

International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



Assessing the Quality of Persian Translation of *Kite Runner* based on House's (2014) Functional Pragmatic Model

[PP: 117-126]

Fateme Kargarzadeh

Department of Foreign Languages, Kerman Science Research Branch
Islamic Azad University, Kerman, **Iran**

Abbas Paziresh

Department of Foreign Languages, Kuzestan Science Research Branch
Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, **Iran**

ABSTRACT

Translation quality assessment is at the heart of any theory of translation. It is used in the academic or teaching contexts to judge translations, to discuss their merits and demerits and to suggest solutions. However, literary translations needs more consideration in terms of quality and clarity as it is widely read form of translation. In this respect, Persian literary translation of *Kite Runner* was taken for investigation based on House's (2014) functional pragmatic model of translation quality assessment. To this end, around 100 pages from the beginning of both English and Persian versions of the novel were selected and compared. Using House's model, the profile of the source text register was created and the genre was recognized. The source text profile was compared to the translation text profile. The results were minute mismatches in field, tenor, and mode which accounted for as overt erroneous expressions and leading matches which were accounted for as covert translation. The mismatches were some mistranslations of tenses and selection of inappropriate meanings for the lexicon. Since the informal and culture specific terms were transferred thoroughly, the culture filter was not applied. Besides, as the translation was a covert one. The findings of the study have implications for translators, researchers and translator trainers.

Keywords: Translation, Quality, Assessment, *Kite Runner*, Overt and Covert Translation

ARTICLE INFO	The paper received on	Reviewed on	Accepted after revisions on
	06/01/2017	28/01/2017	10/04/2017

Suggested citation:

Kargarzadeh, F. & Paziresh, A. (2017). Assessing the Quality of Persian Translation of *Kite Runner* based on House's (2014) Functional Pragmatic Model. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 5(1), 117-126.

1. Introduction

During recent years, researchers have become increasingly fascinated in the investigation of different aspects of translated texts across languages. As the importance of translation from perspective of quality gained importance, the need to measure translation quality and make decisions to improve them emerged. The same need has been manifested itself under the concept of translation quality assessment (TQA). Nevertheless, attempts have been made to evaluate the translations across different languages and across different genres. However, literary translation genre did not get adequate attention as was required particularly in the cases of English novels translated into Persian. Therefore, this study aimed research and discuss this phenomenon in relation to *Kite Runner* translation from English into Persian focusing on quality of

the translation based on famous model of House (2014).

The issue of translation from different perspectives has received considerable attention by different scholars and researchers like- Baker and Saldanha (2009); Bassnett (2013); Darwish (1989); Gerritzen, Lovink and Kampman (2011); Hermans (2014); Kumar and Byrne (2005); Larson (1984); Lefevere (1992); Munday (2001); Munday (2008); Newmark (1989); Nida (1969); Olohan (2004); Pardo (2013); Pochhacker and Shlesinger (2002); Snell-Hornby (1988); Toury (2012); Venuti (2012); Williams and Chesterman (2014) and Kargarzadeh and Paziresh (2016).

Gerritzen, Lovink and Kampman (2011: 250) assert that the term translation has been derived from Latin which denotes 'to bring or carry across'; its equivalence from ancient Greek was *metaphases* meaning 'to speak across'. Gerritzen, et al. have noted that the beginning translations



performed by Sumerian into Asian languages were from the second millennium BC (2011). According to Bassnett (2013), the beginning of a new scholastic field called *translation studies* dates back to 1970s. Therefore, she believed that from 1970s on, this subject has been taken seriously. As such, during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s translation studies developed significantly from perspectives of theory and practice, and finally went into global expansion. Bassnett (2013) argued that once it has been a marginal activity, but later gained its position as a channel of human exchange across the globe. Darwish also (1989) pointed out that translation involves an increasing process, packed with activities related to all other existing fields of enquiry related to language. He further argued that this process covers three main activities of transfer of data from one language to another, analysis of texts in research manner and self-development and learning in educational arenas. Kumar and Byrne (2005) also believe that translation is similar to poetry which is elusive. Pochhacker and Shlesinger (2002) have defined translation as the transference of thoughts or ideas from one SL to a TL. In this respect, Newmark (1989) has regarded the act of translating as transferring the meaning of a text, from one language to another, preserving the functional pertinent meaning. For him, theory of translation is neither theory nor science, but a vast knowledge. Nida (1969) and Newmark (1988) have also asserted that translation consists of reproducing the receptor language to the closest normal equivalent of the source language message.

However, everyone performs a translation of some purpose. But the acceptability or the quality of that translation hinges upon assessment. That is to say, to guarantee the excellence of that translation for improving that translation and preparing a principle for other translations, some measures have to be adopted. Any translation for acceptability and value finding needs a quality control; as such, measuring the quality and value of translational products require a system of valuing. In this respect, the TQA is a growing sub-field of translation studies which aims to determine good and bad of translations either as product or process. Any assessment needs theoretical basis. House (2014) argued that the TQA is a prerequisite of a translation for the existence of any translation theory.

According to Newmark (1988), when we ask which translation is 'good' we mean the exactness of that translation comparing to the SL. Further, according to Newmark (1988) exactness is relative, that is to say exact in relation to which criterion. There is always the idea that the standard for good or bad of a translation is SL, that is to say, how much the translator could recreate the SL successfully (Neubert, Gregory M. Shreve, 1992).

Up to now different models of TQA have been introduced. Every model has targeted series of aspects of translation for evaluation. For example, when Newmark (1997) embarked on TQA wished to report on textual and semantic aspects of translation. Such and similar models targeted linguistic and textual aspects of texts. On the other hand, other significant models emerged which went beyond linguistic-textual consideration to explore functional pragmatic aspects of texts. The greatest function and purpose of functional models were introduction of those functions and purposes of texts in the target language. In this respect, House's TQA model (1977) was also a comprehensive model which targeted the functional pragmatic aspects of translation.

1.1 Aims of the study

According to Honig (2010), 'TQA is an essential part of any theoretical concept of translation and is accomplished daily in an unreflected and authoritarian way. As such, reflections from translators' work bench must be considered to provide a basis for an informed use of TQA' (p. 1). Nerudová (2012) believes that due to globalization, the world nowadays depends on 'successful communication facilitating mutual understanding and helping overcome language and cultural barriers' (p. 9). The increase in need for translations is resulted from recognized event of 'shrinking of the world' and people's aspiration for the augmented awareness of the world. Nerudová (2012) also asserts that literary texts are being translated greatly and momentous section of translations is directed to daily. As such, translation is going to become an industry.

House (2014) believes that any product such as translation requires a check point center where the quality is approved or rejected. Translation as a mental product is no exception and one of the ways to control the accuracy and quality of the products is TQA. According to Nerudová (2012) scholars and researchers have been

trying to seek answer to the difficult question of what translation quality actually is and how to measure it on the basis of translation theory and its application to translation criticism. Thus, the choice of this topic for practical research has generated the researchers' personal interests in translation quality issues. The researchers have showed interest in investigating what is behind the notion of quality. Therefore, this study was initiated to explore comparison between the Persian translations in terms of quality as that would offer several implications for local translation industry in Iran. The study sought to answer the following research question(s):

- 1) To what extent can the quality of Persian translation of *Kite Runner* be assessed based on House's (2014) TQA model?
- 2) Based on the selected model, to which category (overt or covert) of translation did this translations belong?

1.2 Significance of the Study

As this study follows quality principles of Mossop, (2001) i.e. evaluating quality of product embracing issues such as reliability, quality of the physical product i.e. accounting for meeting translation buyer's requirements in terms of the formal aspects of a text such as the page layout, formatting quality of the translation including terminology and the style of writing adapted to the purpose of translation is significant. Besides, as Newmark (1988) suggested a good translator or writer often avoids not only errors of language use but also simply applies his common senses and show sensitivity to language which makes the result of the translation process more tolerable. Besides, testing the quality of the translations, and coming to a decision about the kind of translations underscores the alterations made because of target language structure and also the uninformed changes owing to the style of the translator. For instance, it underlies the differences in theme, order, and linkages between the two languages under study.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

House's (1997) model of TQA was used as theoretical framework for this research. House's model takes the text as a whole phenomenon. The model is functional and encompasses different dimensions of text such as linguistic, pragmatic and discourse. In other words, House's (1997) model of TQA is based on systematic functional linguistics of Halliday. The model operates at different

levels of analysis. It begins from the level of individual textual function; then, goes to the levels of register and genre; and finally ends at the level of language/text. The level of register analysis covers three dimensions of *field*, *tenor*, and *mode*. Comparing ST profile with TT profile brings about mismatches between the two profiles. Dimensional errors and mismatches are referred to as covert errors, whereas, mismatches of the denotative meanings or breaches of target language system are overt errors. House also presumes two kinds of translation, namely- covert and overt translation. A covert translation is a translation that appears as if it produces the target culture. On the other hand, an overt translation is a translation in which the cultural features of the source text are purposefully retained.

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1 Translation and TQA

House (2014:02) defined translation as the result of a linguistic-textual operation in which a text in one language is re-contextualized in another language. In other words, translation is an operation which is rooted in linguistics and is under the influence of extra-linguistic factors. Therefore, translation is the result of interaction between inner linguistic-textual factors, outer linguistic factors and context related factors. Ordudari (2007: 07) also believes that translation is used to transfer written or spoken SL texts to equivalent written or spoken TL texts in order to reproduce various kinds of texts in another language and thus making them available to wider readers. According to Newmark (1988), translation is 'rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text'. (p. 5).

Therefore, any translation which is done has to be beautiful and appealing in the eyes of readers. More exactly, we do translations for readership. As such, they have to meet the criteria of readership. For these and similar reasons, there is the need of evaluation of quality of translations either summatively or formatively. According to Stejskal (2009) the person who buys a translation wish to read the translation not the original, s/he understands the meaning from the translation and not the original. Further, s/he expects something beautiful and complete which will be different from the original. As such, s/he could not assess the quality of that translation independently. The reader has to rely on any assurance that



the translator is accomplished by a good job and it has been performed by some qualified translators (Stejskal, 2009). So, it seems that quality of translation has to be performed for the excellence, authenticity and meaningfulness of translation. Many key researchers such as Al-Qinai (2000); Brunette (2000); House (1977); Lauscher (2000); Williams (2001); Reiss (2014); Williams (2004); Williams (2009); Schäffner (1998) and Xianzhu (2004) have offered models for assessment of translation. Every model has suggested a different methodology of translation quality assessment.

2.2. The Importance of the Translation Quality Assessment

House (2009: 43) states that evaluating translations has always been both an academic and a popular undertaking as philologists and philosophers, journalists, poets, and all manner of lay people have expressed opinions on what makes a good translation. TQA is that much important and unavoidable that even during the act of translation, translator is involved in evaluating the translated text as a reader. Moreover, the significance of translation quality assessment is better exposed when it is drawn as a distinct area of translation studies (Lauscher (2000); Williams (2001); Rothe-Neves (2002); Schaffner (1997); Williams (2009)). However, the evaluation is not a fully-fledged area in the field and many have argued the need for more empirical and theoretical research. The assessment of translator's performance is an activity which, despite being widespread, is 'under-researched and under-discussed' according to Hatim and Mason (1997: 197).

2.3 House's TQA Model

Juliane House, a German scholar of translation studies, introduced the most functional TQA model through her thesis (Barghout, 1990). Within this model, the concept of equivalence is central and translation is constituted by a double-binding relationship both to its source and to the communicative conditions of the receiving Lingoculture, and it is the concept of equivalence which captures this relationship (Drugan, 2013). Thuy (2012:56) referred to TQA as not an undisputed issue; but argued that the main problem resides in the way TQA is performed and different measures are used depending on the purpose of the assessment and on the theoretical framework. House's (2014) comprehensive linguistic model of TQA utilized register variables of field,

tenor, and mode for TQA. In this model theories toward meaning have been divided into three categories of mentalist view, response-based view and discourse and text based view. According to House, spirit of translation is the conservation of "meaning" across three levels: semantic, pragmatic and textual across two languages. According to her, functional equivalence is important and to get the functional equivalence, situational dimensions and linguistic materials should be defined. She concluded that in translation assessment, two kinds of mismatches between the two texts should be identified: overtly erroneous error and covertly erroneous error. In this model the researcher develops two profiles of SL and TL. Firstly, the SL profile is developed using Field, Tenor and Mode. On the basis of findings on the lexical, the syntactic and the textual level, a text-profile is prepared which reflects the individual textual function. Secondly, the translated text experiences same dimensions; thirdly, the two profiles are compared. Finally, an assessment of their relative match/mismatch is given (Al-Qinai, 2000; Brunette, 2000; Honig, 1997; Hickey, 1998; Lauscher, 2000; Williams, 2001; Rothe-Neves, 2002; Schaffner, 1997; Williams, 2009; Williams, 1989; Xianzhu, 2004).

However, some have criticized the model for different reasons. According to Gutt (2014), House espoused function based equivalence to translation. That is to say, the translator has to match the original text in function. For this purpose, House overemphasized covert translation and underestimated overt translation, because the former is able to achieve the original goal of function based equivalence of translation (Gutt, 2014). Despite the importance of covert translation, it cannot do the job so easily, 'since there is an array of differences in the sociocultural backgrounds of the source and target language audiences' (Gutt, 2014, pp. 47-48). Further, there is an enigma to know if the translation is thoroughly equivalent. Another more crucial problem in House model is the fact that keeping the functions in the translation doesn't guarantee a functionally equivalent translation.

2.4 Related Studies on TQA

Many studies like Norouzi (2016); Zekri & Shamsavar (2016); Shadman (2014); Shariati & Shariati (2014); Wanchia (2015) and Namdari & Shahrokhi (2015) have been performed on the quality assessment of translated works across the

world as well in Iran. These studies have adopted different models of TQA. Ehsani and Zohrabi (2014) assessed Persian translations of English advertising texts of cosmetic products based on House's functional-pragmatic model of TQA. They identified and developed Profiles of both source texts and target texts. They showed that overt errors outnumbered covert errors. Consequences of chi-square test manifested that the existing variation was statistically significant. So it was concluded that House's functional-pragmatic model of TQA were not applied when translating English advertising texts into Persian.

A study by Heidari Tabrizi, Chalak and Taherioun (2013) assessed the quality of Persian translation of Orwell's (1949) *Nineteen Eighty-Four* based on House (1997) model of translation quality assessment. They developed the profiles of the source and target texts to be compared. The result of this contrast was dimensional mismatches and overt errors. The dimensional mismatches were classified based on different dimensions of register including field, tenor, and mode. The overt errors were categorized into omissions, additions, substitutions, and breaches of the target language system. Then, the occurrences of subcategories of overt errors with their percentages were calculated. Analyzing the overt errors and dimensional errors, authors indicated that the translation did not conform to House's view that literary works are translated as overt. In other words, non-conformities on different levels of register indicated that the cultural filter was used in translation and the second-level functional equivalence required for overt translation was met. Further, the Persian translation of *novel* was not an overt translation. Instead, this translation was a covert one.

Khorsand and Salmani (2014) assessed the quality of two English-Persian translations of the anthems in Orwell's *Animal Farm* based on House's revised discursal model. First Khorsand and Salmani (2014) analyzed the professional profiles of the translators to find out the expert and novice translators based on Dimitrova's notion of 'expertise in translation'. Secondly, they analyzed the profiles of the source text and the two translations on four different levels of genre, field, mode and tenor. Khorsand and Salmani (2014) discussed two types of errors: covert and overt errors. Finally, Khorsand and Salmani (2014) drew conclusions to find out whether the expert

or novice translator's translation was more or less adequate. The findings of the study revealed that expert performance does not always result in better performance.

3. Methodology

3.1 Corpus

This study sought to determine the quality of Persian translation of the prominent and bestselling novel of *Kite Runner* based on House (2014) model of TQA. The novel has been written by Khaled Hosseini and translated into Persian by Mehdi Ghabaree. It is the first novel of Afghan writer Khaled Hosseini and was published by *Riverhead Books* in 2003. It is a historical novel which revolved around themes of disaffection, disloyalty, companionship, lost innocence, love, religion and retribution. This novel narrates the life in pre-Russian invasion, pre-Taliban rule and post-Taliban rule over Afghanistan. This great novel has been decorated with good character development, stylistic/rhetorical devices, and wide inclusion of imagery.

3.2 Procedure of data collection

This is qualitative and quantitative comparative corpus based study. That is to say, a library source was selected along with its translation. In this study, the quality of the first paragraphs of the all chapters of current Persian translation of English novel of *Kite Runner* were assessed based on House's functional-pragmatic model of TQA. Using House's model, two profiles of both source texts and target texts were developed, the overt and covert errors determined. Furthermore, the frequency of the occurrences was calculated. To finish, the type of translation i.e. overt or covert was specified to witness if they go with House's functional-pragmatic model of TQA.

3.3 Procedure of Data Analysis

The following steps were taken while analysing the collected data:

1. Performing a register analysis for developing ST profile.
2. Specification of text genre
3. Determining the function of ST
4. Repeating items 1, 2 and 3 for TT
5. Comparing the profiles ST and TT
6. Classification of the errors into two covert and overt
7. Rendering the translation as either covert and overt
8. Giving a statement of quality

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Analysis of the Original

In this part, following House's model of TQA, the ST (*Kite Runner*) profile



was prepared. The ST profile is composed of a register analysis. Register itself is composed of field, tenor and mode. Every subcategory of register again is divided into lexical, syntactic and textual means.

Field: this novel revolves around guilt and redemption, violence, price of betrayal and exploration of the power of fathers over sons, their love, their sacrifices and their lies. The *Kite Runner* is a father-son story in which Cultural prejudice and the political power shifts. The novel has been written to be read both by the adult and the children. It includes homosexual rape, murder, beatings, and a suicide attempt, alcohol and drugs and religious discussions. Lexical markers of field were use of neologisms such as gold-stitched, horseman, and scores of Persian and Afghan local words like *Nunn (bread)*, *Toophan Agha* and *Baba*. There were instances of informal words like *Kufta* and *Baba jan*. The story mostly contains short simple clauses and sentences. However, there were several instances of long sentences consisting of short subordinate clauses and phrases. Further, punctuations such as semicolon, colon, and comma in the text are used. The author often starts the sentences with adverbs, conjunctions, and relative pronouns: *After all*; and *because....* Strong cohesion is achieved through repetitions and iconic linkage *and, then, for, if*. There are also theme dynamics especially sequences of theme-rhyme, anaphoric referencing by means of pro-forms for noun phrases, adverbials, clauses or sentences, and instances of clausal linkage: *when, as, but, and, that is, therefore*.

Tenor: Author's temporal, geographical and social provenance is known to everyone, and the English he used in the novel is Standard English amalgamated with Persian and local Afghan terminology. As such, author's social provenance is obvious in the novel. He is against violence, religious ethnicity and very old and metamorphosed traditions of Afghanistan. The novelist acted as a storyteller who told the tale to the audience. He got readers engaged in the story by using second single personal pronoun in an ordinary way without any authority.

Mode: The medium, or the channel, is what House would call *simple*, i.e. written to be read (if you disregard the dialogue). For mode, the medium was multifaceted since the text was written to be read as if spoken. A text may be either a "simple" monologue or dialogue, or a more "complex" mixture"

(House, 1997). Participants are not complex. The relationship between them is simple.

Function: Both ideational and interpersonal functions are present in the text *Kite Runner*. The author wished to show the world the way that common issues of individuality, assimilation and power, violence and ethnicity are challenged in Afghanistan. Interpersonal function was clear from the GENRE, since the author developed the character of Amir who lived in Afghanistan society and described his life and challenges. On the dimension of FIELD, the interpersonal function was there due to using colloquial lexical items, presence of local and non-academic terms, more or less simple syntactic structures, and redundancy through repetition and iconic linkages. On TENOR, the consultative style level was obvious through informal and borrowed lexical items, supported interpersonal function. The MODE was interpersonal function because the text has been written to be read as if spoken.

4.2 Comparison of Original and Translation

On field, lexical mismatches have been seen because the formal words were translated informally and informal words translated formally: argue, چک و چونه زدن; nomad, کولی. Many content words were mistranslated: twinkle, درخشیدن; kill, زیر; چپاندن, bury کم آوردن; ran out; چپان رفتن. Besides, many words are not translated: nomad, childhood classmates and stun. Syntactic mismatches were also committed: we cried at the end, ما در اخر گریه می کردیم, we took strolls, ما گشت می زدیم, we had a daily routine, ما کار روزانه مان مشخص بود. In addition, some of long sentences consisting of several subordinated clauses in the original text were translated into separate short sentences and vice versa. On tenor, there were syntactic mismatches, lexical mismatches were seen in social attitude since some of informal lexical items and idioms are markedly more formal in Persian translation. Regarding the author's temporal, geographical and social provenance and author's personal stance, in the translation of the novel the author's provenances are mostly kept. The temporal, geographical and social provenances of the author in the Persian translation mainly unmarked, contemporary, standard middle class Persian. The chief achievement of the second translation was that the translator was typically capable in caring and conveying the author's personal attitude.

The Persian translation was even, smooth, not intricate, and full of familiar collocations and easily read. On mode, some lexical mismatches are seen in medium, because some of conversational and informal lexical items were translated to more recognized lexical items in Persian translation. At the stage of linguistic features realizing textual meanings, the ST presents a strong textual cohesion, mostly constructed through a wide use of repetitions. They seem to have multiple functions: to convey humor; to keep the reader's or listener's attention; to make comprehension easier.

4.3 Statement of the Quality

The analysis of original and translation has revealed a number of mismatches along the dimensions of field, tenor and mode. On the other hand, no significant changes occurred to interpersonal and ideational function. Further, overt errors which occurred in translation did not detract from the ideational function and change the transmission of information. On field explicitness in the translation was that of original and loss of cohesion seen. Since cohesion was positive, the omission of referential identity, repetitions and iconic linkage were not remarkable. Since cohesion was established in translation, the aesthetic pleasure of the original was present in translation too. On tenor, the author's stance has not changed. The two role relationships, author-reader and author-character were not affected by the second translation just like the first one. The style level was in certain cases normal and like original informal and designed to communicate closeness. On mode, the translation kept its spookiness though some structures and lexical items manipulated. No cultural filtering applied in the translation. So, it is claimed that the translation was both overt and covert. Considering the overtness, the mismatches were not significant and in translation of any genre are probable. Moreover, the translation was the exact replication of the original, that is to say, following House (1981), 'it has enjoyed the status of the original' (p. 194). In addition, the translation is tightly adhered to source text culture.

4.4 Overtly Erroneous Elements

Overt errors were categorized into seven subcategories of not translated; slight change in meaning; significant change in meaning; distortion of meaning; breach of the source language system; creative

translation and cultural filtering. As such, in the comparison of original and the translation, there were minute cases of 'not translated' and 'Slight change in meaning'. Regarding cultural filtering, the cultural norms and linguistic culture specific items transferred as in the original, therefore, no cases of cultural filtration found.

4.5 Covert Aspect

As has been mentioned before, the variations in translation were subtle. The translation remained intact cohesively, culturally and aesthetically. The full image of the original was replicated in translation. Furthermore, consistent with House (1981) this translation had a direct target language addressness, that is to say, immediateness and originality was relevant to ST. In addition, functionally the translation matched the original.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study was supposed to present a TQA account of Persian translation of *Kite Runner* as an English novel based on House's (2014) TQA model. The results have indicated that the type of translation was overt. Further, as the mismatches were some mistranslations of tenses and selection of inappropriate meanings for the lexicon, the overtness of the *Kite Runner* translation was highly consistent with House's overtness of translation of literary texts. As has been stated, the translation of *Kite Runner* into Persian was with some minute mismatches which were accounted for as overt errors. Since the errors were not remarkable, the translation was said to be an overt type translation. The overt mismatches were cases of tenses, translation of words with distance equivalents in Persian and manipulation of the degree of formality of expressions. On the other hand, while the dimensional mismatches were not considerable, the translation as overt translation was put on the agenda. Regarding the research question raised, it has to be said that since the source of this study was a literary one, it was easily assessed based on House's (2014) TQA model. Justifying the overt minute mismatches across original and translation, it can be said that the translator negligence seemed to be the cause since they were cases of equivalence finding of content words like *kill*, *ran out*, *twinkle*, *nomad* and *used to* and mistranslation of tenses like *past to present*, *present to present perfect* etc.

The results of the study are congruent with (Heidari Tabrizi, Chalak and Hossein Taherioun, 2012; Khorsand



and Salmani, 2014) performed on the translation quality assessment of literary texts. Further, as the type of translation of *Kite Runner* as a literary translation has been realized as overt, it is in line with overt translation type theory of House (1975). House (1975) noted that the overt kind of translation is needed for translation of literary works.

The covert form of translation i.e. immediateness, originality, replication of the source text image owed to factors like similarity of Iranian culture to Afghan culture and similarity of the two considering linguistic factors. Since the author of the novel was an Afghan, the text of the novel seemed to be written by an Iranian. Since Afghanistan once was part of Iran, its culture and language is totally similar to Iranian ones (Barfield, 2010; Esposito, 1999; Gnoli, 1989; Graham, 2010; Griffiths, 1981; Hanifi, 2011; Hernández, 2011; Hersh, 2013; Innocent, 2011; Joseph and Nagmabadi, 2003; Kemp and Gay, 2013; Milani, 2010; Moghadam, 1999; Nader, Scotten, Rahmani, Stewart and Mahnad, 2014; Rostami-Povey, 2007; Tapper, 1988; Tapper, 1983; Thomas, 2010; Türk, 2012; Weiner and Banuazizi, 1994 and Yapp, 1980).

The cultural specific items of the text were exactly those which Iranian authors and people utter and believe. All in all, it can be said that this novel if read by an Iranian, s/he would say that an Iranian wrote it. Nevertheless, it is can be said that it is a Persian novel translated into Persian, i.e. a covert translation.

References

- Al-Qinai, J. (2000). Translation quality assessment. Strategies, parametres and procedures. *Meta: Journal des traducteursMeta:/Translators' Journal*, 45(3), 497-519.
- Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. Routledge.
- Barfield, T. (2010). *Afghanistan: A cultural and political history*. Princeton University Press.
- Barghout, M. A. M. (1990). *Translation quality assessment: an application of a rhetorical model* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Salford, UK).
- Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation studies*. Routledge.
- Brunette, L. (2000). Towards a terminology for translation quality assessment: A comparison of TQA practices. *The Translator*, 6(2), 169-182.
- Darwish, A. (1989). *The Translation Process: A View of the Mind*.
- Drugan, J. (2013). *Quality in professional translation: Assessment and improvement* (Vol. 9). A&C Black.
- Ehsani, F., & Zohrabi, K. (2014). Assessing Translation of Advertising Text (English-persian) based on House's Functional-Pragmatic Model of TQA. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 420-424.
- Esposito, J. L. (1999). *The Oxford History of Islam*. Oxford University Press.
- Gnoli, G. (1989). *The idea of Iran: an essay on its origin*. Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Graham, M. (2010). *Afghanistan in the Cinema*. University of Illinois Press.
- Griffiths, J. C. (1981). *Afghanistan: Key to a Continent*. Harper & Collins.
- Hanifi, M. J. (2011). *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History*.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *Translation studies Readers*. London & New York.
- Hermans, T. (2014). *The Manipulation of Literature (Routledge Revivals): Studies in Literary Translation*. Routledge.
- Hernández, P. R. (2011). AFGHANISTAN: A Cultural and Political History. *Military Review*, 91(6), 80.
- Hersh, S. M. (2013). *The Samson option: Israel's nuclear arsenal and American foreign policy*. Random House.
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (2013). *Thinking Arabic translation: A course in translation method: Arabic to English*. Routledge.
- Hickey, L. (Ed.). (1998). *The pragmatics of translation* (Vol. 12). Multilingual matters.
- Honig, H. G. (1997). Positions, power and practice: Functionalist approaches and translation quality assessment. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 4(1), 6-34.
- House, J. (1977). *A model for translation quality assessment* (Vol. 88). John Benjamins Pub Co.
- House, J. (2001). Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation. *Meta: Journal des traducteursMeta:/Translators' Journal*, 46(2), 243-257.
- House, J. (2009). *Translation*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co..
- Innocent, M. (2011). Afghanistan: a Cultural and Political History. *The Cato Journal*, 31(1), 154-163.
- Joseph, S., & Nağmābādī, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Encyclopedia of Women and Islamic Cultures: Family, Law and Politics* (Vol. 2). Brill.

- Kargarzadeh, F. and Paziresh, A. (2016). Investigating the Deformation Of Hafiz Metaphors Translation Through Berman (1985) Deformative System: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies*, 3(2), 59-65.
- Kemp, G., & Gay, J. A. (2013). *War with Iran: Political, Military, and Economic Consequences*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Khorsand, M., & Salmani, B. (2014). Anthems as Propaganda: A Discoursal Translation Quality Assessment. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(3), 222-237.
- Khorsand, M., & Salmani, B. (2014). Anthems as Propaganda: A Discoursal Translation Quality Assessment. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5(3), 222-237.
- Kumar, S., & Byrne, W. (2005, October). Local phrase reordering models for statistical machine translation. In *Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 161-168). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. Lanham: University press of America.
- Lauscher, S. (2000). Translation quality assessment: Where can theory and practice meet?. *The translator*, 6(2), 149-168.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. Taylor & Francis.
- Milani, M. (2010). Iran and Afghanistan. *United States Institute of Peace, the Iran Primer*.
- Moghadam, V. M. (1999). Revolution, religion, and gender politics: Iran and Afghanistan compared. *Journal of Women's History*, 10(4), 172-195.
- Mossop, B. (2001). *Revising and editing for translators*. Manchester: St.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introduction to translation studies*.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies*. London and New York.
- Nader, A., Scotten, A. G., Rahmani, A. I., Stewart, R., & Mahnad, L. (2014). *Iran's Influence in Afghanistan: Implications for the US Drawdown*. Rand Corporation.
- Namdari, R. & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). Differences in Translation by Translation Specialized and Non-Specialized Students in Terms of Accuracy of Pragmatic Equivalence and Lexico-Syntactic Properties. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 3(2), 67-73.
- Nerudová, D. (2012). Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base: sharing the tax base under formulary apportionment. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Finance and Banking* (pp. 279-288).
- Neubert, A., & Shreve, G. M. (1992). *Translation as text* (No. 1). Kent State University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 1, p. 988). New York: Prentice hall.
- Newmark, P. (1989). Modern Translation Theory. *Lebende Sprachen*, 34(1), 6-8.
- Nida, E. A. (1969). Science of translation. *Language*, 483-498.
- Nida, E. A. (1975). *Language structure and translation: essays* (Vol. 8). Stanford University Press.
- Norouzi, M. (2016). Towards Defining a Specific Text as a Valid Instrument in Translation Quality Evaluation Studies: A Conceptual Paper. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(3), 132-141.
- Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Ordudari, M. (2007). Translation procedures, strategies and methods. *Translation Journal*, 11(3), 8.
- Pardo, B. S. (2013). Translation studies: An introduction to the history and development of (audiovisual) translation. *Linguax: Revista de linguas aplicadas*, (1), 1.
- Pöchhacker, F., & Shlesinger, M. (2002). *The interpreting studies reader*. Psychology Press.
- Rostami-Povey, E. (2007). *Afghan women: identity and Invasion*. Zed Books.
- Rothe-Neves, R. (2002). Translation Quality Assessment for Research Purposes: an empirical approach. *Cadernos de tradução*, 2(10), 113-131.
- Schäffner, C. (1997). *Translation and norms*. Multilingual matters.
- Scriven, M. (1966). *Defects of the necessary condition analysis of causation*. Oxford University Press.
- Shadman, N. (2014). The Relationship between Attitude towards Politics and the Quality of Political Translation. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 2(2), 169-178.
- Shariati, M. & Shariati, A. (2014). A Point about the Quality of the English Translation of Gulistan of Saadi by Rehatsek. *International Journal of*



- English Language & Translation Studies*. 2(2), 1-10.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1988). *Translation studies: An integrated approach*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Stejskal, J. (2009). Quality assessment in translation. In *CIUTI-Forum 2008 (enhancing translation quality: Ways, means, methods)* (pp. 291-300).
- Tabrizi, H. H., Chalak, A., & Taherioun, A. H. (2014). Assessing the Quality of Persian Translation of Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four Based on House's Model: Overt-Covert Translation Distinction. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 4(3), 29-42.
- Tapper, R. (1988). Ethnicity, order and meaning in the anthropology of Iran and Afghanistan. *Le Fait ethnique en Iran et en Afghanistan*, 21-34.
- Tapper, R. (Ed.). (1983). *The Conflict of tribe and state in Iran and Afghanistan*. Taylor & Francis.
- Thomas, B. (2010). *Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History*. Tom.
- Thuy, T. T. (2016). House's functional-pragmatic model of translation assessment and implications for evaluating English-Vietnamese translation quality. *VNU Journal of Science: Foreign Studies*, 29(1).
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond: Revised edition* (Vol. 100). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Türk, K. (2012). Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History. *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, (31), 158-162.
- Venuti, L. (2012). *The translation studies reader*. Routledge.
- Wanchia, T. N. (2015). African Cultural and Literary Specificity in the Broad Translation Quality Debate. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 3(3), 143-158.
- Weiner, M., & Banuazizi, A. (1994). *The politics of social transformation in Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan*. Syracuse University Press.
- Williams, J., & Chesterman, A. (2014). *The map: a beginner's guide to doing research in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Williams, M. (1989). The assessment of professional translation quality: Creating credibility out of chaos. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 2(2), 13-33.
- Williams, M. (2001). The application of argumentation theory to translation quality assessment. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 46(2), 326-344.
- Williams, M. (2009). Translation quality assessment. *Mutatis Mutandis: Revista Latinoamericana de Traducción*, 2(1), 3-23.
- Xianzhu, S. (2004). A Translation Quality Assessment Model, A Functional Linguistic Perspective. *Foreign Language Education*, 4, 010.
- Yapp, M. (1980). *Strategies of British India: Britain, Iran, and Afghanistan, 1798-1850*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Zekri, A. & Shamsavar, Z. (2016). Quality Assessment of Persian Translation of English Pharmaceutical Leaflets Based on House's Model. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(4), 67-76.