Translatability and Untranslatability of Collocations in Ernest Hemingway's Novels

Simin Dokht Pahlavani[*], Bijan Bateni, Hossein Shams Hosseini
Department of English, Quchan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Quchan, Iran
*Email: simindokht.pahlavany@gmail.com

Abstract

Collocations are an important phenomenon in language and in translation. Therefore, the importance of collocations in translation of literary texts as well as the ways in which they are translated is analyzed in this study. The Persian translations of Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms, For whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea* have been compared and analyzed. In this study the main causes of the untranslatability between English and Persian have been investigated by the researcher. The notion of collocational untranslatability from Catford's view has been applied for this study. It has investigated different strategies used in translating collocations according to Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) and Newmark's model of translation. Benson M., Benson E., & Ilson R. (1997) classifications for collocations have been adopted for this study. Collocations examined in this study included (Adj +N, V+ N / N+V, V+ Prep, N+Prep/ Prep+N, V+ Adv,). This study is a mixed method research, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The accuracy of selected collocations is based on *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* (2009). Literal translation emerged as the most conspicuous procedure (35.73%) in translating collocations in all three novels.

Keywords: Grammatical Collocations, Lexical Collocations, Translatability, Untranslatability

Introduction

Translation consists of changing from one state or form to another, to turn into one's own language (Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, 2006). According to Newmark (1988a) we may think that this changing ought to be simple, as one ought to be able to put a word in the source language with another one in the target language. But, translation is not simply substitution of lexical items in the two languages. The translator, in the process of translation, is always looking for the most accurate and natural lexical equivalents between the source and the target language (Newmark.1988a).

Since every language has its own collocations, collocations are worth studying in terms of their translations. In fact, to know how to use collocations fluently in a particular language requires having an excellent knowledge of that language (Newmark.1988a). For this reason, knowing collocations of a particular language suggest that one has a good knowledge of that language. Accordingly, collocations are important and interesting as an object of research within translation studies.Furthermore, recognizing whether or not a collocation is familiar, natural, or just acceptable, is one of the most important problems in translation (Noura, 2012). "Collocations fall into two major groups: grammatical collocations and lexical collocations'' (Benson et al, 1997, p. xx).

Grammatical collocations: Grammatical collocations consist of a noun, an adjective, or a verb plus a preposition or a grammatical structure such as an infinitive or a clause or preposition

plus noun. Examples of grammatical collocations include; *account for*, *advantage over*, *adjacent to*, *by accident*, *to beafraid that*.

Lexical collocations: Lexical collocations consist of various combinations of nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Lexical collocations, in contrast to grammatical collocations, do not contain prepositions, infinitives or clauses. Benson et al. (1997) distinguish several structural types of lexical collocations: *verb+noun* (inflict a wound), *adjective+noun* (a crushing defeat), *noun+verb* (storms rage), *noun+noun* (a world capital), *adverb+adjective* (deeply absorbed), *verb+adverb* (appreciate sincerely).

The concept of translatability is one of the central issues to be discussed especiallywhen the question is translating elements of language that are not simple and obvious(Newark, 1988a). Thus, when translating collocations, which is a very language-specific issue, discussing the idea of translatability is essential.

Some of the common methods of translation are proposed by Newmark (1988a) and some theories are explained by Vinay and Darbelnet(1995)

Despite the fact that there are a lot of similarities among languages, nobody can ignore the role of main and significant differences across languages. Furthermore, there are always some parts or elements which exist in one language but they cannot be used in other languages. However, there are many situations in which there is no one to one correspondence between languages. This phenomenon is referred to as untranslatability (Catford, 1965).

According to Catford (1965), Untranslatability can be divided in two categories: *linguistic* and *cultural untranslatability*. Linguistic untranslatability often happens in cases where an ambiguity that is typical of the source language text is a functionally significant feature. When the target language has no corresponding language item, the text is untranslatable. Linguistic untranslatability is common for example with source language items that play with words.

By contrast, cultural untranslatability occurs when a certain situational feature, which is functionally significant for the source language text, does not exist in the target language culture (Catford, 1965). Some examples of this type of untranslatability are certain words and expressions that are absent from the target culture, such as the concept of *snow* in some African culture.

In this research, *A Farewell to Arms,For whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway are analyzed and compared with their corresponding Persian translations. Accordingly, the translatability and untranslatability of collocations have been examined in this research. In this regard, all of the omissions and mistranslated items may be the results of translator's negligence. It investigated different strategies used in translating collocations according to Vinay and Darbelnet and Newmark's model of translation.

The findings of this study will have an influential role in identifying of collocational translatability and untranslatability and gave significant solutions in this regard. Second, its results can be fruitful for translation students, teachers, classes and anyone who is working on translation. Furthermore, it creates sensitivity toward looking for the suitable equivalent to express the meaning in the receptor language and translating as naturally, accurately and with maximum effectiveness as possible. And finally, another reason behind investigating this topic is that many translators may make mistakes when trying to translate collocations especially from English to Farsi.

Review of related literature

Many researchers have different definitions of collocation. In the aspect of cohesive word .In terms of the degree of cohesiveness of lexical combination, Benson et al. (1997) state collocations are fixed phrases stored in the mind. Taking the pragmatic view of collocation, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992, p.36) consider collocations as high frequency word combinations.Benson et al.

(1997) also classifies common types of collocations, which have been adopted by most researchers and are adjusted for use within the focus of this study.

Some studies have been done in this era, first of all is *Collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners in written English* by Modarresi (2009). He worked on EFL learners collocational errors in written English and proved that most of the students' errors in writing come from their lack of collocational knowledge not their grammatical ability. Second study is about *Collocations: Pedagogical implications, and their treatment in pedagogical materials* written by ConstantionsGabrielatos in (1994). This essay looks into the (actual and potential) contribution of the findings of collocational studies to EFL instructions and support materials, as well as examines the pedagogical treatment of the collocational properties of lexical items.Third study is about *Collocational knowledge versus general linguistic knowledge among Iranian EFL Learners* written by Shokouhi and Mirsalari in (2010). This study has a twofold purpose. The first and foremost is to see whether there exists any correlation between the collocational knowledge and general linguistic knowledge of EFL learners. The second is to reveal which type(s) of collocation is or are more difficult for EFL learners. To this end, 35 subjects, screened by a proficiency test, were given a 90-item multiple-choice test.

Methodology
Corpus

This study investigated *A Farewell to Arms, For whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea* written by Ernest Hemingway. First of all, the researcher analyzed A *Farewell to Arms* and its translation by Najaf Daryabandari (2000), then *For whom the Bell Tolls* and its translation by Salimi (2010) and Namvar (2006) and finally *The Old Man and the Sea* and its translation by Faramarzi (2007) and Daryabandari (2007).

The reason for this selection is that Hemingway avoided complicated syntax sentences and he is famous in the literature as modern writer and the language of the book is English.

Table 1. The Frequency and Percentage of Selected Collocations in Each Novel

Novel Title	Frequency	Percent
A Farewell to Arms	75	20
For Whom the Bell Tolls	150	40
The Old Man and the Sea	150	40
Total	375	100

Procedure

In this research nine procedures including Literal, Equivalence, Calque, Transposition, Modulation, Omission (total, partial), and Transliteration have been applied. Mistranslation is not included in Vinay and Darbelnet and Newmark's translation procedures. It has been added because of its significance in translating and in obtaining the desired results for this study. Newmark (1988b) mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures. He states that in contrast to translation methods, which relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language within that text. The following procedures which have been used for this study are:

- *Calque*: The term 'calque', or 'Through-Translation' as Newmark (1988a) calls it, refers to the case where the translator imitates in his translation the structure or manner of expression of the ST.

- *Modulation*: It occurs when the translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL text in conformity with the current norms of the TL, since the SL and the TL may appear dissimilar in terms of perspective (Newmark, 1988b, p.88).
- *Omission*: to concentrate or suppress elements in the TL text.
- *Shifts or transpositions*: It involves a change in the grammar from SL to TL, for instance, (i) change from singular to plural, (ii) the change required when a specific SL structure does not exist in the TL, (iii) change of an SL verb to a TL word, change of an SL noun group to a TL noun and so forth (Newmark, 1988b, p.86).

Table 2.Types of Shifts Based on Newmark'sModel

Shift Type	Abbr.
Class shift	CS
Gerund	G
Intra-system shift	IS
Level shift	LS
Structure shift	SS
Unit shift	US

- *Transliteration*: This procedure refers to the conversion of foreign letters into the letters of the TL (Newmark, 1988a, p.81).
- *Literal translation*: literal translation is "a word-for-word rendering which uses the same number of TL words in the form of established equivalents as well as the same word order and word classes, e.g. English *my cat is hungry*→ German *meineKatzeisthungrig*" (Munday, 2009b, p. 182).
- *Equivalence:* Equivalence in translation studies has a different meaning than the one that disused here as a translation strategy. According to Kenny, equivalence is "the relationship between a source text (ST) and a target text (TT) that allows the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place" (1998, p. 77). Also, Jakobson discusses the notion of equivalence in meaning and states that when we translate from one language to another, we cannot get a full equivalence of what he called a "code unit"(Munday, 2008a, p. 37) in the other language. So equivalence means to achieve an equal level of meaning and structure between the two texts. On the other hand, equivalence as a translation strategy refers to the selection of an established expression in the target language. Vinay and Darbelnet refer to this by stating that "the same situation can be rendered by two texts using completely different stylistic and structural methods." (1995, p. 38).

For this reason the theoretical framework for this study was based on Vinay and Darbelnet(1995) and Newmark's model of translation. These models were chosen to produce quantifiable data, which could be processed statistically. The Chi-Squarestatistic has been used to test any significant difference between two translations of *The Old Man and the Sea* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in the case of translatability and untranslatability of collocations.

This study is a mixed method research, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The popular quantitative data analysis software, SPSS (Software Package for Statistics and Simulation) was used to calculate the data in numerical form. In this regard, it required to create the data file, converting variables to numerical data by means of coding procedure, and analyze the data through the software. The analyzed data were extracted sentences that include five above-mentioned types of collocations, which were chosen from among various types of collocations as the most important

ones. The following Tables (table 3.3& 3.4) show the required information about data, types of collocations and translators.

Table 3.The Frequency and Percentage of Each Selected Collocations Types

Type of Collocation		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Adj+N	15	20	20
	V+N / N+V	15	20	40
	Prep+N / N+Prep	15	20	60
	V+Prep / Prep+V	15	20	80
	V+Adv	15	20	100
	Total	75	100.0	

Table 4. Translators

Translator	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daryabandari	150	40	40
Faramarzi	75	20	60
Namvar	75	20	80
Salimi	75	20	100
Total	375	100.0	

Table 3 illustrates that 15 collocations of each type, totally 75 collocations randomly selected from each novel to compare with corresponding parts in Persian translations and Table 3.4 shows translators information. Catford defined a dichotomy for untranslatability, namely linguistic and cultural untranslatability. Based on the Catford`s model and definitions, this study will examine the untranslatability between Persian and English.

The techniques that the writer uses in collection the data are as follows:
1. To identify the English collocations and their translations.
2. The translation is examined to find out whether is familiar, natural, or just acceptable.
3. The reason behind untranslatability of the collocations will be analyzed to see whether linguistic or cultural.

Chi-Square Test

According to Jonhson, Kotz, &Balakrishnan (1994) the Chi-Square test is used to compare the observed results with the expected results. If expected and observed values are equal, then Chi-Square will be equal to zero. If Chi-Square is equal to zero or very small, then the expected and observed values are close. Calculating the Chi-Square value allows one todetermine if there is a statistical significance between the observed and expected values. The formula for Chi-Square is: $X^2 = \text{sum(observed - expected)}^2 / \text{expected}$.Using the degrees of freedom, use a table to determine the critical value. If $X^2 >$ critical value, then there is a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values. If $X^2 <$critical value, there is no statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values.

Results and discussion

Collocations Analysis of *A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls and The Old Man and the Sea*

The following examples show some sentences (which include collocations) selected from the novels. Moreover, from untranslatability view, the researcher examined the mistranslated items and all of the omissions in the translations.

Example 1:
ST: I thought she was very beautiful and I **took her hand** (p.26).

The type of collocation in this sentence is verb+ noun. Calque is the strategy used in this translation. Lexical words translated singly and grammatical constructions are converted. "took" translated to "*took*" and "her hand" converted to "*her hands*".

Example 2:
ST: It came down through the forest in **sharp turns** (p.24).

The collocation type is adjective+ noun. In this sentence, **sharp** as an adjective means: "changing direction suddenly: a sharp turn to the left" (Hornby, 2005, p.1396). The translator didn't choose a suitable translation for collocation.

Table 5.The Frequency and Percentage of Each Applied Procedures by Daryabandari

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Literal	26	34.7	34.7
Equivalence	20	26.7	61.3
Transposition	4	5.3	66.7
Transliteration	0	0	66.67
Calque	1	1.3	68.0
Modulation	1	1.3	69.3
Mistranslation	8	10.7	80.0
Total Omission	8	10.7	90.7
Partial Omission	7	9.3	100.0
Total	75	100.0	

Example 1:
ST: They had **shaken hands** and he saluted and gone out to the staff car…(p.11).

The type of collocation in this sentence is verb+noun. The translator applied equivalence strategy here **shaken hands**→ *push their hands*. "Equivalence refers to cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means" (Munday, 2008a, p. 58).

Table 6.The Frequency and Percentage of Each Applied Procedures by Salimi

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Literal	40	53.3	53.3
Equivalence	21	28.0	81.3
Transposition	2	2.7	84.0
Transliteration	2	2.7	86.7
Calque	4	5.3	92.0
Modulation	1	1.3	93.3
Mistranslation	3	4.0	97.3
Total Omission	2	2.7	100.0
Partial Omission	0	0	100.0
Total	75	100.0	

Example 2:
ST: They **climbed steadily** in the pine forest that covered the mountain side (p.5).

In this sentence, the type of collocation is verb+adverb. The type of strategy which has been applied in Salimi's translation is modulation **climbed steadily**→ *climbed slowly*. "Steadily" means "does not change or shake" (Hornby, 2005, p.1501). The meaning of "steadily" has been omitted in Namvar's translation. A partial omission has been occurred in his translation **climbed steadily→** *went across.*

Table 7.The Frequency and Percent of Each Applied Procedures by Namvar

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Literal	3	4	4.0
Equivalence	2	2.7	6.7
Transposition	0	0	6.7
Transliteration	0	0	6.7
Calque	2	2.7	9.3
Modulation	0	0	9.3
Mistranslation	0	0	9.3
Total Omission	66	88.0	97.3
Partial Omission	0	2.7	100
Total	75	100.0	

Example 1:
The **old man** was thin and gaunt… (p.5).

The type of collocation in this sentence is adjective+ noun. In both translations, the procedure is calque. The words of the ST collocation are translated literally into TL words **old**→ old; man→ *man*
Example 2:
Do you want me to **make the fire**? (p.12)
The collocation type is verb+noun. The strategy used in first translation is literal. Each word translated singly: "**make**" to "*ignite*" and "**the fire**" to "*fire*". In second translation the applied strategy is equivalence: the collocation "**make the fire**" translated to "*ignite the firewood*".

Table 8.The Frequency and Percentage of Each Applied Procedures by Daryabandari

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Literal	29	38.7	38.7
Equivalence	40	53.3	92.0
Transposition	1	1.3	93.3
Transliteration	0	0	93.3
Calque	2	2.7	96.0
Modulation	1	1.3	97.3
Mistranslation	1	1.3	98.7
Total Omission	1	1.3	100.0
Partial Omission	0	0	100
Total	75	100.0	

Table 9.The Frequency and Percentage of Each Applied Procedures by Faramarzi

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Literal	36	48.0	48.0
Equivalence	33	44.0	92.0
Transposition	1	1.3	93.3
Transliteration	0	0	93.3
Calque	2	2.7	96.0
Modulation	2	2.7	98.7
Mistranslation	0	0	98.7
Total Omission	1	1.3	100.0
Partial Omission	0	0	100
Total	75	100.0	

Collocations analysis of For Whom the Bell Tolls and The Old Man and the Sea based on Chi-Square test

We use inferential statistics for analyzing the differences between observed frequency and expected frequency and significance (Jonhson et al. 1994).

Chi-Square test provides a test of the association between two or more groups, population or criteria (Jonhson et al. 1994).

In this research, by using Chi-Square test, the researcher examined any significant difference between two translations of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea* in the case of translatability and untranslatability of collocations. The below tables will show the outcomes of Chi-Squaretest in details.

Table 10.The Observed and Expected Number in Namvar's translation

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	3	15.0	-12.0
2	2	15.0	-13.0
3	0	15	-15
4	0	15	-15
5	2	15.0	-13.0
6	0	15	-15
7	0	15	-15
8	66	15.0	51.0
9	2	15.0	-13.0
Total	75		

Table 11. Chi-square Table

Chi-Square test		Df	Sig.
Namvar's Translation	216.8	8	0.001

As you can see in the above tables, there is a significant difference between "Observed and Expected" frequency in Namvar's translation. He had 66 total omissions in his translation. His omissions are not the result of untranslatability of collocations. His omissions may be the result of ignorance.

In the next table, Salimi's translation based on Chi-Squaretest has been analyzed.

Table 12.The Observed and Expected Number in Salimi's Translation

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	40	9.4	30.6
2	21	9.4	11.6
3	2	9.4	-7.4
4	2	9.4	-7.4
5	4	9.4	-5.4
6	1	9.4	-8.4
7	3	9.4	-6.4
8	2	9.4	-7.4
9	0	9.4	-9.4
Total	75		

Table 13. Chi-square Table

Chi-Square test		df	Sig.
Salimi's Translation	146.76	8	0.001

In the above table, there is a significant difference between Observed and Expected frequency in Salimi's translation. Salimi's two total omissions (**cup of, asked teasingly**) were not the result of untranslatability. In the below tables, the observed frequency of both translations has been compared.

Table 14.The Comparison of Observed Frequency in both Translations

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Row	1	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	66	2	75
	2	40	21	2	2	4	1	3	2	0	75
Total		43	23	2	2	6	1	3	68	2	150

Table 15. Chi-SquareTest

Chi-SquareTest			
	Value	df	Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	1.184E2[a]	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	146.909	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	104.144	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	150		

According to above tables, we can see significant difference between two translations. This significant difference is due to the 66 total omissions of Namvar's translation which is not related to untranslatability view.

Table 16.The Observed and Expected Number in Daryabandari's Translation

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	29	10.7	18.3
2	40	10.7	29.3
3	1	10.7	-9.7
4	0	10.7	-10.7
5	2	10.7	-8.7
6	1	10.7	-9.7
7	1	10.7	-9.7
8	1	10.7	-9.7
9	0	10.7	-10.7
Total	75		

Table 17. Chi-Square Test

Chi-Square test		df	Sig.
Daryabandari's Translation	153.57	8	0.001

As you can see in the above tables, there is a significant difference between Observed and Expected frequency in Daryabandari's translation. In the next table, Faramarzi's translation based on Chi-Square test has been illustrated.

Table 18.The Observed and Expected Number in Faramazi's Translation

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	36	12.5	23.5
2	33	12.5	20.5
3	1	12.5	-11.5
4	0	12.5	-12.5
5	2	12.5	-10.5
6	2	12.5	-10.5
7	0	12.5	-12.5
8	1	12.5	-11.5
9	0	12.5	-12.5
Total	75		

Table 19. Chi-Square Test

Chi-Square test		Df	Sig.
Faramarzi's Translation	153.57	8	0.001

According to above tables, there is a significant difference in Faramarzi's translation. In the below tables, the observed frequency of both translations has been compared.

Table 20.The Comparison of Observed Frequency in Both Translations

		1	2	3	5	6	7	8	
Ro w	1	29	40	1	2	1	1	1	75
	2	36	33	1	2	2	0	1	75
Total		65	73	2	4	3	1	2	150

Table 21. Chi-SquareTest

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Sig.
Pearson Chi-Square	2.758[a]	6	.839
Likelihood Ratio	3.154	6	.789
Linear-by-Linear Association	.260	1	.610
N of Valid Cases	150		

According to above tables, there is no significant difference between two translations due to translatability and untranslatability view.

Conclusions

The aim of this study was to examine the translatability and untranslatability of collocations in *A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway. Moreover, the translatability and untranslatability of collocations have been investigated in this research. Accordingly, all of the omissions and mistranslated items examined so they may bethe result of translator's negligence and may not be related to untranslatability.

Translators choose many strategies such as Literal Translation 35.73%, Equivalence 30.93%,Total Omission 20.8%, Mistranslated Items 3.14%, Partial Omission 2.4%, Calque2.94%, Transposition 2.13%, Modulation 1.4%, and Transliteration 0.53%. Adaptation had no place in translation of collocations from English into Persian in the novels. The findings of this research suggest that literal translation is the most frequent strategy used by translators. The second top strategy is equivalence. The omissions (total, partial) and mistranslated items were not the result of untranslatability.

There is no significant difference between Daryabandari and Faramarzi's translation in the case of translatability and untranslatability of collocations.

There is a significant difference between Salimi's and Namvar's translation in the case of translatability and untranslatability of collocations. Namvar with66total omissions and two partial omissions out of 75collocations caused significant difference in this part.

Strategies and Hints in Translating Collocations

This part offers some guides in translating collocations based on the finding obtained from the analysis of the data. It is better to translate collocation into collocation but there is no dictionary about collocations in Persian.There are some solutions for translating collocations, for example:

- Collocations may translate freely. Consequently, new and innovative constructions have been created and over translation will be happened. Translation has been done by calquing and new combination take into grant in Persian.
- Google base search can be useful for finding collocations equivalents.
- Collocations may have omitted from original texts.

References

Benson, M., Benson, E., &Ilson, R. (1997).*The BBI dictionary ofEnglish word combinations* (2nd ed). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation.* London: Oxford University Press.

Francis, B. & Poole, R. (2009).*Oxford collocation dictionary for students* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gabrielatos ,C .(1994).Pedagogical implications, and their treatment in pedagogical materials. *Research Center for English and Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved August 15, 2012 from http://www.Gabrielatos.com/collocation.htm.

Hemingway, E. (1957). *A farewell to arms.* Charles Scribner's sons: New York.

Hemingway, E. (1940). *For whom the bell tolls.* Charles Scribner's sons: New York.

Hemingway, E. (1957). *The old man and the sea.* Charles Scribner's sons: New York.

Hornby, A.S. (2005). *Oxford advanced learners dictionary* (7th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jonhson, N.L., Kotz, S., &Balakrishnan. N. (1994).*Continuous univariate distributions (2ed.)*.John Willey and Sons.

Kenny, D. (1998). Equivalence.In M. Baker, (Ed.).*Routledge encyclopedia of translationstudies*. London: Routledge,pp.77-80.

Merriam – Webster's collegiate dictionary(2006).United State of America: Merriam- Webster Inc.

Modarresi, G. (2012). Collocational errors of Iranian EFL learners in written English.*TELL, 3* (1),135154.Retrieved August1, 2012from:http://www.parsgig.com/f/AkUov.

Munday, J. (2008a). *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications* (2nd Ed.). London; New York: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2009b). *The Routledge companion to translation studies*. New York: Routlege.

Nattinger, J. &DeCarrico, J. (1992).*Lexical phrases and language teaching*.Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Newmark, P. (1988a). *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice Hall.

Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to translation.* Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Noura,M. (2012). Translation of good in the history of Tom Jones, a foundling.*Internationalof English*

Linguistics,2 (3). Retrieved August1, 2012from: http://dx.doi.org/ 10.5539/ijel.v2n3p49

Shokouhi, H.,&Mirsalari, G. A. (2010). Collocational knowledge versus general linguistic knowledge among Iranian EFL Learners. *Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language,13*(4).

Vinay, J. &Darbelnet, J. (1995).*Comparative stylistics of French and English: a methodology for translation* (J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Trans.). Amesterdam: John Benjamins.