

1. SZEKCIÓ  
AZ AI-NEVELÉS KIHÍVÁSA  
(ELNÖK: DR. SZŰTS ZOLTÁN)

**Teaching Legal Technology in Law School:  
Forming Competence and Character in the Age of AI**

**Insegnamento della tecnologia giuridica nella formazione giuridica:  
competenza professionale e responsabilità morale nell'era  
dell'intelligenza artificiale**

**Jogi technológia oktatása a jogi képzésben:  
szakmai felkészültség és erkölcsi felelősség az MI korában**

**Dr. Adrienn Aczél-Partos, LL.M.**

*PPCU Faculty of Law and Political Science, Legal Informatics Education*

*Group and Legal Technology Competence Centre /*

*PPKE JÁK Jogi Informatika Oktatási Csoport és a Jogi Technológiai*

*Kompetencia Központ*

*head /vezető*

ORCID: 0000-0001-5848-638X

**Abstract**

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and its widespread accessibility in everyday life are fundamentally reshaping the legal profession and increasingly require legal education to adapt to new technological and societal conditions. This study presents the experience of the Faculty of Law and Political Sciences at Pázmány Péter Catholic University, which became the first Hungarian institution of legal education to introduce university-level instruction in legal technology following the appearance of ChatGPT, launching two new undergraduate courses dedicated to the field. Building on decades of teaching legal informatics, the programme integrates interdisciplinary competencies,

such as design thinking, project management, and business-oriented approaches to legal services, with the pedagogical use of AI-based tools, including generative language models. Drawing on five semesters of teaching experience and student feedback, the study demonstrates that law students are receptive to technology-supported learning methods when these are accompanied by clear methodological frameworks and interdisciplinary cooperation.

Beyond technological and pedagogical considerations, the study situates the teaching of legal technology within the context of Catholic university identity and the Catholic intellectual tradition. Drawing on the teachings of Pope Francis and the principles articulated in *Gravissimum educationis*, it argues that Catholic universities hold a distinctive responsibility in the age of AI, to form lawyers who integrate technological competence with moral responsibility, a deep respect for human dignity, and a commitment to the common good. When guided by the principles of Catholic social teaching, the integration of LegalTech into legal education can foster critical thinking, ethical sensitivity, and the development of character. The study concludes that legal technology education, when grounded in Catholic values, can prepare future lawyers to navigate an AI-shaped legal environment with wisdom, integrity, and a steadfast commitment to justice.

**Keywords:** legal technology (LegalTech), artificial intelligence, legal education, legal technology skills, moral responsibility, Catholic university identity

### Abstract

L'emergere dell'intelligenza artificiale (IA) e la sua diffusa accessibilità nella vita quotidiana stanno ridefinendo radicalmente la professione legale e richiedono sempre più che la formazione giuridica si adatti alle nuove condizioni tecnologiche e sociali. Questo studio presenta l'esperienza della Facoltà di Giurisprudenza e Scienze Politiche dell'Università Cattolica Pázmány Péter, che è diventata la prima istituzione ungherese di formazione giuridica a introdurre l'insegnamento universitario della tecnologia legale dopo la comparsa di ChatGPT, lanciando due nuovi corsi di laurea dedicati a questo campo. Basandosi su decenni di insegnamento dell'informatica giuridica, il programma integra competenze interdisciplinari, come il design thinking, la gestione dei progetti e approcci orientati al business ai servizi legali, con l'uso pedagogico di strumenti basati sull'IA, compresi i modelli linguistici generativi. Attingendo a cinque semestri di esperienza didattica e al feedback degli studenti, lo studio dimostra che gli studenti di giurisprudenza sono ricettivi ai metodi di apprendimento supportati dalla tecnologia quando questi sono accompagnati da chiari quadri metodologici e dalla cooperazione interdisciplinare.

Al di là delle considerazioni tecnologiche e pedagogiche, lo studio colloca l'insegnamento della tecnologia giuridica nel contesto dell'identità universitaria cattolica e della tradizione intellettuale cattolica. Attingendo agli insegnamenti di Papa Francesco e ai principi enunciati nella *Gravissimum educationis*, sostiene che le università cattoliche

hanno una responsabilità particolare nell'era dell'intelligenza artificiale, quella di formare avvocati che integrino la competenza tecnologica con la responsabilità morale, un profondo rispetto per la dignità umana e un impegno per il bene comune. Se guidata dai principi della dottrina sociale cattolica, l'integrazione della LegalTech nell'educazione giuridica può promuovere il pensiero critico, la sensibilità etica e lo sviluppo del carattere. Lo studio conclude che l'educazione alla tecnologia giuridica, se fondata sui valori cattolici, può preparare i futuri avvocati a navigare in un ambiente giuridico plasmato dall'intelligenza artificiale con saggezza, integrità e un fermo impegno per la giustizia. **Parole chiave:** tecnologia legale (LegalTech), intelligenza artificiale, formazione giuridica, competenze tecnologiche giuridiche, responsabilità morale, identità universitaria cattolica

### Absztrakt

A mesterséges intelligencia (MI) megjelenése és a mindennapi életben való széles körű hozzáférhetősége alapvetően átalakítja a jogi hivatást és egyre inkább arra készíti a jogi felsőoktatást, hogy alkalmazkodjon az új technológiai és társadalmi feltételekhez. A tanulmány bemutatja a Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Jog- és Államtudományi Karának tapasztalatait, amely Magyarországon elsők között vezetett be egyetemi szintű technológiai oktatást a ChatGPT megjelenését követően, két új, alapképzésben meghirdetett kurzus elindításával. A több évtizedes jogi informatikaoktatási hagyományokra építve a program olyan interdiszciplináris kompetenciákat integrál, mint a design thinking, a projektmenedzsment és a jogi szolgáltatások üzleti szemlélete, valamint az MI-alapú eszközök, köztük a generatív nyelvi modellek pedagógiai alkalmazása. Az öt szemeszter oktatási tapasztalataira és a hallgatói visszajelzésekre támaszkodva a tanulmány rámutat arra, hogy a joghallgatók nyitottak a technológiával támogatott tanulási módszerekre, amennyiben azok világos módszertani keretekkel és interdiszciplináris együttműködéssel párosulnak.

A technológiai és pedagógiai szempontokon túl a tanulmány a jogi technológia oktatását a katolikus egyetemi identitás és a katolikus intellektuális hagyomány összefüggésében értelmezi. Ferenc pápa tanításaira és a *Gravissimum educationis* dokumentumban megfogalmazott alapelvekre támaszkodva amellett érvel, hogy a katolikus egyetemeknek a mesterséges intelligencia korában sajátos felelősségük van olyan jogászok képzésében, akik a technológiai kompetenciát erkölcsi felelősséggel, az emberi méltóság iránti mély tisztelettel és a közjó iránti elkötelezettséggel kapcsolják össze. A katolikus társadalmi tanítás elvei által vezérelt jogi technológiai integráció elősegítheti a kritikai gondolkodás, az etikai érzékenység és a jellem fejlődését. A tanulmány végkövetkeztetése szerint a katolikus értékeken alapuló jogi technológiai oktatás képes felkészíteni a jövő jogászait arra, hogy az MI által formált jogi környezetben bölcsen, erkölcsi felelősséggel és az igazságosság iránti szilárd elkötelezettséggel eligazodjanak. **Kulcsszavak:** jogi technológia (LegalTech), mesterséges intelligencia, jogi oktatás, jogi technológiai készségek, erkölcsi felelősség, katolikus egyetemi identitás

## Introduction

Legal education traditionally aims to cultivate the capacity for rigorous legal reasoning and to prepare students for the responsible application of legal knowledge in complex social, economic, and technological contexts. This model has long centred on the interpretation of legal texts, the analysis of case law, and the systematic acquisition of substantive and procedural doctrine. While these foundations remain indispensable, the contemporary legal environment increasingly demands competencies that exceed the boundaries of classical training.

Technological transformation – most notably the rapid development and everyday accessibility of artificial intelligence – has reshaped the conditions under which legal work is produced, evaluated, and delivered. Although the conceptual foundations of AI date back to the mid-twentieth century, when the term was first articulated at the 1956 Dartmouth Summer Research Project (McCarthy et al., 1955), its concrete implications for legal practice remained limited for decades. This dynamic shifted dramatically with the emergence of generative AI systems, particularly following the release of OpenAI's ChatGPT in 2022. For the legal domain, these systems brought AI from an abstract, largely theoretical field into an immediate, practical reality, capable of performing tasks that intersect directly with legal research, drafting, and decision-support.

Hungarian law schools, including Pázmány Péter Catholic University Law Faculty, have long incorporated legal informatics into their curricula, equipping first-year students with essential skills in information retrieval and digital research. These competencies – namely understanding legal databases, navigating sources of law, and interpreting judicial decisions – form the baseline of digital literacy expected of the modern lawyer (Berring, 1994; Katsh & Rabinovich-Einy, 2017). Yet the accelerating integration of AI-based tools into legal services now necessitates a broader pedagogical shift.

The rise of legal technology (LegalTech) challenges the traditional structures of legal education by reshaping how legal work is conceptualised, organised, and executed. Rather than functioning merely as auxiliary tools, contemporary technologies increasingly influence professional judgement, workflow design, and client interaction. This evolution compels legal educators to consider how curricula can prepare future lawyers for a profession transformed by automation, data-driven processes, and algorithmic decision-making. The emergence of artificial intelligence is one of the most significant technological and social changes of the past decade. Research into artificial intelligence began in the summer of 1956 at a workshop held at Dartmouth College. John McCarthy introduced the concept at the conference, where he and his fellow scientists discussed the possibilities of researching and developing machine intelligence. One of the starting points for AI research was to create a machine with general intelligence similar to that of humans. At the time, it was predicted that this would be achieved within twenty years. Since then, the field has gone through phases of development with varying momentum, cyclically rising and falling. “Summers” (periods of significant

results and optimism) were followed by “winters” (characterised by stagnation and a lack of resources) (McCarthy, 2007). 30 November 2022 marked a historic turning point when ChatGPT was made available to the public free of charge, ushering in a new era in the practical application and social impact of artificial intelligence. Generative AI, especially the emergence of large language models (hereinafter: LLM), is transforming not only the economy, the labour market and thinking about legal regulation, but also the world of higher education. Advances in technological tools are making new skills available to both students and educators, but they are also raising methodological and ethical questions that make it essential to rethink the goals and values of education systems. Whether it is prompt writing, data literacy or artificial intelligence-supported analysis as new skills, they are significantly disrupting what we currently refer to as competence in higher education (Dringó-Horváth, 2024). At the same time, without an appropriate ethical and pedagogical framework, these competencies can easily degenerate into technical skills that are divorced from the core values of critical thinking and academic integrity (Rajki et. al., 2024).

The fundamental aim of legal education is to prepare students for the theoretical and practical application of legal thinking and reasoning, and to equip them with the ability to respond confidently to changes in the social, economic, and technological environment. Building on these foundations, law graduates must be capable of making responsible, well-reasoned decisions in increasingly complex professional contexts. Traditionally, legal training has centred on the interpretation of legal texts, the analysis of case law, and the systematic acquisition of substantive and procedural legal knowledge. These pillars have long provided the conceptual stability on which legal scholarship and professional competence rest.

In recent years, however, technological developments have posed unprecedented challenges to the established structures of legal education. AI, in particular, has emerged not merely as a technical innovation but as a transformative force reshaping the production, dissemination, and application of legal knowledge. The release of OpenAI’s ChatGPT marked a decisive turning point, bringing AI into everyday professional environments, including legal practice and legal education. Unlike earlier technological tools, generative AI possesses the capacity to produce coherent legal texts, draft arguments, summarise case law, and simulate aspects of legal reasoning. As a result, AI has transitioned from a distant theoretical topic to an immediate and practical reality for lawyers, judges, academics, and students.

The growing presence of AI in legal workflows highlights a broader structural shift, the boundaries between law and technology are becoming increasingly permeable. While computer scientists have long engaged with AI on a technical level, the legal profession is only now confronting the depth of transformation required. The integration of AI-driven tools into legal services underscores the need for lawyers to develop new forms of competence – methodological, ethical, and technological. Legal education must therefore expand its traditional focus and embrace pedagogical models that

prepare students not only to understand the law but also to understand the systems that increasingly mediate how the law is accessed, interpreted, and applied (Qutieshat et al., 2024).

In this evolving landscape, legal educators face a dual challenge: preserving the intellectual rigor of traditional legal reasoning while simultaneously equipping students to navigate and critically evaluate technologies that fundamentally alter legal processes. Addressing this challenge requires a rethinking of curricula, teaching methods, and the professional identity of future lawyers.

Richard Susskind was among the first scholars to articulate the depth of this transformation. As early as 2008, he argued that lawyers would be required to assume hybrid professional identities – legal technologists, legal engineers, process designers, and knowledge managers – to remain relevant within a digitalised legal ecosystem (Susskind, 2008; Susskind & Susskind, 2015). His work highlighted structural shifts such as the unbundling of legal services, the rise of automated decision-support, and the systematisation of routine tasks. While many of his predictions initially seemed speculative, the emergence of accessible generative AI technologies has rendered his analysis more prescient than ever.

Today, nearly two decades after Susskind's early warnings, the central challenge facing legal education is not whether technology will reshape legal work, but how institutions can equip future jurists with the intellectual, ethical, and methodological tools necessary to understand – and critically evaluate – an increasingly technologised legal landscape.

In their influential chapter *The Legal Tech Ecosystem*, Daniel Martin Katz and Michael J. Bommarito (2021) argue that the structure of legal services has undergone a fundamental transformation. The contemporary legal environment is increasingly shaped by digital infrastructures and technology-driven platforms, where automated workflows, data-driven processes, and algorithmic decision-making have become embedded in everyday practice. Document automation tools, e-discovery platforms, predictive analytics, compliance-monitoring systems, smart contract technologies, and online legal service providers now constitute essential components of the legal services landscape.

This systemic shift carries far-reaching implications for legal education. Traditional curricula – grounded in doctrinal analysis, case-based reasoning, and text-centred interpretation – have not kept pace with the technological realities that characterise modern legal work. As Katz and Bommarito (2021) emphasise, graduates often leave law school without the practical technological competencies, interdisciplinary skills, or operational understanding required to function effectively in a legal ecosystem shaped by legal operations and legal engineering. This misalignment creates a dual deficit: law schools fail to prepare students for technology-mediated practice, while legal organizations struggle to respond to rapid technological change.

Katz and Bommarito's analysis underscores the need for systemic reform in legal education, reform that incorporates technological and data-analytic modules, fosters

interdisciplinary collaboration, offers hands-on engagement with legal technologies, and cultivates a critical understanding of how AI-driven and automated systems operate. Their work illustrates that the rise of legal tech does not simply introduce new tools; it reshapes the foundations of legal expertise and redefines what it means to practice law in the twenty-first century.

In analysing the technological transformation of legal services, Katz and Bommarito argue that the contemporary legal ecosystem is increasingly organised around digital infrastructures that structure, constrain, and enable legal work. This insight aligns closely with Lawrence Lessig's influential claim that "code is law", suggesting that technological architectures themselves function as regulatory forces that shape how legal norms operate in practice (Lessig, 1999). In a legal environment where automated workflows, data-driven processes, and algorithmic decision-making are embedded in core professional activities, Katz and Bommarito highlight the structural misalignment between modern legal practice and traditional legal education. As digital systems mediate an ever-greater share of legal tasks – from document generation and discovery to prediction and compliance – lawyers must be capable not only of interpreting legal norms but also of understanding the technological architectures through which those norms are now applied. Their analysis makes clear that without a systemic recalibration of legal education to include technological, methodological, and ethical competencies, future lawyers will lack the capacity to navigate – and critically evaluate – the increasingly code-structured landscape of legal practice.

## Background and Motivation for Introducing LegalTech Education

Interest in digital transformation at Pázmány Law Faculty grew gradually. Building on earlier experiences in legal informatics, the Faculty recognised the need to provide students with interdisciplinary knowledge reflecting the increasing technological sophistication of legal practice. Hungarian scholarship, particularly the work of Zódi (2018), significantly contributed to the domestic dissemination of LegalTech discourse.

Simultaneously, trends within the Hungarian legal profession suggested growing engagement with AI. Although approximately 94% of Hungarian law firms operate as single-lawyer practices, larger firms began experimenting with technological innovation. Dentons, for instance, established Nextlaw Labs in 2015 to explore AI-enabled legal solutions and enhance client services globally (Dentons, 2015).

These factors collectively underscored the necessity of introducing LegalTech education at the university level. In 2022, after discussions with Wolters Kluwer Hungary and LegalTech practitioners, Pázmány Law Faculty became the first in Hungary to launch a dedicated LegalTech course. The implementation required institutional openness, flexibility, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Our curriculum includes a set of innovative courses designed to prepare students for

the technological transformation of the legal profession. Innovation in law, Legal Tech, Legal Design and the practice of the digital age introduces the foundations of digital change in law, examining how automation, big data analytics, and machine learning are reshaping legal services. The course emphasises legal-tech trends, process redesign, and the development of an innovation-oriented mindset through case studies and applied methodologies. Complementing this, Future Lawyer / The Lawyer of Tomorrow focuses on the evolving competence profile of 21st-century legal professionals. Students explore new expectations related to technological literacy, interdisciplinary collaboration between law, IT, and business, as well as the ethical and societal implications of AI-driven legal workflows. Finally, Documents in the World of Legal Tech provides a practice-oriented introduction to how technology transforms document-based legal work. The course covers document automation, natural-language processing, smart contracts, and AI-supported analysis of legal texts, enabling students to understand and critically assess the systems that increasingly mediate how legal documents are created, processed, and applied. Together, these courses equip future lawyers with the technological, analytical, and ethical competencies required to navigate –and shape – the rapidly changing landscape of digital legal practice.

Since 2023, the curriculum has been further expanded with two dedicated courses: Artificial Intelligence, Law and Its Interfaces 1, which offers a structured introduction to the legal and regulatory dimensions of AI – including liability, data protection, and the core logic of AI systems – and Artificial Intelligence, Law and Its Interfaces 2, which builds on this foundation by exploring more complex applications, interdisciplinary challenges, and the broader societal impact of AI. Together, these courses equip future lawyers with the technological, analytical, and ethical competencies required to navigate and shape the rapidly evolving digital legal landscape.

## **Evolving Competence Frameworks in Contemporary Legal Education**

Across disciplines, the development of professional skills has become a central concern of contemporary higher education. Beyond the transmission of theoretical knowledge, universities increasingly emphasise the cultivation of cognitive, methodological, and interpersonal competencies that enable graduates to navigate complex and rapidly changing professional environments. Such competencies form the foundation of lifelong learning, adaptability, and reflective professional practice (OECD Learning Compass, 2030).

In the legal field, skill development has historically centred on doctrinal knowledge and analytical reasoning. Traditional legal competencies include the interpretation of statutes, the analysis of judicial decisions, analogical and deductive reasoning, and the construction of coherent legal arguments. These skills reflect the epistemic foundations

of the legal profession, which values precision, structured thinking, and normative justification.

The widening gap between legal education and the demands of contemporary legal practice has become increasingly evident (Hamilton, 2018). While many law faculties continue to rely on uniform and traditional solutions, the role of the twenty-first-century lawyer extends beyond the conventionally expected analytical excellence and requires technological proficiency encompassing a broad spectrum of digital competencies, from document automation to predictive analytics. Interdisciplinary collaboration at the intersection of law, data science, and business is also becoming indispensable. Traditional curricula, which predominantly emphasise legal theory and classical doctrinal training, often fail to provide opportunities for acquiring these practical and technological skills, leaving graduates frequently unprepared to face the challenges of the modern legal environment (Horn & Pistone, 2016).

A central element of the argument advanced by Fenwick, Kaal, and Vermeulen is that digital technologies – including artificial intelligence, big data systems, and document automation – now fundamentally shape the provision of legal services. This transformation implies that the classical components of legal expertise (dogmatic knowledge, legal reasoning, and doctrinal analysis) are increasingly insufficient on their own, as a substantial portion of legal work is carried out within digital systems whose operation requires at least a basic level of technological understanding.

The authors place particular emphasis on the importance of understanding programming logic. This does not imply that lawyers must become programmers; rather, they must be familiar with the cognitive structures underlying algorithms – such as if–then logic, conditional decision-making, rule-based systems, and data flows – because these constitute the foundations of the digital legal environment. The concept of “Coding for Lawyers” therefore functions as a metaphor as well: according to the authors, the lawyer of the future must be able to understand, critique, supervise, and apply automated systems that are increasingly integral to legal practice.

In their critique of traditional legal education, the authors argue that case-based teaching and text-centred analysis are overly dominant, while they fail to cultivate the practical technological skills that are essential in modern legal practice. Given the rapid growth of the legal tech industry, the authors contend that the inability of universities to adapt constitutes a structural risk: if legal education does not integrate technological components, it effectively produces “technological illiteracy”, which ultimately hinders the modernisation of the profession.

However, the emergence and everyday accessibility of artificial intelligence have expanded the competence profile expected of future lawyers. Contemporary legal work increasingly requires technological literacy, the ability to interact effectively with digital systems, and an understanding of how algorithmic tools shape legal information, workflows, and decision-making. Lawyers must be able to assess the implications, limitations, and risks of AI-driven systems, integrating them responsibly into professional practice.

New competencies arising from this technological transformation include data awareness, critical evaluation of automated outputs, ethical judgment in technology-assisted decision-making, and interdisciplinary collaboration with technical experts. These meta-skills – adaptability, digital resilience, and methodological openness – support the integration of legal reasoning with emerging technological frameworks.

As legal education responds to these developments, the central question becomes how institutions can equip future jurists with the intellectual, ethical, and technological tools required for a profession increasingly shaped by automation and digital processes, while preserving the interpretive and normative foundations of legal reasoning.

Design thinking – a user-centred, solution-focused methodology – has become increasingly relevant in redesigning legal services. While traditionally absent from legal education, design thinking offers a structured yet creative approach to understanding clients' needs and developing efficient legal processes (Brown, 2009; Hagan, 2017). Students learned the core stages of design thinking – empathy, problem definition, ideation, prototyping, and testing – and explored their applications in legal problem-solving.

Project management, routine in corporate and IT sectors, has rarely been integrated into legal curricula. Yet modern legal practice involves managing complex tasks, coordinating multidisciplinary teams, and optimising workflows. The course highlighted agile methodologies, collaborative structures, and the shift from hierarchical to network-based professional environments.

Another component of the course was the introduction of a business-oriented perspective. Despite the predominance of solo practitioners in Hungary, legal education traditionally avoids discussing law firms as economic entities. The course exposed students to issues of market positioning, technological investment, service innovation, and ethical considerations surrounding efficiency and automation. Students also experimented with generative AI, including ChatGPT, learning the basics of prompt engineering and exploring how AI supports research, drafting, and workflow optimisation.

## Ethical Challenges of Generative AI in Legal Education

John Bliss's (2024) study, *Teaching Law in the Age of Generative AI*, provides a comprehensive analysis of the direct and systemic effects that generative artificial intelligence – particularly ChatGPT and other large language models – exerts on American legal education. Bliss argues that the emergence of generative AI does not merely introduce a new tool into the educational environment; rather, it fundamentally challenges the traditional aims, methods, and assessment practices of legal training. The study demonstrates that AI transforms legal education on three interconnected levels: students' learning processes, instructors' pedagogical practices, and institutional regulatory frameworks. Students increasingly rely on language models to produce or analyse legal texts, a tendency that – without appropriate guidance – may result in the delegation of essential learning processes

and the gradual erosion of analytical skills. At the same time, conventional assessment methods based on written assignments become easier to circumvent through AI-generated content, compelling instructors to rethink task design, evaluation strategies, and the structure of academic requirements. One of Bliss's central conclusions concerns the problem of "dual competencies". Law students must simultaneously acquire AI literacy – understood as a critical awareness of how AI systems function, what their limitations and failure modes are, and which ethical issues they raise – while continuing to develop the classical legal skills of argumentation, textual interpretation, and problem-solving. Excessive reliance on AI may lead to analytical degradation, whereas excluding AI entirely would overlook the technological realities shaping contemporary legal practice. The study also formulates practical recommendations for the responsible integration of generative AI into legal education. Bliss emphasises the need for assignments that require students to document transparently how they used AI tools and for assessment models that evaluate the learning process rather than exclusively the final product. The inclusion of personal and oral examination components can serve as an effective means of verifying independent knowledge, while context-rich, real-world legal problems may limit the applicability of automatically generated AI solutions. Bliss also highlights the importance of teaching critical AI use, enabling students to identify algorithmic biases, hallucinations, and the ethical risks inherent in the technology.

According to the author, generative AI also brings new ethical challenges to the forefront of legal education, including issues related to the protection of personal data, responsibility for AI-generated errors, the authenticity of student work, and the potential perpetuation of algorithmic biases. For this reason, the task of legal education is not only to transmit technological skills but also to cultivate ethical sensitivity and critical reasoning.

Bliss concludes that the greatest challenge facing legal education is to strike a balance between leveraging technological innovation and preserving human expertise. Legal training in the age of generative AI remains relevant only if it is capable of preparing practitioners who understand and critically engage with digital tools while maintaining the deep legal, analytical, and ethical competencies that constitute the essence of the legal profession.

## **Catholic Identity and Legal Education in the Age of AI**

Catholic universities carry a distinctive mission grounded in the pursuit of truth, the formation of character, and the service of the common good. In the rapidly evolving landscape shaped by artificial intelligence, this identity becomes not only relevant but essential. Pope Francis has repeatedly emphasised that technological development must remain inseparable from ethical reflection, human dignity, and responsibility. As he writes: "The indiscriminate development of technology risks becoming a source of new injustice unless it is accompanied by an ethical and spiritual progress" (Francis,

*Laudato si'*, 2015). For legal education – entrusted with preparing future guardians of justice – this message resonates profoundly.

AI offers powerful tools that can enhance legal analysis, research, and decision-making. Yet, as Pope Francis warns, “Artificial intelligence is at the heart of a new cultural epoch... It must always serve humankind, not replace it” (*Message for the 57th World Day of Peace*, 2024). Catholic institutions are thus called to shape lawyers who not only master emerging technologies but also understand their moral implications and societal impact. The integration of LegalTech into university curricula must therefore be guided by this educational philosophy: technological competence must be matched by ethical formation. Within the context of legal education, this means cultivating: a commitment to human dignity, ensuring AI systems do not reinforce bias or injustice; a disposition toward the common good, recognising that technological innovation must benefit society as a whole; critical discernment, enabling future jurists to judge when technology aids justice and when it threatens it and intellectual humility, acknowledging the limits of automation and the irreplaceable value of human judgment.

At Pázmány Law Faculty, this identity shapes both teaching and curriculum development. The introduction of LegalTech is not merely a response to market trends, but a continuation of the university’s Catholic mission: forming lawyers who can navigate the ethical, intellectual, and technological challenges of the AI age with integrity and wisdom. As Pope Francis reminds us, “The future of humanity lies not only in the hands of policymakers but also in the hands of those who shape culture with their choices” (*Christus vivit*, 2019).

In light of the challenges posed by generative artificial intelligence in legal education, the ethical dimension of professional formation becomes increasingly central. The Second Vatican Council’s declaration *Gravissimum educationis* underscores that education must be ordered toward the full development of the human person and toward the cultivation of moral responsibility within society. This perspective offers a meaningful framework for contemporary debates on AI and legal training. As legal education enters an era marked by algorithmic decision-making, data-driven reasoning, and automated knowledge production, the document’s emphasis on human dignity, intellectual integrity, and responsible freedom provides a valuable normative compass.

Applying these principles to the context of AI, legal education must ensure that students not only acquire technical literacy but also develop the ethical discernment needed to evaluate, supervise, and, when necessary, question the operation of AI-driven systems. *Gravissimum educationis* calls for an education that strengthens critical judgment and fosters accountability – qualities that become indispensable when future lawyers engage with technologies capable of shaping legal outcomes and influencing human lives.

Thus, integrating AI into legal education is not merely a matter of curricular innovation but a moral imperative that requires educating professionals capable of combining technological competence with a profound commitment to justice, the common good,

and the ethical responsibilities inherent in legal practice. In this sense, the vision articulated in *Gravissimum educationis* remains strikingly relevant: the formation of individuals who can navigate emerging technologies without losing sight of the human person at the heart of the law.

## Conclusion

As contemporary legal scholarship increasingly emphasises, the digital transformation of law requires not only technical adaptation but a deeper rethinking of legal reasoning, professional identity, and institutional responsibility. As Katz (2013) notes, “*law is no longer a wholly self-contained discipline; it is becoming a computational and data-intensive enterprise that demands new hybrid competencies*”. This insight reinforces the urgency of integrating LegalTech into legal education.

Similarly, Remus and Levy (2016) argue that “*automation does not replace legal expertise but reshapes the landscape in which it operates*”, highlighting the continued need for human judgment in an AI-driven environment. From another perspective, Harry Surden (2020) underscores that “*AI systems do not ‘understand’ law in the human sense; their usefulness depends on the lawyer’s ability to deploy them critically and contextually*”. These contemporary positions collectively affirm that technological innovation must be accompanied by sustained development of interpretive, ethical, and analytical skills.

Against this backdrop, the integration of LegalTech into the curriculum at Pázmány Law Faculty represents a substantive step toward addressing these challenges. The experience of recent years demonstrates that law students are receptive to technological innovation when provided with appropriate guidance. As AI continues to transform legal work, legal education must prepare future lawyers to navigate a profession that is increasingly shaped by automation, data-driven processes, and algorithmic tools, yet still fundamentally grounded in human judgment, ethical responsibility, and the pursuit of justice.

The integration of LegalTech into the curriculum at Pázmány Law Faculty represents an important step toward modernising Hungarian legal education. The experience of the first five semesters demonstrates that law students are receptive to technological innovation when provided with appropriate guidance. As AI continues to transform legal work, such initiatives are indispensable in preparing future lawyers to navigate an increasingly complex and technologically mediated legal landscape.

## References

- Barrie, S. (2006). Understanding What We Mean by the Generic Attributes of Graduates. *Higher Education*, 51(2), 215–241.
- Berring, R. C. (1994). Legal research and the world of thinkable thoughts. *California Law Review*, 82(3), 541–554.
- Bliss, J. (2024). Teaching Law in the Age of Generative AI. *Jurimetrics: The Journal of Law, Science & Technology*, 64, 111–161. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4682456>
- Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation*. HarperCollins.
- Calo, R., Henderson, M. A. L. (2016). Innovation in legal education. *Washington Law Review*, 91(3), 757–772.
- Dentons (2015). *Nextlaw Labs: Innovating the business and practice of law*. Dentons Global Media.
- Dringó-Horváth, I. (2024). Educational innovation and networking in Hungarian higher education. Trends, key findings and adaptable best practices. L'Harmattan.
- Fenwick, M., Kaal, W. A., Vermeulen, E. P. M. (2018). Legal Education in a Digital Age: Why “Coding for Lawyers” Matters. *Lex Research Topics in Corporate Law & Economics Working Paper No. 2018/4; University of St. Thomas Legal Studies Research Paper No. 18-21*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3227967>
- Hagan, M. (2017). *Law by design*. Stanford University Legal Design Lab.
- Hamilton, N. W., Organ, J. M. (2018). Each law student must take increasing ownership over professional development during law school. *PD Quarterly*, 27. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3246164>
- Horn, M. B. & Pistone, M. R. (2016). *Disrupting law school: How disruptive innovation will revolutionize the legal world*. The Christensen Institute.
- Katsh, E., Rabinovich-Einy, O. (2017). *Digital justice: Technology and the Internet of disputes*. Oxford University Press.
- Katz, D. M., Bommarito, M. J. (2021). The Legal Tech Ecosystem. In R. Brownsword, E. P. S. Bighetti, R. A. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of Law, Regulation and Technology*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lessig, L. (1999). *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace*. Basic Books.
- McCarthy, J., et al. (1955). *A proposal for the Dartmouth summer research project on artificial intelligence*. Dartmouth College.
- McCarthy, J. (2007). *What Is Artificial Intelligence? Formal Reasoning Group*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3320>
- OECD Learning Compass 2030. *OECD Future of Education and Skills*. <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/projects/future-of-education-and-skills-2030.html>
- Pope Francis. (2015). *Laudato si': On Care for Our Common Home*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pope Francis. (2019). *Christus vivit: Post-synodal apostolic exhortation to young people*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Pope Francis. (2024). *Message for the 57th World Day of Peace: Artificial Intelligence and Peace*. Dicastery for Communication.
- Qutieshat, E., et al. (2024). Exploring the Role of AI in Modern Legal Practice: Opportunities, Challenges, and Ethical Implications. *Journal of Electrical Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3320>
- Rajki, Z., T. Nagy, J., & Dringó-Horváth, I. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education – student access, attitudes and usage practices. *School Culture*, 2024/7. <https://doi.org/10.14232/iskkult.2024.7.3>

- Remus, D. & Levy, F. S. (2016). Can robots be lawyers? Computers, lawyers, and the practice of law. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2701092>
- Second Vatican Council. (1965). *Gravissimum educationis: Declaration on Christian education*. Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Surden, H. (2020). Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview. *Georgia State University Law Review*, 35(4), 1305–1337. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3411869>
- Susskind, R. (2008). *The end of lawyers? Rethinking the nature of legal services*. Oxford University Press.
- Susskind, R. & Susskind, D. (2015). *The future of the professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts*. Oxford University Press.
- Wolters Kluwer (2024). *Future Ready Lawyer Survey*. Wolters Kluwer.
- Zódi, Zs. (2018). *Platforms, robots and the Law: New Regulatory Challenges in the Information Society*. Gondolat.