case details, or even mix materials from different dynasties, institutions, and regions. This risk of “hallucination” is already harmful to general cultural communication, and it is even more serious for the study of legal history and legal culture, because erroneous historical

materials may further affect academic research, teaching content, and public understanding.

Therefore, AI-generated content concerning traditional legal culture cannot be treated as authoritative material without verification. Any generated content involving ancient texts, legal provisions, judicial cases, institutional evolution, or evaluations of historical figures should be accompanied by clear explanations of its sources, versions, and degree of reliability. Where the source of the content cannot be confirmed, a risk warning should be provided. Digital platforms for traditional legal culture should also establish correction mechanisms, allowing experts, researchers, and users to annotate and provide feedback on erroneous content.

From an institutional perspective, the risk to authenticity requires the establishment of a mechanism of “verifiable generation.” That is, when generating content, artificial intelligence should give priority to calling upon critically collated and authorized legal-culture databases, and should provide source links, version information, and citation bases in its outputs. Generated content that cannot provide supporting evidence should be limited to explanatory, heuristic, or creative purposes, and must not be published as academic conclusions or authoritative texts for public education.

4.2. Algorithmic bias and the risk of cultural misinterpretation

The outputs of artificial intelligence models are influenced by training data, annotation rules, and system design. If the training corpus contains one-sided understandings of traditional legal culture, the model may amplify such biases. For example, cultural misinterpretation may arise from overemphasizing the punitive nature of ancient law while neglecting the order of ritual and law, mediation mechanisms, and social governance functions, or from excessively idealizing traditional institutions while ignoring status hierarchy, gender differences, and insufficient protection of rights.

Algorithmic bias may also appear in comparisons between Chinese and foreign legal cultures. If a model interprets traditional Chinese legal culture mainly by reference to Western legal concepts, it may simply place the Chinese legal tradition within frameworks such as “irrationality,” “ethicalization,” or “lack of the rule of law.” Conversely, if the model accepts only a single narrative, it may also overlook the tension between traditional institutions and modern rule-of-law principles. Both tendencies would undermine the accurate expression of traditional legal culture.

Addressing algorithmic bias requires the introduction of multidisciplinary review in corpus selection, annotation standards, and model evaluation. AI systems for traditional legal culture should establish an evaluation mechanism involving experts in legal history, legal culture, comparative law, translation studies, and data science, so as to continuously monitor conceptual bias, value bias, and contextual bias in model outputs.

4.3. Intellectual property and data ownership risks

The digital use of traditional legal-cultural resources involves complex rights issues. Although ancient legal texts themselves may no longer be protected by copyright, modern edited editions, annotated editions, translations, facsimiles, databases, exhibition images, research papers, and digital models may still be protected under copyright law, compilation rights, layout design rights, contractual rules, technological protection measures, or anti-unfair competition rules. If AI models use such materials extensively without authorization during training, retrieval, or generation, they may give rise to copyright infringement and unfair competition disputes.

In addition, images of cultural relics, archival data, and museum digital resources are often produced through institutional investment in funding and technology. Their open use should serve public cultural interests while also respecting the costs of data collection, organization, and maintenance. If commercial platforms freely scrape public cultural data for profit-oriented model training, they may harm the lawful interests of public institutions and researchers and weaken the sustainable supply of high-quality data resources.

Therefore, public-domain materials, copyright-protected works, institutional databases, and sensitive archival materials should be distinguished, and differentiated authorization rules should be established. Public cultural resources may be opened for public-interest use; annotated works, translations, databases, and image resources should be regulated through licensing, attribution, fair-use boundaries, and benefit-sharing mechanisms; and materials involving national security, cultural relic safety, or personal privacy should be subject to stricter access controls.

4.4. Risks of over-entertainment and value imbalance

AI can transform traditional legal culture into short videos, virtual characters, interactive games, and immersive exhibitions, which helps reach wider audiences but may also lead to over-entertainment. If platforms excessively pursue clicks and visual stimulation, serious legal-historical materials may be turned into sensational stories, complex judicial systems may be reduced to a simple opposition between good and evil, and the institutional meaning of traditional legal culture may be weakened into a consumer symbol.

The communication of traditional legal culture needs accessible expression, but accessibility should not become vulgarization. The dissemination of rule-of-law culture should balance appeal with accuracy, communicability with normativity, and innovative expression with value boundaries. In particular, content involving punishment, adjudication, family ethics, women's status, minority groups, and social conflict should avoid playful, sensationalized, or biased presentation.

Therefore, AI-generated legal-cultural products should be subject to content review and value assessment mechanisms. For content aimed at minors, public legal education, and international communication, review standards should be raised to ensure consistency with historical facts, the socialist rule-of-law spirit, and modern public ethics.

5. Institutional construction for AI-empowered traditional legal culture

5.1. Establishing a classified and tiered governance system for traditional legal-cultural data resources

The primary task of institutional construction is to classify and grade traditional legal-cultural data resources^[8]. By resource attributes, they may be divided into public-domain documents, protected edited works, images of cultural relics, archival materials, personal information materials, and classified or sensitive materials. By degree of openness, they may be divided into fully open, authorized open, research open, restricted open, and prohibited-access resources. By use, they may be divided into academic research, public education, commercial development, international communication, and model training.

Classified and tiered governance can help address the current dilemma in the digital use of traditional legal culture: disorder when resources are opened without limits, and stagnation when they are controlled too rigidly. Public-domain documents that do not involve rights or security risks should be encouraged to be

openly shared; works formed through modern editing, annotation, and translation should respect the interests of rights holders; and materials involving personal information, unpublished archives, or cultural relic safety should be subject to strict access controls.

On this basis, national or regional traditional legal-cultural data platforms may be established to unify data standards, metadata specifications, citation rules, and authorization mechanisms. Such platforms should record data sources, versions, rights status, scope of openness, and restrictions on use, thereby providing a clear basis for AI systems to call upon relevant data.

5.2. Establishing a human–machine collaboration mechanism of “expert leadership and machine assistance”

The core of traditional legal culture lies in interpretation, and interpretation cannot be entirely entrusted to machines. Artificial intelligence may undertake tasks such as material identification, text comparison, semantic association, and preliminary generation. However, judgments about the authenticity of historical materials, the understanding of institutional contexts, value evaluation, and plans for modern transformation must still be led by human experts.

It is advisable to establish a multi-level review mechanism in AI projects concerning traditional legal culture^[10–11]. The first level is technical review, mainly checking OCR errors, image-recognition errors, formatting errors, and missing data. The second level is professional review, in which experts in legal history, legal culture, and related disciplines examine textual content, institutional interpretation, and historical sources. The third level is communication review, which examines modes of expression, value orientation, and cultural appropriateness for content aimed at the public and the international community. The fourth level is compliance review, which checks issues such as copyright, personal information, data security, and labeling of AI-generated content.

This human–machine collaboration mechanism does not reduce the efficiency of artificial intelligence; rather, it enhances its credibility. For legal research and rule-of-law education, credibility is more important than generation speed. Only by embedding expert review into the technical process can AI-generated legal-cultural content enter public communication and academic use.

5.3. Implementing rules on labeling, transparency, and accountability for generated content

As generative AI is increasingly used in the communication of traditional legal culture, clearer rules on content labeling and accountability are required. For AI-generated or deep-synthesized texts, images, audio, videos, virtual narrators, and interactive scenarios, explicit or implicit labels should be added according to the application context (The Measures for the Labeling of AI-Generated and Synthetic Content provide for explicit labeling, implicit labeling, and platform responsibilities), so as to prevent the public from mistakenly believing that such content comes entirely from authentic historical materials or expert opinions.

The significance of labeling rules lies not merely in formal compliance. It concerns the public’s right to know, the credibility of content, and the attribution of responsibility. Traditional legal-cultural products aimed at the public should clearly indicate which parts are original historical materials, which parts are expert interpretations, and which parts are generated or assisted by AI. For artistically adapted content, its relationship with historical facts should be explained. For content used in international communication, it

should also be indicated whether the translated terms and explanations are standard translations.

In terms of accountability, the obligations of platform operators, model service providers, data providers, content reviewers, and publishers should be clearly defined. Platforms cannot exempt themselves from review responsibilities on the ground that the content is “automatically generated by AI,” and model service providers must not ignore their basic obligations concerning training data, output safety, and technical labeling.

5.4. Building public cultural platforms and cross-departmental coordination mechanisms

Traditional legal-cultural resources are distributed among courts, archives, museums, libraries, universities, research institutions, local gazetteer systems, and private collections. No single entity can complete their systematic organization and AI-enabled transformation alone. Cross-departmental coordination mechanisms should therefore be established to promote unified data standards, resource openness, project evaluation, and risk governance.

Specifically, legal research institutions may take the lead in working with archives, cultural heritage and museum institutions, education authorities, cyberspace authorities, judicial administration organs, courts, and cultural departments to build digital platforms for traditional legal culture. Such platforms can serve not only academic research, but also rule-of-law education and public communication. Historical judicial archives, local documents, and typical cases preserved by courts should be digitally organized, provided that legal requirements and archival rules are observed, so that they may become important resources for the study of rule-of-law civilization.

Cross-departmental coordination should also include standard-setting. Unified standards should gradually be developed for the collection formats, terminology systems, metadata standards, citation norms, open interfaces, and security levels of traditional legal-cultural data. Without standardization, artificial intelligence can only process fragmented data and will find it difficult to form a high-quality knowledge system.

5.5. Upholding the value orientation of human-centeredness and technology for good

The ultimate purpose of empowering traditional legal culture with artificial intelligence is not to demonstrate technological capacity, but to serve people’s cultural understanding, recognition of the rule of law, and spiritual life. Human-centeredness means that technological applications should respect the public’s genuine learning needs, researchers’ academic judgment, the basic dignity of historical subjects, and the complexity of traditional legal culture itself.

Technology for good requires AI applications to conform to rule-of-law values. Traditional legal culture contains both governance wisdom worthy of inheritance and institutional arrangements limited by historical conditions. AI should neither indiscriminately glorify tradition nor one-sidedly reject it; rather, it should help the public form rational evaluations through historical understanding. Its value goals should be to promote the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization, improve the quality of public rule-of-law education, and strengthen the expressive capacity of Chinese rule-of-law discourse, rather than to create consumption of cultural symbols or expand algorithmic control.

Therefore, future institutional design should incorporate ethical assessment throughout the entire process of AI projects (Both UNESCO’s Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the

OECD AI Principles emphasize human-centeredness, transparency, accountability, and risk governance), with continuous supervision over model training, content generation, public communication, and commercial development^[10–11]. Only by upholding human subjectivity and rule-of-law values can AI truly become a useful tool for the creative transformation of fine traditional Chinese legal culture.

6. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence offers important opportunities for the innovative development of fine traditional Chinese legal culture. However, its real value does not lie in producing more cultural products, but in enabling traditional legal-cultural resources to re-enter the contemporary rule-of-law knowledge system through digitization, structuring, semantic processing, and standardization. Unlike general studies on cultural communication, legal journals are more concerned with the jurisprudential basis, institutional boundaries, and accountability mechanisms that arise after AI becomes involved in traditional legal culture.

This article argues that AI-empowered traditional legal culture should adhere to three basic positions. First, it should aim at the inheritance of rule-of-law civilization and avoid reducing traditional legal culture to a mere object of consumption. Second, it should be premised on the authenticity of historical materials and the accuracy of legal interpretation, and should avoid allowing generative AI to replace professional judgment. Third, it should take data security, rights protection, transparent labeling, and accountability as institutional boundaries, so as to prevent technological application from escaping rule-of-law constraints.

Looking ahead, under the frameworks of the national digital culture strategy, digital rule-of-law development, and AI governance, efforts should be made to build trustworthy databases of traditional legal culture and specialized vertical models, improve mechanisms for expert review, content labeling, intellectual property protection, and data security, and promote the creative transformation of fine traditional Chinese legal culture in contemporary rule-of-law construction in a way that is well-grounded, bounded, and regulated.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Li L, 2024, The Creative Transformation and Innovative Development of China's Fine Traditional Legal Culture. *Journal of Modernization Studies*, 3(1): 28–41. <https://doi.org/10.20200/j.cnki.gjxdh.2024.01.004>
- [2] Zhang J, 2016, *History of Chinese Legal System*. China University of Political Science and Law Press, Beijing.
- [3] Qu T, 2010, *Law and Society in Traditional China*. The Commercial Press, Beijing.
- [4] Liang Z, 2002, *Analyzing Law: The Past, Present, and Future of Chinese Law*. China University of Political Science and Law Press, Beijing.
- [5] Cyberspace Administration of China, National Development and Reform Commission, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, Ministry of Public Security, & National Radio and Television Administration, 2023, *Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services (Order No. 15)*. <https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/202307/>

content_6891752.htm

- [6] Chen Y, 2024, AIGC Empowers the Communication Logic and Strategic Thinking of Excellent Traditional Chinese Culture. *Journal of Hainan Open University*, 25(3): 82–89.
- [7] Cyberspace Administration of China, Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, Ministry of Public Security, & National Radio and Television Administration, 2025, Measures for Labeling AI-generated and Synthesized Content (Guo Xin Ban Tong Zi [2025] No. 2). https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/202503/content_7014286.htm
- [8] President of the CPC, 2021, Data Security Law of the People’s Republic of China, Order of the President of the People’s Republic of China No. 84 (2021) (China). https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-06/11/content_5616917.htm
- [9] President of the CPC, 2021, Personal Information Protection Law of the People’s Republic of China, Order of the President of the People’s Republic of China No. 91 (2021) (China). https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2021-08/20/content_5632486.htm
- [10] UNESCO, 2021, Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (SHS/BIO/PI/2021/1). <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>
- [11] OECD, 2019, Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence (OECD/LEGAL/0449). OECD Legal Instruments. <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449>

Publisher’s note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.