

An Analysis of the Strategies Used in English Translation of Lexical Collocations in Divan-e Hafiz

Biok Behnam, Nastaran Nosratzadegan

Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Email: behnam_biok@yahoo.com

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i1/713>

DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v3-i1/713

Published Online: 29 March 2014

Abstract

The translation of poetry, as a special type of aesthetic function of language, is always regarded as more perplexing than the translation of any other texts. There has always been much dispute about methods that can be employed to preserve the poet's message and the uniqueness of the style in order to generate equivalent effects in the target language. Some of the numerous problems a translator encounters during the process are due to the application of linguistic tools which are undeniably intertwined with language and culture. Poetry entails linguistic subtleties such as collocations with sublime concepts prone to effacement through translation. The point is that collocations are structurally and conceptually language and culture specific and a translator should deal with them precisely so as to maintain cultural and aesthetic values. The present study sought to compare lexical collocations in selected poems from Divan-e Hafiz and the corresponding translations made by Arberry (1905–1969); Clarke (1840-1905) in order to discover the most common techniques the two translators employed and to reveal the merits and flaws pertaining to each technique. This paper explored that religious, cultural and semantic collocations are respectively the most difficult types of word combinations for translators to accomplish the process. It further illustrated that the most frequent approach taken by the two translators were word for word translation and, in some cases, reduction of the lexical relationship to minimize distorting the form, stylistic and semantic features of poems while creating equivalent effects in the TL.

Keywords: Translation of Poetry, Lexical Collocation, Religious Collocations, Semantic Features, Equivalent Effect

The translation of literary works is considered by many to be one of the highest forms of translation as it involves so much more than simply translating text. However, there is still a controversy about whether or not a work of literature can be translated. In fact, the major problem in translating a piece of literary work especially in the form of poetry is the specific linguistic features of composition employed by the poet to make it different from ordinary texts. These poetical features are closely tied to a particular culture, religion and belief as a whole; yet, they are partly unique to a poet. Besides, the idea that **poetry might partly get**

lost in translation could be truthful to a certain extent because there is no one-to-one equivalent when comparing two languages. Even if the translators obtain a profound knowledge in the source language they would not be able to create a replica of the original text.

Collocations have for some time been recognized as something that translators need to be aware of. However, they have been thought to be something arbitrary, difficult to describe, and like meaning itself, difficult to pin down. Since they are considered one of the subtleties of language, we can guess how effective cultural information of the source text could be in grasping the meaning of collocations in that they are like many other aspects of language, highly culture-bound. This feature of collocations makes them complex and difficult to understand. Another reason for the complexity of translating collocations lies in various approaches taken by the translators for different purposes. Thus, a translator should reach to a complete understanding of collocations and their contexts of use in both SL and TL.

Since the focus of the article is semantic preference which supports the equivalent of effect on TL readers as those of the SL, it is easier to appreciate if collocations are properly understood.

What is a collocation?

"Collocation is the concept of word co-occurrence, where certain words appear predictably next to or within a certain number of words from each other; the usual string considered is of four words to either side of the node word, sometimes known as a *nine-word span*." (Sinclair, 1991, p. 121)

Carter (1998, p.60) argues that:

The idea covers collocations in a syntactic relation (such as verb-object: 'make' and 'decision'), lexical relation (antonymy and synonymy), or grammatical items (grammatical collocation or colligation). Lexical collocation is the co-occurrence of nouns, adjectives, verbs or adverbs, such as *stricterules* (rather than *rigid*), or *he prickedhis finger* (rather than *pierced* or *punctured*). Colligation is the co-occurrence of nouns, verbs or adjectives with prepositions or certain features of grammar, for example, a comparative form of an adjective with the word *than*, or the verb *deal* with the preposition *with*.

The importance of collocation with regard to the naturalness of a translation may be considered paramount. Further support for the importance of collocation in language is given by the definition offered by Firth (1968) and Halliday and Hassan (1976) as linguistic phenomena to be meaning-based rather than grammar-based. They further claim that collocation is a group of words used to develop lexical cohesion of text and contain a cohesive force.

In Sinclair's view (1991, p. 170):

A collocational structure is a co-occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a piece of discourse. The notion of collocation is similarly referred to as a sequence of two or more consecutive words with a particular relation between them in a way that it has the characteristics of a single unit whose meaning cannot be extracted from the meaning or connotation of its components.

Knowledge of collocations is vital for the competent translation. A precise translation will stand out as awkward if collocational preferences are violated. This makes collocation an interesting area for translation of different texts specifically poetry.

Grasping the Meaning of Collocations

Collocations are of interest to translators not least because of the challenge of finding target language equivalents for collocate pairs. This is particularly apparent when we try to find equivalents for high frequency, polysemous words. However, regarding the meaning of collocations, Stubbs (1995, pp. 23-55) recommends that "there are always semantic relations between node and collocates, and among the collocations themselves."

It is noteworthy that Cruse (1986, pp. 24-41) defines collocation as "sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur". According to him, "these sequences shape a semantic constituent". Cruse believes context as a crucial factor in expressing the meaning of semantic constituents. He also claims that the transferred meaning is restricted to the context. Similarly, Firth (1957) argues that "a word is known by the company it keeps" (p.11).

Thus, in translating a text the translator should be careful about these relations since he either seeks to break them to use the components in a new context and new form or as an alternative, tends to find a suitable correspondence in TL.

Review of the Related Literature

Several studies have been carried on the subject of collocations and collocational relations in translation. According to Newmark (1988, p.46) "difficulty in translation of collocations is due to two major reasons; first, there is only an arbitrary relation between components of a collocation and its meaning and second, at least one of these components has secondary meaning."

Baker (1992, pp. 60-74) likewise refers to the arbitrary relation between elements of a collocation and the whole meaning of it. She believes that:

There is no such thing as impossible collocations" and the reason is that words are gathered together and create collocations and it is an ongoing process which exists naturally in any language. She also mentions that the difficulty of translating collocations lays in the fact that the collocational patterning of source and target language are different. The following are the most common pitfalls she mentions that a translator may face when translating collocations:

1. The engrossing effect of source text patterning
2. Misinterpreting the meaning of a source-language collocation.
3. The tension between accuracy and naturalness.
4. Culture-specific collocations
5. Marked collocations in the source text.

A further consideration to bear in mind when dealing with collocation in translation is specificity; the more specific a word is, the shorter its collocational range.

Lyons (1997) believes that a collocation should be considered as a whole and that separating its components does not give a legitimate meaning equal to the combination of them. Regarding the degree of cohesiveness of lexical combination, Benson et al (1986, p. 9) state that "collocations are fixed phrases stored in the mind".

Taking the pragmatic view of collocation, Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) consider collocations as high frequency word combinations. Cowie (1993) and Robins (1971) (cited in Herbst, 1996, p. 383) have defined collocation as "the habitual association of a word in a language with other particular words in sentences such as white coffee, green with jealousy and maidenspeech".

Regardless of any particular approach adopted, a number of studies were carried out by Addison (1983); Dechert&Lennon(1989);Bahns&Eldaw(1993); Gitsaki (1996) and others to use collocations from different dimensions.

Addison (ibid.) in probing the concept of lexical collocations proposed the following assumptions:

1. A text structure for a unit of discourse is analogous to that existing at the level of sentence.
2. A text form can become discordant if large enough samples of generically similar texts are examined.
3. An analogous text may be formed by studying the relationship between lexical collocation and topic/comment sequence. (p. 8)

Addison concludes that when a lexical set regularly occurs within the topic portion of sentences, the lexical set will be perceived as representing the point of the text, which can act as a whole theme of the text.

Most of the scholars of translation studies still stick to the notion of equivalence and believe that the more the translator makes use of equivalents of the source text terms in the target text the better will be the product of translation. They advise that in facing collocations, the translator must look for an equivalent collocation in the TL. This seems challenging and time consuming and, most of the time, unproductive due to the cultural differences between SL and TL.

Some Iranian scholars have also carried out research on the field. Mollanazar (1990) considered the role of collocations in translation. According to his studies well-structured combinations and normal sequences of words in SL change in the process of translation and become ill-structured in the TL. The abnormality created in the target text is due to the difference of linguistic features of collocations in SL in addition to the different meaning of the corresponding combinations in the two languages. A similar study has been carried out by Shahriari (1997) about the restrictions of lexical collocations in translation. She has examined different types of corresponding collocations in source and target languages and came up with fruitful results in the field of translation in terms of producing standard and nonstandard combinations.

The studies on the field of collocations and their key role in translation profession illustrate that the translators attention should be drawn to word combinations in general and collocations in particular so as to form appropriate combinations to have equivalent effects on the TL readers.

Literary translation may be said to have the greatest number of peculiar problems and these largely depend on who is translating and what he knows. The researches which have been conducted on the significance of collocations in translation of literary works reveal that to elucidate the poets` attitude and worldview, it is of paramount importance to recognize the approach they take to apply lexical collocations when creating a piece of literary work.

One of the most dominant characteristics lie within the composition of Hafiz poems is the way he benefits from the lexical collocation to make a more delicate and concise literary work. Therefore, this paper is an attempt to examine the challenges that literary translators

are confronted when translating lexical collocations of Divan-e Hafiz from Persian into English. Since Hafiz poems abound with lexical collocations, only some of them are considered here. Furthermore, we focus on feature combinations of lexical collocation in which can give us a clear picture of different translation strategies employed by translators of literary works, since it has not been investigated as extensively. The effect of SL culture on the selection of an appropriate collocation pair is another feature of collocation that can be considered as an obstacle.

Method

In the present study, all the lexical collocations used by Hafiz in his major work "Divan" were examined and their corresponding translations made by the two English translators, A. J. Arberry and H. Wilberforce Clarke were compared in order to find out the extent to which religious and cultural information help the translation of collocations. Among all the collocations examined, because of their abundance, 15 cases were selected randomly and put into religious, cultural and semantic categories to present the analysis. The forthcoming section is allotted to translation analysis following Newmark's (1964) principle of "equivalent effect" through rendition of SL religious, cultural and semantic features into the TL in a way to recreate the SL effect in the TL. What follows is an examination of some of the techniques employed by the two translators for the said purpose.

Data Analysis and Discussion

In order to analyze the data, first the Persian lines including the bold typed collocations under the study are presented together with the transliteration of the collocations, next the two English translations from A. J. Arberry (shown as A) and H. Wilberforce Clarke (shown as C) are provided followed by the analysis and examination of the translators' strategies.

Religious Collocations

A group of collocations worthy of attention is the word combinations with some references to religious allegories or traditions. When these words collocate with other words, it is expected that the whole collocation gains a secondary meaning which makes them even more difficult to translate. Having a rich body of knowledge about religions, some poets are intent to transfer religious messages in a delicate way with a higher degree of effectiveness. In some cases there is an interval between the two components that collocate. The following is some of the examples of religious collocations used in Hafiz verses:

1. Halal-o Haram

نان حلال *شیخ ز آب حرام* ما

ترسم که صرفه ای نبرد روز بازخواست

A.:

But when the Day of Reckoning is here,

I fancy little will be the gain

*That accrues to the Sheikh for his **lawful** cheer,*

*Or to me for the draught **forbidden** I drain.*

C.:

On the day of up-rising (the resurrection), I fear, a profit taketh not.

*The **lawful** bread (piety) of the shaikh, more than the **unlawful** water (wine of love) of ours.*

The two components of the religious collocation "*Halal-o Haram*" are in antonymous relationship referring to "a deed in full accordance with / against Islamic spirit and religious obligation". Both translators have created the same base "*lawful*" but different collocates of "*forbidden*" and "*unlawful*" respectively; both of which in contrast with their respective base; yet, "*forbidden*" is more likely to imply the religious aspect of the term to the readers. However, it is obvious that connotative religious meanings of the collocation could not be transferred at all.

2. Setr-o Effaf

ساکنان حرم سترو عفاف ملکوت با من راه نشین باده مستانه زدند

A.:

Oh dwellers in the halls of Chastity!

You brought Love's passionate red wine to me,

Down to the dust I am, your bright feet step.

C.:

The dwellers of the sacred fold of the veiling and of the abstaining (from what is forbidden) of the angles,

On me, dust-sitter (holy traveller), the intoxicating wine (of divine knowledge) cast.

The use of combined lexemes of Arabic origin like "*Setr-o Effaf*" as marked in the above line, has become so frequent that Persian speakers automatically associate the two synonymous components. According to Islam the term literally includes "*setr*" meaning "to cover the sins of others" and "*effaf*" which is defined as "chastity" and together "sacrosanctity" and "purity" are implied. To overcome the obstacle of translating this collocation, both translators, while aware of the meaning, have taken different approaches. Arberry considered transference of the meaning through reducing the term into the noun "*chastity*"; while, Clarke has rendered a word for word translation as "*veiling and abstaining*" followed by a complementary definition.

Semantic Collocations

Collocations are sometimes semantically transparent, which means that the meaning of the whole equals the sum of the meanings of each of its components. For this reason, collocations may be easily decoded if one merely knows the meaning of the base and that of the other element it collocates. However, it must be partial as there are numerous cases in which one of the components acquires a figurative sense. Collocations of synonymy and antonymy types are created when there is similar or different semantic relationships between the two components they entail. These collocation types are mostly fixed in colloquial speech and so associated that the base implies the specific meaning of the element it co-occurs with. In semantic collocation two juxtaposed vocabularies are mostly nouns and adjectives and owing to their synonymy, they belong to the same grammatical category. Here are some examples:

1. Rah-o Rasm

به می سجاده رنگین کن گرت پیر مغان گوید که سالک بی خبر نبود ز راه و رسم منزلها

A.:

Let wine upon the prayer-mat flow, and if the taverner bids so;

Whose wont is on this road to go its **ways and manners** well doth know.

C.:

With wine, becolour the prayer-mat- if the Pir of the magians (the perfect murshid) bid thee;
For of **the way and usage** of the stages (to God) not without knowledge is the holy traveller
(the perfect murshid).

In Persian culture, in the term "Rah-o Rasm", the node and it's collocate are synonymously meaning "the way to act". Such binary word combinations which construct synonymous collocations carry no metaphorical meaning; thus, the translator can easily transfer the meaning through a word for word rendition. Arberry translated the collocational term into "ways and manners" in which the two parts share the same semantic feature and seems to be proper equivalent for the ST equivalent. Clarke, on the other hand, has used the term "the way and usage" as "usage" doesn't transfer the concept of "rasm" and doesn't deal with it appropriately.

2. Kouh-o Biyaban

صبا! به لطف بگو آن غزال رعنا را که سر به **کوه و بیابان**، تو داده‌ای ما را

A.:

Go, friendly Zephyr! Whisp`ring greet

Yon gentle fawn with slender feet;

Say that in quest of her I rove

The dangerous steeps, the wilds of love.

C.:

O breeze! With softness speak to the beautiful fawn (the murshid),

Saying: Thou hast given to us desire for **the mountain and the desert** (the hardship and pain of separation).

The term "kouh-o biyaban" in persian language implies "wandering aimlessly from place to place". In the first translation "the dangerous steeps, the wilds", it is more likely to assume that arberry has created a bizarre equivalent, but in fact it represents the contextual view of meaning in lexical semantics as implied in the source text. In rendering second translation, using the term "the mountain and the desert", clark has first provided a word for word equivalent then it is followed by an elaboration in parentheses knowing that through a mere word for word rendition the meaning cannot be transferred.

3. Sa`y-o Amal

دولت آن است که بی خون دل آید به کنار ورنه با **سعی و عمل** باغ جنان این همه نیست

A.:

Like an empty cup is the fate of each,

That each must fill from Life`s mighty flood;

Nought thy **toil**, though to Paradise gate thou reach,

If Another has filled up thy cup with blood;

C.:

*Fortune is that which, without the heart's blood, cometh to the bosom:
And, if not, the garden of the Beloved (gained) with **effort and toil** all this is naught.*

Both the base and the collocate in the collocational term "Sa`y-o Amal" imply "hard working". The components of the term are so tightly tied that the first translator preferred to reduce the term into a single word; i.e. the noun "toil" which seems to be adequate to correspond the same meaning as that of the SL term. However, in the second translation, Clarke has unnecessarily provided a word for word rendition which is resulted into a bizarre word group for the TL readers.

4. Ahd-o Vafaa

نشان عهد و وفا نیست در تبسم گل بنال بلبل بیدل که جای فریادست

A.:

*Take not for sign of **true intent**
Nor think the rose's smile sincere;
Sweet, loving nightingale, lament:
There is much cause for weeping here.*

C.:

*In the smile of the rose, is no trace of **the covenant of fidelity**:
O Bulbul-lover; bewail; for it is the place of wail.*

In the collocational structure of "Ahd-o Vafaa", it seems obvious to the translator that semantically there is a complementary relationship between the node and collocate i.e. 'to abide by one's promise'. However, Arberry preferred to use the adjectival phrase "true intent" as a correspondence for the Persian collocation and Clarke has translated the collocation sufficiently into the phrase "the covenant of fidelity" meaning "faithfulness" to keep the notion of it. However both are likely to provide acceptable equivalents to transfer the meaning component of SL to TL and to recreate the SL effect.

5. Khorram-o Khandan

دیدمش خرم و خندان قدح باده بدست و اندر آن آینه صدگونه تماشا میکرد

A.:

*I saw him standing in his place,
A goblet in his grasp, **a smile**
Of right good cheer upon his face,
As in the glass he gazed awhile
And seemed to view in vision clear
A hundred truths reflected there.*

C.:

*Him, **happy, laughing**, wine-goblet in hand, I saw:
And in the mirror (of the goblet), a hundred kinds of views (mysteries of divine knowledge) he made.*

In the collocation "Khorram-o Khandan", both parts are adjectives referring to the same semantic component meaning "happy and delighted". Arberry has altered the lexical relationship and provided the noun phrase "a smile of right good cheer" to maintain the notion of the SL collocation; whereas, Clarke decided to employ the literal translation "happy, laughing" to maintain the rhythmic pattern of the verse. Both translations, although at different word level, are comprehensible, but the delicacy of the poetical structure is somehow lost. Probably, an equivalent like "exultant" can semantically pose a more appropriate equivalent for the collocation.

6. Qorb-o Bo`d

در راه عشق مرحلهٔ قرب و بعد نیست می بینمت عیان و دعا می فرستم

A.:

Or far or near there is no halting-place
Upon Love`s road- absent, I see thy face,
And in thine ear my wind-blown greetings sound,

C.:

In love`s Path, is no stage of nearness or of farness:
(Hence, O true Beloved!) I clearly see Thee; and prayer, I send Thee.

This is originally an Arabic collocation entered the Persian language meaning "distance". However, since it is not a language specific collocation, it has more or less the same semantic feature in Arabic, Persian and English languages. Hence, both translators have attempted to retain the collocational structure through using "far or near" and "nearness and farness" respectively to indicate both the rhythmic and the antonymous relationship existing between the two components. The translators seem to have appropriately created literal translation but in different word levels i.e. the former used the word level of adjective while it is noun in the latter. Although "nearness or farness" has maintained the structure of the SL collocation, it is not applied with this meaning as frequently as "far or near" which is more fitting and can be easily inferred by English readers.

7. Yamin-o Yasar

ز زیر زلف دو تاجون گذر کنی بنگر که از یمن و یسارت چه سوگوارانند

A.:

When veiled beneath thy curls thou passest, see,
To right and leftward those that welcome thee
Have bartered peace and rest on thee to gaze!

C.:

(O true Beloved!) for Thee, the wind (bearing news to men, and far and near thy perfume) and for me the water (tear) of the eye (declaring me to be a lover) became informers:
If not, mystery-keepers (of each other) the lover and the Beloved are.

The collocation "Yamin-o Yasar" is an Arabic anonymous combination. The term literally means "right and left" but in fact in Persian language there is more than a slight difference in meaning as it implies "far and wide". The first translator probably could not understand the meaning of the combination and his efforts in transferring the concept through a word for

word rendition, "right and leftward", was a failure because the two parts are not semantically and structurally compatible with their corresponding term in SL. The second translator, on the other hand, has partly understood the semantic component of the collocation and has drawn on the term "far and near" which has the nearest meaning to the source term.

8. Soud-o Ziyān

نقد بازار جهان بنگر و آزار جهان گر شما رانه بس این سود و زیان ما را بس

A.:

Look upon all the gold in the world's mart,
On all the tears the world hath shed in vain;
Shall they not satisfy thy craving heart?
I have enough of **loss**, enough of **gain**;

C.:

The cash of the world's market, and the world's pain, behold:
If this **profit** (is not) for you enough; this **loss**, for us enough.

In the collocation "Soud-o Ziyān", the two parts share antonymous relationship. Such semantic feature isn't language specific and, thus, can be associated by English speakers. Therefore, a word for word translation, as both translators employed, seems a proper approach for adequately *translating* the term into English. However, the equivalent "loss and gain" as used by Arberry is considered more corresponding to the source text term than "profit and loss" as "profit" and "gain" have different concepts as well as usages; the former is used more in business but the latter has a wider range of applications; notwithstanding, they are usually used to carry the same semantic feature.

Culture-specific Collocations

In this category, the meaning of a whole may not be constructed from the meanings of the parts that make up the whole. In other words, one should not be in a position to understand the whole if one is not familiar with the culture in which the language is spoken. In fact, culture-bound collocations are made of vocabularies which closely associated with the culture of source language. They are repeatedly used in colloquial language and can be only understood in source language; therefore, translators are likely to encounter some adversities as they deal with the practice. The following examples are employed to illustrate the point:

1. Hast-o Nist

به هست و نیست مرزجان ضمیر و خوش می باش که نیستی است سرانجام هر کمال که هست

A.:

Nor with **Is** nor **Is Not** let thy mind contend;
Rest assured all perfection of mortal birth
In the great **Is Not** at the last shall end.

C.:

Grieve neither at **existence** nor at **non-existence**: Be thy mind, happy.
For the end of every perfection that is – is non-existence.

In philosophy, the antonymous collocation of "Hast-o Nist" connote "life and death"; the two facts which are so intertwined that one cannot avoid. Despite the first collocational term "Is and Is not", though with capitalized initials, Arberry has managed to a lesser degree to convey the true concept of the original text as does by Clarke using the term "existence and non-existence". In truth, however, the concept of "death" as used in Holy Books does not imply "annihilation" or "nonexistence"; rather, "separation", "transition to another life" and others.

2. Bal-o Par

به بال و پیر مروازره که تیر پرتابی هوا گرفت زمانی ولی به خاک نشست

A.:

Shoot not thy **feathered arrow** astray!
A bow-shot's length through the air it has sped,
And then dropped down in the dusty way.

C.:

With **the wing** (of wealth) **and the feather** (of rank) go not (in pride) from the Path (and be not fascinated with thy own frail life). For, the arrow far-flying
Keepeth (loftily), the air awhile; but, at last, lieth (low) in the dust.

Due to the fact that the meaning of a collocation cannot be perceived through understanding the meaning of its individual components, it is not possible to transfer the message through a literal rendition; as the synonymous collocation of "Bal-o Par" means "what you boast about which is transient and won't last long" rather than "wing and feather". In the first translation, Arberry preferred to reduce the collocational structure into the word level as translated to the adjective "feathered". On the other hand, in the second translation Clarke has understood the meaning of the collocation but has been unable to find an appropriate equivalent. Knowing that a word for word translation carries different semantic features like "The wing and the feather" as he does which the original collocation does not imply, he decided that a literal translation plus some definitions in parentheses would suffice to overcome the problem. This latter point shows that the Persian collocation is a culture bound term.

3. Kwon-o Makaan

حاصل کارگه کون و مکان این همه نیست باده پیش آر که اسباب جهان این همه نیست

A.:

What is wrought in the forge of the **living and life**
All things are nought! Ho! Fill me the bowl,
For nought is the gear of the world and the strife!

C.:

The produce of the workshop of **existence and dwelling** (the whole world) all this is naught;
Bring wine (of the love of God), for the goods of the world all this is naught.

The collocation "Kwon-o Makaan" meaning "the whole world and whatever is in it", due to the frequency of use, has lost its primary meaning forming an idiomatic expression instead. Both translators have employed similar equivalents. Arberry has used the collocational term "living and life" which is not idiomatic but understandable for the TL readers while Clarke as mentioned earlier has rendered a word for word translation followed

by some definitions to compensate this lack of meaning in an attempt to generate an analogous effect on TL readers.

4. Piyade-o Savaare

تو دستگیر شو ای خضر پی خجسته که من بیاده می روم و همرهان سوارانند

A.:

*Oh Khizr, whose happy feet bathed in life's fount,
Help one who toils afoot-the horsemen mount
And hasten on their way; I scarce stir.
And loose me not!*

C.:

O Khizr of auspicious foot (the Murshid perfect and excellent)! be thou my hand-seizer. For I Travel on foot; and my fellow-travellers(Arifs)on horse-back are.

The two antonymous words "piyade" and "savaare" are tightly combined to form the collocation "Piyade-o Savaare" which in this context meant to convey a description of "the maturing process of those who embark on the spiritual path of sacred journey to God". They either take slow steps (on foot) or fast steps (on horseback) along the path of affinity to God. As it is obvious in the case when an interval happens between the two parts of a collocation, word for word translation could be the easiest means to transfer the meaning appropriately. However, both translators presented a word for word translation to correspond with the collocation in the source text.

5. Choun-o Chera

حافظ رسید موسم گل معرفت مگویی دریاب وقت را وز چون و چرا مپرس

A.:

*But when the time of roses comes again,
Take what it gives, oh Hafiz, ere it flies,
And ask not why the hour has brought it thee
And wherefore ask no more!*

C.:

*Hafiz! The rose-season hath arrived: divine knowledge, utter not:
The cash (value) of time, discover; of how and why ask not.*

The lexical relation between the components of the term "Choun-o Chera" is of synonymous type, having a significant similar semantic content. Since the term is not language specific, the meaning is analogous in Persian and English languages and; therefore, could be conveyed through word for word rendition. Both translators have similarly taken word for word approach but in first translation "why and wherefore" seems an awkward equivalent since both components share the same concept and fail to have a corresponding effect on TL readers as it is on the readers in SL. Thus, Clarke's choice of equivalent "how and why" seems sufficient for the purpose.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to compare the two English translations of verses of Divan-e Hafiz as a Persian literary work which contains a large number of cultural and religious

references. The article has been limited into the subject of lexical collocations as linguistic tools with a different application when used in poetry. The results showed that the degree of difficulty in translating collocations is depended on the type of collocation and the existence of similar views in target language. Collocations related to religious contexts appeared to be the most problematic; so that the two translators had to take several approaches to deal with them appropriately. They mostly tended to use equivalents which were more familiar for the TL readers in order to domesticate the text while maintaining the message and style of the poetry. In some cases the translators preferred a word for word translation followed by definitions to make the term more explicable and maximize the effect in the target text. Other difficult collocations included those related to the culture. No problems appeared in case for a source text collocation there was an equivalent in the target language with analogous meaning. But in most cases the meaning or form had to be changed to become understandable for the target readers and to provide equal effects. The least problematic type, were collocations with semantic relations between the components constructing them. Most of the time they posed no serious problem and a word for word rendition seemed to be adequate. However, for collocations with synonymous relationship between the two parts, the translators preferred to reduce the term into a word level. But sometimes they go beyond their primary meaning and adopt a secondary meaning to play the role of a literary device which demanded translator's attention to employ different approaches as discussed to sufficiently deal with them.

References

- Arberry, A. J. (1947). *Poems from the divan of Hafiz*. (Eng. Tr. *Divan-e-Hafiz*). Cambridge.
- Addison, J. C. (1983). Lexical collocation and topic occurrence in well-written editorials: a study in form. In A. E. Fantini (Ed.), *The Growth of Word Meaning* (pp. 69-91). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Benson, M. (1989). The structure of the collocational dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2(1), 1-14.
- Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary. Applied linguistic perspectives* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Clarke, H. W. (1881). *The divan-i-Hafiz*, (Eng. Tr. *Divan-e-Hafiz*). The office, Board of Examiners, Elysium Row. (Ed by Major H. S. Jarrett). Calcutta.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dechert, H. W., & Lennon, P. (1989). Collocational blends of advanced second language learners: A preliminary analysis. *Contrastive pragmatics*, 131-168.
- Firth, J. R. (1968). Descriptive linguistics and the study of English. *Selected papers of JR Firth (1952-59)*, 96-13.
- Gitsaki, C. (1996). *The development of ESL collocational knowledge*. University of Queensland, Bangor.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (Eds.) (1976). *Cohesion in English* (English Language). Essex: Longman.
- Herbst, T. (1996). What are collocations: sandy beaches or false teeth? *English Studies* 77(4), 379-393.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 2). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mollanazar, H. (1990). The role of collocation in translation, Unpublished. Tarbiyat Modarres University, Tehran.

- Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Shahriari, Z. (1997). The restrictions of lexical collocations and translation. Islamic Azad University, Tehran.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1995). Collocations and semantic profiles: On the cause of the trouble with quantitative studies. *Functions of Language*, 2(1), 23-55.