Al-Noor Journal for Digital Heritage and Cultural Preservation
Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Al-Noor Journal for Digital Cultural Heritage

Challenges of Translating Iraqi Archaeological Terms into English

Nathume Younis Salih

Department of Translation, College of Arts, Alnoor University, Nineveh, 41012, Iraq

Article information

Article history:
Received:4/5 / 2026
Accepted:25/6/2026
Published:29/7/2026

Keywords:
Translation,
Archaeology,
Meaning, Equivalence,
Culture

Correspondence:

Nathume Younis Salih
nazim.younis@alnoor.edu.iq

Abstract

Archaeological terminology refers to the specific lexicon used to describe the excavation, classification, and interpretation of human history. Translating these terms accurately requires understanding the exact contextual meaning behind specialized excavation, geological, and artifact-related vocabulary.

The study highlights the difficulties and nuances involved in translating terminology related to archaeology. It also covers the methods used by translators to maintain the usability and validity of archeological terminology. The current study is significant because translating archaeological terms is one of the most intricate and sophisticated areas of translation studies; it necessitates not only linguistic proficiency but also a deep understanding of the history, culture, and sociopolitical context of the original historical era.

The aim of the study is to find practical ways to guarantee cultural validity, equivalence, and accurate transmission of archeological terminologies.

It also aims at preserving and promoting the Iraqi heritage and civilization to global audiences.

The study hypothesizes that translating Iraqi archaeological terms into English is a complicated task due to the cultural and historical intricacy of Iraqi pre-Islamic history and civilization. The study also assumes that Direct semantic equivalents for culture-specific Iraqi archaeological terms do not exist in English thus, translators must rely on transliteration or borrowing, which shifts the burden of interpretation to the target reader. Finally, the study hypothesizes that only skilled and proficient translators will be capable of implementing the translation task adequately.

The analysis will be based on Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) model. This model tackles the main translation strategies used by translators handling the translation of archaeological terms and it represents the most appropriate framework for translating such terms accurately.

The study concludes that translating archaic terms is an intricate and complex task due to the fact that word meanings shift over time, and they often describe obsolete cultural customs with no modern equivalents. Translators must bridge these linguistic and historical gaps, balancing historical accuracy with modern readability.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4, ©Authors, 2026, College of Art, Alnoor University.
This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Translation and meaning

Many scholars have different perspectives on the definitions of translation. While some academics conceptualize it in terms of meaning transmission, others view it from an equivalence perspective.

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

According to Ray (1962: 187), it refers to "the transference of meaning from language into another." This view goes also in agreement with Newmark (1982: 7, 1992: 27).

Savory (1968: 34) describes translation as "a craft attempting to replace a written message and/or statement in another language."

According to Farghal and Shunnaq (1999: 2), translation is "often regarded as a project for transferring meaning from one language to another." This perspective corresponds to those who support equivalence-oriented translation, such as Nida and Taber (1974: 12), McGuire (1980: 29), Aziz (1998: 258), Catford (1965: 1), and Aziz and Lataiwish (2000: 61).

The term "meaning" in the context of translation has been defined in a number of ways, including, as the message's content (Nida and Taber, 1974: 12), the entire operative context (Steiner, 1975), and a linguistic characteristic (Catford, 1965: 35). Different theoretical frameworks serve as the foundation for these ideas of meaning. For example, Steiner believes in hermeneutics, but Nida and Taber adhere to the communicative theory of translation.

Catford follows the Firthian theory of meaning. Some views envisage meaning as mental concepts (realist theories), as something related to past experiences (behaviorist theories), or as something related to the linguistic and non-linguistic context (i.e., current surroundings and cultural conditions). However, meaning cannot be conveyed through a single system (such as linguistic, cultural, or psychological); instead, a variety of systems may appropriately contribute to the meaning of the text.

Equivalence in Translation

One major issue with translation is that of equivalence. It goes without saying that handling translation will be totally unfeasible without considering equivalence. Farghal and Shunnaq (1999: 4) and Obeidat (1998: 1) assert that equivalence is essential to both comprehending translation and translating a range of texts. Numerous perspectives have been used to assess and analyze equivalence. For example, Catford (1965: 27) describes equivalence as "an empirical phenomenon which can be discovered by comparing the SL text with the TL text."

Catford (1965: 27) defines formal equivalence as "any TL category that may be claimed to hold the same place in the economy of the TL, as the given SL category occupies in the SL,". Conversely, "any TL form (text or portion of a text) which is observed to be the equal of a specified SL form (text or portion of a text)" may stand for the definition of textual equivalence. Nida (1964: 159) asserts that "there are two different kinds of equivalence: formal and dynamic." While dynamic equivalence is based on the concept of equivalent effect, formal equivalence stresses the message's form and content.

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Nida states that the equivalent effect principle "is primarily receptor-oriented and aims at duplicating an equivalent effect on the TL receiver as that experienced by the SL receiver, that is, it attempts to build a similar relationship between the SL receiver and the TL message"

(Nida, 1964: 166-167). Additionally, Popovic (1967, cited in Mcguire, 1980: 25) identifies the following four categories of equivalence:

1-Linguistic equivalence is "A word-for-word translation where there is linguistic equivalence in both the SL and the TL texts".

2-"Paradigmatic equivalence: is an equivalence of grammar-related items"

3-"Stylistic Equivalence: is a Functional Equivalence of Elements in Original and Translated Texts" .

4-"Textual equivalence: is a comparison of two texts' syntagmatic structures." Put differently, "form and shape must be equal" (ibid: 26).

According to Baker (1992: 11–13), equivalence can be divided into three categories:

1- Finding the appropriate equivalent in the target language (TL) can be challenging since different languages apply grammatical rules differently.

This is known as grammatical equivalence. She believes that the grammatical variations between SL and TL could change the way the message is communicated.

2. The idea behind textual equivalence is that the coherence and information of a TL text and an SL text are comparable." Because it provides useful indications for comprehending and interpreting the source material, texture is an essential component of translation, helping the translator produce a text that is coherent and cohesive for the target reader in a particular context.

3-Pragmatic equivalence describes the implicatures and avoidance techniques used in translation. Since implicatures are about what is implied rather than what is actually conveyed, the translator must deduce the meaning in order to convey the original message. In order for the target audience in a different culture to comprehend the author's message, it is the translator's duty to accurately transmit it (Baker, 1992: 11–13).

Ghazala (1994: 9) defines "stylistic equivalence" as "the right selection of the TL text style that is derived from the style of the SL text."
"The style of a document is a combination of syntactic/grammatical and semantic/lexical elements of language, in contrast to other options open to the author." The components that define style in the text are immediately apparent to the translator. (See also Nemet-Nejat, 1991:

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

1; Robberecht, 1982:223; Kuepper, 1977: 243; Aziz and Latiwish, 2000: 66; Wendland, 2000: 4).

Translation Strategies

The key feature of the phrase "strategy" "is that it must be conscious," according to Lorscher (1991: 70). "Translation strategy is a potentially conscious procedure for the solution of a problem which an individual is faced with when translating a text segment from one language to another,". According to Dancette (1997), translation strategies can be described as a series of structured techniques that the translator use when faced with a particular issue.

According to Lorscher (1991), the phrase "translation strategy" has not been clearly defined because it is not used in translation theory. Numerous academics have been interested in this issue, including "Chesterman, 2005; Kearns, 2009; Chesterman, 1997 and Hejwowski, 2004." They all affirm that (strategy) implies a number of elements and that multiple formulations could signify a similar meaning.

Krings (1986: 18) considers "translation strategy as translator's potentially conscious plan for solving concrete translation problems in the framework of a concrete translation task". In the previously discussed viewpoints of Lorscher, Dancette, and Krings, the idea of "consciousness" was often invoked to differentiate between translators' techniques and other kinds of learning strategies.

According to Cohen (1998: 4), "the element of consciousness is what distinguishes strategies from these processes that are not strategic." Another appropriate definition is given by Hejwowski (2004: 76) as "a translator's consciously or unconsciously preferred procedure within an entire text or its significant passages."

Seven translation strategies are listed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958: 46): borrowing, calque, literal translation, transposition, modulation, equivalency, and adaptation.

The translation strategies suggested by Vinay and Darbelnet will be used as a framework in the upcoming practical section of this study.

Adaptation

Verschueren (1999: 61) notes that, "the ability to adapt is a feature of language that allows people to choose from a variety of linguistic options in order to get closer to communicative demands being satisfied". We may now examine adaptation on its own terms as a local and global phenomenon thanks to the development of translation studies as a distinct academic discipline.

Recognizing adaptation as a creative undertaking that aims to restore the balance of communication that is occasionally upset by conventional translation strategies is crucial.

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Consequently, by recognizing it as a valid strategy, we can only start to understand why it is used and how it relates to other traditional translation methods. Ibid.

For Bastin (2001: 5) "It's possible to think of adaptation as a series of translation related operations that produce a text that isn't considered to be a translation but is still acknowledged to be a roughly equivalent source text". It is possible to create a rough list of the ways that adaptations are implemented; these ways can be divided into the following categories:

1.Transcription of the original text, word for word.

2.Omission: the elimination or reduction of a section of the text.

3.Expansion: Including previously implicit information.

4.Exoticism: substituting lengthy passages of slang or dialect in the source text with almost identical phrases in the target language.

5.Updating: replacing outdated information with current information.
6.Situational equivalence: is the application of a different, more identifiable context than the original.

7. Creation: a more complete substitution of the original text with a new one that retains only its primary concepts, intent, and message.

Context in Translation

The need of context in translation is usually demonstrated in any translation work because it is challenging to understand any text in isolation. A comprehensive analysis of the role of context in translation is provided by House (2006) and Baker (2006). They both argue that a better understanding of the significance of context will enable everyone involved in multilingual communication to work together to create successful, suitable, and effective translations.

According to Baker and House (2006), the majority of context debate comes from sources outside translation studies. It is possible to assess previously finished translations or improve the process of producing new translations by studying context in translation. The "context of situation" from Systemic Functional Linguistics, which comprises field, tenor, and mode, is the translation studies literature's most explicit division of context into component pieces (Halliday, 2004).

Olivera and Sacristán (2010) state that the translator makes a choice while translating. Instead of being random, the choice depends on the situation. When a translator selects one of the alternatives, they are free to decide on grammatical structures, how to interpret hypothetical scenarios, and whether to create or standardize new terminology.

Al-Noor Journal for Digital Heritage and Cultural Preservation
Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Translation and Culture

For oxford dictionary, culture is described as "the inherited knowledge, values, feelings, activities, traditions, customs, attitudes, beliefs, ideas, arts, social behavior, and the way of life shared by a particular organization, country or group of people or society".

The public's definition of "culture" differs greatly from that of an archaeologist. In common language, culture is a collection of individuals with similar identities and ideas. However, a term like "Beaker Culture" in archaeology is merely a technical phrase used to classify related pottery patterns discovered in a certain area. When translating these findings for a global audience, the common usage of the word incorrectly suggests that there was a single ancient nation, even if the evidence just indicates that they had comparable ceramic preferences. Bing (2006)

Bing (2006:95) defines culture as "the knowledge and traditions possessed by a certain group of people including, language, music, habits, religion, arts, foods and different types of clothes and fashion prevalent in that community".

Terms and idioms used by one community are different from those used by other communities. This suggests that the right meanings of certain terms and phrases are closely associated with the cultures and communities in which they are used. Because of this, translators may encounter a variety of challenges while attempting to determine the most correct translation equivalent for these terms that are normally called "Culture-specific terminology". Ibid.

According to Bing (2006), translation based on culture can pose significant difficulties and problems for translators since certain terms specific to the SL culture do not exist in the TL culture, suggesting that the target language does not have suitable translations for certain expressions.

As a result, and in line with Newmark (1982: 55) "a lexical gap could arise in the target language and that would render the translator unable to benefit from many translation possibilities except turning to particular ways to transmit the required meaning accurately".

Difficulties of translating archaic terms

It is challenging to translate terms related to archaeology because many old artifacts are no longer in existence, making it difficult for translators to utilize direct modern terminology. The actual history and significance of the artifact are lost if a generic term like "pot" is used in place of the original cultural designation. Furthermore, different nations have extremely different naming conventions, and it can be distorted to force a local discovery into a Western category. (Wang Yao, Li Jingna, 2019).

The history of a whole excavation site might be ruined by misinterpreting a sophisticated scientific statement, hence translators need to be multidisciplinary experts in topics like soil science and

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

geology. Lastly, because ancient writings frequently have broken, fading, or missing vowels, translators must examine the artifact's physical state in order to infer the missing text. Ibid.

Many ancient artifacts had profound religious, spiritual, or political connotations that are no longer relevant. For instance, an intricate cosmic belief system exclusive to that ancient society may be represented by a straightforward animal carving or a particular architectural design. Translators are unable to come up with a single similar word because these ideas are completely alien to contemporary languages. To explain a topic that an ancient person would have grasped immediately, they are compelled to write lengthy, cumbersome explanations. (Wang Yao, Li Jingna, 2019).

The practical part

Several translators will be given a variety of archeological terms to implement the translation task in this section of the study. Their renderings will be assessed and verified for errors and misinterpretations.

SL text 1

احتوى الجناح الآشوري في المتحف العراقي على ***"منحوتات بارزة"***

SL text	**منحوتات بارزة**
Significance of the SL text	Protruding sculptures

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Relief sculpture	Literal translation	+
Translator 2	Free standing statues	Adaptation	_
translator 3	Oil paintings	Adaptation	_
Translator 4	Mosaic floors	Adaptation	_

Discussion

The archaeological term منحوتات بارزة designates the meaning of an artistic method where figures are carved onto a flat surface, extending slightly out from the background without totally detaching from it.

This meaning was conveyed appropriately by translator 1 only. His rendering is compatible with the targeted meaning of the SL text, thus deemed adequate translation of the original text. Conversely, renderings proposed by translators 2, 3 and 4 contradict the intended original meaning and therefore, considered inappropriate rendering of the SL text.

Al-Noor Journal for Digital Heritage and Cultural Preservation
Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

SL text 2

عثرت البعثة التنقيبية في جنوب العراق على ***رقم طينية*** تحمل كتابات مسمارية

SL text	**رقم طينية**
Significance of the SL text	Flat pieces of clay

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Clay tablet	Literal translation	+
Translator 2	Mud brick	Adaptation	_
translator 3	Cylinder seal	Adaptation	_
Translator 4	Stone Monument	Adaptation	_

Discussion

The archaeological term رقم طينية designates the meaning of flat pieces of clay that were used in Mesopotamian civilization as a tool for writing . This meaning has been accurately conveyed by translator 1. His rendering corresponds to the intended meaning and hence regarded appropriate translation of the SL text.

Alternatively, renderings provided by translators 2, 3 and 4 fall short of achieving the targeted meaning and consequently deemed inappropriate renderings of the SL text.

SL text 3

اكتشف الآثاريون في نينوى مجموعة من ***"الأسلحة البرونزية"*** مثل الرماح والخناجر

SL text	**الأسلحة البرونزية**
Significance of the SL text	Bronze made weapons

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Iron tools	Adaptation	_
Translator 2	Bronze weapons	Literal translation	+
translator 3	Flint blades	Adaptation	_
Translator 4	Wooden shields	Adaptation	_

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Discussion

The SL archaeological term الاسلحة البرونزية is associated with the meaning of a kind of bronze made weapons that were used by warriors in that historical era. This meaning has been accurately conveyed by translator 2. His rendering conform to the intended meaning, therefore regarded appropriate rendering of the SL text. Alternatively, renderings presented by translators 1, 3 and 4 fall short of achieving the targeted meaning and thus deemed inappropriate translations of the original text.

SL text 4

كانت الالهة الحارسة تتمثل في تماثيل حجرية عملاقة تدعى ***الثيران المجنحة***

SL text	**الثيران المجنحة**
Significance of the SL text	Winged bulls

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Lamassu	borrowing	+
Translator 2	sphinxes	Adaptation	_
translator 3	griffins	Adaptation	_
Translator 4	centaurs	Adaptation	_

Discussion

In this example the archaic Assyrian term الثيران المجنحة refers to the protective deity in Mesopotamian heritage (winged-bull protective deities) found mainly at the entrances of castles and official buildings. with regard to the renderings provided, translator 1 has been successful in achieving the targeted rendering (Lamassu) which represents the accurate rendering of the archaic term. Therefore, his rendering represent an appropriate translation of the original text. Consequently, translators 2, 3 and 4 Were not capable of attaining the targeted rendering of the SL term. Their renderings were not compatible with the original text meaning, ultimately their translation versions regarded inappropriate renderings of the SL text.

Al-Noor Journal for Digital Heritage and Cultural Preservation
Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

SLtext 5

عثر الفريق الهندي المشارك في التنقيب على ***كسر فخارية*** تعود لفترة العبيد

SL text	**كسر فخارية**
Significance of the SL text	Fragments of baked clay

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Stone tools	Adaptation	_
Translator 2	Mud bricks	Adaptation	_
translator 3	Glass vessels	Adaptation	_
Translator 4	Pottery shards	Literal translation	+

Discussion

The archaeological term كسر فخارية refers to broken fragments of a ceramic vessel or other clay object. They are typically retrieved from archaeological excavations and other historical sites. Regarding the renderings provided, translator 4 interpretation of the SL text is deemed suitable since it clearly conforms to the intended original meaning. However, the translation versions offered by translators 1, 2, and 3 are deemed unsuitable renderings of the SL language since they are irreconcilable with the original intended meaning.

SL text 6

عبارة عن أداة صغيرة تترك طبعة دائرية على الطين الطري. **"الختم الاسطواني"**

SL text	**"الختم الاسطواني"**
Significance of the SL text	Stamp made of hard stone, glass or ceramic.

Translator	Rendering	Strategy used	Meaning appropriateness
Translator 1	Stamp seal	Adaptation	_
Translator 2	bulla	Adaptation	_
translator 3	Cylinder seal	Literal translation	+
Translator 4	Royal cartouche	Adaptation	_

Vol. 1, No. 2 , 2026 (63 - 74)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jndh.v1.i2.a4

Discussion

In this example the archaic term الختم الاسطواني designates the meaning of a stamp made of a stone or clay, engraved with administrative, religious, or decorative designs. When rolled across wet clay, it leaves a continuous, raised impression. It is used to authenticate identity and authorize legal documents. Regarding the renderings, translator 3 rendering is considered adequate for the SL text since it conforms with the intended meaning of the original text. However, translators 1, 2, and 4 renderings are deemed improper translations of the original language since they do not accurately convey the intended meaning.

Conclusions

1- Translating archaic terms represents an intricate and complicated task for translators.
2- The difficulty emanates from linguistic and cultural differences between old Sumerian and Assyrian civilizations and contemporary English language.
3- Only proficient translators with profound knowledge of Iraqi old civilizations can handle the task of translating such terms appropriately.

References

1. Aziz, Y. (1989). *A Contrastive Grammar of English and Arabic*. Mosul, University of Mosul.
2. Aziz, Y.Y. and Lataiwish, M.S. (2000). *Principles of Translation*. Beni-Ghazi: Qar-Younis University Press.
3. Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course book on Translation*. Canada: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.
4. Baker, M. (1992*). In other words*: A coursebook on translation. Routledge.
5. Bastin, G. (2001). *Introduction to translation*. *Meta*, *50*(3), 797-799.
6. Bing, H. X. (2006). "*Translating Cultural-Specific Items*: A Descriptive Study". Sino-US English Teaching 3/12, 82- 93.
7. Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Catford, J.C. (1965). *A linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
9. Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's.
10. Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
11. Dancette, J. (1997). "*Mapping Meaning and Comprehension in Translation: Theoretical and Experimental Issues*". In: *Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting* [Applied Psychology, Vol. 3.], J. Danks et al. (eds.), Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
12. Farghal, M. and Shunnaq, A. (1999). *Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide*. Irbid: Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.
13. Fuertes-Olivera, P. A., & Velasco-Sacristán, M. S. (2010). *Specialised dictionaries for learners*. Walter de Gruyter. [ISBN: 9783110231328].
14. Ghazala, H. (1994). *Stylistic Translation English-Arabic*. Paris: FIT Publications.
15. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004*). An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

16. Hejwowski, K. (2004). *The Cognitive – Communicative Theory of Translation*. Warszawz: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
17. House, J. (2006). *Text and context in translation*. Journal of Pragmatics, 38(3), 338–358. doi.org.
18. *Juridica e Institucional*, Granada: Comares. 69–83.
19. Kearns, J. (2009). "Strategies". In: M. Baker and G. Saldanha (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (pp.282-285). London: Routledge.
20. Krings, H. P. (1986). "*Translation Problems and Translation Strategies of Advanced German Learners of French* (L2)". In: J. House & S. Blum-
21. Kuepper, K. J. (1977). *Literary Translation and the Problem of Equivalency*. *Meta*, *22*(4), 243–251. https://doi.org/10.7202/003357ar.
22. Lorscher, W. (1991). *Translation Performance, Translation Process, and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tubingen: G. Narr.
23. McGuire, B. S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
24. Nemet-Nejat, M. (1991). *Translation and Style*. Internet Publishing, pp.98-100.
25. Newmark, P. (1982). *About Translation.* Bristol: longman Press.
26. Newmark, P. (1982). *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
27. Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R (1974).*The Theory and Practice of Translation.* E.J. Brill, Leiden.Schaffner, C. (2012). *"Press conferences and recontextualisation*". Alonso Araguas Iciar, Jesus Baigorri Jalon and Helen L. Campbell, eds. *Ensayos Sobre Traduccion*
28. Nida, E.A. and Taber, C.R. (1974). *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.
29. Nida, Eugene A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. j. Brill, 1964.
30. Obeidat, H.A. (1998). "*Stylistic Aspects in Arabic and English Translated Literary Texts*: A Contrastive Study". In: Meta. Vol. Xiii, No.3, PP. 1-9.
31. Popovič, A. (1967). Die Stellung der Übersetzung in der Kultur der Gegenwart [*The position of translation in contemporary culture*]. In Preklad včera a dnes (pp. 37–51). Slovenský spisovateľ.
32. Ray, P.S. (1962). "*A Philosophy of Translation*". In: Babel. Vol. Iii, No.4, PP.182-188.
33. Robberecht, P. (1982). *"Linguistics and Translation*". In: *IRAL*. Vol. XXX3, pp.217-227.
34. Savory, T. (1968). "*The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd.
35. Steiner (1975) Steiner, G. (1975). After Babel: *Aspects of language and translation.* Oxford University Press.
36. Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. Edward Arnold, London.
37. Vinay, Jean Paul and Jean Darbelnet, *Stylistia Comparee du Francais et de L'anglais*, Didier, Paris, 1958.
38. Wang Yao & Li Jingna. (2019). *The Evaluative Potential and Significance of Archaic Words in Legal English. Contemporary Foreign Language Studies,* (6).
39. Wendland, E. R. (2000). "*Discourse and Style in Translation*: *Literary, Multimedia and Religious Perspectives"*. In: *Translation as Text and Discourse*. Internet Publishing, II, pp.1-6.