

Contrastive Study of Relativization in English and Persian Translation in Light of Mismatches in Julian House's Model: A Case Study of *Lord of the Flies*

Mahdiyeh Sadat Miri

Department of English Translation, Faculty of Humanities, Tolue-e-Mehr Institute of Higher Education, Qom, Iran

Email: mirimahdieh1377@gmail.com

Abstract:

Translation is an important part of people's life in order to have communication and conception of other people's cultures. This research aimed to find the similarities and differences between two Persian translation, and also to found what mismatches occur in the translation. This research includes the source text by a well-known book, *Lord of the Flies*, and two Persian translations by Susan Ardakani and Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam. This research aimed to compare these two translations and found the similarities and differences between them. After the comparison is accomplished, the researcher attempted to draw another comparison between these two translations and the original text based on House's model of TQA. The research tended to find the mismatches of relativization in these two translations. Relativization includes *who*, *which*, and *where* and they refer to people, things, and places respectively. Relative clauses are the same both in Persian and English translations as a result; there are many mismatches, which happen in these kinds of translations. Therefore, the major aim of this research is to find the mismatches in these two Persian translations to understand which one is better and conveys a better meaning, and is more understandable based on House's model of TQA. The research tended to find the mismatches of relativization in these two translations. Relativization includes *who*, *which*, and *where* and they refer to people, things, and places respectively. Relative clauses are the same both in Persian and English translations as a result; there are many mismatches, which happen in these kinds of translations. Therefore, the major aim of this research is to find the mismatches in these two Persian translations to understand which one is better and conveys a better meaning, and is more understandable based on House's model..

Keywords:

Relativization, Mismatches, House's model translation quality assessment (TQA)

I. Introduction

The history of comparative linguistics (originally known as comparative philosophy) goes back to the 18th century when scholars began to compare different languages systematically and scientifically in order to find out whether there were similarities between them. Translating is an operation performed on source and target languages. The operation is based on a systematic comparison of two linguistic systems and the function they each perform (Catford1965). The linguistics approach to translation theory focuses on the issues of meaning, equivalence, and shift, known as structural linguistics, and features the work of Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida, Newmark, Vinay, Darbelnet, and Catford. Later on, some theorists realized that language is not just about the structure, but also about the way it is used

in a given social context. (Catford1965). It is supposed to say that, translation project can be considered as one of important factor in the human generation so translators should do their best to translate text or book in a best quality. The text refers to the source language document, which is to be translated. The desirability of translating a particular text must be determined. Texts are chosen to be translated for various reasons. Most often, it is to communicate certain information to people speaking another language or it may be to share the enjoyment of the source text.

The translator should examine his reason for choosing the text and the potential for its use by the receptor language audience. The lexical item of a language represents a great network of interrelated meaning often called a cognitive network. Different approaches to the analysis of this network will highlight different aspects of the semantic structure of the language. Studying the lexicon is the principle that meaning can be discovered only in terms of semantic contrast. We have already stressed the fact that different languages have different concentrations of vocabulary, depending on the culture, geographical location, and the people around the world. Sometimes, distinctions proposed in the literature are abandoned by newer proposals, for example when morphology is considered as entirely syntactic, or at least so similar to syntax as to warrant the assumption that there is no separate morphological component after all (as in Chomsky1965). In other cases, the classic subdivisions are not only retained but carried further. In some theories, certain grammatical subcomponents are themselves deconstructed into further parts. In Minimalist frameworks, the syntax is divided up into core syntax, and a separate branch of the grammatical architecture taking care of the mapping to PF of core syntactic representations (Chomsky 2007, 2008; Chomsky et al.2019, a. o.). In yet other cases, subdivisions are created that run orthogonally to the classic subdivisions. Inflectional morphology is considered a part of the syntax, but the word formation is considered a separate component (as part of a computational conception of the lexicon, cf. Chomsky1970; Anderson1982).

Idiomatic translations use the natural form of the receptor language both in the grammatical constructions and in the choice of lexical items. Therefore, a good translator will try to translate the idiomatic translation. The translator's goal should be to reproduce a text in the receptor language. A text which communicates the same message as the source language, but uses the natural grammatical and lexical choices of the receptor languages. Idiomatic translations reproduce the meaning of the source language in the form of the receptor language. However, there is a danger of interference from the form of the source language.

The similarities and differences lie in grammatical structures, pronunciation, legume, and other aspects of the language. In addition, English and Persian come from different cultures. Learning has its own interactive function because in this matter people can communicate with each other. This paper aims to discuss two languages: English and Persian through the study of relativization. Relativization is the essential part of the language and it is related to the grammar and structure which are hard to learn lots of students and native speakers have a problem with these matters for there are lots of similarities and differences between these two languages and that makes it hard to learn. On the whole, this paper attempts to compare, and contrast the two languages and analyze the existing mismatches in the Persian translations of the selected novel.

II. Review of Literature

Catford (1965) makes a distinction between total translation which involves translation at all levels such as grammar, Lexis, phonological, and graphological levels, and restricted translation, which involves translation at one or two levels. Finally, based on rank, Catford differentiates between rank-bound translation and unbounded translation. The unbounded translation is also called literal translation and is rank free. Newmark believes that “we do translate words because there is nothing else in a page to translate” (1988, P:193). Generally speaking, we can say that translation is a text processing and a text reproducing activity that leads from a source text to a resulting text. Other types of text-producing activities are commenting, summarizing, interpreting, adapting a text for a different group of addressers, and transposing the text into another medium. What sets off translation from all these text processing activities is that translation is based on an act of creating a relation of equivalence between a source text in one language and its resulting translation in another language. (Catford,1965). The translation should also employ equivalent pragmatic means for achieving that function. In Williams' view, “Translation has always been connected with the notion of quality. For centuries translation quality has been central for various reasons. Such as “aesthetic, religious, political, pedagogical, administrative, and economic” (Williams, 2004: xiii). Apart from the motives, people have always strived to produce a good translation. Today perhaps more than ever before the issue of quality in translation deserves discussion (Williams, 2004,as cited in Ludmila, N.2012).

III. Research Method

3.1 Design of the Study

The design of this study is a qualitative-comparative one in which its original text, Lord of the Flies, as a source text and its two Persian translations as a target text, will be read thoroughly. Then the target text going to assessed only compared to their source language to see which one is more qualified and suitable for this so-called book based on House's model of translation quality assessment. Translation or implementation studies use case study methods with small sample sizes. Methodological approaches that systematize findings from these types of studies are needed to improve rigor and advance the field. Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) is a method and an analytical approach that can advance implementation science.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

This research was done based on House's model (1957). House's model is based on the translation quality assessment, translation is not only a linguistic act it is a way to communicate, In his opinion, translation is the major component of the target text. He defined translation as the relationship between the original text and its translation, and the consequences which view these relationships when one wants to distinguish a translation from other types of multilingual text production (House, 2015:8). His translation quality assessment is based on pragmatic which is the correlation between linguistics and its uses in a given communication situation. The translation quality assessment is not just only based on pragmatics, it is based on communication too. (House, 2015:8). In House's idea translation can be divided into two parts: covert translations and overt translations. Overt translations are not second originals; in overt translations, the original text is tied in a specific manner to the source language community and its culture. Covert translations which enjoy the status of an original source text in the target culture translations have different approaches including mentalist view, behaviorist view, and functionalist 'skopos ' relativized. (House, 2015:8).

After deciding about the needed type of translation in order to assess the quality of translation covert and overt, House introduces the genre of the text which is registered to capture the connection between text and the micro context. As mentioned by House's model "If a translation text is to fulfill the requirement of a dimensional, and as a result of this, a functional match, then any mismatch along the dimensions is an error. Such dimensional errors were referred to as covertly erroneous errors. These were differentiated from those overtly erroneous errors which resulted either from a mismatch of the denotative meanings of source and translation text elements or from a breach of the target language system." (House, 2015:8).

In his opinion, a translation text fulfills the requirement of a dimensional and as a result of this functional match, any mismatch along the dimensions is an error. The qualitative judgment of a translation text consists of listening both covertly and overtly translation but the mismatches happen frequently in the covert errors: 1. The socio-cultural norms or more specifically the norm conditioned expectations generated by the text. 2. The differences between the two languages are such that they can largely be overcome in translation. Far more mismatches happen in social role relationships. There are different approaches to translation quality assessment:

1. Text and discourse-oriented approaches
2. Psycho-social approaches
3. Response-based approaches
4. Philosophical, social-cultural, and socio-political approaches
5. Linguistically Oriented Approaches

The first one of them is the psycho-social approach under which is the mentalist view. The mentalist view was reflected as the subjective, intuitive, and anecdotal judgment of mostly lay people who talked about how good or how bad one finds a translation in old centuries. In the majority of cases, these judgments are based on simple impressions and feelings. Hermeneutic translation scholars believe that the quality of a translated text is linked to translation. Most mentalist approaches to translation evaluation emphasize the belief that the quality of a translation depends on the translators' subjective decisions which in turn to experience.

The second one is response-based translation approaches, which fall into two parts:

1. Behavioristic views
2. Functionalistic skopos-related views

Behavioristic views: Nida believes that several behavioral tests enable translation to evaluate and formulate a more objective statement about the quality of a translation. The test which is used in the approaches has used criteria such as intangibility and infectiveness. Functionalistic skopos related views: these translations move towards the consideration of the extinguish setting of a translation. functionalistic or skopos-oriented approach to translation either downplay the equivalence to a special form of adequacy or completely abandon it. The skopos or purpose is the most important factor in translation. This means that in my view the skopos theory is not very useful for translation quality assessment.

The third part is related to the text and discourse-oriented approaches: the first part of this section is related to the descriptive translation studies: equivalence in this approach is considered 'of little importance in itself.' In the descriptive historical approach, a translation is evaluated in terms of forms and functions. The focus of the descriptive is 'actual translation.'

translations are seen as cultural factors and facts of cultures that host them. Translation activities are both norm-governed and culturally significant. Toury claims that the issue of equivalence has a historical root and is crucial in translation studies.

The fourth is philosophical, socio-cultural, and socio-political approaches: In a plea for making translations and translators more visible adherents of these approaches focus on the 'Hidden persuader' in texts whose ulterior often power-related motives are to be brought into the open.

The fifth and the last one is linguistically oriented approaches: the linguistic approach attempts to explicate the relationship between the features of a text and how are proved by authors, translators, and readers. Reiss claims that different types of texts can be differentiated based on the linguistic basic functions of the languages.

Malinowski (1923) classified the functions of a language into two basic ones: the pragmatic and the magical or ritual function. The latter is associated with religious and ceremonial activities in the culture. The pragmatic or practical function was further sub-classified into active and narrative. It is broad enough to cover what is called the symbolic or representational function in other classificatory systems.

Ogden and Richards, in their classic work *The Meaning of Meaning*, differentiate five functions of a language: symbolization of reference, expression of attitude to the listener, expression of attitude to the referent, promotion of effects intended, and support of reference (1946: 227). Having grouped, all functions save the first one, as forming a complex of what they call 'emotive functions' (1946: 229). The authors differentiate two basic functions: the symbolic use of language and the emotive-evocative use of language. In the former, the correctness of the symbolization and the truth of the reference are most important; in the emotive evocative use of language, the character of the attitude aroused in the addressees is of prime importance.

3.3 Procedure

As mentioned before the book *Lord of the Flies* as the original and source text which was a best seller in 1984 by William Golding who is a well-known English writer and poet has been selected. To do this study, the whole text was compared with its two Persian translations by Susan Ardakani and Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam. As the moral based on which this study is done introduces no type of measurement, so the assessment is based on House's model of translation quality assessment. Therefore, this study is an attempt to assess the grammatical points, similarities, and differences between these translations. First of all, the researcher tries to read the text thoroughly, and then compares it with the translations based on House's model of translation quality statement to find different kinds of mismatches and errors.

3.4 The Book

Lord of the Flies is a 1954 debut novel by Nobel Prize-winning British author William Golding. The book focuses on a group of British boys stranded on an uninhabited island and their disastrous attempt to govern themselves. Themes include the tension between groupthink and individuality, rational and emotional reactions, and morality and immorality. The novel has been generally well received. It was selected as one of the 100 Best Novels in the Modern Library, it reached number 41 on the editor's list, and 25 on the reader's list. In 2003 it was listed at number 70 on the BBC's *The Big Read* poll, and in 2005 *Time Magazine* named it one of the 100 best English-language novels from 1923 to 2005. *Time* also included

the novel in its list of the 100 Best Young-Adult Books of All Time. Popular reading in schools, especially in the English-speaking world, a 2016 UK poll saw Lord of the Flies ranked third in the nation's favorite books from school. This book is translated by two people, Susan Ardakani and Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam.

3.5 The Translators

Susan Ardakani and Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam are two translators of Lord of the Flies. Susan Ardakani is a Persian translator who was born in 1333 and she translated some other books such as the call of the wild, Jack London, Daddy long legs, and many more. Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam is an assistant professor of English literature and translator of many books.

IV. Result and Discussion

Both versions of translations have some flaws in translating the relative clauses, however, in the translation of Susan Ardakani there are more flaws. According to the total research conducted on the two novels and scrutiny of all the relative clauses, we reach to this conclusion that 70% of the translation of the relative clauses out of 100% in Susan Ardakani's version suffer from mismatches and that of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam is about 20%, thus the translation of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam out of 100% is closer to the source language and is more qualified and suitable than that of Susan Ardakani. The Persian translation of Susan Ardakani is not near to the target language, and the source text is translated more literally. Furthermore, the meaning is a bit hard to understand, the name of one of the characters, Piggy, is translated to **خوک چه** which should not have been like that. About the translation of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam, there are fewer flaws of relative clauses and the translation of the source text is closer to the target language and characters' names are not translated in the novel.

There are many mismatches of relative clauses in Susan Ardakani's translation.

1. And this is what the cabin done. **ا ست مساف ران ک اب ین ک ار هم این**

Here the word 'what' is a kind of relative clause that should be translated into **که** but there is no translation with this meaning.

2. That's right. Can not catch my breath. I was the only boy in our school what had asthma.

دا شد تم ت نگی ن فس من ف قطمان مدر سه ت وی می گ یره ن فسم آره

In this sentence, there are many mismatches of omission, like 'that's right' is not translated completely and the word 'what' which is related to the relative clauses is not translated.

**ب و دم پ سری ت نها من می گ یره ن فسم در سد ته شود ت رجمه صورت این ب ه جمله این ا ست ب ه تر
دا شد تم ت نگی ن فس که مدر سمان ت وی**

3. I don't care what they call me.

ن ی ست مطرح خودم اسم من ب رای

This sentence is translated in a formal way without translating the other parts like the relative clause.

This sentence should be translated like this:

م یزندن دامص چی که دم نومی اهی تی

4. So long as they don't call me what they used to call me at school.

راضیم نزنند صدایم بدزدندگ داشتته روبرو مدرسه توی که اسمی به که قدر همین

In this sentence, the translation of the relative clause is observed.

5. He took off his glasses and looked vainly for something with which to clean them.

کند پاک راعینکش شپشه آن باتاگشت می چیزی دن بال بهیوده برداشت راعینکش

In this sentence, the meaning of relative clauses of که is translated into تا for having a better meaning in the sentence.

6. did not you hear what the pilot said?

گفت؟ چی خلبان نشنیدی مگر تو وانند نمی آذان

In this sentence, the use of the translation of the relative clause is not very necessary, but it can be better because the translation itself has a good meaning. It also can be said like this:

گفت؟ چی خلبان که نشنیدی مگر تو وانند نمی آذان

7. But the vivid phantoms of his daydream still interposed between him and piggy, who in this context was an irrelevance.

او اوهم دنای از که خوک چه او میان اش زنده خیالات و روزانه های رویا سایه هنوز حال باین
بپگانه
انداخت می فاصله بد

In this sentence, there is no problem with the relative clauses.

8. That was what you mean, did not you?

نه؟ مگر بدو همین مقصودت هم تو

In this sentence, there is no translation for the relative clause, but there is no problem with it.

9. Piggy muttered the name to himself and then shouted it to Ralf, who was not interested because he was still blowing.

کرد بازگ و رالف برای بدند صدای باران آن بدو کردت کرار لب زیر را جانی اسم خوک چه
هیچ رالف
دمیدی صدف در هنوز چون داشت آذان به توجهی

In this sentence again the relative clause 'who' is not translated, but there is no need at all, if we added that, it would be like this:

کردن بازگشت و رالف بر روی بلند صدای باران آن بعد و کردت کرار لب زیر را جانی اسم خود چه هیچ که رالف دمیدی صدف در هنوز چون نداشت آن به توجهی

10. Three small children no older than Jonny appeared from startling close at hand where they had been gorging fruit in the forest.
در شدند نمایان نمودند می جانی و سال سن هم که که و چک پ سر چه سه ناگهان کمی فاصله از مشغول آنجا بدند زندگی های میوه بدیدن

V. Conclusion

In this research we tried to apply the theory of House's model of translation quality assessment to two Persian translation models of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam and Susan Ardakani. The aim of this research was to compare the two Persian translations with each other in terms of mismatches and relative clauses based on House's model of translation quality assessment. About the question number 1: Many similarities and differences existed between the relative clauses of Persian and English. Relative clauses in the Persian translation are may be similar to English translation as a result, many translators may have problems in translating such sentences. Relative clauses have long been examined in research both in Persian and English and due to their close similarity in these two languages it is to some extent difficult to recognize them. About the question number 2: As relative clauses in both English and Persian may be similar and frequent mismatches and mistakes may occur in translations and as a result many translators and translators confront such errors and mismatches. About the question number: Mismatches can be considered as errors and are divided into two groups namely covertly erroneous error and overtly erroneous errors. Covertly erroneous errors refer to dimensional errors and overtly erroneous errors refer to non-dimensional errors. According to House (2005), covertly erroneous errors result from mismatches of one situational dimensional with a similar one in target text. Overtly erroneous errors result from non-dimensional errors and appear in a translation text as follows: They might appear in a sentence which are not translated or have a slight change in meaning, in a sentence with a significant change in meaning, or in a sentence with a distortion of meaning and finally breach of the source language system, creative translation, and cultural filter.

About the question number 4: According to the entire research done on these two translations, we reach to this conclusion that Susan Ardakani's translation has 70% and Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam has 20% of mismatches in relative clauses. As a result, A better translation is one which has fewer flaws and mismatches, thus Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam's version of translation is more qualified, suitable and closer to the target language. The purpose of this research was to compare these two translations with each other in order to identify which one is better and fits the original text or which one is more understandable.

This research compared the similarities and differences of the relative clauses between the two languages and recognized the frequent errors and mismatches which a native speaker might confront. The research also investigated mismatches present in *Lord of the Flies* and explicated the nature of them. Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam's translation seems to be more qualified and appropriate than Susan Ardakani's based on House's TQA model and relativization. Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam's translation is very close to the target language. As far as we know, there are many similarities and differences between the relative clauses of English and Persian languages. Thus, in the translation of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam, many

of these things have been observed and most of the relative clauses have been translated, and there are a few mismatches and errors.

1. Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam's translation is translated into the native language, the translation is very fluent and very close to the target language, and it is easy to understand what the meaning of the translation is. There are not many problems in the translation of Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam in terms of related structures. All the names of the characters in the novel have been translated in the same way because the names of the characters are better not to be translated, and in Nahid Shahbazi Moghadam's translation, such a case has been fully observed.
2. Susan Ardakani's translation is not close to the readers' mind and is not fluent, and there are many errors and mismatches in the translation of the relative clauses. About the name of the characters of this novel Susan Ardakani have translated 'piggy' to 'خوکچه' which does not have a major problem or it is not very necessary, but it is better not to translate the name of the characters because it causes the concept of translation to be lost and it may lead to readers' confusion. The other problem is that Susan Ardakani's translation had been done literally and is not too much understandable for the readers.

References

- Akbari, A., & Segers, W. (2017). Evaluation of translation through the proposal of error typology: An explanatory attempt. *Lebende Sprachen*, 62(2), 408-430.
- Barkhordar, S. Y. ., & Fatemi, R. . (2020). A Comparison between the Translation
- Basirizadeh, F, Raoufzadeh,N, Zaheri Birgani,SH, Khoshgam,M. An Adlerian Reading of Personality Development in Emma Donoghue's Room. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal* Volume 6, No 3, August 2023, Page: 221-227.
- Basirizadeh, F, Raoufzadeh,N, Zaheri Birgani,SH. The Study of Spurt of Blood in the lens of The Theatre of Cruelty. *Linglit Journal: Scientific Journal of Linguistics and Literature*. Vol. 3, No. 1, March 2022, Page: 31-36
- Dichotomies Suggested by Juliane House and Lawrence Venuti. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 1(2), 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v1i2.13>
- Dehghani, M, Badirizadeh,F,Mostafa Rahimirad, M. zaheri Birgani,SH, Raoufzadeh,N. The Effect of Covid-19 pandemic on Online Education on EFL Learners. *Tobacco regulatory science* 8 (1), 4047-4059
- Boase-Beier, J., Fisher, L., & Furukawa, H. (2018). *The Palgrave Handbook of Literary Translation*. Springer.
- Buhrig, K., House, J., & Ten Thije, J. (2014). *Translational action and intercultural communication*. Routledge.
- Golding, W. (1987). *Lord of the Flies: Casebook Edition*. Penguin.
- Golding, W., (1396). *Lord of the Flies* (S. Ardakani, Trans.).Tehran. Abre Sefid.
- Golding, W. (1954). *Translation quality assessment*. London: Faber and Faber DOI (<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315752839>)
- Golding, W., (1396). *Lord of the Flies* (N.shahbazi Moghadam, Trans.).Tehran.Amot Publisher.
- House, J. (2001). Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation. *Meta: journal des traducteurs/ Meta: translators' Journal*, 46(2), 243-257.
- House, J. (2010). Overt and covert translation. *Handbook of translation studies*, 1, 245-246.
- House, J. (2013). Assessing Translation. *The Companion to Language Assessment*, 1, 248-264.

- House, J. (2014a). Translation quality assessment: Past and present. In *Translation: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 241-264). Springer.
- House, J. (2014b). *Translation: a multidisciplinary approach*. Springer.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.
- House & J.D. ten Thije (Eds.), *Translatory Action and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 1- 6). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Karimi Alavijeh, K. (2020). Source of Errors in English Headless Relative Clauses Produced by Persian Learners/Speakers of English. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 9(2), 185-217.
- Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham, MD. New York and London: University Press of America.
- Malcolm, W. (2004). Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-Centered Approach. In: Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Mossop, B. (2004). Malcolm Williams. Translation Quality Assessment: An Argumentation-Centred Approach. Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 2004, 188 p. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 17(2), 185-190.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. Routledge.
- Redelinghuys, K. (2016). Levelling-out and register variation in the translations of experienced and inexperienced translators: a corpus-based study. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics*, 45(1), 189-220.
- Shyam, R. (2007). Translating Evaluative Discourse: the Semantics of Thick and Thin Concepts.
- Steiner, E., & Yallop, C. (2001). *Exploring translation and multilingual text production: Beyond content* (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter.
- Sudarsono, S. (2021). Relative Clause Transfer Strategy and the Implication on Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 9(4), 452-461.
- Wiesmann, E. (2019). Machine translation in the field of law: A study of the translation of Italian legal texts into German. *Comparative Legilinguistics*, 37, 117-153.
- Wilson, P. (2018). The Restored New Testament of Willis Barnstone. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Literary Translation* (pp. 231-249). Springer.
- Xiang, X. (2009). Contrastive linguistics: history, philosophy and methodology. In: Taylor & Francis.