

Longman group UK. Limited.

Hatch, E., and Brown, C. (1995). *Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.

Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based Translation*. University Press of America, Inc.

Mollanazar, H. (1990). *The Role of Collocation in Translation*. Unpublished MA Dissertation. Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran.

Nattinger, J. R., and DeCarrico, J. J. (1992). *Lexical Phrases and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Conclusion

By focusing on collocations, which are "potential trouble spots" (Beekman and Callow 1974) we will provide future translators with a kind of information they need to do their job better. This will be more helpful when translating from L1 into L2 in which the translator is in many cases less proficient. Practice with L2 collocations and their equivalents in L1 will help our would be translators realize that looking up individual words in a bilingual dictionary is not enough, in many cases the meaning of a word changes depending on the words with which it is used or collocated. Our information about different types of collocations and their respective difficulty level will make the trouble spots more predictable.

Errors in collocating L2 words will surely expose some of the weak points of a translator. These weak points may be detected by using various tests on collocations to help the teacher judge about the learners' level of lexical competence.

Studying the problems the translators encounter in finding acceptable L2 collocations throws light on the fact that those who are engaged in writing bilingual dictionaries should not simply translate one of the monolingual dictionaries into their native language. The translators of such dictionaries should adopt the original dictionary considering the kinds of problems the translators have in their linguistic community.

If further studies confirm the usefulness and practicality of this approach in predicting and dealing with some of the problems in the field of translation, the next step would be to find the frequency of occurrence of different types of collocations. This will be very helpful in designing exercises and textbooks for translators and also in evaluating translated texts.

References

Beekman, J. and Callow, J. (1974). *Translating the Word of God*.

Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Carter, R. & MC Carthy, M. (1988). *Vocabulary & Language Teaching*.

Table 1.

Types of collocations	% of mistakes	Positive effect of context
Type I.1	44%	2%
Type II.1	55%	12%
Type II.2	76%	3%
Type II.3	88%	11%
Type I.2	82%	23%
Type I.3	96%	--

What is important is not the number or percentage of the mistakes the subjects make in each type. This will obviously differ according to their level of language proficiency in SL and TL. The differences in the percentage of mistakes in various collocational types are more meaningful. The frequency of Type I. 3 is definitely lower than the others. But the probability of making mistakes in finding acceptable TL equivalents for this type of collocations is considerably great.

As we move down the list the amount of bottom-up processing decreases and dependence on top-down processing increases, so that in dealing with Type I. 3 collocations providing a correct translation will be almost impossible without background knowledge or top-down processing.

In processing collocations, grammatical competence will not be of considerable help. Relations between lexical items in a collocation, and also between SL collocations and their TL equivalents are independent of grammatical considerations (Beekman and Callow 1974, p. 162; Carter R. and Mc Carthy M. 1988, p. 35). In this article the author has limited himself to Adj + N, and N + N structures which are cited as "the most common collocations types" (Newmark 1988). In the absence of bilingual dictionaries tailored according to the needs of translators, and without proper exercises on dealing with collocations the learner/translator has only to rely on contextual clues and his TL competence to solve his problems.

Mental processes in understanding and translating collocations

It seems that difficulty level of collocations depends largely on the use of primary and non-primary sense of the component words. Collocations in which the words are used in their primary sense are easily understood and translated. Many authors do not even consider them collocations (Newmark 1988; p. 149). Understanding and translating collocations becomes more and more problematic when one or both of the component words distance themselves from their primary sense. Consider the gradual decrease of the use of the primary sense from Type I. 1 through Type II. 3. The word which is used in its primary sense acts as a clue for the translator to guess the meaning of the unknown or less transparent element and consequently plays a major role in helping the translator form a mental image, and this works as a context in which the less transparent word must be used. As a result the number of possible candidates to fill the slot or be used as a collocate is limited. Thus it may be claimed that Type II.3 collocations in which no SL element is expressed in primary sense will cause more problem for the translator than Type II.1 and II.2. In Type I.2 in which the expected TL equivalent for one of the elements is missing, or is considered redundant, the translator will unconsciously be inclined to include a word for the missing element.

To compare the difficulty levels of different types of collocations a list of sixty collocations (10 of each type) was given to two hundred intermediate EFL students to provide Farsi equivalents. To examine the effect of context, 50 of the subjects were also provided with sentences in which twelve of the collocations were contextualized (except for Type I.3). The result is summarized in Table 1.

Type I.2	A1	+	B1	→	x + φ	
	military		police	→	dežban	دژبان
	fringe		benefit	→	mxzaya	مزایا
	sparking		plug	→	fxm	شمع
	police		headquarter	→	fxhrbani	شهربانی
	high		tide	→	mxdd	مدّ
	foreign		exchange	→	xrz	ارز

To indicate two-word collocations in Farsi which are translated into only one word in English, the above formula may be adapted as follows:

Type I.2	a1	+	b1	→	X + φ	
	heyxte		monsefe	→	jury	هیئت منصفه
	fxrike		dzorm	→	accomplice	شریک جرم
	vxgte		molagat	→	appointment	وقت ملاقات
	dxsture		jlxse	→	agenda	دستور جلسه
	siyah		pust	→	negro or black	سیاه پوست

In order to translate the third group of Type I collocations, we need to have background information. Although only a small percentage of the combinations fall under this category, the translator is more likely to produce an incorrect translation if he/she doesn't have access to the background information. These collocations which can not be categorized under proper names or idiomatic expressions may be represented as follows:

Type I.3	A1 + B1	→	(b1 + a1) + background information	→	x + y	
Achilles heel		→	paŋneye aŋi:l	→	nogteye zx?f	نقطه ضعف
fifth columnist		→	sotune panjomi	→	khayen	خائن
Number Ten		→	fomare dxh	→	dowlxte englis	دولت انگلیس
the Cross and the Crescent		→	sxlibo helal	→	eslamo mxsihiyxt	اسلام و مسیحیت
sword of Damocles		→	fxmfire dxmokli:s	→	khxtre gxribolvegu?	خطر قریب الوقوع

Type II.2	A1	+	B2	→	x2	+	a1	
	brain		drain	→	fxrare		mxxgzha	فرار مغزها
	air		pocket	→	chahe		hxvayi	چاه هوایی
	oil		baron	→	soltane		naft	سلطان نفت
	ear-drum			→	pxrdeye		gouf	پرده گوش
	price-freezing			→	txsbite		giymxtha	تثبیت قیمت‌ها
	second reading (of a bill)			→	foure		dovvom	شور دوم

Acceptable translation of Type II.3 collocations does not carry the literal or primary meaning of any of its lexical items. Obviously this type will cause more problem to the learner/translator than the previous types because none of the words in the collocation acts as a clue for the elicitation of the TL elements:

Type II.3	A2	+	B2	→	x	+	y	
	liberal		arts	→	olume		ensani	علوم انسانی
	finishing		blow	→	ti:re		khelas	تیر خلاص
	daylight		saving	→	txgyire		sa?xt	تغییر ساعت
	open		shop	→	estekhdame		azad	استخدام آزاد
	dark		horse	→	adxme		mxxrmuz	آدم مرموز

Going back to Type I in which the words are used in their primary sense, we discover two smaller groups of trouble-maker collocations. Sometimes the meaning of a collocation in one language may be expressed by only one word in the other language or vice versa (lexicalization).

"Learning to avoid production when a term does not exist in the L1 or learning to collapse several forms to one form in the L2 is not always an easy task. Learners keep looking for the missing terms" (Hatch and Brown 1995: 134). This may be represented as:

word used in its non-primary sense in the SL collocation is also expressed in TL by a word in its non-primary sense; but the problem is that the SL and TL words used in their non-primary sense are not the correspondent equivalents in the two languages. The primary sense of words in different languages may completely match but their non-primary senses, especially when expressing perception, evaluation, and culture bound notions (Hatch and Brown, 1995: 132) do not usually match. In this case literal translation may produce a strange collocation and wrong meaning.

Collocations with at least one lexical element in non-primary sense may appear in three forms as follows:

Type II.1	A2	+	B1	→	b1	+	x2	
	heavy		accent	→	lxhjeye		gxliz	لهجه غليظ
	rich		food	→	gxzaye		sxnġin	غذای سنگین
	dead		market	→	bazare		raked	بازار راکد
	easy		money	→	pule		badavorde	پول باد آورده
	life		imprisonment	→	hxbse		xbxd	حبس ابد
	dead		silence	→	sokute		mxyz	سکوت محض

Words under A2 and x2 are all used in non-primary sense. The words under x2 are the non-primary meanings of words other than the correspondent TL equivalents of the words under A2. In this case the translator can not get any help from his traditional bilingual dictionary in finding the appropriate TL meaning of the words in the sense they are used in SL collocations. He has only to rely on context clues and his TL competence to come up with an acceptable translation.

The second group of Type II collocations mostly consist of N+N structures. They are less frequent than Type II.1 but cause more problem for the learner/translator.

in different fields such as politics, economics, etc. we will come up with a possible string of words with a greater-than-chance likelihood to occur in any text. This will give us a long list of collocable words/elements which at the first sight would seem too long to handle. But there is light at the end of the tunnel. Most of these collocations can in fact be translated word for word or morpheme for morpheme and do not require special attention by the L2 learners or translators. These are string of words in the source language in which the component lexical items are used in their primary sense, and the target language also has lexical equivalents for those primary meanings, which very nearly match the meanings of the lexical items in the source language. We can easily predict the meaning of these collocations if we know the meaning of the words that co-occur in the collocations. In these cases where there is a one-to-one correspondence between SL and TL the translator's reliance on his first language will not cause any problem. Let's call this friendly kind of collocations Type I.1.

Type I.1	A1	+	B1	→	b1	+	a1	
	military		intervention	→	modakheleye nezami			مداخله نظامی
	experimental		stage	→	mrxhleye azemaye fi			مرحله آزمایشی
	mass		production	→	towli:de xmbuh			تولید انبوه
	private		sector	→	bxkhfe khosusi			بخش خصوصی
	elected		member	→	ozve entekhabi			عضو انتخابی
	racial		discrimination	→	txb?ize nežadi			تبعیض نژادی

* 'A' and 'B' represent SL words, 'a' and 'b' represent TL words. 'A1' represents SL words in primary sense.

Trouble-maker Collocations

Translation of collocations becomes problematic when at least one of the collocates appears in its non-primary sense. In many cases the meaning of the

language under the influence of the source language.

Second language learners and incompetent translators may also produce unacceptable string of lexical items by using synonyms interchangeably without realizing that synonyms often produce different sets of collocations due to the fact that they have quite different range or recurring lexical patterns. Each word in a language may be used with a limited number of other words in that language, and the list of words that have a greater-than-chance likelihood of co-occurrence with a word defines its collocational range e.g. list of nouns which may be qualified by an adjective. Our knowledge of the range of a specific word enables us to accept or reject collocations we have never heard before (Palmer, 1981, p. 78). Studying the range of two seemingly equivalent words in L1 and L2 will reveal the nonequivalence of collocational range between the words in the two languages; and this will lead us to conclude that violating the collocational range of a word or overextension of the range of words constitute the major source of collocational clashes between the source and target language, ie translating the meaning of an acceptable collocation in source language using combinations of words which can not be acceptable in the target language. In a study (Mollanazar, 1995, p. 154) fifty-five percent of mistakes in translation is attributed to non-observance of collocational possibilities in the target language.

How to deal with the problem

The kind of conflict of meaning component discussed here is not related to the structural pattern in which the words are used. It is the result of the lexical choice that is made. So without considering the structural patterns and only by making a syntactic analysis of SL words (Larson, 1984) and by considering the choice of words in their different senses, we can categorize the possible collocations and make predictions on which collocations may be problematic. After analyzing high frequency SL words in their respective spans

inclusion of lexical items and use of various tasks to help learners internalize different senses of L2 words should receive due attention.

Second language learners often rely on their native language in trying to communicate. They assume that there always exists a one-to-one correspondence between L1 and L2 lexical items. This strategy may be of some help to the learner at the beginning levels of language learning, but it is also a major cause of errors because even equivalent lexical items do not always convey the same sense in two languages for various reasons including cultural differences which are reflected in the vocabulary of every language. This false assumption about L1 and L2 words causes the learners to use L2 lexical items in incorrect contexts.

Even after the learners have mastered single lexical items, they still face difficulty in using them appropriately, especially in uncontrolled speech because they have yet to learn which words go together. In fact, one of the components of word knowledge is its relation to other words, ie knowing a word also includes the knowledge of possible combinations into which it can enter. This means that a great deal of vocabulary learning/teaching time in intermediate and advanced levels of language learning should be allocated to learning collocations, ie "habitual co-occurrence of individual items such as "perform an operation"; "commit a murder"; "resounding victory"; "weak tea" but not "feeble tea"; "a high probability" but not "a good probability" (Newmark 1983, p. 212). Without focus on this aspect of language learning, L2 learners will produce unacceptable collocations without being aware of the fact that combinations of words that form a semantically correct meaning in their L1 may not do so in the second language they are learning.

The double-edged problem of collocations causes more trouble for translators who must be lexically competent enough in L1 and L2 to decide if putting together the equivalents of source language elements will produce an acceptable collocation in the target language. Even in translating from L2 into L1 a translator is likely to produce unacceptable collocations in his native

Sources of Collocational Clashes

Mehdi Nowruzi Khiabani

In the literature on collocations we do not find any clear suggestion on how to predict which collocations may be more problematic for the translators and FL learners. This article attempts to categorize collocations in six types regardless of their syntactic patterns.

From syntactic point of view, this study is limited to Adj + N and N + N structures, which contain the most common collocations.

In the second part of the article mental processes in understanding and translating different types of collocations are discussed. Then an attempt is made to show the difficulty level of each type.

When it is decided which types are potentially more problematic, the teachers and textbook writers will be better equipped to provide the learners and translators with the kind of information and practice they need most.

Despite the importance of vocabulary in second language learning under the influence of structuralism little attention was paid to this aspect of L2 learning. But never-ending nature of vocabulary learning implies that