

A Study on the Historical Etymology and Causes of Collocations in Persian Language

Shahla Sharifi

Linguistics Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

PO box 91779-48974, Azadi Square, Mashhad, Iran

Tel: 98-915-503-1683 E-mail: sh-sharifi@um.ac.ir

Shima Ebrahimi (Corresponding author)

Linguistics Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

PO box 91779-48974, Azadi Square, Mashhad, Iran

Tel: 98-915-503-9738 E-mail: shima.ebrahimi@yahoo.com

Received: August 15, 2012 Accepted: Sep. 10, 2012 Published: December 1, 2012

doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2250

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2250>

Abstract

The issue of collocation which is carried out on the basis of appropriateness of semantic relationship between the words is a field of study in Linguistics and has a strong relationship with lexicology and semantics.

Thorough and comprehensive researches vis-à-vis the fields of syntax have been undertaken and achieved results indicate that not only the meaning of each individual word but also their bond with “their syntagmatic words” is a determining factor in collocational cases. Therefore, it is not possible at all to limit the subject of collocations to a specific framework.

The present study seeks to examine and explain the concept of collocation in Persian language and the causes of collocating words from a scientific and etymological perspective. For this reason, lexical collocations are grouped into categories such as collocations with historical and scientific roots, collocations in poets’ verses or with Quranic allusion, collocations used together in the same situation, and collocations made of synonyms and antonyms.

Keywords: Lexical collocation, Semantic relation, Collocation, Etymology, Synonym-antonym collocation

1. Introduction

All objects in the world are in relation with one another and since the words reflect the concepts in the universe, being analogous and having semantic relations are unavoidable. Words have their limitations in juxtaposing with each other and it is impossible to use all feasible combinations of words together.

The issue of collocation is related to all units of language. For instance, in the field of phonology in Persian language consonants collocate with vowels and create a syllable and two consonants can never come together in the initial position or the middle of a word. Collocations also exist in the area of semantics. As an example, “ham” which is a prefix can be used with a specific group of words i.e. nouns such as “hamxāne (home mate)”, “hamkar (co-worker)” or “tar” which is a suffix and can only be used with adjectives such as “kūxtar (younger)”, “bozorgtar (older)”. Since this domain is too broad and examining collocations from a semantics view shows that explaining it on the basis of semantics is more reasonable, we dismiss that in this article. This research aims to examine and describe the concept of collocation in Persian language and the causes of word sets in combinations and collocations. Historical and scientific reasons, similar usage and examining collocations are among the reasons for collocating words which are addressed in this article.

2. Literature Review

Studies on lexical relationships in the field of semantics had often been conducted in respect for pragmatic relations. But, in late twentieth century for the first time, a group of British Linguists in a different approach accentuated the syntagmatic aspects of the words.

The reason for this alteration in lexical studies can be traced back in works of Firth in the form of concept of collocation. The term collocation was first introduced by G. R. Firth in his theory of meaning. Fundamentally, he considered these linguistic phenomena to be meaning-based rather than grammar-based and used them to nominate and specify the combinations on the basis of their semantic-idiomatic relations, their frequency and their occurrence. Collocation is a way of expressing the meaning. (Palmer, 1971:170)

Firth believed in recognition of words through the meaning of its collocating words and postulated that collocations of words can only reveal one part of their meaning. In this case we can refer to dog and barking, railway- train, darkness- night. (Palmer, 1971:161)

One of the Palmer’s findings suggests that words can take new meanings in different collocations. One such case is the meaning of the word “bank” in combinations such as bank of the river or bank of Australia. According to Firth, the criterion in granting permission for collocations is not only the meaning of each individual word, but also linguistic conventions in their juxtaposition. As it is the case about the two words “fāsed” (corrupted) and “gandide” (rotten). Although there are lots of similarities in their meaning in Persian linguistic

conventions, these two words cannot be used with the same words; one can be used with “Si:r /milk in the combination “Si:r-e fâsed” meaning spoiled milk. The other, however, is collocated with “toxm-e- morq”(egg) in form of “toxm-e morq-e gandise” which means rotten egg.

In Palmer’s view point, a word is collocated with those words whose meanings are compatible with it in one way or another. One example can be seen in the case of words “rehlat” which means departed and “dargozašt” meaning deceased. Despite being synonymous, these two words have different connotations which limit their usage in different contexts. For instance, “rehlat” is not used to talk about the death of ordinary people. Thus, they are restricted to a narrower context.

Lyons (1977) refers to Porzig’s findings which suggest that words in their individual form are different from their compounding form. This makes it impossible to give a definition of each collocating word separately and without considering the collocation as whole. Take the case of the verb “pârs kardan” in Persian which means “to bark”. The meaning of this word can be easily defined when it is collocated with the noun “sag” meaning dog. (Lyons, 1977: 261-262)

Lyons (1966) states that range and field are the main criteria in identifying lexical collocations. He also adds that the field of these collocations is not just determined by their meaning and that synonyms are not necessarily of the same field. One example in Persian is the case of the words “bozorg” (big) and “vasi?” (broad) which cannot be substituted for each other in similar context even if used in the same meaning. Consequently, if substitution takes place in this situation, an abnormality in the sense of collocation is resulted. Take the statement “Soma mortakebe yek eštabahe bozorg šode?id” which means “you have made a big mistake”. The word “vasi?” is not suitable to be used instead of “bozorg”.

Lyons also proposes that concerning collocations, substitutional and combinatorial relations are important factors. While combinatorial relation can be found between words of different parts of speech, substitutional relation exists between identical members of the same part of speech. For example, to define the word “mote?ahhel” (married) we can say “mard-e dârazan va farzand” (a man with a wife and children) which is well-structured and acceptable in terms of collocations. But, a disorder occurs if the words “mard” (man) and “zan” (wife) are changed in that statement. Lyons claims that anticipating these relations is only based on semantic features. (Lyons, 1966: 60-63)

Discussing the issue of collocational restriction of lexical units, Cruse (1989) refers to the notion of collocation. He defines collocation as “sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur”. According to him, these sequences shape a semantic constituent. Examples of this

in Persian language could be “tufān hāye musemi” (seasonal storms) and “gard-o qobā-e mahhali” (local dust). Cruse believes that context is of considerable importance in expressing the meaning of semantic constituents. He also believes that the transferred meaning is restricted to the context.

The examples from Persian language mentioned bellow confirm his opinion.

The word “saxt” has two different meanings; difficult and serious which are observable in the two sentences “?u saxt bimār ?ast” (he is seriously ill) and “kari saxt ?ast na ? āsan” (it’s a difficult job not an easy one). Another example is the word “sangin” (heavy) in the two sentences “qazā-ye sangin bimār rā ?azyat mikonad” (the heavy meal hurts the patient) and “ketāb-e ruy-e miz besyār sangin ?ast” (the book on the table is very heavy).

Cruse suggests that in light of semantic cohesion, collocations are more easily identifiable than idioms and expressions. As an example, the meaning of collocational combination of “leng-e kaf” (one of a pair of shoes) or “leng-e jurāb” (one of a pair of socks) in comparison to “leng-e b-e leng-e” which is an idiom. (Cruse, 1986: 24-41)

There are similar studies in Persian into the subject of collocation which will be discussed below.

Mollanazar (1990) has examined the role of collocations in translation. His study reveals that well-structured combinations and normal sequences of words in source language may become ill-structured in the target language. The abnormality in the target text is due to the difference of the source and target language in terms of their linguistic features of collocations and also the different meaning of the corresponding combinations in the two languages. (Mollanazar, 1990:101)

Shahriari (1997) has carried out a similar study about the restrictions of lexical collocations in translation. He compares different types of combinations of collocations which are equivalent in source and target languages. Researches on the field of collocation and its relation with translation demonstrate that these experiments have a significant role in translation profession in creating normal combinations and avoiding unnatural ones. (Shahriari, 1997:1)

Rasam (1996) in his research points out that collocational relations are one of the important features of language. He takes advantage of collocations to present an innovative approach to categorize compound verbs in Persian language. In his opinion, collocations are crucial in identification of words. Furthermore, collocations help the words to take on meaning in the text, through the text, and by means of collocating with other words. He exploits relations between lexical items in a collocation to recognize the verb and its bound morphemes and studies simple and complex verbs on a vector diagram of collocation. (Rasam, 1996:80)

Afrashi (1999) defines collocation as a constructed relation between the words which is resulted from a mixture of syntax and semantics. Her approach has an interdisciplinary nature and using Jakobson's opinions, she divides collocations into two groups of intralinguistic and extralinguistic. For example in combinations like “yek farvand havāpēymā” (one set of airplane) or “yek tup parč-e” (one piece of cloth) collocations are based on syntagmatic axis and intralinguistic type. In her point of view, the word formation process – compounding and affixation- is somehow related to collocation. (Afrashi, 1999:78)

Nowruzi Khiabani (1999) states that one part of vocabulary knowledge is related to people's awareness about the existing relation between each word and other words. It means that knowing a word consists of full understanding of its ability to be combined with other words in possible combinations. Thus, a large part of learning vocabulary should be devoted to teaching and learning collocations. (Nowruzi Khiabani, 1999:2)

Panahi (2000) considers collocation to be a universal concept of language and believes that collocation has a semantic-morphological characteristic. Her research revealed that morphologically, collocation is a production of a combinational word formation process during which syntactical role of word is also examined. Semantically, the meaning of the components in a combination is a determining factor in collocational restriction and conventionality of the combination. (Panahi, 2000:8-11)

Shifting from form to meaning, Stubbs (2005: 225) suggests that “there are always semantic relations between node and collocates, and among the collocations themselves”. The collocational meaning arising from the interaction between a given node and its typical collocates might be referred to as semantic prosody, a term for meaning which is established through the proximity of consistent series of collocates (Louw, 2000: 57).

Sharifi and Namvar (2010) have presented a new classification of lexical collocations and assessed both linguistic and metalinguistic elements in shaping collocations. They have proposed eight criteria for determining lexical collocations in Persian language which are as follows: pivot word, feature percolation and inseparability, juxtaposition, number and the type of vocabularies, linguistic and metalinguistic features of lexical collocations, upward and downward collocations, simple and multi-word collocations, semantic collocations, contextual collocations, etc. Eight following criteria have been chosen as the yardsticks to consider the collocates of words as a collocation:

- 1) Frequency: Just those groups can be regarded as collocations whose repeated co-occurrence is not by chance and accidental.
- 2) Pivot word: Pivot word in a collocation should be a lexical morpheme.
- 3) Feature percolation: Semantic features in a lexical collocation are percolated from the pivot word to the associate words.

- 4) The notion of upward and downward collocations: If associate words are closely linked to each other, they can be regarded as collocations. But if a grammatical item occurs between them, they cannot be considered as collocations.
- 5) Characteristics of semantic choice: Semantic features of associate words should not be contrary to the semantic feature of pivot word. For example, the terms “mountain” and “eating” cannot be regarded as a collocation even if they follow each other several times.
- 6) Separability: This criterion has been used to make a difference between compound words and collocations. It suggests that if the components of a group of words are not used separately in other contexts, they cannot be considered as collocations.
- 7) The capability of expanding: This criterion has also been used to differentiate between compound words and collocations. A group of words can be considered as a collocation only when the pivot word can be expanded at least with a word; otherwise, they cannot be regarded as collocations.
- 8) Linguistic intuition: Although linguistic intuition is considered no longer as a criterion, some scholars still use it. In the present study, it is applied only when there is no other acceptable criteria to determine the collocates of words as collocations (Sharifi & Namvar, 2010: 5-8).

It should be noted that the concept of collocation is a relative concept, rather than an absolute one; therefore, it differs from language to language. By and large, no specific criterion can be determined for classifying a group of collocates as collocations.

3. The Statement of the Problem

As it was adverted earlier, collocation is considered a universal concept of language and aforementioned researches in different languages confirm this fact.

Some combinations are inoperative in everyday language because of lacking collocation and are consequently omitted because of their rare occurrence like the artificial and pseudo-collocations which are unpopular with most of the people. But, those that almost get into the high-frequency list become fixed in the language.

Words collocate together for a variety of reasons which are taken into account in this article from etymological and scientific perspective. It means that collocations become conventional in a society because of being used repeatedly whether rooted in the history and transferred generation after generation or collocated for scientific reasons.

In the present article, collocations with historical origins some of which have come in the form of slangs are grouped into different categories in order to examine the reasons why they are collocated.

4. Data Analysis

In analyzing the data related to this research, historical documents such as poets' verses and reliable sources like Quranic narratives have been gathered and with referring to medical

issues, a body of words has been collected which reveal historical or scientific reasons for their collocations. Used repeatedly through ages, these words have become colloquial and have lost “va” (and) as their conjunction and are pronounced as a single word.

4.1 Collocations of Scientific Origin

Sometimes the reason that a collocation becomes widespread is because of the medical background that has been firmed up for that collocation. We can also classify these combinations according to their function in identical situations or their co-occurrence. This means that these collocations have been formed because of their co-occurrence or scientific advantage.

Some examples of this kind could be:

“Panir-o Gerdu” (cheese and walnut): There is a substance in cheese called tyramine which causes mental retardation and dementia if accumulated in the brain. Although this substance can be broken down in a catabolic process by a kind of enzyme in human body, this enzyme is active only to a certain extent. To activate the enzyme to a higher degree the amount of copper in body system should be increased and it is worth mentioning that walnut is a great source of copper. This is why eating cheese with walnut is recommended in religious texts as prophet of Islam (PBH) says eating walnut and cheese separately is harmful but if eaten together they will be healthful and nutritious. Eating walnut along with cheese modifies the amount of calcium proportional to that of phosphorus in the body especially in the case of children in whose body the proportion of calcium to phosphorus is two to one and eating cheese with walnut improves this proportion.

“Somaq kabab” (kebab with sumac): The reason for adding sumac to kebab is that eating roasted meat creates harmful enzymes in the body and sumac can prevent these enzymes to affect the body. Besides, adding sumac to meat can also eliminate the risk of gout. “somaq” was pronounced as “soma” in old days in Iran. In fact, “soma” is the Persian pronunciation, whereas “somaq” is the Arabic one.

“Sir-o Serke” (garlic and vinegar): The combination of garlic and vinegar prevents from being infected with contagious diseases. Rubbing the mixture of these two substances on the skin cures the swollen parts body. Vinegar is used for disinfection and is a symbol of teardrop and anguish in literature. Today, when they appear together in a collocation, it means anxiety and anguish. “delam mesle sir-o serk-e miyusad” (I have butterflies in my stomach) refers to being worried.

“Kahu va Sekanjebin” (lettuce and syrup): In Iranian traditional medicine, lettuce is believed to be cold-natured. Eating lettuce with syrup is both delicious and appetizing.

As we can see above, the reason for collocating words in the combinations mentioned earlier is rooted in science and medicine and using them as collocations is justified through

CT: When the mosquito flies, it will bite the elephant with all celerity and alacrity.(Sadi)

As you notice, in the above mentioned examples, the word “pil” has come together with the word “pāse” to show the contradiction between two things one which are totally different in terms of size, age,... and today this combination has been changed into “fil-o fenjān”

“Hesāb-o Ketāb” (account and book): It refers to organizing something. The word “hesāb” (account) comes from the word “mohāsebe” (count) it can also be equal to “arithmetic” which is from the Greek word *arithmos* “number”. In Persian the word “hesāb-o ketāb” first was employed by Mohammad Ayub Tabari in his book “Shomarname vameftah al moamelat” in which he has used the word “shomar” in place of “hesāb” and the word “somarname” instead of “ketāb-e hesāb” (account book). The word “somar” has been etymologically derived from “Pahlavisāsāni” and over the ages the word “somarname” which means account book has been replaced by “hesāb-o ketāb” (account and book).

There could be also another reason for this collocation. Since digits are written when calculating, the word “ketāb” (Arabic for writing) followed the word “hesāb” or counting.

“Sam?-o Parvāne” (candle and butterfly): Regarding the fact that the story of candle and butterfly has been told recurrently in verses and myths, and that when these two words come together they symbolize love and passion, it is fully justified to use them together today. The story is that butterfly goes round the candle to the extent that its wings are blazed and burnt. Therefore, candle and butterfly are symbols of the beloved and the lover. These two words have been used together many times in various poems to show a passionate love.

به خنده گفت که من شمع جمعم ای سعدی مرا از آنچه که پروانه خویشتن بکشد (سعدی)

“Be xande goft ke man sam?e jam?am ?ey sa?di marā ?azan?e ke

parvāne xi?tan beko?ad” (Sadi)

CT: He said with laughter thou sadi! I am like a candle among the fellows. I won’t be hurt if butterfly burns itself.

تعجب نیست گر پروانه در بیرون در سوزد که شمع کشته روشن در شبستان تو می گردد(صائب تبریزی)

“Ta?ajjob nist gar parāvne dar birun dar suzad ke sam?e košte rošan dar
Sabestāne to migardad”

CT: It is not surprising if the butterfly is burning outside while the turned off candles are kindled inside your bedchamber. (Saeb Tabrizi)

“Gol-o Bolbol” (flower and nightingale): Nightingale singing on top of a flower has always been interpreted as passion and desire. These two words are similarly used to show love in poems.

فکر بلبل همه این است که گل شد یارش گل در اندیشه که چون عشوه کند در کارش (حافظ)

“Fekre bolbol hame ?an ?ast ke gol sod yara gol dar ?and sie ke
?un ?e?ve konad dar kara?”

CT: All nightingale thinks about is that the flower is his mistress while flower just thinks how to coquette)

ز جام گل دگر بلبل چنان مست می لعل است که زد بر چرخ فیروزه صفیر تخت فیروزی (دکتر معین)

“Ze ?ame gol degar bolbol ?enan maste meye la?l ?ast ke zad bar ?arxe firuze
safir-e taxte firuzi”

CT: Now nightingale is so drunk of the red wine from flower that is trumpeting in the skies for his triumph. (Dr. Moein)

The reason why nightingale goes round the flower is for its pleasant smell. This action is interpreted as his love for the flower. Today the two words are collocated and are used humorously to refer to a pleasant situation. “ke?vare gol-o bolbol” (a country which is not in a good condition), “?oza?e gol-o bolbol” (not a very pleasant situation).

“Leyli-o Majnun” (Leyli and Majnun): It is an ancient story which is open to debate whether it is real or just myth. There are many poems in Arabic literature describing Leyli and her love for Majnun or Gheys Ameri. The story of Leyli and Majnun is also very well-known in Persian literature. And Nezami Ganjavi put it into verse in 584 A.H. This story originally an Arabic Myth is more a creation of Nezami’s delicate mind. Today these words collocate to indicate the romance between lovers.

“Xosrow-o Shirin” (Xosrow and Shirin): Xosrow refers to Khosrow Parviz Sassani whose love is depicted in Nezami’s poetry to represent earthly love. He fell in love with Shirin an

Armenian girl. These two words likewise form a collocation to refer to love and passion.

“Širin-o Farhad” (Širin and Farhad): Farhad was a soldier in Xosrow Parviz’s army who is also in love with Shirin, but their difference is that Xosrow reached his love but Farhad lost his love and threw himself down from the top of mountain Bistoon. Farhad, the stonemason, is a symbol for faith and pure love while Xosrow symbolizes a licentious and unfaithful man. That is why the name Shirin is more associated with Farhad than Xosrow.

4.3 Collocations in Quran

“Sabr-e Ayyub” (Job’s patience): Job (PBH) is one of the highly respected prophets who is known for his patience in hardship and endurance in praising God. Many lines and verses of Quran refer to his patience as his distinctive personality trait which is also noteworthy for many authors. Job’s patience is so significant that now represents a proverb both in Arabic and Persian literature. Since he is known for his patience, his name is collocated with “sabr” in the combination “sabr-e Ayyub” to express someone’s endless patience.

“Omr-e Nuh” (Noah’s lifetime): Noah (PBH) was one of the five greatest prophets who had an exceptionally long life and this has become a proverb in Arabic and Persian literature. History and quotes and hadith indicate that he lived for about two thousand to two thousand and eight hundred years. “omr-e nuh” (Noah’s life) ironically refers to a very long lifetime and today is use as a collocation which has the connotation of living a long life.

“Ganj-e Qarun” (Qarun’s treasure): Qarun was Moses’ cousin who collected a treasure of gold and silver objects astonishing Moses’ people. It is said that Moses ask him to pay one dinar for each container of golden coins as zakat, he disobeyed and rebelled against Moses (PBH) and Moses in return cursed him and all his belongings sank into the earth. Today these two words form a collocation which refers to a person who indulges in accumulating wealth. Some poets also refer to this.

احوال گنج قارون کایام داد بر باد با غنچه باز گوید تا زر نهان ندارد (حافظ)

“Ahvāle ganj-e Qarun ke ?yyān dād bar bād bā qonṭe bāz gu?id

tā zar nahān nadārad” (Hafiz)

CT: The circumstances of the treasure of Karun which, to the wind of destruction time gave Utter ye to the rose-bud (the miser), so that its gold, hidden, it-- have not.

گنج قارون که فرو می رود از قهر هنوز خوانده باشی که هم غیرت درویشان است (حافظ)

“Ganj-e Qarun ke foru miravad ?az qahr hanuz xānde bāsi ke ham qeyrate

darvisān ?ast” (Hafiz)

CT: Karun's treasure that, from the wrath (of Musa), yet descended (into the earth) that also, thou wilt have read, is from the wrath-- of Dervishes.

شبی کو گنج بخشی را دهد راد کلاه گنج قارون را برد باد (نظامی)

“šabi ku ganj baxši ra dahad rad kolahe ganje

Qarun ra barad bad” (Nezami)

CT: The night when he bestows beneficence to a person, who devotes his wealth, Karun's treasure will go out of the wind)

4.4 Lexical Collocations and Their Field of Development

The words in these combinations are collocated because they are used together in a particular field such as cooking, tailoring, carpentry, etc. We can refer to the words “nax-o suzan” (needle and thread) in the field of tailoring. When using thread it is inevitable to use needle and because they are used at the same time they have formed a collocation. An example in the field of carpentry could be “mix-o takkoš” (nail and hammer). In the field of cooking we can

talk about words such as “dig-o sepaye” (pot and cooker) or “Qashoq-o tangal” (spoon and fork).

Other examples could be “qalam-o davat” (quill and inkwell), “qalam-o kaqaz” (pencil and paper), “par-o livan” (pitcher and glass) “kard-o tangal” (fork and knife) which could be grouped because of the features mentioned earlier.

While these words can be used in syntagmatic collocations, they are mostly grouped in associating collocations which means hearing one of them associates the other one in the mind.

Some examples of this kind are referred to in the following paragraphs:

“Qashoq-o tangal” (spoon and fork): Stone knife was one of human's first inventions. Spoon is also invented long ago and dates back to ancient times. “Qhashogh” has a Turkish root and is derived from the verb “ghashmogh” which means to cut and to scrub. In the past, knife and spoon were used instead of fork and spoon. When it became popular in Turkey and East Europe it was brought into use widely in other parts of the world. Since it is easy to use them together, “qashoq-o tangal” replaced “qashoq-o kard”

Kot-o salvar” (coat and pants/ suit): From ancient times, Iranian people believed in covering

the whole body and were fully dressed. Their clothes consisted of long skirts and long-sleeved dresses which have been observed on the statues to be worn by the kings and queens of Elam. Men of high status were allowed to wear a type of dress called “kandis” which was a gift from the king. Later, “kandis” was replaced by a long coat and this was certainly the origin of the standard styles of the coat worn today by men. Because of being used together, the two words “kot” and “salvar” formed a collation and now are used as a single word.

4.5 Antonyms in Collocations

Relation of the words can be also found between antonymic words. Their collocations often appear in a pair of words such as “garm-o sard” (hot and cold), “dur-o nazdik” (distant and near), “siyah-o sefid” (black and white), “past-o boland” (high and low) “xord-o kalān” (tiny and massive). Antonymic groups of words express contradiction and cannot be used separately. To illustrate this, we can understand the notion of “nazdik” (near) by means of the word “dur” (distant) or put it another way, it is the result of feeling the heat that we can understand what cold means. It is like the existence of two poles in which the existence of one brings about the other one. These antonymic words are often united under one single notion and expressed as a single word and this relation and semantic relevance causes them to collocate. The combinations mentioned bellows are among the collocations of antonyms.

“Dār-o Nadār” (to have and to lack): It refers to all the possessions that one has. Because of the collocational relations the word “dār” (wealthy, the one who has something) is associated with the word “nadir” (the one who lacks something) which makes them to set together.

“Behset-o Jahannam” (the heaven and the hell): “behesht” (heaven) is used to refer to righteousness and “Jahannam” (hell) is used to refer to evil things. There are also other similar combinations such as “xeyr-o šar” (good and evil), “vorud-o xoruj” (enter and exit), “šab-o ruz” (day and night), “siyah-o sefid” (black and white), “torš-o širin” (sour and sweet), “?amr-o nahy” (to order and to forbid), “did-o bāzdid” (to visit) “jam?-o tafriq” (addition and subtraction). It is worth mentioning that at the present time most of these combinations are considered a single word. The directions such as “šomal-o Jonub” (north and south) and “šarq-o qarb” (east and west) could be also considered in this classification.

4.6 Synonyms in Collocations

Synonyms with near meanings form a specific lexical group in the language system and most of the times are paired together. Examples are: “xoš-o xorsand” (happy and satisfied), “baxt-o sa?adat” (fortune and bliss), “šur-o ?osyān” (excitement and rebellion), “qam-o qosse” (grief and sorrow), “naz-o ne?mat” (opulence) etc. using synonymous words is because the speaker or writer is not satisfied with using one word to transfer the meaning and therefore, brings the second word to complete the meaning of the first one so that s/he can fully express the meaning.

But, using synonyms in collocations are restricted in coming together. For example, words such as “kalān”, “bozorg”, “?azim”, “kabir” are synonymous and could be grouped together for the similarities in their meaning- all of them mean great. However, they cannot be used interchangeably. The combination “sang-e kabir” (great stone) is not correct while it is permitted to use adjectives “kalān” and “bozorg” with the word “sang” (stone). For instance, consider the two words “bozorg” (great) and “gond-e” (massive) in Persian language. Despite the relative synonymy between these two, in the word “delgonde” (idle) there is a collocational relation between “del” and “gonde” which does not exist between “del” and “bozorg”. Hence, they cannot be used as a collocation.

Some examples of synonymy in collocations could be; “elm-o dāneš” (science and knowledge), “?adab-o rosum” (customs), “gard-o xāk” (dust), “qam-o qoss-e” (grief and sorrow) “naz-o ne?mat” (opulence)

5. Conclusion

According to what mentioned before, the meaning of words is the determining factor in all collocations and a word is often collocated with the words which have something in common with it. When collocating two words we should consider semantic relations of each individual word to avoid damaging the rationalization behind the criteria in making expressions.

In a lexical view, special attention is given to expressions and collocations which include common sentences, frameworks and topic sentences. We always try to consider and use collocations rather than the words. We try consciously to see things from a higher perspective instead of experiencing.

Collocations are easy to observe in which some words occur with a higher frequency in a natural context. In addition, collocation is not determined based on logic or frequency. It is a matter of taste and merely based on linguistic conventions. These conventions are different from one language to another. The more fixed the collocational relation is, the more it will be

like the structure of an expression. It means that it forms a pattern which should be learned as whole not as separate parts.

It should be pointed out that there are numerous collocations of this kind and we referred to a number of them in this article. To examine all of them a comprehensive dictionary should be compiled in Persian language. Besides, in the issue of collocation there are a number of reasons for collocating words such as synonymy, antonymy, being used together, family relations and the rest some of which were examined in this research.

We can conclude that collocations have specific reasons in their creation. They may be created for cultural or historical requirements and find their way to be stabilized. These kinds of collocations have been transferred generation after generation and have become parts of every day speech in a way that it is impossible to use one of the words in the collocation without the other one.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to take this opportunity to thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on the final version of manuscript. Any shortcomings in this paper remain the authors' responsibility.

References

- Allerton, D. J. (1984). Three four levels of co-occurrence relations. *Linguistics*, 63, 17-40.
- Benson, M. (1989). The structure of the collocation dictionary, *International Journal of Lexicography*, 2(1), 1-14.
- Cruse, D.A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, J.R. (1967). *Modes of Meaning*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Greenbaum, S. (1974). Some verb-intensifier collocations in American and British English. *American Speech*, 49, 79-89.
- Halliday, M.A. K., & Ruqhiya Hasan. (1992). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. (1998). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Rutledge.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of lexis in Text*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical Approach*. Language Teaching Publications.
- Lobner, Sebastian. (2002). *Understanding Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Louw, B. (1993). *Contextual prosodic theory: Bringing semantic prosodies to life*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Lyons, John. (1997). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

- McEnery, A., & A. Wilson. (2001). *Corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nowruzi khiabani, & Mehdi (1378), Sources of Collocational Clashes. *In Language and Literature*. No 7,8,11.
- Palmer, H. E. (2000). *Linguistic Context*, PhD thesis, Computer Science Department, Colombia University, New York, NY.
- Panahi, Sorayya, Collocational Combinations in Persian Language, *Fahangestan Journal*, 19.
- Pawley, A., & Syder. F. (1983). *Two puzzles for linguistic theory*. London: Longmans.
- Safavi, Kourosh. (2000), *Semantics*, Tehran: Soure Mehr Publications
- Sinclair, J. M. (1966). *Beginning the study of lexis*. London: Longmans.
- Sinclair, J. M. et al (1991). *Collocations and semantic profile*. London: Longmans.
- Stubbs, M. (1995). Collocations and semantic prosodies: on the cause of the trouble with quantitative methods. *Human of Language*, 2, 1-33.
- Widdowson H. G. (2000). *On the limitations of Linguistics Applied*.
- Yahaghi, Mohammad Jafar. (2006), *Persian Mythology Dictionary in Persian literature*, Tehran: Farhang Maaser.