



Legal Translation in the Context of Military Interpreting: Sensitive Topics, Challenges to Accuracy, and Ethical Obligations

Safaa Saleem Naji Al-Rubaye

Assist Lect, University of Babylon, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: Safaa Saleem Naji Al-Rubaye

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-8261

Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.41

Volume: 05

Issue: 03

May-June 2026

Received: 23-03-2026

Accepted: 21-04-2026

Published: 19-05-2026

Page No: 139-145

Abstract

Military interpreting is a high-demand and high-stakes area of translation studies. Legal language and military operational language are worlds apart, however, creating a divide that provides unique challenges in terms of linguist talent competency, cultural context knowledge, and ethical obligations. This paper discusses some of the challenge's military interpreters are faced with when working with legal texts and legal situations, such as accuracy, appropriate use of terms and concepts, rhetorical equivalent, and the handling of matters sensitive content. Based on broadly established conceptual frames from Translation Studies, Legal Translation theory and Military Interpreting scholarship, it seeks to examine the potential for engendering serious consequences of mistranslations and terminological errors in military-legal contexts – such as miscarriages of justice, operational failures or violations of international humanitarian law. The article also presents ethical issues specific to interpreters in military contexts such as conflicting roles, divided loyalties (as an aide for the armed forces) and stress from high-pressure interpreting tasks. It concludes that military interpreters must be trained in legal translation within a specialized interdisciplinary framework, which encompasses linguistic cultural competence, ethical awareness, and strategic communication skills.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJSSER.2026.5.3.139-145>

Keywords: Military nterpreting, Legal Translation, Terminology Accuracy, Sensitive Content, Ethics, Translation Studies, International Humanitarian Law

1. Introduction

Military interpreting is a very specific and tricky niche of professional translation practice. In contrast to commercial or literary translation, military interpreting is performed in extreme circumstances—battlefields, enemy prison camps-Hearings post-combat operations, and peacekeeping missions presided over by international laws. The situation is particularly dire when legal language and military operations converge, as a single mistranslated term during a tribunal, misinterpreted rule of engagement or vague rendering of an international treaty provision can lead to everything from wrongful imprisonment to full-blown diplomatic crises.

The issue of military interpreting has been subject to increasing academic scrutiny as the role of interpreters was thrust into the public consciousness with conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan (Baker, 2010) [3]. The ADF internalisation of the conflicts highlighted a systemic under-preparation to deploy linguistically and culturally competent interpreters within increasingly complex legal frameworks by all military institutions. Follow-up studies emphasising the multi-faceted nature of this issue have noted the absence of uniform training, the dependence on locally and informally trained interpreters with little formal education in translation and inadequate professional codes tailored to military-legal contexts (Inghilleri, 2010) [15].

The paper focuses on legal translation and military interpreting by highlighting challenges and best practices of interpreters in translating legally binding text where quick decision-making is required after all parties have agreed to the contract. The argument is structured around five thematic topic areas: the difficulties of legal-linguistic terminology and translation, cultural and pragmatic factors influencing cross-language legal discourse, political and ethical challenges surrounding clients' rights to effective assistance in this area compared to other practitioner roles, potential impact on military-legal proceedings arising from poorer quality translations or interpretations (including possible ramifications of plausibly ineffective counsel), along with recommendations for interpreter manufacturing & institutional policy. Along the way, the paper engages established Scopus-indexed scholarship to contextualize arguments within contemporary academic discourse.

2. Legal Translation as a Specialized Field

Legal translation is generally acknowledged as one of the most technically challenging, and therefore crucial areas in Translation Studies. As Šarčević (1997, p. 3) ^[27] set forth in one of the initial works establishing this field, legal translation is primarily a form of cultural communication about law; it requires the translator not only to bridge language differences but also those that are deeply entrenched among disparate legal systems and legal cultures, and in entrenched assumptions underpinning bodies of law. It is this system-level characteristic that differentiates legal translation from technical or scientific translation, where terminological equivalence can be more easily attained through reference to universal phenomena.

In military situations, a specific challenge of legal equivalence arises because the relevant legal contexts will often include domestic criminal law, military law, international humanitarian law (IHL), and the procedural rules applicable in international tribunals. According to Cao (2007, p. 24) ^[4], legal language indeed manifests its performativity — the words of legal text do not only describe the reality but also become a part of doing law or binding obligation. This essentially performative nature implies that legal translation in the military context requires not merely semantic equivalence but functional equivalence — the translated text needs to have an identical legal function in the target legal and cultural system as it does in the source.

Solan (2010, p. 57) ^[26] states that legal language is also intentionally technical featuring terms of art with specific meanings in defined areas of law and resistant to casual paraphrase. Military interpreters, the vast majority of whom have no formal legal training, may be called upon in operational settings to translate terms of art under extreme time pressure, increasing the risk that consequential error will occur. Functional equivalence then presents the challenge of an ideal to be attained theoretically and also a target: it is something which military interpreting institutions must actively pursue in the provision of training and quality assurance.

2.2. Military Interpreting as a Separate Field

Few studies have theorised military interpreting as a discrete sub-field of interpreting studies, with its own role expectations and ethical pressures; lack of privacy due to the working environment (scenes of war); societal expectations that trained interpreters will behave in a certain way or assist

those perceived as oppressed; and widespread censorship by governments who deploy interpreters. Footitt and Kelly (2012, p. 8) ^[7, 16] contend that military interpreters occupy an inherently ambiguous status: they are language professionals, operational assets, but also subordinate subjects in the chain of command whose engagement directly contradicts the code of ethics associated with interpreting neutrality and transparency. This role ambiguity is magnified in legal contexts such that the interpreter becomes a vehicle for legally meaningful dialogue, while also negotiating conflicting loyalties to their client and institution, or towards the justice system.

Placing military interpreting into a broader perspective of conflict and political violence, Baker (2010, p. In this respect, the interpreter in a military tribunal, for example, is both under military command while having professional responsibilities for correct translation—and fully aware that if his or her words are upheld as accurate, it could lead to jail time (or worse) for the individual whose words one would be rendering. The ethical dilemma is compounded even further when, as in the Cameroon and Myanmar cases where war crimes are alleged or IHL detention or intelligence information is involved.

Inghilleri (2010, p. 178) ^[15] theorizes the military interpreter as a 'situated subject,' defined in part by the particular social, political and institutional fields governing what may be said, and better yet who may say it to whom and how. This located perspective is especially pertinent with military-legal discourse, where not only does the interpreter output an interpretation that is not a simple neutral reflection of source material, but rather rooted in a socio-institutional practice that has direct legal relevance. For a view of military interpreting like this we need to consider not just linguistic competence but the larger power relations and institutional structures within which the interpreter lies.

3. Technical Ideas and Professional Dialects

This Military-legal discourse overlaps two already specialist domains, each with its own terminology system, and the fused terminology poses different problems for interpreters. Military language is one of the precise, hierarchical form that uses acronyms, codes and operational terms proper to their own interest with no equivalent in other languages or legal systems (Baigorri-Jalón, 2014) ^[2]. As noted above, legal terminology involves terms of art with specific technical meanings particular to jurisdictions. The problems of translation proliferate when these two languages overlap, as phrases like 'unlawful combatant', 'protected person', or 'command responsibility' or terms like 'proportionality assessment' can be used.

You can use the idea of 'command responsibility' as another easily understood example. Command responsibility (also superior responsibility) in international criminal law is a legal doctrine stating that a military commander (superior) may be held criminally liable for crimes committed by his or her subordinates under his or her effective command and control, if the commander knew or should have known that the subordinate was committing those crimes and the commander failed to prevent this, (or to punish this when it has been committed)(Cryer *et al.*, 2014) ^[6]. The immaculation of this doctrine over languages is legally relevant: different translations may conceal the requirements, the scope of a commander's knowledge, or the essence of the subordinate relationship. Paraphrasing this word instead of interpreting it

literally may be the cause for an interpreter to apply a standard that is different from what is legally correct. In relation to international criminal tribunals, Sandrelli (2015, p. 217) ^[24] has specifically researched legal-military terminology and explains that interpreters at these tribunals are regularly faced with words or phrases that lack direct equivalents in all working languages. What the interpreter does in such gaps—but pursue a functional equivalent, borrow the source-language term, use a description paraphrase, suspend proceedings to ask for clarification—is itself consequential and may influence the legal record. Sandrelli underlines the importance of terminology management for military interpreting institutions, the building up of specialized glossaries and important documentation made available in advance to interpreters before each assignment.

3.1. False Cognates and Lexical Gaps

One of the most dangerous types of terminological false friends in military-legal translation, among other things, is a false cognate—similar words with hugely different legal meanings between two languages. As Garzone (2000, p. 111) ^[8] points out, false cognates are the most insidious type of error in this respect specifically because they are less likely to be recognized as problematic by reviewers without the expertise needed to notice such pitfalls among legal texts. In the military-legal domain, false cognates may occur across a large set of language pairs in particular those with high degrees of direct borrowing of legal vocabulary between languages from Latin or French sources (e.g.

Lexical gaps—when a legal concept in the source language does not have a corresponding term in the target language—are just as problematic. This issue is particularly acute in the context of translating between legal systems based in different traditions (e.g. common law versus civil law), or when rendering history which concern terms originating from international humanitarian law into languages whose domestic legal systems do not incorporate principles of IHL (Šarčević, 2012, p. 189) ^[28]. In military contexts, interpreters are often asked to translate terms such as 'combatant immunity', 'military objective' or 'direct participation in hostilities' into languages with no established technical equivalents. Management and what the interpreter can do with these lexical gaps, as well as institutional backing for such decision-making, is at the heart of quality assurance in military interpreting.

Cao and Zhao (2008, p. 84) ^[5, 5] investigated the particular difficulties faced in dealing with legal lacunae in court interpreting situations and claimed that interpreters must contrive explicit strategies to accommodate when there is no target-language equivalent of a source-language concept. Accordingly, they encompass explanatory notes, parenthetical glosses and code-switching—each of which holds different ramifications for the legal record as well as the understanding of parties to proceedings. And in military-legal contexts, consideration of OSINT may be further limited by operational security requirements, timeliness and the interpreter's own legal acumen.

4. Legal Culture and the Cultural Embeddedness of Law

We know that law is not simply a technical rule system but more of a cultural institution, the elements and principles being internalised in the very fabric of society which produces them (Legrand, 1996 p.56) ^[18] The sociolinguistic embedded nature of law gives rise to fundamental issues for legal translation extending beyond merely terminology equivalence to what Wierzbicka (2006, p. 14) ^[31] has termed 'cultural scripts' — shared assumptions about how legal processes operate, what rights and obligations constitute or imply, how authority and justice are conceptualised ^[26]. Military interpreters operating in cross-cultural legal settings should deal with not only linguistic but also deep cultural differences in understanding law.

The military-legal translation experiences I focus on and the aspects of culture that drive them are especially pronounced in cases with parties originating from societies with grossly divergent systems of law. Nord (2001, p. 30) ^[21] contends translation has to be perceived as a cultural activity and not merely as a linguistic one, emphasizing that translators need to pay attention to the pragmatic aspect of the text in their target cultures besides paying attention to their semantic meaning. This applies particularly in a military tribunal context where the interpreter must be attuned to how legal terms such as 'rights,' 'due process,' 'testimony' and 'evidence' are understood by defendants, witnesses and lawyers from various cultures.

The tension between the 'domestication' and 'foreignization' of translation has been theorized by Venuti (1995, p. 20) ^[30] as an ethical and political choice that is fundamental to translation itself. This tension is particularly relevant to military-legal translation: a domesticating translation that recasts input legal concepts in familiar target-culture terms may increase cognitive accessibility of the translated text but distort the legal meaning; while a foreignizing translation that maintains source-culture legal concepts may preserve legal precision at the cost of making it incomprehensible to parties unfamiliar with this area of law. Translate the translation is gonna depend on what the function of that precise translation is and in what legal context it will be utilized.

4.1. Pragmatic aspects: speech acts and legal performativity

The performative aspect of legal language (its ability to do things with words) poses distinctive challenges for military interpreters. Austin's (1962, p. 94) ^[1] seminal speech act theory cited locutionary acts (doing it uttered), illocutionary acts (something done by saying something, such as promising, ordering, or swearing an oath), and perlocutionary acts (the effect induced on the hearer). The illocutionary dimension is arguably the most salient in legal discourse — a judge's ruling, a witness's oath, or a defendant's plea are all speech acts with legal effects. The translator has to interpret not just the linguistic meaning of these acts, but their illocutionary force as well.

Empirical studies conducted by Hale (2004, p. 131) ^[13] on court interpreters have found that pragmatic and prosodic features of legal speech (register, tone, hedging, deixis) are

often completely absent from or misinterpreted in target language. Interpretations which could be highly detrimental to the security of justice. The potential for pragmatic distortion, in this regard, is even stronger in military settings compared to regular courts, where proceedings may occur under time pressure and in conditions very far from the controlled environment of a courtroom. Interpreters may be inclined to simplify, paraphrase or summarize in ways that reduce pragmatic fidelity even while retaining semantic content.

5. Loyalty, Neutrality, and Role Conflict

The traditional understanding of ethics and what is codified in the codes of practice adopted by most professional interpreting organizations is predicated on neutrality, fidelity and confidentiality (Mikkelsen, 2000, p.75) ^[19]. An interpreter is an unopinionated professional—they are a neutral channel, they carry the message without bias, providing no personal opinion and not allowing personal beliefs or ideology to color their presentation of the source message. However, this notion of neutrality undergoes intense pressure in military interpreting environments due to command structures implicating the interpreter directly in operations, possible personal interest that boosts engagement with military objectives and even overt pressures to interpret according to operational needs.

It is argued that there is more to be said about the complexity of what interpreters do, as the relevance and application of the 'conduit model' of interpreting is increasingly being recognized as inadequate in high-stakes culturally complex interpretation contexts (Pöchhacker, 2016, p. 156) ^[23]. In military-legal contexts, this tension is pronounced: when an interpreter learns that a defendant's statement is being translated in such a way as to alter its legal meaning, the interpreter faces a direct conflict of loyalty between their fidelity to the institution, fidelity bound up with professional obligations regarding accuracy and an ethical norm more broadly committed to justice. Because few institutional guidelines exist to help interpreters navigate these dilemmas, individual practitioners are free to grapple with conflicting pressures.

Inghilleri (2010, p. 184) ^[15] noted military interpreters in conflict zones are often faced with situations where strict neutrality cannot be fulfilled as silence or collusion in distortion itself is morally questionable. The interpreter who interprets an interrogation that employs physical coercion, the interpreter who translates testimony in a proceeding that denies essential due process safeguards, and the interpreter asked to interpret documents which might incriminate a client to whom he or she has an ethical duty of loyalty all present professional moral dilemmas far beyond those addressed today by existing codes.

5.1. Confidentiality, Security, and Handling Sensitive Information

Military interpreters have access to the most sensitive and classified intelligence materials, operational plans, informant names, and recordings of interrogations as a regular part of their job. Consequently, confidentiality concerns that shape all professional interpreting are more complicated and demanding in military contexts than they are civilian legal contexts. As Gile (2009, p. 26) ^[11] states: [O]ne of the major challenges in managing sensitive information is the fact that interpreters may have an obligation to protect this

confidential information from third parties but also against their own institutional employers, if refusing to disclose it would lead to justice perverted or at least harm done (of course given that some disclosure by the interpreter is not required).

That tension between the obligations of ethical individual and that of a confidential institutional obligation is most pronounced, especially when interpreters observe evidence during their work of abusive human rights concerns including war crimes. Kelly (2012, p. 147) ^[16] recorded cases where military interpreters were punished for passing on or refusing to take part in activities that breached IHL, demonstrating the vulnerability of the interpreter position and the failure of protections available for them. It is still an urgent task for the field to create clear legal and institutional frameworks that protect military interpreters who act upon ethical grounds in good faith.

6. Mistaken convictions and breaches of due process

Translation failures — and research on this topic is largely focused on military-legal settings, where the consequences can be catastrophic. For instance, in criminal cases they can lead to wrongful convictions, incorrect acquittals or loss of evidence (i.e., miscarriage of justice), which affect the primary objectives of a proceeding (justice). Gibbons (2003, p. 202) ^[10] provides a wealth of examples of translation mistranslations in criminal trials with material consequences on the case outcome and notes that the adversarial nature of legal proceedings means that translating misinterpretations is more difficult to be detected or corrected in real time.

The right to translation and interpretation of criminal proceedings arises also in the international human rights (e.g. Article 6(3)(e) of the European Convention on Human Rights, that establishes right to assistance with an interpreter free of charge). In military tribunal contexts, the governing standards come from international humanitarian law and in particular Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and the procedural guarantees found in Additional Protocol I. Schabas (2011, p. 296) ^[25] points to a precedent that has regularly gone under-discussed: "The right to interpretation in military proceedings is frequently neglected and translation quality continuity at military tribunals presents an extensive, overlooked human rights challenge."

Cryer *et al.* Arresting, of course, these are three cases out of dozens documented by (2014, p. 392) ^[6] and described defence-expressed translation concerns ignored or only partially investigated by the court that left defendants convicted on appeal for shaky linguistic reasons. It can be inferred that the problems are systemic rather than individual, which implies that translation quality assurance in military-legal proceedings needs not only individuals with proven translation capabilities but also institutional mechanisms for tracking and rectifying the consequential outputs of translation.

6.1. Operational and Diplomatic Consequences

There are also more far-reaching organizational and diplomatic implications of failed military-legal translation. Baigorri-Jalón (2014, p. 198) ^[2] chronicles historical examples where erroneous translations of military communications and treaty clauses increased miscommunication, operational failures as well as armed conflicts that might otherwise have been averted. It is therefore not only a profession, but also a strategic issue: the

accuracy of military-legal language. interacts with international relations and regional security.

In peacekeeping and stabilization operations today, legal translation can have a direct impact upon the legitimacy and overall success of the mission. To ensure effective implementation, Status of Forces Agreements (SOFAs), rules of engagement, and the procedural regulations that govern treatment of detainees must be translated into and consistently interpreted across the languages of all parties. Translation quality in multinational military operations is systematically poor (Palmer, 2007, p. 85) ^[22] and the consequences so seldom unambiguously isolated from the wider operational failure that garnering evidence of any specific contribution of translation error to adverse outcome can be impossible.

7. Military Legal Interpreters: Training Requirements

Military interpreters in legal settings have very extensive and multi-faceted training requirements. Such interpreters should at a minimum have near native-level skill in both working languages, specialized knowledge of legal-military terminology (as many of the actual cases will not be criminally prosecuted), familiarity with the major frameworks of International Humanitarian Law and International Criminal Law [i] situated on state parties (Tipton, 2011) ^[29], as well as some basic skill in processing sensitive and traumatic material. Yet in practice military interpreters are seldom trained to meet all these needs. Political establishments need interpreters quickly, so military institutions tend to push them out the door with scant preparation; quality failures therefore follow an establish order.

According to Gentile, Ozolins and Vasilakakos (1996, p. 83) ^[9], consecutive interpreting alone cannot prepare the trainees for working in legal settings because the cognitive skills of legal interpretation are fundamentally different from those required for community or conference interpreting. C: The ability to cope with complex sentence structures, the retention of legally significant detail and the interpretation under emotional and psychological pressure are all skills that require specific training and close supervision. These demands are even greater in military-legal contexts due to the added complexities of the operational environment.

Tipton (2011, p. 70) ^[29] views military interpreter training as requiring a competency-based approach which encompasses linguistic and terminological competencies but does not neglect broader cultural competence nor sorely needed skills in ethical reasoning and psychological resilience. It builds on models built up around health care interpreting, a field which faces the same challenges of sensitivity and complexity but where Tipton proposes a localization curriculum with theory combined with meaningful practice simulation, reflection and mentoring by those who have successfully maneuvered these passages. This kind of curriculum would have to be part of wider military training systems, and constantly refreshed in order to remain relevant—as the circumstances that inform operational contexts shift along with their related legal frameworks.

7.1. Institutional Quality Assurance Mechanisms

Simply being trained as an interpreter is not enough to ensure quality assurance in military interpreting; there must be institutional mechanisms with the capacity to (in a systematic way) monitor, evaluate, and improve translation outputs. Mossop (2014, p. 22) ^[20] outlines a broad scheme for translation quality evaluation covering the areas of adequate accuracy, fluency, style and appropriateness to purpose. In military-legal contexts, the most important values are those of accuracy and appropriate for purpose: the legal content of the source text must be rendered with just enough detail to meet its legal needs, but in a language that is comprehensible to all actors involved in the proceedings.

House (2015, p. 48) ^[14] distinguishes two types of translation quality problems: covert and overt: in legal settings it is often the covert errors that make a good target text(s), i.e. which read fluently and sound "natural" but deviate from the source text in legally relevant ways. Identification of such errors needs to be performed by people possessing both linguistic expertise and legal knowledge, a combination not often available in military circles. This means that the institutional ability to form new, specialized quality assurance teams mixing legal and linguistic expertise is vital in order to be able to gainfully continue to employ military interpreting as an alternative method of law enforcement in settings where criminal proceedings would otherwise take place.

Technologies have benefits and risks in military-legal translation. Machine translation systems have advanced by leaps and bounds in the last few years and there is a lot of interest on the use of machine translation to quickly translate military documents. But as noted by Koehn (2010, p. 8) ^[17], machine translation systems still perform poorly in translating domain-specific legal jargon and performing translations for low-resource languages—essentially the conditions most likely to be encountered during military operations. Institutionally, it is a challenge to create protocols regarding the use of machine translation in contexts where legally relevant language ensures that human oversight and quality control remains part of the process.

8. Conclusion

Herewith this paper has investigated the multifaceted complexities emerging at the junction of legal translation and military interpreting, where linguistic precision and cultural competence meet ethical integrity and operational constrain, in extremely demanding ways. The analysis shown that military interpreters operating in legal settings face problems that are more challenging than those dictated by either domain: they have the meet the terminological precision of legal translation under the operational demands of military service, navigate the moral dilemmas identified with loyalty as a virtue and neutrality as a value within institutionally skewed contexts, bear all responsibility for translations whose errors can have serious and far-reaching consequences.

The theoretical considerations presented in the paper—from Šarčević's early work on the nature of legal translation as a type of legal communication (1997, 2000) ^[27, 8], through to

Inghilleri's sociology of military interpreting—provide invaluable analytical tools for appreciating these difficulties. Nevertheless, the review identifies many gaps in the literature: for instance, with regard to the intersection between legal and military interpreting; interpreters' experiences outside of a tribunal setting/our focus on institutional dimensions of quality assurance at least within military-legal translation.

This analysis has practical implications for the field by highlighting several priorities. 1. Designing comprehensive training programs in military-legal interpreting Military institutions must design and offer training programs tailored to the full spectrum of competencies required for successful military-legal interpreting including legal terminology, international humanitarian law, ethical reasoning/decision making and psychological resilience. Second, meaningful quality assurance mechanisms need to be institutionalized and developed with a confluence of expertise at the linguistic and legal domains that work as checks in place to systematically oversee translation outputs in military-legal contexts. Third, military interpreters who find their professional obligations clashing with their duty to operate in a manner that is not only effective but ethical require clearer human rights frameworks and institutional protections.

Finally, the paper hopes to stimulate a more focused scholarly interest in military interpreting in legal contexts as an important sub-field of interpreting studies. The implications of translation breakdown here—concerning individual defendants, the legitimacy of military operations, and international humanitarian law itself—are simply too grave to be left without sustained empirical and theoretical scrutiny. Addressing these challenges requires a bridging of Translation Studies with (legal) scholarship, military studies and ethics.

References

1. Austin JL. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1962.
2. Baigorri-Jalón J. *The Interpreting Studies Reader*. Mikkelson H, Clark BS, translators. Paris: Routledge; 2014. Originally published 2000.
3. Baker M. The role of interpreters/translators in the war zone: narrator and narrated. *Translator*. 2010;16(2):197-222. doi:10.1080/13556509.2010.10799467.
4. Cao D. *Translating Law*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters; 2007.
5. Cao D, Zhao X. Partial reformulation in meaning expansion for translation: translation trigger and lexical abstraction. In: Riemer BS, editor. 2008.
6. Cryer R, Friman H, Robinson D, Wilmshurst E. *An Introduction to International Criminal Law and Procedure*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2014.
7. Footitt H, Kelly M. *Languages at War: Policies and Practices of Language Contacts during Conflict*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2012.
8. Garzone G. Legal translation and functionalist approaches: an oxymoron? In: *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Transfer (ICLT): Translation in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2000. p. 395-414.
9. Gentile A, Ozolins U, Vasilakakos M. *Liaison Interpreting: A Handbook*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press; 1996.
10. Gibbons J. *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing; 2003.
11. Gile D. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and*
12. *Translator Training*. Rev ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2009.
13. Hale SB. *The Discourse of Court Interpreting: Discourse Practices of the Law, the Witness and the Interpreter*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; 2004.
14. House J. *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London: Routledge; 2015.
15. Inghilleri M. “Never go to war without knowing why”: the decision to interpret in Iraq. *Translator*. 2010;16(2):175-196. doi:10.1080/13556509.2010.10799466.
16. Kelly M. Military interpreters: serving beyond the battle lines. In: Footitt H, Kelly M, editors. *Languages at War: Policies and Practices of Language Contacts During Conflict*. London: Palgrave Macmillan; 2012. p. 130-155.
17. Koehn P. *Statistical Machine Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2010.
18. Legrand P. European legal systems are not converging. *Int Comp Law Q*. 1996;45(1):52-81. doi:10.1017/S0020589300058649.
19. Mikkelson H. *Introduction to Court Interpreting*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; 2000.
20. Mossop B. *Revising and Editing for Translators*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge; 2014.
21. Nord C. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing; 2001.
22. Palmer J. Western media in Iraq: interpreting and translation. In: Salama-Carr M, editor. *Translation and Interpreting Conflict*. In: *Language, Identities and Conflict*. Amsterdam: Rodopi; 2007. p. 13-28.
23. Pöchhacker F. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2016.
24. Sandrelli A. Police and military interpreting: training and professional issues. In: Mikkelson H, Jourdenais R, editors. *The Routledge Handbook of Interpreting*. London: Routledge; 2015. p. 380-396.
25. Schabas WA. *An Introduction to the International Criminal Court*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011.
26. Solan LM. *The Language of Statutes: Laws and Their Interpretation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2010.
27. Šarčević S. *New Approach to Legal Translation*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International; 1997.
28. Šarčević S. Challenges to the legal translator. In: Tiersma PM, Solan LM, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012. p. 187-199.
29. Tipton R. Relationships between soldiers and interpreters in violent conflict situations: dual pedagogies and the transformative power of cultures of normalization. *Interpreter Transl Trainer*. 2011;5(1):45-74. doi:10.1080/13556509.2011.10798814.

30. Venuti L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge; 1995.
31. Wierzbicka A. *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.

How to Cite This Article

Al-Rubaye SSN. Legal translation in the context of military interpreting: sensitive topics, challenges to accuracy, and ethical obligations. *International Journal of Social Science Exceptional Research*. 2026 May–Jun;5(3):139–145. doi:10.54660/IJSSER.2026.5.3.139-145.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.