A New Approach for Paraphrasing and Rewording a Challenging Text

Yahya Polat
Translation Studies Department, Faculty of Humanities, Ala-Too International University
Bishkek, 720048 Kyrgyzstan

Satylmysh Bajak
Turkish Studies Department, Faculty of Humanities, Ala-Too International University
Bishkek, 720048 Kyrgyzstan

Ainuska Zhumaeva
Translation Studies Department, Faculty of Humanities, Ala-Too International University
Bishkek, 720048 Kyrgyzstan

Abstract
This article aims to propose a practical model for intra-lingual translation or *paraphrase* in another term. Paraphrase is a restatement of a text, rewording something written or spoken, especially to achieve greater clarity. This approach could help a troubled translator who is having issues translating a complex text into a receptor language by assessing the source text and reconstructing the contents in a simpler semantic structure. (Larson, 2012) Noam Chomsky's generative–transformational model (1957, 1965) and Larson's (2012) methodology have been followed to analyze sentences into a series of related levels governed by the help of several other techniques. To achieve this, firstly, the concepts; *Intralingual translation*, *rewording*, *paraphrasing,* and *restatement* are identified and explained. Secondly, methods of rewording are unpacked, then other elements that play an essential role in paraphrasing are presented. Thirdly, steps of paraphrasing are applied to the text Taj Mahal where skewings between semantic structure and grammatical features are studied and unskewed. Lastly, a conclusion is drawn from the findings to verify the hypothesis of the paraphrase. The findings and results of rewording are also briefly discussed.
Keywords: antonyms, paraphrase, reciprocal words, restatement, skewing, synonyms, substitute words

Introduction:

We, easterners, are much different from Europeans in many ways. Most of us prefer short poems over long, thick novels of the West. Two-hour symphonies bore some of us to death. Many members in our parliaments have no more a function than what a chorus does in Shakespeare's plays. Accordingly, as an Asian, I am for more practice and a little theory in teaching translation studies. In the preface of the book "Meaning Based Translation" (Larson, 1998), Newmark emphasized the need for additional practical works in the subject of translation studies, claiming that the books, which have primarily been authored by Germans, have been too philosophical and abstract to relate to any of the translator's everyday issues. Nida was one of the first researchers to deal practically with the cultural and the *numerous* linguistic issues of translation. Larson has produced the first textbook designed to be used in the classroom. Therefore, Larson's Meaning Based Translation (2012) has been one of my favorites for a long time. I and my students have studied and paraphrased complicated texts step by step following the instructions in the book. With a little theory thrown in, we have created a sample model that can serve as a guide for translators, linguists, and researchers.

Literature Review
Definition

The term translation itself has several meanings: Translation, according to Larson (2012), is essentially the act of transferring the meaning of the source language into a receptor language. Translation occurs when a form of the first language is transferred to a second language via a semantic structure. The meaning of a word or set of words can be well understood because of its role in the whole linguistic expression where they occur. The translation can refer to
- the general subject field,
- the product (the text that has been translated) or
- the process (the act of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating).

Types of Translation

A translator is expected to turn an original written text (the source text or ST) in the original verbal language (the source language or SL) into a written text (the target text or TT) in a different verbal language when translating two separate written languages (the target language or TL). (Munday, 2016) This type corresponds to *interlingual translation*. Jakobson (1959/2004) makes a significant distinction between three types of written translation:
- intralingual translation, or 'rewording': 'an interpretation of verbal signs through other signs of the same language;
- interlingual translation, or 'translation proper': 'an interpretation of verbal signs employing some other language;
- intersemiotic translation, or 'transmutation': 'an interpretation of verbal signs using signs of non-verbal sign systems.

Paraphrase and Rewording

In this article, we will deal with intralingual translation, in other terms rewording or paraphrasing, that holds important information about how meaning is created in texts. We will do our best to show how to make a complicated English text or paragraph easier through paraphrasing making a translator's job easier.

The term paraphrase is explained by Oxford English Dictionary (2012) as a restatement of a text, rewording of something written or spoken, especially to achieve greater clarity. Newmark (1988) defines it as amplification or explanation of the meaning of a segment of the text used in an 'anonymous' text when it is poorly written or has essential implications and omissions. For example, a Spanish siesta may be restated by a phrase; '*a rest or a nap, especially one taken in the early afternoon during the hottest hours of the day in a hot climate*.

Larson (2012) calls the process of paraphrasing "unpacking" the semantic structure of a word which is sometimes called restatement" (p. 65)

Restatement technically means to say the same thing in another way. In this kind of restating;
- there should be no change in the semantic components;
- there should be no additions or deletions, but the exact meaning should be carried by the restatement as much as possible
- there should be no skewing between the grammar and the semantics,
- each concept should be made explicit, and in this way, all of the meaning is brought out.

Paraphrase, from simple text analysis to machine translation, has a wide range of applications in linguistics. In this article, we have followed the following procedure: We will minimize the complex and compound sentences into simple kernel sentences (propositions) in terms of syntax; turn complicated, abstract words into simple concrete words using transformational rules; and replace the words mentioned above with synonyms, antonyms, and reciprocal words where necessary.

Methods

In our work, we will follow Noam Chomsky's generative–transformational model (1957, 1965). He proposes; four groups of word classes; deep, surface structures and Kernel sentences as the way of weighing any world language in the same scale. Larson (2012) has developed the best methodology to apply the above-mentioned rules step by step to a complicated, presented below clearly.

Four groups of Word Classes

Larson, benefitting from Chomsky's model, has developed a new methodology to analyze the source text. According to Larson (2012), the smallest unit in the semantic structure is a *meaning component* (morpheme)**.** *Meaning components* group together to form *concepts* (words)**.** Concepts make *semantic propositions* (clauses) that exist in all languages.

Meaning components and *concepts* are classified semantically into four main groups; *things*, *events*, *attributes*, and *relations*.
1- Events include all verbs; (actions, process, and experiences), e.g., run, fall, grow, think.
2- Things include all nouns; (animate beings, natural and supernatural, and all inanimate entities), e.g. woman, horse, book, table.
3- Attributes include all adjectives and adverbs; (attributes of quality and quantity ascribed to *things* or *events)*, e.g. big, fast, hot, soft, rough, slowly, suddenly, few, all.

4- Relations in other terms, *function words,* include all *affixes, prepositions, conjunctions, and copulas* posited between any two of the semantic units e.g., with, by, because, since, and, therefore, after, pre-, into, of, and, be).

Kernels and Propositions

Chomsky states that the structural relations described in this model to be a universal feature of human language. *Kernels* are simple, active, and declarative sentences that require minimum transformation. E.g., the deer sucked her fawn. Murray (2016). They are the essential structural elements out of which the language builds its elaborate surface structures. Larson (2012) prefers to use the term *propositions* instead of kernels. Propositions are to be obtained from the ST surface structure by a reductive process of back transformation.
Examples: "I cannot fly." "She bought a dress." "I am a teacher."

Surface and Deep Structures

American linguist Noam Chomsky popularized the terms *deep structure* and *surface structure* in the 1960s and 70s. The deep structure represents meaning, and the surface structure is the actual sentence we see. Through an analysis of the surface structure, a language, so to speak, is restored back to its factory settings, and become ready to translate. Behind the surface, (grammatical, lexical, phonological) structure is the deep (semantic) structure, the meaning (Larson, 2012).

The key features of this model, as explained by Murray (2016), can be summarized simply as follows:
1. Phrase-structure rules generate the deep structure.
2. Getting help from transformational rules, the deep structure is transformed, relating one underlying structure to another (e.g., active to passive),
3. A final surface structure is produced, which is subject to phonological and morphemic rules.

For example:
1. Surface Structure: Usman and John met in the restaurant to dine. When they finished eating, Usman left first, and then John also went.
Deep Structure: Usman and John met in the restaurant. Usman and John dined. Usman left. John left.
2. Surface Structure: When I came to the store, I bought ice cream.
Deep Structure: I came to the store. I bought ice cream.

Skewing in Translation

The skewing occurs between the grammar and the semantic categories. Larson (2012) warns translators to be aware of skewing because they exist in all modes of surface structures. Skewing is defined in the online Merriam-Webster Dictionary as *deviation from a straight line*. However, in linguistic terms, "skewing" means *the diversity or the lack of one-to-one correlation between form and meaning.* (Larson, 2012, p. 10) If a noun in one language corresponds to a noun in the target language, that will create no problem. However, in contrasting languages, there is no correlation between two different parts of speech. Where one language uses the verb with some degree of frequency, another language may be expressing the same meanings using the verbal noun.

The skewing frequently occurs between semantic classes and parts of speech. Many languages can use an *event* concept as a noun in grammar. For example, in English, *death* is a noun based on the *event* concept *to die*. *Strength* is a noun based on the *attribute* concept *strong,* and *a happy life* is a noun phrase based on the concept *to live happily*. In some languages, some forms modify nouns that refer to *event* concepts, as, for example, In the phrase *rosy cheeks*, the adjective *rosy* refers to *things*, so the semantic structure would be the *cheeks* that look like *roses*. There is a skewing between grammar and the semantic structure (Larson, 2012).

Example of Analysis
The words of a language on the surface structure are classified by distribution in the grammar. The words in a sentence are categorized using word classes, such as subject, predicate, object, and so on. For example, if we say, "The plan is nice," the word *plan* would be classified as a noun in English grammar. *The plan* here is used as the subject of grammatical construction. However, it is an *action* that one does; it is an *event*. There is, therefore, a skewing between semantic classes and grammatical classes at this point (Larson, 2012).

Table 1. *Examples from (Nida 1964a: 64), (Larson 2012) in phrase-level:*
Note 1. Adapted from Nida 1964, p. 64) and Larson (2012)

Surface Structure	Skewing	Comment	Deep Structure	Comment
<u>will</u> of God	will	*Will* is a *thing* in the sentence. It is originally an *event*	God *wills*	Subject, God and event, wills.
<u>creation</u> of the world	Creation	*Creation* is a *thing* in the sentence. It is originally an *event*	(God) *created* the world.	An agent (God) is added. It was implicit in the surface structure
<u>death</u> of the <u>dancer</u>	death, dancer	The concept *of death* and *dancer* are things (nouns) in the surface structure. They are events & actions in the deep structure.	(The man or woman) that *danced, died*.	The proposition gets an agent, man or woman. Dancer became *'a person who dances.'*
<u>falling</u> star attribute	falling	falling is an attribute here but refers to an event concept.	a *star* which is *falling*	A *star* became an agent, and *falling* became an event.

Table 2. *The sentence level*

Surface Structure	Skewing	Comment	Deep Structure	Comment
Forgiveness is important	Forgivenes s	The thing *forgiveness* becomes an event.	It is important to *forgive*.	
The sheep were taken to the *slaughter*.	slaughter	The thing *slaughter* becomes an event.	(They) took the sheep (somewhere). They *slaughtered* it.	A passive sentence becomes an active one. One sentence becomes two simple propositions. The agent of the

				proposition changes: Sheep = They
She was told of the *death* of Hassan.	death	The thing *death* becomes an event.	Somebody told. Hassan died.	The passive sentence becomes active. One sentence becomes two simple sentences. The agent shifts. *She* becomes *Hassan*.
Suddenly there was a great *earthquake*.	Earthquake	The thing *earthquake* becomes a thing and an event.	Suddenly the *earth* began to *quake*.	A compound word becomes two separate words.
Her *singing* is too *loud*.	singing, loud	A thing *singing* becomes an event. An adjective *loud* becomes an adverb.	She *sings* very *loudly*.	Possessive pronoun *her* becomes, *she*.

Other Elements Playing an Important Role in Paraphrasing

There are several basic "elements" in creating paraphrases: *synonyms, near-synonyms, substitute words, and reciprocal words*. They all play an essential role in paraphrasing.
Synonyms

Synonyms are one of the best sources of paraphrase. They are used to create more varied and fluent text. The interchangeable character of words gives rise to paraphrases. For example, the English words *wage, salary, income*, and *pay* can be used interchangeably to express a form of periodic payment established between an employer and an employee (Haas, 2000).

Larson (2012) states that, although there are very similar words in any language, in meaning, there are very few exact synonyms. Even if the words are identical in essence, they might not have the same usage in sentence and paragraph structures. The terms *often* and *frequently* are close synonyms. There are some groups of words that are equivalent in their basic meaning but have additional positive or negative implications. One word may be appropriate in one situation and the other appropriate in a different situation. One may be more formal and another less formal.

The words *speak, tell,* and *say* all have an ordinary meaning. However, there are only specific contexts in which they are interchangeable. *Gülmek, (to laugh), tebessüm etmek (to smile),* and *sırıtmak (to grin)* in Turkish are also synonymous words but with a big difference in usage. Even though *cop, policeman, and police officer* all refer to the same thing, *police officer* is more formal than *cop.* A target language may have more words to choose from the source language or not have any specific word for each synonym of the source language. The translator must be aware of the very minute differences between words and near-synonyms to choose the word with the right connotation.

Baker (1992) states that words that we might think of as *synonyms or near-synonyms* will often have entirely different sets of collocates. English speakers typically *break the rules*, but they do not *break regulations*; they typically *waste time* but not *squandering time*. (1986, p. 281). Despite the fact that the adjectives: *unblemished, spotless, flawless, immaculate,* and

impeccable are synonyms or near-synonyms, they do not combine freely with the same set of nouns.

Antonyms

The antonym of a term, according to Larson (1997), is the exact opposite or contrasts in some parts of its meaning. All languages will have **antonyms**, but different languages will have other pairs. For example, in English, we distinguish *flesh* and *meat* between humans and animals. In Turkish, there is only one-word, *et which* is used for both animals and men.

It can sometimes be beneficial to a translator looking for an *antonym*, the word opposite in meaning. He may simply construct a negative form of that antonym**.** Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) call it the *negation of opposite* under the category of *Modulation*. For example, *it does not seem unusual*, and it can also be said like *it is very typical.* It is said that in some Dagestani dialects, they do not have a word for *love.* They have the phrase *want* instead. While others speak to the girl they love, *"I love you!"* they simply say, *"I want you!"* In English, the words *good* and *bad* are antonyms. However, in Kyrgyz, the distinction is made by the word *beautiful, suluu*, contrasting with the same word *beautiful* linked to a negative suffix, not-beautiful, *suluu emes*. That is, there are not two separate words; there is simply beautiful and *not beautiful*.

Substitute Words

In speaking and writing, we try to avoid repeating words, phrases, or clauses. We use substitute forms to do this:
A: Pam always brings us back chocolates when she travels.
B: Oh, nice.
A: She brought some Belgian **ones** from her last trip, which were delicious.
B: Lucky you! (https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/substitution)

Substitute words are utilized when receptor language natural patterns prefer various terms to refer to the same *thing* or *event*, according to Larson (2012), and the reverse may also be true. It would be more realistic to use substitute words in the receptor language if the original term has been repeated several times. It is not necessary to interpret substitute words literally. Instead, natural patterns of the receptor language for substitute words should be used. Example:

"My old Mercedes broke down again. It has been a good car. But it is time to get rid of the old thing." In this paragraph, *Mercedes* has been referred to by *it, car,* and *thing.* These are all substitute words for the antecedent *Mercedes*. A substitute word refers to something already introduced to context. Sometimes the substitute word will be more generic. For example, *car* is a more generic word than *Plymouth,* and *thing* is more generic than *car*. However, it is a pronoun, a substitute word that may substitute for any noun

Reciprocal Words

Most languages have sets of words, which are *reciprocal* of one another. This changes the semantics and point of view of the SL. As Larson (2012) suggested, this technique may sometimes help translate where the receptor language has a specific word used in the same way as the source language. It may be that the same meaning can be communicated by using a **reciprocal word**. For example, *the government gave a large grant to the miners,* which might in

some translation need to be translated conversely; *the miners received a large grant from the government.* Style in some language may make one phrasing more correct than the other. In Turkish, there is no word for *being born*. *"I was born in 1995"* can only be translated into Turkish as; *"my mother gave birth to me in 1995."*

Text Analysis and Paraphrase
The Text: Creation History of Taj Mahal
    The Taj Mahal is actually an integrated complex of structures, with the white-domed marble mausoleum being its most significant component. Entrusted to a board-of-architects by Emperor Shah Jahan, the construction of the Taj Complex began about 1631 AD. The principal mausoleum was completed in 1648 AD by employing thousands of artisans and craftsmen, whereas the outlying buildings and gardens were finished five years later in 1653 AD. The Taj, the ultimate expression of love, speaks volumes of indulgence coming from an overflowing treasury and political security of that era and much more by way of the finesse in art and science of architecture.

Definitions of highlighted words
- **Dome** a large hemispherical roof or ceiling
- **Marble** something (such as a piece of sculpture) composed of or made from
- **Mausoleum** a large tomb, or a large gloomy building or room especially**:** a usually stone building with places for the entombment of the dead above ground

Paraphrase and Analysis
    In this part, the text Taj Mahal that has four sentences will be paraphrased and analyzed. First, the original sentence in the surface structure is presented below. In the deep structure, it is paraphrased, and lastly, in the commentary part, all the techniques used in the paraphrase are explained.

Surface Structure
1. The Taj Mahal is actually an integrated complex of structures, with the white-***domed marble*** mausoleum being its most *significant component*.

Deep Structure
The Taj Mahal is actually a group of buildings joined together. It has a mausoleum with a
                white *dome* made of *marbles*. It the most *important* part of the complex.

Commentary
- Advanced words and complex structures in the source text are replaced with more simple synonyms and equivalent forms; *significant* to *important*, *component* to *part*, *construction* to *building*, *integrated* to *joined*, *complex* to *group*.
- The word order of the surface structure has been slightly modified.
- Long propositional clusters (sentences) were divided into two or more propositions (clauses).
- The phrase Taj Mahal is substituted with the terms: *a building*, and *it*.
- *It* substituted the mausoleum.
- Skewings are handled. For example, things (nouns) after the paraphrase became events (verbs) which made the sentences easier to understand: The word *marble* was an *attribute*

(adjective), but after paraphrasing, it became a *thing*. The *dome* in the source text was an *attribute, and* it became a *thing*. This process is called *nominalization*.

Surface Structure

2. *Entrusted* to a board-of-architects by Emperor Shah Jahan, the **construction** of the Taj Complex began about 1631 AD.

Deep Structure

Emperor Shah Jahan *hired* the best architects *to build* the complex Taj in 1631 AD
.

Commentary

- Complex words in the source text are replaced with more simple equivalents; *entrusted* to *hired*, *board-of-architects* to *best*.
- The word order on the surface structure has been slightly adjusted, known as Modulation, and Transposition.
- Shah Jahan became the agent in the deep structure: Reciprocal words & Modulation.
- Long propositional clusters (sentences) were divided into two or more propositions (clauses).
- Skewings were eliminated. For example, *things* (nouns) after the paraphrase became events (verbs), making the sentences easier to understand. The word *construction* was a *thing,* but then it became an *event; to build.* This process is called *verbalization*.

Surface Structure

3. The *principal* mausoleum was *completed* in 1648 AD by *employing* thousands of artisans and craftsmen, whereas the outlying buildings and gardens were finished five years later in 1653 AD.

Deep Structure

In 1648 AD Shah Jahan *employed* thousands of artisans and craftsmen to complete the *central* mausoleum. However, they finished the other buildings and gardens five years later, in 1653 AD.

Commentary

- Complex words in the source text are replaced with more simple synonyms: *principal* to *central*, outlying to *other*.
- The structure, the word order of the surface structure, has been slightly modified*,* called *transposition* & *Modulation*.
- Shah Jahan became the agent in the deep structure: *Reciprocal Words* & *Modulation.*
- Long propositional clusters (sentences) were divided into two or more propositions (clauses).
- The passive sentence became active. It is another type of Modulation.
- Skewings were eliminated. The word *employing* has become *to employ*. This process is called *verbalization*.

Surface Structure

4. The Taj, the ultimate *expression* of love, speaks volumes of *indulgence* coming from an *overflowing* treasury and political *security* of that era and much more by way of the finesse in art and science of architecture.

Deep Structure

The king wanted to *express* his deep love (for his late wife) through the most beautiful building in the world, the Taj complex. He was able to achieve his goal because he flowed his treasure. Secondly, there was no political *threat* to the country, much more by way of the finesse in art and science of architecture.

Commentary

- In this part, complicated phrases in the surface structure are simplified. For example, *volumes of indulgence* are modified to *the most beautiful building in the world.*
- The long propositional cluster is divided into four propositions. The word order and structure of the propositions have slightly changed.
- Skewings are unskewed. The phrase *expression of love* became '*to expresses a deep love'* after paraphrasing (verbalization). *Overflowing treasury* has been modified to *flowed his treasure. Overflowing* was an attribute that became an event *to flow*. In the second part, *the treasury was a thing* has been changed to *the treasure.*

Conclusion

This study provides a guide for puzzled translators, indicating clear steps of paraphrasing a challenging text prepared to be translated. Having explained the terms, skewing, and restatement as the initial steps of paraphrasing, we have shown how to handle skewings with examples. Synonyms, antonyms, substitute words, and reciprocal words have been explained as supplementary techniques of paraphrasing. We hope that this study might help a translator identify the difference between the grammatical categories and the semantic categories. This way, they can eliminate most of the skewing and make it easier to translate into a more verbal language. The skewing and all the complexities between grammar and semantics are eliminated in this method, and each concept is made obvious, bringing out the meaning.

About the Authors

Dr. Yahya Polat is an associate professor of linguistics and literature at Ala-Too International University in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, where he teaches courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Some of the courses are; Turkish-Kyrgyz-English translation, History of English and American Literature, Introduction to Translation, and Machine Translation. His research interest includes Kyrgyz, Turkish, and English Syntax and Proverbs, the title of his dissertation. Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9938-8628

Dr. Satylmysh Bajak is an associate professor of Turkish Studies at Ala-Too International University. He teaches courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels; some of the courses are Translation, Syntax, Phonetics, and Etymology. His research interest includes etymology of words, Phonetic changes in Kyrgyz, Mongol, Turkish words, and their translation.

Ainuska Zhumaeva is a senior student at Ala-Too International University, Humanities Faculty, Translation Studies Department. She assists her professors in their academic studies. She is interested in Literary Translation, Computer Assisted Translation and Cultural Translation.

References

Baker, M. (2011). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (2ⁿᵈ ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chalker, S., & Weiner, E. (2014). *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar.* Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures.* Gravenhage: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cruse, D. A. (1997). *Lexical Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creation history of taj mahal. (2019). In tajmahal.gov.in. Retrieved October 11, 2019, from https://www.tajmahal.gov.in/creation-history-of-taj-mahal.aspx.

Danielsson, P. (2007). In other words: Using paraphrases in translation // [Translating and the Computer 29, November 2007] University of Birmingham.

Haas, S. W. (2000, September 29). A Terminology Crosswalk for LABSTAT: Mapping General Language Words and Phrases to BLS Terms. *Final Report to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.* Retrieved from stephani@ils.unc.edu School of Information and The Library Science University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Jakobson, R. (2012). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (ed.), (pp. 126-131).

Koller, W. (1979). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg. Quelle & Meyer.

Komissarov, V. (1977). Zur Theorie der linguistischen Übersetzungsanalyse. In O. Kade (ed.), *Vermittelte Kommunikation, Sprachmittlung, Translation* (pp. 44-51). Leipzig Enzyklopädie.

Larson, L. M. (2012). *Meaning Based Translation*. Boston: University Press of America.

Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). London, New York: Routledge.

Murray, J. (1884). Oxford English Dictionary (OED). The Oxford University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York. Prentice-Hall.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Owczarzak, K., Groves, D. Van Genabith, J., & Way, A. (2006). Contextual Bitext-Derived Paraphrases in Automatic MT Evaluation. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation* (pp. 86-93). New York: ACL.

Paraphrase. (2012). In oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com. Retrieved May 3, 2021, from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/paraphrase_2

Reiß, K. (1976). *Texttyp und Übersetzungsmethode: Der operative Text.* Kronberg/Ts. Scriptor.

Skew. (2011). In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved May 26, 2021, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/skew.

Substitution. (2021). In dictionary.cambridge.org. Retrieved May 10, 2021, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/substitution.

Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative Stylistics of English and French: A Methodology for Translation*. John Benjamins.

Zhou, L. Lin C. Y., Munteanu, D. S., & Hovy, E. (2006). ParaEval: Using Paraphrases to Evaluate Summaries Automatically. *Proceedings from the Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the ACL* (pp. 447-454). New York: ACL.