

Original Research Article

Study of Nida's (formal and dynamic equivalence) and Newmark's (semantic and communicative translation) translating theories on two short stories

Shabnam Shakernia

Abstract

M.A. in Translation Studies, Working
as a Translator

E-mail:
shabnam_shakernia@yahoo.com

This study aimed to investigate the use of Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence and Newmark's Semantic and communicative translation on two short stories. The present study aimed to investigate which of these approaches are the main focuses of the translators in the translations of the two short stories. In order to systematically conduct the study, two short stories with their corresponding Persian translations were analyzed. The findings obtained from the analysis show that the readability of the translation especially in short stories is more important than preserving the original wording. Moreover, the findings manifest that these translations are also tried to have naturalness.

Keywords: Formal and dynamic equivalence, Semantic and communicative translations, Stories, Translators, Naturalness

INTRODUCTION

This paper tends to introduce Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence and Newmark's semantic and communicative translation. Nida and Newmark are two outstanding western theories in the field of translation. Both of them have rich experience in translation and they have written many articles and theoretical works on translation. Nida's approaches in translation are formal and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in the both form and content. However, dynamic equivalence is seeking the closest natural equivalence to the source – language message. Newmark's semantic and communicative translations like Nida's are great contribution to the translation study in the world. Semantic translation attempts to render as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original. However, Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained

on the readers of the original.

Semantic Translation is more complex, awkward, more detailed and concentrated, however, Communicative Translation is more smoother, simple, Clearer, more direct and conventional.

This paper also works on two English short stories and compares them with their different translations which were done by some different translators to identify their works are intended to be Formal or dynamic equivalence, be Semantic or Communicative translation, through their specific features.

Nida's and Newmark's translation theories

Pre – linguistic period of writing on translation, was dated from Cicero through St. Jerome, Luther, Dryden, Tytler, Herder, Goethe, Schleiermacher, Buber, Ortega, y Gasset, and the opinion between literal and free, faithful

and beautiful, exact and natural translation was changed, depending on whether their intention was to for the author or the reader, the source or the target language of the text. Up to the nineteenth century, literal translation was concentrated by the translators. In the nineteenth century, a more scientific approach was brought. It suggested that certain types of texts must be accurately translated, while other texts could not be translated. However, modern linguistics supported this fact to focus on the reader and it was shown notably in Nida, Firth, Koller and the Leipzig school. Nida took the old terms such as literal, free and faithful translation away in favor of two basic types of equivalence: (1) Formal equivalence and (2) dynamic equivalence

Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence translation

Nida argued that there are two different types of equivalence, namely formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Formal equivalence tries to remain as close to the original text as possible, without adding the translator's ideas and thoughts into the translation. Thus, the more literal the translation is, the less danger there is of corrupting the original message. This is therefore much more of a word – for – word view of translation. The problem with this form of translation is that it assumes a moderate degree of familiarity with the subject matter on the part of the reader. The King James Version (KJV) and English Standard Version (ESV) are two examples of this kind of translation. KJV and ESV are English translations from the Hebrew of the opening of Genesis, the first book of the Old Testament of the Christian Bible.

Most printings of the KJV specially mark words (using Square brackets or italics) that are implied but not actually in the original source text, since words must sometimes be added to have valid English grammar.

However, dynamic equivalence is an approach to translation in which the original language is translated "thought for thought" rather than "word for word" as in formal equivalence. Dynamic equivalence involves taking each sentence (or thought) from the original text and rendering it into a sentence in the target language that conveys the same meaning, but does not necessarily use the exact phrasing or idioms of the original. The idea is to improve readability by rephrasing constructions that could be confusing when literally translated, but retain some faithfulness to the original text rather than creating a complete paraphrase. Because dynamic equivalence sacrifices some faithfulness to the original text to achieve a more natural translation, it is designed to be used when the readability of the translation is more important than preserving the original wording. For example, a novel could be translated with dynamic equivalence so that reads well, but in international diplomacy the exact original meaning may be very important, so formal equivalence would be more suited. Dynamic equivalence

is useful when the original language is very different from the target language, making a more literal translation difficult to understand. The term "dynamic equivalence" is usually used in the context of Bible translations.

The New Living Translation (NLT) is an example of a translation uses dynamic equivalence. The New International Version (NIV) attempts to strike a balance between dynamic and formal equivalence; some place it is a dynamic equivalence "translation, while others place it as leaning more towards "formal equivalence".

An example of these differences can be found in John 17:6. the ESV (English Standard Version) a more literal translation, translates the original as "I have manifested your name", while the NIV (a translation that uses dynamic equivalence) uses the phrase " I have revealed you". The NIV is simpler, and is thus easier for an English reader to understand. However, the NIV translation omits the fact that in the original God's name.

Since in the following verses he specifically prays about God's name, the connection between this statement and other verses (including the ones that immediately follow) is eliminated by this less literal translation.

Nida's definitions of formal and dynamic equivalence in 1964 consider cultural implications for translation.

According to him, a "gloss translation" mostly typifies formal equivalence where form and content are reproduced as faithfully as possible and the TL reader is able to "understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression" of the SL context. Contrasting with this idea, dynamic equivalence, tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture" without insisting that he "understand the cultural patterns of the source – language context". According to him problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned. Nida cites his examples from Bible translation, where the phrase "Lamb of God" would be rendered into "seal of God" for the Eskimos because the Lamb doesn't symbolize innocence in their culture. In this case, a literal translation (formal equivalence) doesn't mean anything in a different culture, so the dynamic equivalence is necessary.

Completely unambiguous formal translation of larger works is more goal than reality, if only because one language may contain a word for a neologism may be created in the target language to represent the concept (sometimes by borrowing a word from the source language). The more the source language differs from the target language, the more difficult it may be to understand a literal translation on the other hand, formal equivalence can sometimes allow readers familiar with the source language to see how meaning was expressed in the original text, preserving untranslated idioms, rhetorical devices (such as chiasmic structure in the Hebrew Bible), and diction.

Contrast of formal and dynamic equivalence

Those who prefer literal or formal equivalence believe that literal translation is closer to the original, therefore it is better. Those who prefer free or dynamic equivalence suggest that such translations enable people to better understand the original, therefore it is better. The problem with formal equivalence is that it might demand too much of some readers. The problem with dynamic equivalence is that the reader encounters the text with most of the decisions already made and must assume that the work of the translators is not prejudicial.

His introductions of the concepts of formal and dynamic equivalence were crucial in introducing a receptor – based orientation to translation theory. However, both the principle of equivalent effect and the concept of equivalence have come to be heavily criticized for a number of reasons. Van den Broeck and Larose consider equivalent effect or response to be impossible. In deed, the whole question of equivalence inevitably entails subjective judgment from the translator or analyst.

The criticism that Nida's work is subjective raises the question of whether Nida's theory of translation really is scientific. Also, it was debatable whether a translator follows these procedures in practice. Edwin Gentzler (1993) denigrates Nida's work for its theological and proselytizing stand point with the concept that dynamic equivalence serves the purpose of converting the receptors, no matter what their culture, to the dominant discourse and ideas of protestant Christianity.

Despite the heated debate it has provoked, Nida's systematic linguistic approach to translation has been influential on many subsequent and prominent translation scholars, among them Peter Newmark in the UK.

Newmark's semantic and communicative translation

Newmark takes Bühler's functional theory of language as his theoretical basis. According to Bühler, language has three main functions: the expressive, the informative and the vocative. Every original text exercises at the same time these three main functions, with a difference in the significance of each function in the text.

Texts are classified into three broad categories according to their dominant function. The core of the expressive function is the mind of the speaker, the writer, the originator of the utterance. He uses the utterance to express his feelings irrespective of any response. Serious imaginative literature, authoritative statements, autobiography, essays and personal correspondence are typical expressive text – types.

The core of the informative of language is external situation, the facts of a topic, reality outside language, including reported ideas or theories. Informative texts are concerned with any topic of knowledge and often have standard formats: a text book, a technical report, a

scientific paper or agenda of a meeting. They principally convey information.

The core of the vocative function of language is the readership, the addressee. The readership is called upon to act, think or feel, or in a word, to react in the way intended by the text. Notices, publicity, propaganda, persuasive writing and advertisements are typical vocative texts.

When faced with a text the translator has to ask himself several questions: To which text – type does it belong? Should the focus of translation be on the author or on the readership? The conflict of loyalties, the gap between emphasis on source and target language will always remain as the overriding problem in translation theory and practice. Newmark suggests narrowing the gap by replacing the old terms with those of semantic and communicative translation, with the former mainly for expressive texts and the latter mainly for informative and vocative. The distinction between semantic translation and communicative translation is that the former focuses on the meaning while the latter on the effect. As Newmark remarks in his approaches to translation, semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original while communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original semantic translation is basically focused on the writer of the source language text and follows his thought – processes. It tends to be more complex, more detailed, and more awkward and it tends to over translate. It remains within the original culture and language as much as possible. Communicative translation addresses itself solely to readers in the target language, who do not anticipate difficulties or obscurities and would expect a general transfer of foreign elements into his own culture and language where necessary. It tends to under translate, to be smoother, more direct, more idiomatic and easier to read. Syntax is remodeled and commoner words are used. But here the translator still has to respect and work on the form of the original text as the only basis for his work. In a communicative translation badly or inaccurately written passages should be corrected while in a semantic translation the translator is denied this freedom. In a word, semantic translation is individual, follows one single person (the author of the original text), communicative translation is social, concentrates on the message and the main force of the text and serves a large readership.

Most texts require communicative rather than semantic translation, since the number of informative and vocative texts far exceeds that of expressive texts. Most non – literary writings comprise material suitable for communicative translation. On the other hand, original expression, where the manner is as important as the matter, whether it is philosophical, political, technical or

literary, needs to be translated semantically. Autobiography, private correspondence and any other personal effusion also require a semantic translation, since the original is more important than the effect on the reader.

It is not thoughtful to say that a text requires a completely semantic or communicative translation. In a literary text there may be a sentence, a paragraph or a section that requires communicative translation. For instance, when a figurative usage can't be transferred or if transferred the form will be quite misleading or incomprehensible to the reader, and then it must be translated communicatively. On the other hand, there may be part of non – literary writing that requires a semantic translation. It is impossible to apply only one method to a text. The two methods are usually taken into use alternatively with varying focuses. And there are times when the two methods can't be distinguished from each other. They actually become one. For instance, if the translation of serious philosophical, artistic or technical works is not constrained by temporal or geographical elements and a rather close translation can render the reader in the target language with the same message and acquaint him with the stylistic features of the original language, there is no way and no necessity to identify which method is applied.

The description of communicative translation resembles Nida's dynamic equivalence in the effect it is trying to create on the TT reader, while semantic translation has similarities to Nida's formal equivalence.

From our general review of Newmark's semantic and communicative translation we can see clearly that Newmark differs from Nida mainly in that Newmark proposes different translation methods for different text – types while Nida regards that the function of a message is of overwhelming importance in translation. Nida stresses receptors' responses while Newmark emphasizes faithfulness not only to readers, but also to the author and the source text.

There is a basic difference in their attitude toward the importance of readers in the mind of the translator. Newmark's view is that the translator should attempt, on the basis of the variety of language used in the original, to characterize the readership of the original and then of the translation, and to decide how much attention he has to pay to the target language readers. He suggests that in the case of a poem or any work written primarily as self – expression the amount of attention is very little. His attention is distributed in accordance with the function of a text.

As the paper considered the content of these four approaches of translation, it tends to apply those approaches in tow English short stories with their several translations by different translators. It tends to clarify the function of these approaches in real texts to distinguish different approaches which were proposed by Nida and Newmark through their specific features which were

mentioned above. The first story which this paper is going to study is Animal Farm by George Orwell. And the second short story is OF Mice and Men by John Steinbeck. This paper is going to cover several paragraphs and compare them with different translations by different translators to identify whether the translators used Formal or dynamic equivalence, Semantic or Communicative translations.

DISCUSSION

Based on the features of Nidas' and Newmarks' approaches in Translation, this part of the paper is going to study some paragraphs in the first short story name Animal Farm by George Orwell and compares it with its different translations.

The first sample is the first paragraph of chapter 1:

Sample 1

Mr. Jones, of the Manor Farm,, had locked the hen – houses for the night, but was too drunk to remember to shut the pop – holes. With the ring of light from his lantern dancing from side to side, he lurched across the yard, kicked off his boots at the back door, drew himself a last glass of bear from the barrel in the scullery, and made his way up to bed, where Mrs. Jones was already snoring.

The first translation was done by Salehe Hosseini and Masoumeh Nabizadeh:

شب که شد آقای جونز، صاحب مزرعه اربابی، در مرغداری را قفل کرده بود، منتها از فرط مستی یادش رفته بود روزنه های بالای آن را ببندد. در حلقه روشنایی فانوسش که این سو و آن سو تاب می خورد، تلو تلو خوران از حیاط گذشت به در عقب که رسید چکمه اش را با شلنگه از پا در آورد و آخرین گیلای آبجو را از بشکه ظرفشورخانه پر کرد و راهش را کشید به تختخواب رفت. خانم جونز، تا بگویی چه، صدای خر و یوفش بلند شده بود.

FINDINGS

This translation is intended to follow dynamic equivalence of Nida because it does not use the exact phrase of ST (English) into TT (Persian). For example in English, there is (of the Manor Farm), however, it is rendered (صاحب مزرعه اربابی). In the English, we do not have the word which means the owner. However, in the translation in Persian, the owner is translated. Also, the place of phrases changed (some changes in structure). In translation, the first sentence is started by (شب که شد); However, In Original text, we have "for the night" as the equivalence.

It doesn't come at the beginning of the sentence in English, at first. Also, it is not literally meaning and translation. The last sentence in English "where Mrs. Jones was already snoring" is ren-

dered "خانم جونز، تا بگویی چه، صدای خور و پوفش بلند شده بود." in Persian. The way of its rendering goes to the TL language and culture in order to make the translation more natural in conveying the message and as it was said naturalness is the key of dynamic equivalence.

Now, based on Newmark's approaches, if this text is studied, it will be said that it is following communicative translation. This text is easy to read, it is direct. It addresses the readers in target language. It uses common words. It also concentrates on the message.

The second translation is rendered by Zeinab Alizadeh.

آقای جونز، مالک مزرعه ی مانو، شب در مرغانی را قفل کرد، ولی از شدت مستی فراموش کرد دریاچه ها را ببندد. در حالی که حلقه ی نور فانوس اش به این طرف و آن طرف می رقصید، تلوتلو خوران طول حیاط را پیمود، پشت در پوتین هایش را از پا در آورد و به سویی پرت کرد، آخرین گیلای آبجو را از بشکه ی آبدارخانه پر کرد و به طرف اتاق خواب در طبقه ی بالا رفت، در اتاق خواب خانم جونز در حال خر و پف کردن بود.

As it is shown, this rendering is almost intended to pursue formal equivalence because it tries to remain as close as to the original text, it tries to remain the original words and the syntax. For instance, in the sentence "his lantern dancing from side to side", she translated "فانوس اش به این " طرف و آن طرف می رقصید". On the other hand, the translator tried to simplify the use of the grammar and change the past perfect tense to past tenses in her renderings. So it makes the text somehow smoother. It shows that the translator interest is communicative translation as well as focusing on the source language text and follows his thought – process. In a way, in this translation, both methods are somehow used.

Sample 2

-Translation by Mr. Hosseini and Mrs. Nabizadeh

It is obvious that their renderings go to Dynamic equivalence. The readability is improved in this translation. The thought of the translator is involved in this rendering. So it goes to communicative translation. It is smooth, direct and easy to read. It also tends to the TL culture.

-Translation by Zeinab Alizadeh:

It mostly tried to remain the original form and content. It is focused on the author, so formal equivalence is involved. It also tries to have the exact contextual meaning of the original. It is almost literally translated. Therefore, it is semantic translation.

Sample 3

Translation by Mr. Hosseini and Mrs. Nabizadeh:

Their translation is much more subjective, It is focused on the TT readers, it also transfers foreign elements in the culture of TL (Persian): such as (آنقدر خون دل خوردند), (نگو و نپرس). So it tends to be communicative translation. It

is simpler, clearer, and conventional. Also, it is trying to have the closet natural equivalence to the SL text (message), so it is dynamic equivalence.

However, Translation by Zeinab Alizadeh tends to be Formal equivalent which it focused on the message itself, in both form and content of the SL text. It has loyalty to the ST author, It has tendency to over translate. The style of writing is like the original text. It is more detailed. So, Based on Newmarks' approaches, it is more semantic translation.

Sample 4

Translation by Mr. Hosseini and Mrs. Nabizadeh:

It is smoother, direct and easy to read. It doesn't have any obscurities for the Persian readers. It uses common words. Suppose, in the third sentence in English it is written "mingle", in rendering it is "قاطی شدن".

It uses common word and makes the translation more direct, or "rebellion in English text which is rendered "شورش".

However, in Mrs. Alizadeh translation it is "انقلاب", so it is shown in the first translated story, it uses more common words. This translation has the tendency to under translate. It doesn't go to the detailed. In short, it is communicative translation, and as it tries to remain naturalness of the original message, it is dynamic equivalence.

However, translation by Mrs. Alizadeh is almost semantic translation as it is so close to the form and content of the original text. It has literal translation as "spread" is translated "منتشر شدن" but in previous translation it was rendered "فرا گرفته بود". Or "sent out" in her translation, it is "می فرستادند". However, in previous rendering, it was "مامور می کردند".

Her translation is more concentrated and has tendency to over translate because it is more detailed.

Sample 5

Translation by Mr. Hosseini and Mrs. Nabizadeh:

They translated it very easily. They use more common words such as "عجیب و غریب" for: "mysterious" in English. Or excellent is translated "حرف نداشت" in Persian. Their translated is almost direct, clear. It has loyalty to TL norms for example, it is used "مدام" which is not mentioned in the SL text, so it is an addition word but by using it, they tend to go to the TL culture and the way of communication in TL. On the whole, it is concluded that their translation is communicative and based on Nida's approaches, it tends to be dynamic equivalence.

However, Translation by Mrs. Alizadeh is intended to remain the form and content of the original text. It is loyal to the ST author and it is more detailed to render almost all the words of ST. It tends to over translate, so In short,

it is semantic translation. And as it is close to the original text without adding the translator's ideas and thoughts, into the translation, it is Formal equivalence.

Sample 6

In the following, there are some examples from another English short story named "OF Mice and Men" by John Steinbeck and compare it with two of its translation by two translators, Mrs. Elham Tabe Ahmadi and Mr. Mohammad Sadegh Shariati.

Here is the translation which is done by Mrs. Elham Ahmadi.

-paragraph 1, chapter 1

Her translation is not that much direct and simple. For the reader, it is awkward and complex to read. It is loyal to the form and ST author. The translator does not add her own ideas and thoughts into the translation. This translation is more literal so it makes some obscurities in this sentence "from the mountain" two meanings can be extracted from the text, "در سمت کوهستان" or "از کوه سرازیر می شود". The latter is used by Mr. Shariati in his rendering. Therefore, this text is involved with semantic translation. It is also remained the form and content of the original and so close to the ST, it is almost formal equivalence too.

However, Mr. Shariati's translation is more direct, clear and easy to read. It tends to under translate. It is not detailed. It is subjective and focused on the readers of the TL the sentences are short. This translation tends to be communicative. And, as the thoughts of the translator are involved in the rendering, it is dynamic equivalence.

Sample 7

Paragraph 1, chapter 2

In this paragraph, it is completely shown the difference between these two translations.

In the first one by Mrs. Tabe Ahmadi, it is more awkward and detailed. It is not direct. It sticks to the original text and tries to remain the form and content of the SL text.

Translator's ideas and thoughts are not involved in it. It tends to over translate. In short, it is semantic translation. The translation is literal; like "night came quickly" it is rendered "شب به سرعت فرا رسید". It is formal equivalence.

But in Mr. Shariati's translation, the rendering is more direct, clearer. This translation is subjective and it is focused on TT reader. It is easy to read for the TT readers because of using common words. For example, "I have to stay with you" it is rendered "باید همراه تو باشم". However, in the previous translation it was "مجبورم با تو بمانم". On the whole, it can be said that this translation is

communicative and based on Nida's approaches, it tends to dynamic equivalence.

Sample 8

Paragraph 1, chapter 3

In Mrs Tabe Ahmadi's translation, the form and content of the sentence are remained. It is a literal translation as all the words are rendered without adding the translator's ideas to the translation. It is author – oriented translation.

The translator focuses on the author of the text. In the English text, there is "bag", as the translator rendered to "کیف". In fact, it is a literal translation and it made an obscurity. Also, as it can be a bag pack or something like a packet. It is overtranslated and more detailed. It is loyal to ST author and ideas of the author. So this translation is semantic.

However, Mr. Shariati's translation is communicative because it is clearer, more direct, and very easy to read. It tends to under translate. It utilizes common words to make it simple for the readers. It is reader – oriented rendering as "bag" in English text is rendered "کیسه ها" in Persian. It is comprehensible by the readers because this event as it is mentioned in this story happened in the farm.

So, the translator focuses on the message and of course functions of the text.

Sample 9

Paragraph 1, chapter 4

In Mr. Shariati's translation, the obscurity is missed. In the first sentence of this paragraph, "there was a noise at the bunkhouse door" and it is rendered "صدایی در میانه در خوابگاه آمد". However, in the other translation by Mrs. Ahmadi, this sentence is rendered "صدایی از در خوابگاه برخاست", here the reader has difficulties to clarify whether the authors' intention is that noise is of the door or it is something or somebody at the back of the door.

Also, his translation is reader – oriented. Besides its respect for the form of the SL, it is loyal to TL norms. It is clear and direct and easy to under translate.

Common words are used so it is a simple text. It tends to under translate. To conclude, it is communicative translation. As this text tries to have naturalness and be close to the source – language message, it is dynamic equivalence, also.

But in Mrs. Tabe Ahmadi's translation, the rendering is so close to the original text, and manner of thought of the SL context. This rendering tries to remain form and content of the ST so in this way the TL reader is able to understand as much as he can of the manner of thought. In this sentence "نگاه لنی به آهستگی بر روی اندام زیبای زن به حرکت درآمد", it is shown the manner of thought of the SL context.

It tends to over translate. It is more detailed and awkward so it is semantic translation.

Sample 10

Paragraph 1, chapter 5

Mrs. Tabe Ahmadi's translation is more detailed and awkward and it tends to under translate. It follows the thought – process and author ideas. Her thoughts are not involved in her rendering so it can say, it is formal equivalence, as her rendering is close to the original text. Based on Newmark's approach, Semantic translation is applied here. But in some sentences she tends to apply communicative translation as "تقریباً هوا تاریخ شده بود".

However, Mr. Shariati's translation is more clear and direct. It emphasizes on force rather than the content of the meaning. His rendering is simple and easy to understand. It is under translated. On the whole, he follows communicative approach of Newmark. And as he seeks naturalness, dynamic equivalence is applied here.

CONCLUSION

After studying on some samples of these short stories, it seems that readability of the translation especially in short stories is more important than preserving the original wording. This paper tried to show that translators

should provoke reader's interest toward their translation by choosing the appropriate ones. As here was mentioned, this paper worked some approaches in translation which were proposed by Nida (formal and dynamic equivalence) and Newmark (semantic and communicative translation) on two English short stories and their different translations.

The result of this comparison show that the more smoother, simpler, clearer, conventional, generic translation is, the less danger in having difficulties, obscurities and confusion among the readers. Although it is believed that in literal translation the original message is less corrupted, it is studies in this paper that natural is important to be preserved in rendering stories.

REFERENCES

- Alizadeh Z (1385). *Anima Farm Translation*. Yaran publications
 Hosseini S, Nabizadeh M (1385). *Animal Farm Translation*. Golshan Publications.
 Munday J (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies*. Theories and Applications. London/New Yourk: Routledge.
 Newmark P (1981). *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
 Nida EA (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: E.J.Brill
 Orwell, George (1386). *Animal Farm*. Jungle publications.
 Shariati MS (1386). *Of Mice and Men Translation*. Guyesh No. Tehran.
 Steinbeck J (1381). *Of Mice and Men*. Takrim publications.
 Tabe AE (1382). *Of Mice and Men Translation*. Jungle Publications.