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ABSTRACT

Translation Quality Assessment (TQA) is a fast-growing sub-field of Translation Studies. It focuses on the relationship between the texts translated from ST into TT. This study applied House’s (1997) TQA model to English Translations of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, in order to evaluate the quality of these translations. The errors were identified, classified and the frequency of their occurrences was computed. Based on House's model, the errors were categorized into covert and overt errors. Overt errors were further categorized into seven categories: 1) Not translated; 2) Slight change in meaning; 3) Significant change in meaning; 4) Distortion of meaning; 5) Breach of the source language system; 6) Creative translation; and 7) Cultural filtering. According to House's model, poetry has to be translated overtly and deviations would be considered errors.

It was found out that both translators have successfully translated Khayyam's poetry. However, the first translation by Saeed Saeedpour (2012) has fewer errors (68 errors) in comparison with second translation (95 errors) by Edward Fitzgerald (1859), as a conclusion, ST native speaker could master the implications better, so he could translate better than the TT native speakers. Both translators have introduced Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam successfully to English readers, and they have overcome some cases they have encountered "Cultural--Filtering" and have found their best equivalent for each case. It was also observed that House's model of TQA is applicable and useful in the field of translation of poetry, for both translators and students of translating studies.
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1. Introduction

Translation quality assessment (TQA) is a way to evaluate the existing translations so as to differentiate suitable translations from those which are not translated with great care. An important thing to consider is that the assessment of translation quality should be as objective as possible. To prevent any subjective assessment, one should do it systematically according to a theoretical view or model. Since TQA is a fast-growing sub-field of translation studies, there are many theoretical views or models in this area. However, it seems that from among these many models, a few of them sound promising. One of the practical models is provided by the German scholar Juliane House (1997).

Juliane House's TQA model is based on Hallidayan systemic-functional theory (SFT), but it also draws on Prague school ideas, speech act theory, pragmatics, discourse analysis and corpus-based distinctions between the spoken and written language. It analyzes and compares an original text and its translation on three different levels: Language/text, Register (field, tenor and mode) and Genre. According to House, translation would be "the replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language” (House, 2015, p. 23).

Today translation courses are offered at many universities worldwide. There are lots of researchers who have done research on different methods on assessing a translated text but in the case of House’s model and in the field of literary text, few works have been done. This task is far more
important when the translation text is a literary text as important as Khayyam’s Rubaiyat which is the corpus of the present research. Such an elaborate analysis of the translations of a literary masterpiece would develop a better understanding of the dominant tendencies for adopting translation strategies among native and non-native translators. And it is hoped that the results of this study will be effective in the improvement and creating a model for assessment of the translation of literary and non-literary texts from Persian to English, especially the poetry. The possible results of this study hopefully can be used in the process of learning/teaching of the translation by the instructor and learners.

2. Related Literature

Gehrmann (2011) used the TQA model proposed by House (1997) to assess Swedish translation of Tolkien’s The Lord of the Rings in “Translation Quality Assessment: A Model in Practice.” The research focused on determining textual profiles of ST and TT. Several mismatches in terms of tenor and field dimensions were found by analyzing the profiles of the two texts. In addition, there were found some overt errors caused by the semantic additions. No errors were found regarding the dimensions of genre and tenor. Gehrmann finally concluded that the translation of ‘The Lord of the Rings’ was a covert kind.

Khedmatgozar and Eslami Rasekh (2013) in “Functional-Pragmatic Model of Translation Assessment: A Case Study of Two Translations of Lessing’s Ben in the World” analyzed the original text and the two translations and comparing two kinds of translations based on House’s TQA model. They found that there were a number of mismatches along with the dimension of the tenor and a consequent change of the interpersonal functional component. Moreover, different overt errors changed the transmission of information.

Yamini and Abdi (2010), in “The Application of House’s Model on William Shakespeare’s “Macbeth” and its Persian Translation by Ala’uddin Pasargadî”, found that statistical procedure indicates a significant difference between the two kinds of errors i.e., overtly erroneous errors and covertly erroneous errors. Application of House’s TQA Model on their work indicates that “this particular work did not abide by the hypothesis stated which was a literary work, according to House’s Model, has to be translated overtly and any deviation of it will be considered as an error in this model.” They noted that “these results do not blemish this model in any ways; rather, quite vice versa these results show the strength of this particular, yet parsimonious, TQA model.”

With this background, the study aimed to conduct a systematic evaluation of the translations produced by two native and non-native translators of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, a Persian masterpiece by comparing the translations produced by a source text native speaker (Saeed Saeedpour) and a target text native speaker (Edward Fitzgerald) according to an influential translation quality assessment model proposed by House in 1977 and revisited in 1997.

The study is an attempt to find answer to the following questions:

RQ1: What is the frequency of errors in the translation rendered by source language native speaker?
RQ2: What is the frequency of errors in the translation rendered by target language native speaker?
RQ3: According to House’s translation quality assessment model, how is the quality of Persian-English translations of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam?

3. Theoretical Framework

The present research means to assess two English translations of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. House’s TQA model, is the framework for assessing the quality of the translated texts. This model is utilized, firstly through a comparative analysis of the ST and the TTs. Secondly, the problematic elements of these poems are analyzed in the translated versions and also attempt will be made to see if the problematic elements in the process of translation have been addressed and treated adequately.

3.1. An overview of translation quality assessment

Translation quality assessment (TQA), as a comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of translation evaluation makes explicit the grounds of judging the worth of a translation and emphasizes that translation is, at its core, a linguistic operation (House, 2015, p.2). TQA can be ‘quantitative’ or ‘qualitative’. It can be based on mathematical/statistical measurement (as in the case of most academic instruments) or on readers’ responses, interviews and questionnaires. TQA can also be ‘diagnostic’, (determining areas for improvement at the
beginning of a course of study), 'formative' (measuring progress and giving feedback during a course of study) or 'summative' (measuring the results of learning).

3.2. Juliane House's translation quality assessment model (1977)

There are three issues in House's (1997) model that she considers important in translation evaluation. The first one is the relationship between the source and target text. The second is the relationship between texts (or features of the texts) and the persons involved as regards how they perceive the texts. The third one is finding these relationships to determine which texts are translations and which ones are original.

3.2.1. Individual textual function

The model states the idea that each text has an individual function which can be considered through analysis. House calls it "individual textual function" (i.e. the function of an individual text) and defines it as the application or use which the text has in the particular context of situation (1997, p.36). Providing the function of an individual text require that the text's textual profile is characterized by "… a systematic linguistic-pragmatic analysis of the text in its context of situation" (1997, p.36). The analysis of a text is thus completed with the statement of the individual textual function of the text. The statement consists of an "interpersonal and ideational functional component", and it is derived from the "register and genre analysis" (1997, p.42). In the definition of the individual textual function, "the particular context of situation" indicates the "immediate environment of a text", or "the context in which the text unfolds" (1997, pp. 36-37). A given text may contain all the language functions, one of them is usually more important than others, but it has only one individual textual function.

3.2.2. Register categories: field, tenor and mode

As mentioned in the previous chapter, 'register' refers to functional language variation. Thus, register deals with how meanings are conveyed through words, grammatical constructs and textual choices in a particular situation. The aspects of a situation bearing linguistic consequences are 'field, tenor and mode'.

A. Field

Subject Matter: It can be a Novel, Poem, Play,….

Social Action: It can be Specific, General, Popular …. 

B. Tenor

Writer's or Translator's Provenance and Stance

Social Role Relationship: Symmetrical means the text contains features indicating solidarity and equality between addressee and addressee.s; and, Asymmetrical means the text contains features indicating authority relationship between addressee and addressee.s.

Social Attitude: The text contains features indicating the degrees of social distance or proximity – or in other words, five styles of formality: frozen, formal, consultative, casual and intimate.

C. Mode

Medium: is Simple if it is written to be read and Complex if it is written to be heard. Participation: is Simple if it means monologue or Complex if it means addressing a large community;

3.2.3. Genre

Register refers to the context of situation, whereas genre refers to the context of culture. Genre can be viewed from several different angles, including linguistic, sociological, psychological and literary points of view and the term has many definitions. Bhatia defines genre as “…a recognizable communicative event characterized by a set of communicative purpose(s) identified and mutually understood by the members of professional or academic community in which it regularly occurs” (1993, p.13). Most often it is highly structured and conventionalized with constrains on allowable contribution in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value. Texts can thus be intuitively recognized as belonging to certain genres. Bhatia (1993) also remarks that although in principle writer can use his/her linguistic resources in any way she/he likes, in practice the writer tends to comply with the demands and limitations imposed by genre. House defines genre for her model as follows: "genre is a socially established category characterized in terms of occurrence of use, source and communicative purpose or any combination of these" (1997, p.107). Genre operates at the level of discourse structure. Readers are able to identify texts as belonging to certain genres on the basis of their knowledge of texts.

3.2.4. The complete model

The resultant revised model consists of four levels: "function of individual text, genre, register and language/text" (1997, p.107). The complete model for translation quality assessment can be seen below.
House (1997, p.108) presents a figure of the revised model, on the basis of which the figure 2.1. Below has been drawn which shows the basic structure of the model. In sum, the model divides Language/text into Field, Tenor and Mode, which together form the Register. Register and Genre make up the Individual Textual Function.

![Figure 1: House’s (1997, p. 108) model](image)

3.3 Corpus of the Study

Khayyam’s Rubaiyat in its Persian version as the literary source text (ST) and its translations into English by Edward Fitzgerald and Saeed Saeedpour are the corpus of the present study. In this study, Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam by Khorramshahi (1994), rendered into English verse by Edward Fitzgerald (the First and Fifth edition) with original Persian text edited by Foroughi has been chosen. Khorramshahi (1994) includes a collection of 178 Persian quatrains that Foroughi and Ghani have selected among a myriad of quatrains attributed to Khayyam, along with 75 English translated quatrains in the first edition and 101 in the fifth edition. For the purposes of the present study, the English verses of the both editions would be analyzed and compared with the corresponding Persian Rubaiyat.

3.4 Procedures

In order to apply House's model, 30 quatrains were selected from the literary source text (ST) and its corresponding English translations. The criterion for selection of 30 quatrains is that they had two English translations. Then the original text is compared with its two English translations. Next, two types of errors, overt error and covert error are detected. In addition to the researcher, there are two raters involved in the assessment of translations who are completely familiar with both the source and target language used in this research. The evaluation is opened with the basic presupposition that, since the original Persian book is a literary work, it is tied to ST or Persian language and it must be translated overtly based on House's (1997) model of translation quality assessment. The House's model (1997) has commonly applied in translation quality assessment by doing the following chronological steps:

- a. Doing a register analysis to get the source text profile; Table: 1 below gives the details of comparative profiles of ST and TT;
- b. Describing source text genre realized in register;
- c. Giving a statement of the function of the source text related with and interpersonal meanings;
- d. Treating the target text in the same way as the source text was treated;
- e. Comparing the two text profiles to produce statement of “in-equivalence” which is categorized according to the genre and the situational dimension of the genre and register. The errors found are categorized into ‘covertly erroneous errors’ to distinguish them from ‘overtly erroneous error’ which are denotative mismatches or target system errors;
- f. Providing a statement of quality with reference to the translation result; and
- g. Categorizing the translation results into two kinds: overt translation and covert translation. For doing this kind of analysis, two kinds of errors, namely overt errors and covert errors, should be looked for.  

4. Data Analysis

According to House’s model (1997), errors are of two kinds: overt and covert. There were two mismatches regarding covert errors, in two of the categories as mentioned below and for discovering overt errors we have analyzed each translation through seven subcategories of overt errors.

4.1. Defining covert errors

4.1.1. Source text profile

The details of the components of the theoretical model of the present research are given here once, and the same definitions will be utilized for the analysis of all of the source materials throughout the study.

Field: the register category of field deals with the subject matter and social action of a text. The subject matter or content of this poem is “quatrains of Omar Khayyam” and
social action of the text is **general and popular**.

**Tenor:** the first situational dimension under the register category of tenor is author's provenance and stance. It refers to the author's position on a social scale, realized by social dialect and author's and her/his intellectual and effective position in relation to the content of the text and in relation to her/his communicative task. Regarding this aspects it is obvious that the author's provenance and stance is a **mystic poet**. The second situational dimension under tenor is social role relationship which is divided into symmetrical and asymmetrical. It is obvious that the poet uses complicated terms which indicate that he treats the readers more or less unequal so the social role relationship is **asymmetrical**. The third situational dimension under tenor is social attitude. The text seems to be **formal** as the formal lexical items are numerous.

**Mode:** it is divided to medium and participation. As it is written to be read and to be heard (as the vocal artists have produced CDs for the poems) so the medium of the text is both **simple** and **complex**. The text is a monologue but as the poet indirectly addresses the readers, so the participation of the text is complex.

**Genre:** the genre of the text is poetry belonging to the subcategory of mystic poems.

**Function of the text:** About the source texts function, it can be stated that, the texts' function is **Ideational**.

Finally, the summary of the analysis of these poems as the source text is given in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1: **Source Text Profile**

4.1.2. Target texts profile

**Field:** the subject matter or content of this poem for the target reader is "**quatrains of Omar Khayyam**".

**Tenor:** the first situational dimension under the register category of tenor is author's provenance and stance. Regarding the text under investigation, it can be said that the provenance and stance is that of translator and university instructor. The second situational dimension under tenor is social role relationship which is divided into symmetrical and asymmetrical. It is obvious that in this case the translated text is complicated which indicate that it treats the readers more or less as an unequal, so the social role relationship is asymmetrical. The third situational dimension is social attitude. The text seems to be formal as the formal lexical items are numerous.

**Mode:** it is divided to medium and participation. As the text is written to be read so the medium of the text is simple. The text is monologue but as the text indirectly addresses the readers, so the participation of the text is complex.

**Genre:** regarding the target text genre, it can be stated that the target text genre is also, mystic poem (quatrain).

**Function of the text:** about the target text function, it can be stated that the target text function is **Ideational**.

The summary of the analysis of the target texts is given below in Table 2.

TABLE 2: **Target Texts Profile**

In conclusion, in all the cases the covert errors identified were the mismatch between the author's provenance and stance (mystic poet) and that of the translators' (translator and university professor); the other mismatch considered was in the medium category under mode i.e. the ST has been written to be read and to be heard by audiences but, the translated texts are just to be read. In the below analyses and throughout the entire work, the same definition of the constituents of a profile are utilized. The summary of the profile of TT, Table 3 below gives the results of comparison of ST & TT side by side.

TABLE 3: **Comparative Side by Side Profiles of ST & Two TTs**
4.2. Defining overt errors

In the following part, the overtly erroneous errors will be analysed. As it was stated above, overt errors are categorized into seven subcategories:

- Not translated
- Slight change in meaning
- Significant change in meaning
- Distortion of meaning
- Breach of the language system
- Creative translation
- Cultural filtering

Accordingly, the poems have been analyzed on the basis of these seven categories and the errors are identified by underlining. After the analysis, the results of the application of House’s (1997) model will be explained. It should be mentioned that, the source material under investigation is selected from “Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam (1994), Gathered by Baha-ud-din Khorramshahi ”. The 1st TT, is “Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam translated by Edward Fitzgerald (the First and Fifth edition) (1859, 1889)” and the 2nd TT, is “Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam translated by Saeed Saeedpour (2012) ”.

4.2.1 The category Not Translated: This category includes those words/expressions which are not translated either because of translator’s negligence or not being able to translate.

Example 1:

1ST TT: the revelations of devout and learned
2nd TT: those who mastered high learning and grace

Discussion: The translation of underlined word doesn’t exist in the first translation.

4.2.2 The category Slight Change in Meaning: This means that there is a little distortion of meaning, partial transference of meaning or not complete faithfulness to ST; but this change in meaning is not so severe as to impair communication.

Example 1:

1ST TT: another said why near a peevish boy
2nd TT: the mold of a glass so finely cast

Discussion: The translation of underlined word in the second translation has different meaning from the source and has been translated with slight change in meaning.

Example 2:

1ST TT: Whether the cup with sweet or bitter run
2nd TT: When the cup's filled, sweet or dry is the same

Discussion: The underlined word in the second translation is not the appropriate translation for the word mentioned by the poet, so it conveys the meaning with slight change.

Example 3:

1ST TT: A vessel of a more ungainly make
2nd TT: another said why near a peevish boy

Discussion: The underline word in the second translation is not the appropriate translation for the word mentioned by the poet, so it conveys the meaning with slight change.

4.2.3 The category Significant Change in Meaning: This category materializes when there is a big difference between the ST and the TT.

Example 1:

1ST TT: the revelations of devout and learned
2nd TT: those who mastered high learning and grace

Discussion: The translation of underlined word in the ST "cosmos its shade" has not been translated in the first translation.

Example 3:

1ST TT: the revelations of devout and learned
2nd TT: those who mastered high learning and grace

Discussion: The translation of underlined word doesn’t exist in the first translation.

Discussion: the poet has not mentioned that those people have once awakened from sleep and to sleep returned and this can lead to a significant change in first translation.

Example 2:

Discussion: the underlined word in the first translation is extra and it makes a big change in conveying the meaning.

Example 3:

Discussion: the underlined word in the source language which refers to nightingale as a metaphor has been translated to the moment and the mood in the second translation so it is not the appropriate equivalent and it leads to significant change in meaning.

4.2.4 The category Distortion of Meaning:

This category refers to those mistakes which result in complete distortion of meaning of the ST.

Example 1:

Discussion: none of the words of the source text matches with correspondent equivalents of the first translation and distortion of meaning has taken place.

Example 2:

Discussion: the word now has changed the grammatical tense of the phrase from past to present.

Example 3:

Discussion: the word now has changed the grammatical tense of the phrase from past to present as well as the function of the phrase.

4.2.5 The category Breach of the SL System:

This category is recognized when the TT has deviated from the norms or syntax or grammatical rules of the ST.

Example 1:

Discussion: ”their cup” in the first translation shows possession, using the possessive adjective “their” while it is not seen in grammatical structure of the source text.

Example 2:

Discussion: the word has now changed the grammatical tense of the phrase from past to present.

Example 3:

Discussion: the word now has changed the grammatical tense of the phrase from past to present as well as the function of the phrase.

4.2.6 The category Creative Translation:

In this case, the translator translates the ST somehow freely by adding some extra words/ information which did not exist in the original ST.

Example 1:

Discussion: the word gloried has been added creatively to the first translation as an instance of explanation and extension.

Example 2:

Discussion: both translations have been translated creatively. The first translation refers to the wild ass stamping on the ground where the corpse of Bahram has been buried.so the words He lies fast asleep are added creatively. In the second translation the words prance over his dust are not explicitly mentioned, and these are creatively added by the translator.
Example 3:

1st TT: Who rose before us, and as prophets burned
2nd TT: whose merits shone with rare excellence

Discussion: the underlined phrase in the first translation has been translated creatively. The word candle in the source text is an explicit metaphor while it has been rendered as an implicit metaphor and also extra word "prophet" has been added to the meaning that is a sign of creative translation.

4.2.7 The category of Cultural Filtering:

There are some cultural phrases, words or local names and titles, which are untranslatable. In these cases usually the translator tries to find some alternative equivalents according to target culture and intended readers.

Example 1:

أهيه كرد و روه آمگرفت
1st TT: they say the lion and the lizard keep
2nd TT: the deer now breeds, the fox does amass

Discussion: the words deer and fox have been translated to lion and lizard that may be due to cultural filtering and may seem more familiar to target culture readers.

Example 2:

آُْ تچَ کرد ّ رّتَ آرام گرفت
1st TT: Whether at Naishapur or Babylon
2nd TT: When life's over, east and west are the same

Discussion: the underlined words are not familiar to the western people, so both translators have mentioned alternatives that seem to be more understandable for target readers and this is due to cultural filtering.

5. Discussion

House's (1997) model of Translations quality assessment is used to assess the quality of two English translations of some of Quatrains of Omar Khayyam. In the method part above, it was mentioned that since the original source text is a literary work, according to House's translation quality assessment model it must be translated overtly. In the 30 selected quatrains, the errors in the two translator's versions were identified and underlined. Therefore, all instances which were not translated overtly were indicated and underlined. Then, the English translations of these quatrains were compared with the original ST to show the differences.

The summary of findings for overt errors is given in Tables 4 and 5 below:

Table: 4 Total Frequency of Different Kinds of Overt Errors in 1st TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overt translation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight change in meaning</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant change in meaning</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distortion of meaning</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of the ST</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encompassing errors</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative translation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural filtering</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 5 Total Frequency of Different Kinds of Overt Errors in 2nd TT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overt translation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight change in meaning</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant change in meaning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distortion of meaning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of the ST</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encompassing errors</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative translation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural filtering</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

As it is obvious in above tables in the first translation in all 30 quatrains, we can consider 19 words or phrases which are not translated or have been omitted from translation; this rate for the second translation is a bit lower and is just 12. The numbers of errors under subcategories of, Slight change in meaning and significant change in meaning are reasonable. There were 5 breaches in translations grammatical system in the first translation and 6 ones in the second translation; it means the translated texts had mismatch in the grammatical structures and, not in regards to vocabularies. There were 32, 22 examples of creative translation in two target texts respectively; this means that the translated texts were not the exact translation of the source text, and the translator has translated these parts freely. There are respectively 19, 5 places in which the translators had encountered some words that totally have decided to ignore them and use the equivalents that leads to complete distortion of meaning. Finally, There are respectively 3, 2 places in which the translators had encountered some local and cultural phrases; in these cases the translators have chosen their best alternatives, sometimes they have not translated the words, and have kept the original form and sometimes they have...
found the nearest equivalent in English language and culture. Since the original text is a literary work, according to House, it has to have an overt kind of translation. Finally, in this research it was proven by evidence and examples that House's translation quality assessment can be useful, suitable and practical for assessing poetry in translation. Brief answer to research question 3: Both translators have translated the selected poems successfully and considering the acquired data the second translator has done the translation job more successful than the second translator.

Second translator (Saeed Saeedpour) who is considered as native speaker of the source text has a better understanding of the whole poetry; this may be due to his dominance over the ST as well as his academic knowledge of literature. On the other hand, FitzGerald has a tendency toward creating absolutely fresh poems that may be called imitation as he is a poet and cannot perceive some very mystic concepts of Khayyam and it is obvious that some patterns have been totally misunderstood by him.

**Implications of the findings**

The purpose of the study was to conduct a systematic evaluation of the translations produced by two native and non-native translators of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam.

The first important implication of the results obtained in this study is that students learn how to analyze ST and TT in order to evaluate the quality of the translated text from Persian into English. In fact, knowing the theory is as important as practice in Translation Studies. Students can understand the concepts of different theories when they learn them practically. Therefore, the finding of this study hopefully can help the students to gain a better understanding of the relevant models in TQA.

Secondly, the results of this study can be used by the translators in order to revise their translation especially in the field of literary texts. The findings of this study are hoped to be of help to trainers of translating and those who are interested in the field of Translation Studies. The finding of this study is also hoped to be helpful for translators of Persian poems into English in order to create an acceptable translation.

Third, In addition, comparing the source text with its translation by this model can give an insight in teaching translation because it offers the characteristics of the ST and TT languages. This model could be investigated for the study of text typologies and the strategies of translation. This model could also be used in the classification and grading of the texts into overt and covert types and their subdivisions.

**Suggestions for further research**

For anyone interested in pursuing research in this area, the following suggestions are mentioned:

First, different figures of speech of poetry and the way they are translated can be assessed based on House's revisited model. Second in the present research some of the mystic Persian poems were investigated. It is suggested that some other contemporary poems be investigated. Third, the direction of the present study is from Persian into English, some work can be done changing the direction from English into other languages. Finally, since the present study focused on poetry, it is suggested that the same model be used with other genres such as prose and even drama.
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Appendix: Sample Translations

Quatrain No. 1

Anak ke mazahesh va Adasht Nobel
Bar jam alam niger e mahmoud
Za zereh shi nazir Bedarion
Gharkade biar e darokhshend

First translation

The revelations of day and learned
Who rose before us, and as prophets burned
Are all but stories which awake from sleep
They told their comrades, and to sleep returned

Second translation

Those who mastered high learning and grace
Whose merits shine with rare excellence
Found no way out of this gloomy night
A tale they told and passed with no grace

Quatrain No. 2

Az farsh ke hejmadi dar jolak gafnet
Agh be do, kordi Roh abar gomret
Beharoktegori Mi gharkhume ba
Dideya ke vorgonai Goz beharoktegori

First translation

They say the lion and the lizard keep
The courts whose Fanashid gloried and drank deep
And Bahram that great hunter the wild ass
Stumps over head and he lies fast asleep

Second translation

In the castle that king Fanashid raised glass
The deer now breeds, the fox dead names
King Bahram who loved hunting the zebra
See now prance over his dust the ass