



Linguistics and Translation

Elixir Ling. & Trans. 56A (2013) 13779-13785

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

Translation of Binomials in Political Speeches and Reports; A Contrastive Study of English and Persian

Parisa Khatibzadeh¹ and Motahareh Sameri²

¹Sheikhabai University, Esfahan, Iran.

²Esfahan University, Esfahan, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 15 August 2012;

Received in revised form:

21 March 2013;

Accepted: 25 March 2013;

Keywords

Binomials,
Collocation,
Natural equivalence,
Contrastive linguistics.

ABSTRACT

Binomials – as a subcategory of collocation- consist of two words from the same category which are joined with a linguistic link. Like collocations, binomials are mostly language specific. Therefore getting familiar with binomials for any translator is an important task which is usually overlooked. As a result, they produced body of language which usually seems unnatural from viewpoint of target language audience. This study attempts to evaluate the naturalness of translated binomials in the genre of political speeches and to introduce procedures producing natural equivalence. The result showed that although the literal translation procedure proved to render natural translation in 54% of cases, the translators overused this procedure (86%) and overlooked the idiomatic nature of binomials and thus produced unnatural or binomials which does not sense in English. Therefore they fail to render the intended political effect.

© 2013 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Binomial is a linguistic phenomenon, which despite its presence and pervasiveness in nearly all languages is an insufficiently researched area and has not received the attention it deserves. Since the inception of the linguistic phenomenon of binomials, it has been treated under different labels, including (Irreversible) binomials (Malkiel 1959; Bolinger 1962; Gustafsson 1984; Kadi 1988; Saeed 2010), 'freezes' (Cooper & Ross 1975; Oden & Lopes 1981; Gill 1988), and 'conjoined lexical pairs' (Bakir 1999) (cited in Gorgis & Al-Tamimi 2005) and doublets (Mayoral Asensio, 2003). However, the difference is a matter of labeling and the common thread running through all of them is that they conceive of binomials as "the sequence of two words pertaining to the same form-class, placed on an identical level of syntactic hierarchy, and ordinarily connected by some kind of lexical link" (Malkiel, 1995). For the sake of convenience we use the term 'binomials' hereinafter.

The first thing to notice about binomials is that the two main word or better to say conjuncts come from the same word class. The link which joins the two conjuncts mostly is 'and', less frequently 'or', 'to', 'by', 'neither' and rarely 'against', 'but', 'after' or even sometimes without any lexical link.

Moreover, one of the other characteristic features binomials, which make its acquisition a thorny area for both second language learners and translators, is that they occur almost exclusively in a specific order. This feature is made manifest in Malkiel's (1959) aptly-phrased terminology, i.e. irreversible binomials. The meaning of a binomial is usually perceived as a whole. Moreover, their meaning generally is irrelevant of their ordering of the conjuncts. In other words, the meaning of 'exciting and interesting' remains identical to 'interesting and exciting'. put more precisely; in many cases, there is a preferred (better to say fixed) order in realization of the conjuncts. In some instances "the preference is so strong that the reverse is

perceived as highly marked and may even be difficult to understand" (Copestake & Herbelot n.d.) or at least it sounds almost unnatural. From the vantage point of translation, failing to deploy binomials (or broadly construed as language-dependent word orders) correctly gives rise to a number of problems namely, hindering his audience's understanding of the content of the text and impeding the natural flow of language and on the other hand, s/he fails to render the intended political effect.

Different scholars have scrutinized binomials from pure linguistics perspectives. They attempted to find the rationale behind the existing alignment of conjuncts. They propose some constraints which could describe the order of conjuncts of binomials. Among the most prominent constraints we can name phonological constraints (Malkiel 1959, Bolinger 1962, Cooper and Ross 1975), semantic constraints (Malkiel 1959, Cooper and Ross 1975, McDonald 1993, Muller 1997) and pragmatic constraints (Sarah Bunin Benor 2006, Fenk-Oczlon, 1989).

Besides being fixed in terms of order, the other hall mark of binomials is that they are language-specific phenomenon (to which we made a passing reference above) (reference). Accordingly, to adduce evidence in favor of the language-specific nature of binomials and to bring the cross linguistic differences into the fore, a number of Studies (although they are few), with a contrastive method as their major thrust was conducted. For instance, some researchers studied the translation of English binomials into a specific language and compared and contrasted the use of binomials in the two languages under question. In this line of research, Gorgis & Al-Tamimi (2005), for instance, making a comparison between English and Arabic have arrived at interesting conclusions. According to the authors, not all constraints justifying the order of conjuncts in English are fully responsible in Arabic. Therefore, they rejected the universality of the English constraints.

The other poorly explored domain (even in English), which also affords clear confirmation of the rationale behind conducting the present study is the investigation of binomial in translation. The only piece of research with translation as its focal point of attention (to the researcher's best knowledge) is the one conducted by Carvalho (2008). The overarching goal of her study was scrutinizing the translation of binomials used in the contracts and agreements originally written in English and translated into Brazilian Portuguese. She tried to catch the eyes of translators of legal texts to the differences between nature of binomials in English and Brazilian Portuguese. Although she didn't provide any practical guideline for translation of this phenomenon, her work was the first and the only study (to the researcher's best knowledge), which embarks on the translation of binomials. Accordingly, a cursory glance at the literature of the field reveals that, studies on the binomials is very scant and leaves many research lacunas for the investigation of its translations in different genres and different languages.

Compared with English, in Persian, for example, the phenomenon of binomials constitutes seriously neglected area both in terms of its nature and linguistic feature and in terms of its translation. Besides the dearth of research on binomials in some languages and in the field of translation, the investigation of binomials across different genres has not grasped the researcher's attention. Being informed by the fact that, the appropriate exploitation of binomials contributes to the naturalness of the text and one of the genre in which naturalness of the text is of paramount importance is political genre, the present study narrows down its scope to the genre of political speech. Put differently, the rationale underlying the choice of political genre comes from the fact that, in this genre the naturalness of binomial expressions is of a great prominence. It should be noticed that the function of political speeches and reports is first to inform the common and sophisticated people in an intelligible fashion and then to produce the desired response. According to Reiss's text type model (1977), the type of political speech is something between informative and operative. Thus in translation of political genre, on the one hand the content dominates and on the other hand the response elicited from audience dominates. Hence any intervening element that hinders rather than helps the improvement of these functions must be prevented. Moreover, the pivotal qualification of the language of this significant genre is naturalness. One of the factors that guarantee naturalness is to follow the prescribed word orders. Consequently, as Venuti puts it, it is the task of the translator to "leave the reader in peace as much as possible" (1995, p. 19). To address such research lacunas, the present study aims at investigating the translation of binomials in Persian political speeches.

As said earlier, different constraints determine the order of conjuncts the order in binomials. Here below a bird view of each constraint is provided.

The principle of "short plus long": this principle accounts for the order of binomials from phonological perspective. This notion was first introduced by Malkiel and then expanded by other scholars (Bolinger, 1962; Cooper and Ross, 1975; Wright and Hay 2002, Benor, 2006). In brief the principle proposes the following rules:

1-number of syllables: the word with fewer syllables resides in the first position; kit and caboodle, stuff and nonsense
2-vowel length: short vowel occupies the first position; stress and strain

3-number of initial consonants: the word with fewer number of initial consonants is the first conjunct; helter- skelter, fair and square

4-quality of initial consonant: the word with initial sonorant consonant occupies the first position and the word with initial obstruent consonant occupies the second position. Huff and puff, namby-pamby

5-vowel quality: the more closed and more front the vowel is, the more likely occupies the first position; dribs and drabs, flip-flap

6-number of final consonants: the word with more final consonants occupies the first position; betwixt and between

7-quality of final consonant: kith and kin push and pull

Even if the above-mentioned rules were universal, it would not be surprising that different languages align the conjuncts differently; for, the same notion in two languages is represented by different words with different phonological features.

The principle of Me First: Cooper and Ross (1975) summarized the semantic constraints into 19 subcategories and then propose an umbrella notion; "Me First". This constraint says that speakers place first those things that are most closely linked to their self-image. Cooper and Ross suggest that the first conjuncts refer to those factors which describe the prototypical speaker. The first is Here, Now, Adult, Male, Positive, Singular, Living, Friendly, Solid, Agentive, Powerful, At Home, Patriotic, General (he is a stereotype).

Although Cooper and Ross purport that this principle could account for the most of binomials in English, there is a piece of research which refute its universality. Gorgis and al-Tamimi (2005) showed that this principle could not justify the order in Arabic. They try to prove their claim by giving a counterexample. In Arabic, binomial structure 'take' precedes 'give'. Based on the Me First principle, Arabs might tend "to take more than give". Whilst, George and Al-Tamimi insist that there are "ample evidence in the literature on Arabs which highlights their generosity and hospitality". Therefore, it is not logical to apply this principle for translation of all languages without meticulously scrutinizing the self-image of the speakers of that language.

Principle of "more frequent (high-token frequency) before less frequent": Fenk-Oczlon (1989) according to the long series of psychological studies which scientifically prove that in English "we automatically and incessantly, register frequencies and differences in frequency". Therefore, it is expected that our cognitive system puts elements with high information content at the beginning of the sentence in order "to avoid an overloading of cognitive capacity and to achieve a constant information flow". She adds that "particular factors such as natural salience or the cultural importance of particular concepts lead to a higher frequency of the lexical units that present them and this higher frequency again leads to the shortness of the linguistic forms". This principle also could not be deemed as a completely universal rule; as for the cultural importance of elements differs from language to language.

The principle of markedness (less marked plus more marked): Sometimes the conjuncts in a binomial can be perceived through extra linguistic or real-world knowledge; including power, perceptual based markedness (inanimate/inanimate, right/left, positive/negative, concrete/abstract, and singular/plural), formal markedness (general/specific, more frequent/less frequent, structurally more simple/less simple). Here again the markedness is the matter of culture and thus universality cannot assert itself here.

As noted above, none of the above mentioned principles is a universal feature. Besides, on the one hand different constraints may be at play for each binomial expression (Malkiel, 1959). On the other hand, determining the predominant constraint is not always an easy task. This is exactly why one cannot predict the order of conjuncts in a binomial a priori. Moreover, binomial expressions are not easily found in any dictionary (Carvalho, 2005). By that very reasons, it is the native speakers (hereinafter NSs) who are the legitimate authorities to judge on the preferred order of binomials. Bearing this in mind and the fact that order of conjuncts in binomials is language-dependent it is not surprising that non- native speakers (hereinafter NNSs) would make glaring errors while using these phrases. The translation of NNSs is significantly influenced by the source language structure which may be fundamentally different from the binomial system of the target language.

Carvalho (2008) attempted to provide necessary guidelines for rendering a natural translation in the genre of legal agreements. He found out that Brazilian translators in dealing with binomials "tends to translates all the elements of binomial literary" and consequently, "fail to attain the intended legal effect of the communicative event". She asserts that binomials are a "distinct mark of legal discourse and extremely common in legal English". It is common to see binomials with synonymous conjuncts in the legal texts; for instance, aid and abet, aid and comfort, authorize and empower, cease and desist, null and void. She found out that Brazilian legal language is not characterized by use of such superfluous word orders. For this reason, the translator must be familiar with the language and cultural conventions of each legal system involved in the translation activity in order to attain the intended legal effect; otherwise the result would be an unidiomatic translation. She prescribes that in translation of English legal texts into its Brazilian counterpart, translators must not to translate literary, and instead the translator must "provide naturally occurring language patterns "to" attain the intended legal effect.

Another significant research carried out in this domain is that of Gorgis and Al-Tamimi (2005). As mentioned earlier, Gorgis and Al-Tamimi believe that world view provides the deepest interpretation for binomial orders. On the other hand one of their goals was scrutinizing binomials in Iraqi and Jordanian Arabic to highlight the similarities and differences in the order of conjuncts. They concluded that as for the two languages are from the same origin and the languages enjoys the same cultural background, the preferred order on conjuncts in the two languages is the same.

A few works have been conducted on binomials. Most of these studies are among explanatory essays which try to justify the order of conjuncts a posteriori. Few works dedicated to implication of binomials. Sadly, in Persian binomials are completely unexplored. Thus, this study sheds light on this phenomenon to fill this gap. By scrutinizing the translation of binomial expressions, this study contributes to the translation studies into two branches of translation studies; pure and applied. From view point of the former, this study attempts to formulate a partial theory of translation restricted to a specific phrase i.e. translation of binomial phrases in political genre. From perspective of the latter, the findings of this study could be fed into translator training courses, teaching methods and testing techniques.

Vinay and Darbelnet Model

Vinay and Darbelnet were the pioneers in the natural equivalence paradigm. In 1958, when no translation theory was

expressed explicitly, they approached to the notion of equivalence practically. As Pym (2010) explains, they try to come up with procedures which could produce a body of language which "says virtually the same thing as English [text]". In other words they sought to find procedures by which one could substitute source language with target language as if no one has translated it; this type of equivalence is said to be natural. "It is what different languages and cultures seem to produce from within their own system. The natural equivalence is reciprocal"(p.12).

The central notion in translation is the notion of equivalence. As Pym puts it, the relation between the source text and the translation is equal value, no matter whether the relation is at the level of form, meaning, function or anything in between (2010, p.6). Many translation theorists in this paradigm (vazquea-Ayora, Nida, Ernest-August Gutt, venuti) believe that all languages have the same expressive capacity. So translation should have the same value as its corresponding source text. Moreover, these scholars defense the ideology that translation should not read like translation (Pym, 2010). The scholars who first used the term "equivalence" were Vinay and Darbelnet in their classic course book "stylistique comparee du francais et de l'anglais" (1958). The most salient feature that distinguishes Vinay and Darbelnet's work from others is that they provide practical instructions. They proposed a list of procedures and techniques that proved to be valuable in the training of translators. In brief, the two general strategies are Direct translation and Oblique translation. Below is the adaption of Vinay and Darbelnet's model elaborated in Munday (2001):

Direct translation:

- Borrowing: the SL word is transferred directly to the TL.
- Calque: the SL structure is transferred in a literal translation
- Literal translation: word for word translation

Vinay and Darbelnet believes that the best method of translation is direct translation. Notwithstanding, they assert that sometimes the literal translation is unacceptable when it

- Gives a different meaning
- Has no meaning
- Is impossible for structural reasons
- Does not have a corresponding expression within the metalinguistic experience of the TL
- Corresponds to something at a different level of language (quoted in Munday 2001, p.57)

Thus the oblique translation is prescribed whenever direct translation entails the above problems. The oblique translation covers the following four procedures:

- Transposition: changing of one part of speech for another without changing the sense
- Modulation: changing the semantics and point of view of the SL
- Equivalence: describing the same situation by different stylistic or structural means
- Adaptation: changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture

As far as the unit of translation concerns, the scholars consider the unit to be a combination of a lexicological unit and unit of thought and they define it as "the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually".

Methodology:

Materials:

Being contrastive in its nature, the corpus under investigation in this study is a multilingual unidirectional

parallel (translational). It capitalizes upon 10 speeches delivered by Iranian political leaders. The rationale underlying the selection of this sensitive genre is three folded. The first and most determining reason is that, for the translation of a political speech to bring about the desired effect, it must be the most natural one and as it was pointed out above, the appropriate use of binomials contributes to the naturalness of the text. Thus, binomials used in this genre must obey the prescribed word order of the target language. Whilst in the genres like literary or advertisement, the word orders are violated because of aesthetic or appealing effects it might entail. Secondly, the speeches of major political figures are always target of analysis. Thus, it goes without saying that, they should not read as a translation. Again, natural word orders provide a body of language which makes the discourse become closer to the norm of target language and consequently, it becomes easier to be analyzed. The last but not the least reason is its availability. As Granger rightly put it, "it is not always possible to find translation of all texts, either because of text type or because there are more translation in one direction than in another" (2003: 20). Therefore, the rationale behind scrutinizing political speeches is that, the speeches of political figures always could be found along with their translation, on the one hand and the political speeches are among rare discourses which are translated as soon as they are delivered, on the other hand.

The corpus was the sample of political speeches delivered during the years 2005 to 2012. It consists of 3 speeches delivered by Supreme Leader of Iran in Friday prayer congregations (9912 words), 3 speeches delivered by the president to united nation General Assembly (3258 words), 3 speeches delivered by foreign minister of Iran (6174 words) in addition to the one of the speeches of intelligence minister (970 words) available on the internet. Besides, the English translations of these 10 speeches were collated, i.e. the translation of 3 speeches of the Supreme Leader (9055 words), the translations of 3 speeches of the president (3168 words), the translations of 3 speeches of the foreign minister (5997 words) and the translation of the speech of the intelligence minister (956 words).

The primary pool of the data of the present study consists of 147 binomial expressions extracted from Persian speeches alongside their 147 English equivalences. However, 9 Persian binomials were repeated two times. Thus, The 9 repeated binomials alongside their translation into English were eliminated. Thus, this study comprises of 138 Persian binomials and 138 English binomials. It is worth mentioning that not all of English translations of Persian binomials are necessarily binomials in English.

In this study, the data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. To investigate data in quantitative phase, the translated binomials were categorized based on the procedure employed for their translation.

Then, for each procedure the frequency was measured and the percentage was calculated. Given that, the only legitimate authorities who could judge on the naturalness of binomial expression are NSs, The qualitative phase of research was conducted based on the native speakers' linguistic intuition. In point of fact, in this phase two NSs of English were asked to determine whether the translated binomials are in conformity with the norms of English language or not.

Procedures:

To find out the best methods for translating Persian binomials into English in the political genre, the following steps were taken;

First, for the sake of practicality the scope of this study was restricted to the political speeches. Thus, 10 Persian political speeches delivered by prominent Iranian political figures were selected from online sources. Then the corresponding translations of all 10 speeches are retrieved. In the second step, the binomials used in the Persian corpus were extracted. And then, their English counterparts were collated. In the third, the translated binomial expressions were submitted to the two native speakers of English. They were asked to underline unnatural combinations. And then they were demanded to provide the most natural equivalence for the unnatural word orders.

In the forth step, each binomial expression was categorized under one of the seven procedures proposed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), i.e. Direct translation (borrowing, calque, literal translation) and oblique translation (transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation). And then, the percentage of each procedure was calculated. In the next step, for each method the percentage of (un)natural binomials (from viewpoint of the native speakers) was calculated. Then, the corrected equivalences were scrutinized to find the procedures which should have been applied for producing the natural equivalence. In the last stage, again the frequency and percentage of each procedure were calculated with the corrected equivalences.

Results:

The analysis of the data revealed that most of the binomials in Persian corpus are from noun phrase category (75.2%), followed by adjectival phrase (16.8%), verb phrase (6.4%) and adverbial phrase (1.6%) respectively. This finding is in full accordance with the results of Carvalho's (2006) study; in his English corpus binomials were formed by nouns most frequently. It is also remarkable to note that, as Gorgis and Al-Tamimi (2005) purport, in Arabic, likewise, the most frequent grammatical pattern is noun plus noun (75.33%); then adjectival phrase (13.33%), verb phrase (6.0%) and adverbial phrase (4%) are placed on the second, third and forth position respectively.

Regarding the quality of being target-like, the two raters unanimously marked 84 out 138 English translated binomials as target-like and 39 English translated binomials as not being target like. However, as expected, there were apparent discrepancies between the opinions of the first rater and the second rater. The thirteen binomials on which the raters did not enter into agreement were eliminated from data. Thus, the result of this study was based on the 125 Persian binomials and their 125 English translations. With regard to the methods adopted for the translation of the binomials, the findings of the present study demonstrated that, translators used different strategies for translating binomial expressions. The frequency and percentage of each method is represented in table 1.

Table1. Distribution of strategies applied for translation of binomials in political genre

Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Literal translation	107	85.6 %
Equivalence	12	9.6 %
Modulation	4	3.2%
Adaptation	2	1.6
Transposition	0	0
Loan translation	0	0
Calque	0	0
Total	125	100%

As table 1 makes manifest, the most frequently-used strategy is revealed to be literal translation. It is surprising that, the difference between the first and second strategy is nearly 76%. Equivalence modulation and adaptation are the three next applied strategies. And there was no binomials translated based the 3 procedures transposition, loan translation and Calque.

To address the second question, it was necessary to scrutinize the analysis of the two native speakers. They marked 39 translated binomials as unnatural or nonsense. In other words, 31.2% of translated binomials were reported to be unnatural or nonsense. What is most interesting regarding such findings is that, all of the 39 unnatural expressions were the result of literal translation.

Table 2: The percentage of correct translation of binomial expressions for each procedure

Procedure	Word	natural equivalence	Unnatural equivalence or nonsense expressions	Percentage of natural translation
Literal translation	106	67	39	63.2 %
Equivalence	12	12	0	100 %
Modulation	4	4	0	100%
Adaptation	2	2	0	100%

The insights gained from native speakers' correction revealed that, in the 19 translated expressions, the conjuncts should have been reversed. In other words, the translators should have used modulation procedure instead of literal translation. For instance, in the corpus, translators used the expression "financial and economic problems" whilst the intuition of native speakers prefers "economic and financial problems", or the expression "poetry and prose" is unnatural although conveys the meaning, the natural expression is "prose and poetry". To illustrate the issue under investigation, table 3 presents some of the erroneous instances identified by the native speakers.

Table 3: examples of unnatural translated binomials into English

Persian binomials (transliterated)	The literal translation provided by the translators	The equivalence provided by the NSs
Amricaee va oropai	American and European	European and American
Talash va kooshesh	Struggle and effort	Effort and struggle
Shahrha va mardome [ma]	[our] Cities and people	People and cities
Afghanistan va aragh	Afghanistan and Iraq	Iraq and Afghanistan
Asiaee va afrighaee va orupae	Asian, African and European	European, Asian and African
Amniat, abe va ghaza	Security, water and food	Security, water and food
Nazm va nasr	Poetry and prose	Prose and poetry
Siasi va eghtesadi	Economic and political	Political and economic
Eslam va din	Islam and religion	Religion and Islam

Moreover, 20 of the translated expression were nonsense from viewpoint of NS. For instance, the expression "police force and border guards" is nonsense. The equivalent expression which convey the same meaning with different wording should be used, i.e. "the Border Police Patrol", in some expressions, on the other hand, the translators produced unidiomatic

expressions; like the binomial expression "impolitely and arrogantly" whilst the natural equivalence is "rudely and arrogantly". Moreover, there are some Persian binomials which should not have been translated as binomials; "people and group" is one of the examples in which one of the conjunct is redundant; in other words there is no need to express the notion with the help of two words, therefore, one of the conjuncts should be eliminated. In other words, the translation of some Persian binomials is not necessarily a binomial expression in English. In these cases the translators should have translated these expressions by different stylistic and structural means. Thus they should have applied the equivalence procedure.

Table 4: examples of nonsense translated binomials into English

Persian binomials (transliterated)	The literal translation provided by the translators	The equivalence provided by the NSs
Enghelabi va zede enghelabi	Revolutionary and anti-revolutionary	Revolutionary and counterrevolutionary
Fardi va gorouhi	Individualistic and cumulative	Individualistic and collective
[masaele marbut be] Mordom va hokumat	People and government affairs	Public and government affairs
Ghazi va dastgage ghazai	Judge and judicatory	Judge and judicial proceeding

Based on the native speakers' intuition, in the expressions translated by procedures equivalence, modulation and adaptation there is no unnatural combination.

According to the corrections the native speakers provided, the distribution of Vinay and Darbelnet's procedures would be as follows:

Table 5: the distribution of strategies applied after the correction

Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Literal translation	68	54.4%
Equivalence	23	18.4%
Modulation	32	25.6
Adaptation	2	1.6
Transposition	0	0
Loan translation	0	0
Calque	0	0
Total	125	100%

As the table above show, the procedures modulation and equivalence should have been applied more than the translators actually used. The table below compares the percentage of each procedure before applying the correction and after it.

Table 6: comparison of the distribution of strategies before and after the correction

Strategy	Before correction	After correction	The difference
Borrowing	-	-	-
Calque	-	-	-
Literal translation	85.6 %	54.4%	- 31.2
Transposition	-	-	-
Modulation	3.2%	25.6%	+ 22.4
Equivalence	9.6 %	18.4%	+ 8.8
Adaptation	1.6%	1.6 %	0

As the table 6 shows, the translators applied the literal translation procedure 31.2% more than they actually they have to. Instead they should have applied modulation (22.4%) and equivalence procedure (8.8%) more than they applied.

Discussion:

For having the intended political effect, the translation must obey the conventions of target language. Word order as one of the factors that guarantee the naturalness of a text should be observed. Binomials as a phenomenon in which the order of conjuncts is influential must be introduced in translator training courses as well as English learning classes. In the former case the first the translators must acquire the idiomatic nature of binomials and thus sacrifice literal translation in cases structural and metalinguistic requirements obliged. In the latter case, binomials expressions should be taught as a part of vocabulary and idiomatic repertoire of learner.

Regarding the mostly applied procedures, literal translation procedure won the first position. This could be justified on the ground that "literal translation is [Vinay and Darbelnet's] prescription for good translation" (Munday, 2001: 57). Notwithstanding, the translators here fail to consider the reservation that Vinay and Darbelnet expressed: literalness should be sacrificed because of structural and metalinguistic requirements (Vinay and Darbelnet and Hamel, 1995: 288). In the cases where these requirements aren't observed the following problems would arise.

- The translated binomials have no meaning; sdnamed eht) * and will of people) instead of (the demand of people)
- They are unnatural for structural reasons; * (poem and prose) instead of (prose and poem)
- They does not have a corresponding expression within the metalinguistic experience of the TL; *(police force and guidance police) instead of (police force and patrol police)

The first problem stems from the inappropriately chosen unit of translation. As Carvalho (2005) concluded, the conjuncts in binomials should not necessarily translate separately but the binomials must be considered as a unit. In other words, the unit of translation should be the binomial itself. For, in these cases the meaning of binomial is not compositional i.e. the meaning of binomial is not the sum of its elements. In these cases the translators tried to be as much accurate as possible. Thus, they sacrificed the naturalness of expressions for the sake of accuracy. In these cases, the equivalence method should be applied.

The second problem arises whenever the translator neglect the idiomatic nature of binomials, although in these cases the meaning of binomials is not changed, the produced binomial does not follow the prescribed word order of language and thus it is not natural. Unnatural language could not bring about the intended effect. In the sensitive genres like political speeches in which the function is to influence the audience, the natural flow of language is very important. Thus by reversing the order of conjuncts, the natural equivalence will be provided. Carvalho also highlights the importance natural equivalence in the legal genre.

Regarding the third problem, translators neglect the cultural meaning of expressions. Some expressions reflect the cultural setting in which they occur. There are some binomials in the text which are culture-dependent. For example "nirouye entezami va gashte ershad" literally translated as "police force and guidance police" while the equivalence which could convey the same meaning as Persian is "police force and patrol police". Vinay and Darbelnet propose adaption method in these cases. Thus by translating the binomials literally, they produce expressions which are not exists in the metalinguistic expressions of language.

As binomials are a subcategory of collocation, therefore it is possible to attribute the problem concerning the translation of collocation to its subcategory. Baker (1992:65) names the following problems for translation of collocations:

- The engrossing effect of source text patterns
- Misinterpreting the meaning of a source language
- The tension between accuracy and naturalness
- Cultural specific elements

The finding of this study showed that 14% of binomials were translated with procedures other than literal translation. It is not astonishing that the provided translations have no errors. This is because the translators recognized the idiomatic nature of binomials in the texts and treat them appropriately.

Binomials - which are subcategory of collocation- run through nearly all languages especially Persian. For the writers and of course for the translators, choosing the right binomial expressions will make their writing sounds more natural and as the result more native-like. Unfortunately, not having acquaintance with this linguistic phenomenon, translators usually could not recognize binomials in the body of texts; therefore they overused the literal translation procedures (86%). While at most in 55% of cases literal translation proved to produce natural equivalence. In 25% of cases the modulation and in 20% of cases the equivalence and adaptation should be applied.

References:

- Baker, Mona, (1992). In other words: A Coursebook on translation, London and New York: Routledge
- Bell, Allan, (1991). the language of news media. Oxford UK & Cambridge MA: Blackwell
- Benor, S. & Levy, R. (2006). The chicken or the egg? A probabilistic analysis of English binomials. *Language* 82 (2), 233-278.
- Bolinger, Dwight. (1962). Binomials and pitch accent. *Lingua* 11.34-44.
- Carvalho, L. (2008). Translating Contracts and Agreements: a Corpus Linguistics Perspective. *Culturas Juridias*, 3,1, 1-15.
- Cooper, William and John Ross. (1975). World order. *Papers from the parasession on functionalism*, ed. by R. Grossman, L.J. San, and T. Vance, 63-111. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Copestake, A. & Herbelot, A. (n.d.) Exciting and Interesting: Issues in the Generation of Binomials. University of Cambridge, Cambridge.
- Doblin, H. (1981). Irreversible Binomials and Other Paired Formulae in German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 14, 1, 78-88.
- Fenk-Oczlon, Gertraud. (1989). Word frequency and word order in freezes. *Linguistics* 27.517-556.
- Gorgis, D. T. & Al-Tamimi, Y. (2005). Binomials in Iraqi and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4, 2, 135-151
- Granger, s. and Lerot, J. and Petch-Tyson, S. (ed.) (2003), *Courpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies*, Amsterdam-New York, Rodopi
- Gustafsson, Marita. (1976). The frequency and 'frozenness' of some English binomials. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 77.623-637.
- Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason, (1997). the Translator and Communicator. London and New York: Routledge
- Jakobson, Roman (1962). On linguistic aspect of translation. Chapter 8 in *Translation Studies reader*. London and New York, Routledge (2000)

- Julie Sweetland, and Qing Zhang, 175-191. Stanford: CSLI Press.
- Malkiel, Yakov. (1959). Studies in irreversible binomials. *Lingua* 8.113-160
- McDonald, Janet L., Kathryn Bock, and Michael H. Kelly. (1993). Word and world order: Semantic, phonological, and metrical determinants of serial position. *Cognitive Psychology* 25.188-230.
- Munday, J. (2001/2008) *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and Application*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Pinker, Steven and David Birdsong. (1979). Speakers' sensitivity to rules of frozen word order. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 18.497-508.
- Pordany, Laszlo. (1986). A comparison of some English and Hungarian freezes. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics* 21.119-127.
- Pym, A. (2010) *Exploring translation Theories*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Reiss, k. (1971/89) *Text Type, Translation Type and Translation Assessment*. Translated by A. Chesterman, in A. Chesterman (ed.) (1989), pp. 105-115
- Saeed, S. (2010). Phonological constraints on binomials in Iraqi Arabic with reference to English. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language and Linguistics* 12. 81-101
- Shaw James and Vasileios Hatzivassiloglou. (n.d.). *Ordering Among Premodifiers* Colombia University, New York.
- Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Willems, D., Defrancq, B., Coleman, T. & Noel, D. (2003). *Contrastive Analysis in Language*, Palgrave macmillian publication.
- Wright, Sandra and Jennifer Hay. (2002). Fred and Wilma: A phonological conspiracy. *Gender and linguistic practice*, ed. by Sarah Benor, Mary Rose, Devyani Sharma