Co-habitality in Translation: The Comparative Case of Collocations

Mohammad Bin Naser
Department of English Language and Literature,
College of Arts, Kuwait University, Kuwait

Abstract
The Present paper examines the nature of collocations in Arabic and English as a frequent multi-word item in both languages. The aim of this research is to illustrate the semantic and syntactic nature of collocations and these linguistic features' effect on translation in both Arabic and English. The supportive examples showcase the problems that might arise in the translation process and their reflection on the quality of translation and level of competence of Arab translators. The findings have shown that collocations are not open to any word, as they co-habit with a limited range of words, which is the real translation crisis for the translator. These findings were supported by a proposed lexicographical model for collocation translation, which could improve the way Arab translators transfer English and Arabic collocations when encountered during the translation process.
Keywords: Collocations, dictionary, multi-word items, restriction, translation

Introduction
Various researchers have investigated the importance of collocations in language production and comprehension (Emery, 1991; Farghal&Obeidat, 1995; Nesselhauf, 2003). They surveyed the effect of collocations in L2 naturalness and awareness of their complex structure. In addition, other researchers (Heliel 1990; Bahumaid, 2006) paid attention to the problems that collocations pose in translation in terms of their lexical co-occurrences. Such problems are manifested in the 'threat' of collocations in the accuracy of translation.

However, despite the significance of these studies, a comparative linguistic perspective has not received much attention. This kind of analysis would demystify the unexpected linguistic nature of collocations, whether from a semantic (content) or syntactic (form) point of view. The comparative analysis focuses on English and Arabic collocations, which will assist translators who still face problems with collocations during the stage of translation.

The objectives of the study
The current study has three objectives:
1- To investigate the linguistic components of English and Arabic collocations.
2- To examine the hurdles that translators encounter when translating these collocations.
3- To explore the possibility of having a tool that assists a successful transfer of collocations during the translation process.

The research questions
The study aims to answer the following questions:
1- What makes collocations linguistically special?
2- Do they pose a problem in translation?
3- Are they syntactically and semantically maintained when translated?
4- Is there a solution to all of this?

Theoretical background
Teubert has pointed out (2004, p. 187) that there is a combination of words that are "ready-made chunks of language" and different from single words; these ready-made chunks are called collocations. Collocations, as Jackson (1988) defines them, are "the combination of words that have a certain mutual expectancy. The combination is not fixed expression, but there is a greater than chance likelihood that the words will co-occur.", (p. 96). Similarly, Izwaini (2015) describes collocations as "the habitual co-occurrence of words and a manifestation of the idiomatic usage of the language.". (p. 71)

According to Sinclair, (1987), there are two different principles of text interpretations. One is the 'open choice principle', and the other is the 'idiom principle'. In terms of the open choice principle, Sinclair notes that "this is a way of seeing language text as the result of a very large number of complex choices." (p. 319). This wide range of choices opens up each time a word is completed and the only thing that restrains them, as Sinclair notes, is the grammar. Sinclair considers this interpretation principle as a normal model for describing language and says it can be described as a slot-and-filler model since it looks at the text as a series of slots that need to be filled with words that satisfy the constraint.

In the case of the idiom principle, Sinclair argues that this particular model does not support the idea that words appear randomly in a text, but rather that words occur together based on a stronger chance of being together. Based on the idiom principle, language contains semi-preconstructed phrases that are treated as single choices. Collocations illustrate the idiom principle due to the fact that their constituents expect to co-occur with each other. Cruse (1986, p. 40) argues that collocations are easy to distinguish from idioms due to their semantic cohesion. Components are mutually selective and on occasions can be understood and interpreted from their individual parts.

1. English collocations

Gabrys-Biskup (1990, p. 32) states that collocations can be either established or potential. Collocations are considered established if they have been commonly found in the usage of a certain language. For example, *fish and chips* and *eggs and bacon* are established in English because of constant repetition by the native speakers; therefore, the familiarity of these collocations makes them established. On the other hand, collocations like *mild and bitter* or *salt and pepper* are, as Gabrys-Biskup, (1990) argues, potential collocations they have not yet been commonly established in English even though they are identified by native speakers. (p. 32).

In addition, Gabrys-Biskup (1990) states that collocations are either open or restricted. Collocations are open if they are free to collocate with many words within the syntax and semantics of the language like *nice car*, *nice weather*, *nice perfume* or *nice glasses*. Restricted collocations do not collocate as freely as open collocations, they collocate with a limited list of words. Aisentadt (1981, p. 54) defines restricted collocations as "a type of word combinations consisting of two or more words, unidiomatic in meaning, following certain structural patterns, restricted in commutability not only by semantics, but also by usage". Aisentadt indicates three points of interest for restricted collocability: (a) Their structural pattern. (b) The commutability restrictions. (c) The meanings of components. The following structural patterns are those for restricted collocations in English:

1-Verb + (art) + (Adjective) + Noun
e.g. *command admiration/attention/respect*, *give a (loud, low, soft, etc) laugh*
2-V + prep + (art) + (Adjective) + Noun
e.g. *leap to a (sudden, rash, etc.) conclusion, leap to a conviction.*
3-Adjective + Noun
e.g. *cogent argument/ remark*
4-Verb + Adverb
e.g. *take off, sit down*

5-I (intensifier) + Adjective
e.g. *dead tired, stark mad*

In terms of the commutability restriction in restricted collocations, Aisentadt (1981) points out two: restricted collocations where both components are restricted in their commutability, and other restricted collocations with one restricted component and one free component. Aisentadt provides examples of restricted collocations with both components being restricted, such as *shrug one's shoulder*, *shrug something off*, *payattention*, and *attract attention*.

On the other hand, examples like *have a walk*, *have a smoke*, *give a laugh*, *take a glance* or *make amove* are of restricted collocations with one restricted component and one free component that follow the verb + (art) + N structural pattern. Aisentadt argues that the nominal component is not always restricted to one verb only, e.g. *make/take amove* and *have/take a look*.

In addition, restricted collocations like *auburn hair* and *hazel eyes* are examples where one component is restricted and the other is free in commutability. Aisentadt points out that *auburn* is restricted to *hair* and *hazel* is restricted to *eyes*. However, *eyes* and *hair* are nouns that commute freely with many adjectives. (Aisentadt, 1981).

In terms of the meaning of the components, Aisentadt indicates three types of meanings: (a) A very narrow and specific meaning. (b) A secondary meaning of a word, which in its main meaning commutes freely. (c) A grammaticalised and vague meaning.

In an example like *shrug one's shoulders* the verb *shrug* has the main meaning of a person's shoulder movement, which commutes the noun *shoulders* only. Thus, the meaning of this example has a very narrow and specific meaning.

Aisentadt states that the following examples are of restricted collocations with secondary abstract meanings:
-*pay attention/heed/a call/a visit/homage*.
-*carry conviction/persuasion*.
-*command respect/attention*.

According to Aisentadt, these verbs, namely, *pay*, *carry* and *command* in their main meaning denote concrete actions and commute freely. However, in these examples they also denote secondary and abstract meanings and are thus restricted in their commutability by usage. Accordingly, we *pay respect*, but we do not *pay greetings*.

In the case of restricted collocations that have a grammaticalised and vague meaning, Aisentadt precisely uses examples of the type *have a fall*. In the case of this type of meaning, the nominal component, as Aisentadt points out, "commutes with one or more of the verbs used in such a vague meaning that sometimes they become synonymous, which they are not in their other uses." (Aisentadt, 1981, p. 59). For example, *shrug one's shoulders*, *grind one'steeth,* or *grit one's teeth* shows that the verbs *shrug*, *grind,* and *grit* are restricted to one noun only. On the other hand, the nouns *shoulders* and *teeth* can collocate with several verbs.

Indeed, restricted collocations are an integral part in collocations, and the study of Aisentadt shows that restricted collocations do not collocate in the same manner as open collocations. In fact, the significance of this study is that it focuses on the syntactic structure of restricted English collocations and the semantic nature they have. The provided structures along with their examples show the complexity of restricted collocations and indicate all their different structural patterns, the place of restrictions in the components of the collocation, and the types of meanings of restricted collocations. Thus, this study reveals the complex nature of this type of collocation and links between the semantic content and syntactic form of English restricted collocations.

In addition, collocations, as Benson (1985, p. 61) states, can be divided into two types, i.e. grammatical and lexical. According to Benson (1985, p. 61), grammatical collocations are "a recurrent combination, usually consisting of a dominant word (verb, noun, adjective) followed by a grammatical word, typically a preposition.". Benson cites the eight types of grammatical collocation found in Benson's *BBICombinatory Dictionary of English* along with their examples:

1-Noun + preposition
> e.g. *blockade against, apathy towards*

2-Noun + to- infinitive
> e.g. *a pleasure to do something, an attempt to do something*

3-Noun + that-clause
> e.g. *he made an oath he ..., we reached an agreement that we would ...*

4-Preposition + noun combinations
> e.g. *by accident, in advance*

5-Adjective + preposition combinations
> e.g. *they were fond of children, they were ashamed of him*

6-Predicate adjectives + to-infinitive
> e.g. *it was necessary to work, he was difficult to convince*

7-Adjective + that clause
> e.g. *she was afraid that, it was nice that*

8-English verb pattern

> e.g. *they began to speak, he kept talking*

Moreover, Benson (1985, p. 62) defines the other type of collocation, the lexical ones as the collocations that "contain no subordinate element, they usually consist of two equal lexical components.". Similarly, Benson cites the seven types of lexical collocations from Benson's *BBI Combinatory Dictionary*.

Benson (1985, p. 10) points out that there are two types of verb + noun collocations; one is CA collocations and the other is EN collocations. The former consist of a verb denoting creation and/or activation and a noun, while the latter consist of a verb denoting eradication and/or nullification and a noun. The latter are explained in the second type of lexical collocations. Benson (1985, p. 11) states that CA collocations are both non-predictable and arbitrary. For instance, we can say *hold a funeral*, but not *hold a burial, or *make a mistake*, but not *make a misprint. Thus, Benson properly demonstrates that the arbitrary nature of CA collocations particularly indicated when translated into a foreign language. For example, the English CA collocation *give a lecture* when translated in Arabic is ألقى محاضرة   which demonstrates that even though the meaning is the same, the verb used in Arabic is different from the ones used in English.

1- CA (creation, activation)
Verb + noun (pronoun, prepositional phrase)
> e.g. *to reach a verdict, to launch a missile*.

2-EN (eradication, nullification)
Verb + noun
> e.g. *to lift a blockade, to revoke a licence*

The second type of lexical collocations involves EN collocations. These EN collocations, as pointed out by Benson (1985, p. 13), consist of a verb that denotes eradication and/or nullification and a noun. For example, *reject an appeal* or *reversea decision*.

The CA and EN collocations are the first two types of lexical collocations. The remaining types are the following:

3-Adjective + noun
e.g. *reckless abandon*, *sweeping generalisation*
4-Noun + verb (action characteristic of a person or a thing)
-e.g. *alarms go off*.
5-Noun + of + nouns
e.g. *a piece of advice*, *a bouquet of flowers*
6-Adverb + adjective
e.g. *deeply absorbed*, *closely acquainted*
7-Verb + adverb
e.g. *to apologise humbly*, *to affect deeply*

Benson's examples show that CA and EN collocations are in the verb + noun structure. However, the remaining lexical collocations are not in this syntactic form, as some have verb + adverb forms, while others have adjective + noun forms.

Benson's study is a key study of English collocations, as it focuses on the two types of collocations (grammatical and lexical) and refers to the different structures of the two types of aforementioned collocations. All of which were cited in Benson's *BBI dictionaryof collocations*. Regarding the importance of the study, the citations of the various syntactic forms of grammatical and lexical collocations along with their examples help show the semantic and syntactic manner of these collocations, which assist the language learner in knowing how these collocations behave based on their form. For instance, the EN collocation *revoke a licence*, which has a verb + noun structure, denotes nullification based on the semantic field of the verb *revoke*. Therefore, the aforementioned classifications assist the language learner understand collocations.

2. Arabic Collocations
Like English, Arabic is rich with collocations that are similar in nature to their English counterparts. Certain words in Arabic co-occur with either a range or a restricted list of words e.g. إرتكب جريمة 'commit a crime' or may be literal or metaphorical e.g. شبح الحرب 'the spectre of war'. Moreover, Arabic collocations are similar to their English counterparts when it comes to their classifications, as shown by Emery's (1991, p. 60) classification of the types of Arabic collocations:

1-Open collocations: in this type, a literal combination of two words co-occurs with each other with no restriction involved, e.g. إنتهت الحرب 'the war ended'
2-Restricted collocations: as the name suggests in this type of Arabic collocation, two or more words co-occur in a restricted way, where a word collocates with a restricted list of other words. Emery accurately states that this type of collocation occurs in different types of syntactic

configurations:(a) Adjective + noun,e.g.جريمة نكراء 'heinous crime'. (b) Verb + object, e.g. خـاض المفاوضات 'he embarked on negotiations'. (c) Subject + verb, e.g. اندلعت الحرب 'the war broke out'
3-Bound collocations: this type of collocation exhibits "unique contextual determination; in other words, one of the elements is uniquely selective of the other" (1991, p. 61), e.g. حرب ضروس 'fierce war'

Furthermore, Hoogland (1993) argues that restricted collocations are the most difficult type of collocations since the co-occurrence of words is limited and restricted, an aspect that is considered problematic to translators when rendering collocations in the target language or producing them in the foreign language. Consequently, Hoogland classifies Arabic restricted collocations into the following groups:

1-Noun + Verb, the noun being the subject
    e.g. إشتدت الأزمة 'crisis increased'
2-Noun + Verb, the noun being the object
    e.g. أحرز تقدما 'to advance'
3-Preposition + Noun + Verb, the noun being the direct object
    e.g. أخذ على نفسه 'to take it upon one self'
4-Noun + Adjective
    e.g. إرادة حديدية 'strong will'
5-Noun + Noun
    e.g. صندوق اقتراع 'ballot box'
6-Verb + Adverb
    e.g. اعتقد واهما 'he mistakenly thought/believed'
7-Adjective + Adverb
    e.g. محدود للغاية 'extremely limited'
 8-Noun + Preposition + Noun
    e.g. صراع على السلطة 'a struggle for authority'
9-Adjective + Noun
    e.g. حسن النية 'good intention'
10-Word + Synonym
    e.g. حفاوة وترحيب 'hospitality and welcoming'
11-Word + Antonym
    e.g. شحن وتفريغ 'loading and unloading'

Hoagland's (1993) classification of restricted Arabic collocations enriches the Arabic literature and shows the various syntactic forms of Arabic collocations. Indeed, the above classifications assist the Arab translator in knowing the way Arabic restricted collocations behave syntactically, which allow the translator to indicate the words that collocate with each other based on the syntactic form they belong to. this key study of Arabic collocations helps in the understanding of collocations in their respective languages.

3. Translating English and Arabic Collocations
Collocations are part of the lexicon in languages and distinguish, as Almanna (2016, p. 117) maintains, between native speakers of a certain language from non-native speakers. Faris and Sahu (2013, p. 52) argue that collocations are interesting to translate due to importance to

language, as they are vitally indispensable for the 'coherence' of the language. Thus, learning them is a must. However, several studies have revealed that collocations are a problematic area for foreign language learners and translators. Interestingly enough, Bani-Younes (2015, p. 57) notes that translators are confused when they encounter collocations during the translation process because of their culture-bound element. His solution for the problems of collocations is in the form of a recommendation to universities in the Arab World. He recommends that universities offer at least two academic courses that pay attention to collocations in order to shed light on the translation problem of collocations.

Moreover, a study by Bahumaid (2006, p. 135) classifies these collocational problems into 'intralingual' and 'interlingual'. Intralingual problems relate to problems of identification and establishment of collocations within a language. As a matter of fact, only native speakers of a language will easily distinguish between 'habitual', 'occasional' and 'unique' collocations and the figurative collocability of a certain combination. For example, Bahumaid notes that *barren* not only has material collocates like *land* and *region*, but also figurative ones like *discussion* and *argument*.

Significantly, Bahumaid (2006) considers collocations that are associated with specific registers as another intralingual problem for translators. For example, *dull highlights* is a specific register collocation that relates to the registers of meteorology and photography and thus rose another intralingual problem for translators. Regarding interlingual problems, Bahumaid affirms that these problems "revolve around questions of collocability across languages" (p. 136), and he argues that these problems are the translators' main concern to find acceptable collocations in the foreign language. He correctly argues that what constitutes a collocation in one language does not necessarily in another language and that languages will differ in the collocational range. For example, the English collocations *catch a fish/a cold/a train/fire* are different from their Arabic counterparts   يصطاد سمكة/يصاب بنزلـة برد/يلحـق بالقطار/تشـتعل فيه النـار. Other problems can constitute culture-bound collocations like the English collocation *Hercules of his time* and the Arabic collocation عنتر زمانـه, or language specific ones like the English collocation *eatone's soup* and the Arabic collocation *drink one's soup*.

Other scholars like Shakir and Farghal (1992, p. 229) point out that "natural language should be looked upon as fundamentally constituting syntagms rather than paradigms, thus viewed as being highly prefabricated or preconstructed rather than original or creative.". They argue that languages do not only consist of single words, as the nature of multi-word items shows that ready-made phrases do exist in languages. Shakir and Farghal argue that translators and/or interpreters should be competent in the target language and embody a good knowledge of the multi-word items, especially collocations.

Farghal and Obiedat (1995, p. 320) indicate there are four strategies adopted by translation students and foreign language learners when translating collocations. These strategies are: synonymy, avoidance, transfer, and paraphrasing. When using synonymy when translating collocations, Farghal and Obiedat stress student unawareness of collocational restrictions. For instance, the student translation of *rich food* is *oily food* in Farghal and Obiedat's study. The authors precisely pointed out that students fail to recognise the collocability of *rich* with *food* because of their reliance on the open principle instead of balancing it and the idiom principle.

According to Farghal and Obiedat(1995), avoidance is the second most used strategy, and is used when the target lexical item is avoided in favour of another that affects and alters the meaning of the collocation. The use of this strategy indicates the students' failure to understand the collocation. For example, students avoid the translation of *heavydrinker* when they render it as *great drinker*. Here, they pick a word that is a related natural collocation, but it does not reflect the true intended meaning. (p. 322). Moreover, the authors accurately point that students may rely on their native language when translating target language collocations and assume the existence of a one-to-one correspondence between the collocations. For instance, translating ' شـاي ثقيـل' as *heavytea* instead of *strong tea* shows that translators relied on native language knowledge, which caused them to render an erroneous collocation.

The last strategy utilised by translation students is paraphrasing. Farghal and Obiedat(1995) point out that this strategy relies on the description of the target collocation, which may lead to the correct translation, yet one that is unnatural or unidiomatic. Students who rely on this strategy will show a deficiency in English collocations.

On a similar note, Nesselhauf (2003, p. 230) indicates the common types of mistakes in collocations. They are as follows:
1-verb: wrong choice of verb, e.g.*carry out race*s instead of *hold races*.
2-noun: wrong choice of noun, e.g. *close lacks* instead of *close gaps*.
3-usage 1: combination exists but is not used correctly, e.g.*take notice* instead of *to notice*.
4-usage 2: combination does not exist and cannot be corrected by exchanging single elements, e.g.*hold children within bound* instead of *show children where the boundaries lie*.
5-preposition (verb): the preposition or the prepositional verb is either missing, wrong or present but not acceptable, e.g. *fail in one's exam* instead of *fail one's exam*.
6-preposition (noun): the preposition of a noun is either wrong or present but not acceptable, e.g.*raise the question about* instead of *raise the question*.
7-determiner: the pronoun or article is wrong or present but not acceptable, e.g. *get the permission* instead of *get permission.*
8-structure: syntactic structure is wrong, e.g. *make somebody friends* instead of *make friends with somebody*.

This echoes Heliel's (1990, p. 131) argument about the translation errors in collocations. He iterates that the collocability of a word may be different in different languages. For example, the word *heavy* may collocate with *smoker/drinker* to indicate 'excessiveness' or *meal* to indicate 'a difficulty in digestion'. However, *heavy* may also collocate with other words like *blood* to indicate 'the dullness of a person', or *hearing* to indicate 'deafness'. Heliel argues that in order to provide the correct rendering of the collocation, translators should be aware of the differences between the two languages.

Further, Heliel (1990) states that collocations function in languages differently since each language has a system of lexical collocations that are in accordance "with its semantic, structural valencies and usage". There are verbs with wide and vague meanings, and each will collocate with different nouns in English, such as *take*, *give*, *run*, *do*, *get*, *have*, *make* and *put*. These verbs are problematic to translators since they are grammaticalised and have a weakened meaning whereas their meaning and function is expressed in the noun. For example, In English we *make a*

distinction, *take an examination* or *give advice*, whereas in Arabic, we either use specific verbs or just verbs for the whole collocation, e.g. *to give advice* = أسدى نصيحة or *to take a walk* = تنزه.

Based on the above studies and their illustrative examples, collocations pose a threat to the Arab translator. However, in order to paint a clearer image, one should pay attention to further unpredictable examples that show the translation crisis of these multi-word items. Further examples are the collocations *slim pickings* and *a moving image*. The former collocation may not be predictable, since it means that the good options are very few (خيار محدود). The problem is the unpredictable meaning of *slim*. Indeed, the literal meaning is (نحيف), however, an Arab translator who is oblivious to the intended meaning will never render this collocation accurately. Only a competent translator who is aware of the meaning of *slim* in *slimpicking* is able to render it successfully. On the other hand, the collocation *a moving image* refers to an image that has an effect on one's emotions (صورة محركة للمشاعر أو مدغدغة للعواطف), as in *seeing my grandfather's last photograph before his passing is a moving image*. A knowledgeable translator will never have a problem transferring this collocation into Arabic because s/he will never render *moving* without referring to the concept of 'emotions'.

Similarly, the collocation *floweryeloquence* has nothing to do with 'flowers' or 'roses', but is about 'embellished' eloquence (بيان فصيح). *Flowery* here will pose a threat to natural translation because of its non-literal meaning, which is a concept that many inexperienced Arab translators may not be conscious about.

The same can be said about Arabic collocations, the collocation حي يرزق may be easily comprehended, however, rendering it into English might yield an unnatural translation in the target language. The proper and natural option would be *alive and kicking*. The problem here is that this translation, although is natural in English, it is not a word-for-word transfer from Arabic. This means that the translator has to be fully aware of the suitable translation of يرزق, which is *and kicking*. If the translator renders it into *alive and earns/receives*, then s/he will taint his/her translation with an unnatural collocation that will damage the coherence of the text.

Another Arabic collocation is أطرق الرأس. A satisfying translation is simply *to bow his head*. The verb أطرق has nothing to do with 'to hammer', but rather 'to lower one's head'. Only a bilingual translator can translate this collocation effectively. On a similar note, the Arabic collocation جيش جرّار has a similar imposing threat to an Arab translator who is not aware of the right word to go with 'army' in English. A proper translation is 'a huge/colossal army'. Untrained translators might not be aware of the figurative meaning of جرّار, which will cause them to choose an erroneous adjective to collocate with 'army'.

Furthermore, مطر غزير poses another problem despite the known meaning, since the problem lies in the fact that غزير can simply be translated as 'heavy', as in 'a heavy rain'. This problem, as Elewa (2014, p. 208) puts it should not be "an attempt to paraphrase such incompatible or semi-compatible collocations, without prior knowledge of the linguistic idiosyncrasies of both languages, may lead to less effective or mistranslation". The translator should be aware that both English and Arabic may agree with the noun here, but differ with their choice of the adjective, as this example illustrates, which supports Farghal's argument that what collocates with a certain word in one language might not do the same in the other (2012, p. 120).

Other examples that illustrate the unpredictable element in collocating words when translated are ذوق رفيع, إصابة جسيمة and سم زعاف. The first example when translated literally mean 'a high taste', however, one can guess the meaning here, which is 'an exquisite taste'. The latter equivalent is more natural in English than the former. The translator has to be aware that 'exquisite' collocates with a limited range of words, such as 'taste', 'pain', 'collection', and 'details'. Therefore, having a prior knowledge about these choices s/he would know that 'taste' is one of the choices that collocates with 'exquisite'.

The second example is إصابة جسيمة, which naturally means 'a major casualty'. The word إصابة is not problematic here because it allows a literal translation. However, جسيمةneeds to be translated in a way that does not harm the equivalent. A competent translator should be aware that the proper collocating word for 'casualty' is 'major'. Similar to 'exquisite', 'major' is exclusively co-habiting words that denote a high rank among others 'major artist', great scope 'major improvement', great size 'major portion', seriousness 'major illness', or musical scales, as in 'major interval' and 'major key'. A translator with a background on collocational range will have no problem translating إصابة جسيمة as 'a major casualty'.

As for سم زعاف, one would expect an unpredictable collocation here, but in fact, it can simply be translated as 'deadly poison'. Interestingly enough, this example shows that some collocations do not have to be translated with unpredictable collocates, as they do allow literal translation. A similar case would be تسرب خبر. Like the previous example, this collocation allows a literal translation, which does not affect its naturalness in the target language. Thus, the literal translation of تسرب خبر is 'news leak'.

The examples provided in this section show that collocations are problematic to language learners and unpredictable, restricted co-occurance can cause errors in translation. Thus, Hussein (1998, p. 45) suggests that foreign language students enrich their reading experience by gaining exposure to English newspapers, magazines, and novels because doing so 'not only broadens their vocabulary range but also vastly enhances their capability of collocating words' (Hussein, 1998, p. 45).

The above examples show that collocations pose a threat to the quality of the target text due to their unpredictable co-occurrence and limited range. Thus, a solution should be proposed to maintain the accuracy of translation. This solution will be elaborated in the following section. The proposed model is mainly a combination of the suggestions by Atkins and Rundell (2008) and Svensén (2009) with a few from the researcher. Both books focus on the compilation of dictionaries, both monolingual and bilingual. Both books pay attention to the entry and its planning and point out that the components of the entry, the ones that assist in the process of translation, are the lemma headword, the definition, the equivalent and examples.

4. A proposed model
This proposed model will provide a translator-friendly documentation and treatment of these multi-word items and help provide correct translations of the items in the target text. The proposed model consists of the dictionary entry and its components which the translator needs for that production.

4.1. Lemma headword

Most scholars argue about the placement of multi-word items in dictionaries, both monolingual and bilingual. For example, Svensén (2009, p. 176) argues that collocations in the L2→L1 dictionaries (English-Arabic dictionaries in this research) should be documented under the entry of the collocator (second component of the collocation) since it is problematic, while the base (first component of the collocation) is not since it rarely causes any problems of interpretations. However, Svensén states that L1→L2 dictionaries (Arabic-English dictionaries in this research) should place the collocation in the entry for the base because 'it is about the base that one wants to say something' (2009, p. 177).

4.2. Definitions

In dictionaries, a definition is the second component in the entry after the lemma headword. The definition is provided 'in order to catalogue the meanings in a language' (Atkins and Rundell, 2008, p. 407). Atkins and Rundell stress that dictionary users rely on definitions when they encounter unknown words or expressions to explain their meanings or when users want to produce a word or an expression in the target language. (2008, p. 407). In addition, Atkins and Rundell argue that there are certain requirements of a good definition. They are the following:

- To help explain the word in context, the definition should provide enough information to the dictionary user.
- Definitions should allow the dictionary user to interpret the word or expression in any applicable context.
- Definitions should allow the dictionary user to use the word or expression correctly in any context.

4.3. Equivalent

Next, once the definition is included to support the headword, the equivalent is provided in the target language so as to be used in the target text by the translator. Moreover, equivalents provided in the dictionary are either translational or explanatory equivalents, as Zgusta points out (1971, p. 319). The former can be inserted into the translation text, whereas the latter gives information about the lexical word. According to Svensén (2009, p. 257), explanatory equivalents have a higher degree of explanation, but a lesser degree of insertability and vice versa.

4.4. Examples

In monolingual dictionaries, examples of the headword in context are common; however, they are not always included in the bilingual dictionaries. Examples and their translations should also be included in bilingual dictionaries because, as Atkins and Rundell (2008, p. 454) point out, they elucidate meaning and complement the definition. The inclusion of such examples in dictionaries can also help distinguish between the different meanings of a polysemous word. Each example of each meaning provides the context and allows the translator/dictionary user to understand the difference in the meanings. In addition, Atkins and Rundell (2008, p. 454) note that examples illustrate the contextual features and collocational range.

4.5. Application of the model

In this section, the proposed lexicographic model is applied based on the suggestions offered above on English and Arabic collocations. The proposed entry consists of the lemma headword

(and sub-headword in some cases) in bold, followed by a definition and then the equivalent, followed by the examples. Eight random examples of different English and Arabic collocations support the researcher's model and they are the following:

- *Have a look*
- *Take advantage*
- *Foreseeable future*
- *Rapid growth*

Svensén (2009, p. 176) argues that collocations should be documented under the entry of the collocator in the L2→L1 dictionaries because they are the most problematic. In this case, *have a look* should be included in the entry of *look* in a section dedicated to that collocation:

Look:
Collocation: *Have a look*. To look with attention: ألقي نظرة.
We'll just have a look at what we've got.
علينا أن نلقي نظرة على ما لدينا

Advantage:
Collocation: *Take advantage*. 1-Take advantage of an opportunity: انتهز الفرصة
Dental treatment is free during your pregnancy and until your baby is one year old, so take advantage of this!
إن علاج الأسنان مجاني خلال فترة حملكِ وحتى بلوغ طفلكِ عامه الأول ، فانتهزي الفرصة
2-Take advantage of someone: استغل
People he looked on as friends took advantage of him.
لقد استغلّه من كان يعدّهم أصدقائه

Next is the collocation *foreseeable future*. It is the third collocation in this model and documented in the entry of *future*:

Future:
Collocation: *Foreseeable future*. As far as one can see: في المستقبل القريب.
The US's foreign trade deficit was likely to continue for the foreseeable future, he said
وذكر بأنه من المرجح استمرار عجز التجارة الخارجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية حتّى في المستقبل القريب

The last collocation is *rapid growth*. It is covered in the entry of *growth* in this model:

Growth:
Collocation: *Rapid growth*. A quick rise: نمو سريع/عاجل.
An outstanding feature of the UK economy in recent years has been the rapid growth in employment in the service industries.
لقد كانت السمة البارزة في اقتصاد المملكة المتحدة خلال السنوات الأخيرة هي النمو السريع في التوظيف في قطاع الخدمات

Unlike their English counterparts, Arabic collocations should not be placed in the entry of the collocator. Svensén states that L1→L2 dictionaries should place a collocation in the entry of the base because 'it is about the base that one wants to say something' (2009, p. 177). Consequently, all the collocations in this model will be documented in the entry of the base.

- قصارى جهد
- عواقب وخيمة
- حجر عثرة
- إراقة دماء

The first collocation in this model is قصارى جهد. As Svensén stressed, L1 collocations should be placed in the entry of the base, which is قصارى in this particular case:

> **قصارى:**
> **متلازم لفظي:** *قصارى جهد*. كل طاقته: Go to a great length
> *سوف ابذل قصارى جهدي لاثبات براءة موكلي من هذه التهمة الخطيرة.*
> *I will go to great lengths to prove that my client is not guilty of this outlandish allegation.*

The second collocation is عواقب وخيمة. The placement of عواقب وخيمة should be in the entry of the base (the base in the singular form):

> **عاقبة**
> **متلازم لفظي:** عاقبة وخيمة (جمعها عواقب وخيمة). نتائج سيئة: Bad results
> *إن التخفيض في حد ذاته يمكن أن يؤدي إلى عواقب وخيمة على الإقتصاد القومي ككل*
> *Devaluation couldlead to serious consequences on the national economy as a whole.*

Next, the collocation حجر عثرة, and is covered in the entry of حجر in this proposed model:

> **حجر:**
> **متلازم لفظي:** حجر عثرة. عقبة أو عائق: An obstacle
> *وتمثّل مشكلة الموارد المائية الشحيحة في المنطقة وسبل ادارتها حجر عثرة امام المفاوضات في الشرق الأوسط.*
> *The problem of scarce water resources is considered an obstacle to negotiations in the Middle East.*

The last collocation in this model is إراقة دماء. As in the previous three cases, إراقة دماء is placed in the entry of إراقة with an invented example provided as well since the examples from the corpus are out of context and do not clearly indicate the specific context of this collocation:

> **إراقة:**
> **متلازم لفظي:** *إراقة دماء*. إشعال الحروب والمعارك وكثرة القتل: Bloodshed
> *سيؤدي هذا الخلاف إلى إراقة الدماء*
> *This conflict will lead to bloodshed.*

As shown above, the proposed model is applied on both English and Arabic collocations. The model covered the parts that assist the translator in rendering collocations into the target language, which are entry, definition, equivalent and example. This model helps the translator by assisting him/her in finding multi-word items in clear entries.

The application of these policies solves the first problem which translators face when looking up collocations in the dictionary. Also, the model assists the translator by providing definitions that explain the meaning of the item. English definitions were provided for English items and Arabic definitions were provided for Arabic items based on the direction of the dictionary. The inclusion of definitions in this model allows the translator to understand the intended meaning of the item and eliminate any confusion that might arise from the figurative meaning of the collocations. In addition, the inclusion of translation equivalents in particular in this model provides ready-made equivalents of these items in the target language in order to achieve correct translation in the translation text. Although explanatory equivalents explain the metaphorical meaning of the item, they cannot be used in the translation text because they are not ready-made equivalents. This model assists the translator by providing contextual examples of collocations along with the translation of these examples. The inclusion of examples shows the translator how the item behaves in context and distinguish the different meanings of the item in case of a documentation of a polysemous multi-word item. Thus, the inclusion of these entry components in this proposed model allows the translator to look up collocations in a dictionary and understand and translate the unpredictable meaning easily.

Conclusion

The present study paid attention to English and Arabic collocations in terms of their phraseological nature, from both a linguistic and translation point of view. Collocations are part of the English and Arabic lexicon. Based on their frequency, they can prove that language is not just a combination of words and that language does balance the open choice principle and the idiom principle. Thus, they can be literal, idiomatic or both. Therefore, they will be nothing but trouble to foreign language learners and translators, since idiomaticity constitutes a hurdle to achieve the right interpretations of these items. To reach native-speaker proficiency, translators and learners alike must acquire these phraseological units. Finally, this paper proposes a model entry for English-Arabic and Arabic-English dictionaries that include entries for collocations in order to assist the translator and encourage him/her to rely on his/her translation tools when encountering puzzling collocations.

About the Author:

Dr. Mohammad Bin Naser is a Lecturer in the Department of English Language and Literature, Kuwait University. He obtained his BA in English Linguistics from Kuwait University in 2004, his MA in Translation Studies from the University of Birmingham, England in 2005 and his Ph.D. in Translation Studies from Durham University, England in 2010.

References

Aisentadt, E. (1981). "Restricted Collocations in English Lexicology and Lexicography", *Review of Applied Linguistics*, *53*, 53-61.

Almanna, A. (2016). *The Routledge Course in Translation Annotation: Arabic-English-Arabic*. London: Routledge.

Atkins, B.T. &Rundell, M. (2008). *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bani-Younes, M. (2015). "Cultural and Sociolinguistic Issues in English-Arabic Translation of Collocations", *Studies in Literature and Language*, *10* (6), 53-58.

Bahumaid, S. (2006). "Collocation in English-Arabic Translation", *Babel*, *52*: (2), 133-52.

Benson, M. (1985). "Collocations and Idioms", in Ilson, R. (ed.) *Dictionaries,Lexicography and Language Learning*, ELT Documents 120 (pp. 61-68) Oxford: Pergamon Press/British Council.

Cruse, D. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elewa, A. (2014). *Levels of Translation*. Cairo: Qalam for Translation and Publication.

Emery, P. (1991). "Collocation in Modern Standard Arabic", *Zeitschrift furArabischeLinguistik*, *23*, 56-65.

Farghal, M. (2012). *Advanced Issues in Arabic-English Translation Studies*. Kuwait: Kuwait University Press

Farghal, M. &Obiedat, H. (1995). "Collocations: A Neglcted Variable in EFL", *IRAL*, *33*, 315-31.

Faris, A &Sahu, R. (2013). "The Translation of English Collocations into Arabic: Problems and Solutions", *Journal of College of Arts*, University of Basra, 64, 51-66.

Gabrys-Biskup, D. (1990). "Some Remarks on Combinability: Lexical Collocations" in Arabski, J. (ed.) *Foreign Language Acquisition Papers* (pp. 31-44) Katowice: UniversytetSlaski..

Heliel, M. (1990). "Lexical Collocations and Translation", in M. Thelen& B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. (eds.) *Translation and Meaning*, Part. 1 (pp. 129-39) Māstricht.

Hoogland, J. (1993). "Collocation in Arabic (MSA) and the Treatment of Collocations in Arabic Dictionaries", in KingaDévényi, T. Ivonyi& A. Shivtiel (eds.) *Proceedings of the Colloquium on Arabic Lexicology and Lexicography*, (pp. 75-93) Budapest.

Hussein, R. (1998). 'Collocations Revisited', *Journal of King Saud University: Languages and Translation*, 10, 39-47.

Izwaini, S. (2015). 'Patterns of Lexical Collocations in Arabic', *ZeitschriftfürArabischeLinguistik*, 61, 71-99.

Jackson, H. (1988). *Words and Their Meaning*. London: Longman.

Nesselhauf, N. (2003). "The Use of Collocations by Advanced Learners of English and Some Implications for Teaching", *Applied Linguistic*, *24:* (2), 223-42.

Shakir, A. &Farghal, M. (1992). "Collocations as in Index of L2 Competence in Arabic-English Simultaneous Interpreting and Translation", *Federation Internationale des Traducteurs Newsletter*, 11, 3-27.

Sinclair, J. (1987). "Collocation: A Progress Report" in Steele, R. &Threadgold, T. (eds.) *Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday* (pp. 319-331). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Svensén, B. (2009). *A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teubert, W. (2004). "Units of Meaning, Parallel Corpora and Their Implications for Language Teaching" in Conner, U. & Upton, T. (eds.) *Applied Corpus Linguistics: AMulti-Dimensional Perspective*. (pp. 171-189) Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of Lexicography*. Mouton: The Hague.