

“Immerse yourself in the traditions of the simply way of life”

Analysing English translations of Italian *agriturismi* websites

ELENA MANCA

Università del Salento

ABSTRACT

This article aims to analyze and compare the Italian and the British languages of tourism, and the language used by translators in their translations of tourist websites into English. In particular, we will focus on mistranslations of collocations. The tools used for analysis are two sets of corpora: a comparable corpus made up of original Italian agriturismo websites and original British farmhouse holiday websites, and a parallel corpus made up of original Italian agriturismo websites and their translations into English. The theoretical framework adopted is the one proposed by Sinclair in his description of the phraseological approach to language. The results of the analysis show the importance of studying collocations across cultures and the strict relationship between language, culture, and promotional strategies.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the basic notions students trained to be translators are taught is that translation is communication between languages and across cultural boundaries (Ulrych 1992; Katan 2004). The complex process includes accounting for the cultural and the social context of both source and target texts, the communicative function of the texts, the source and the target language with their differences and similarities, the nature of the source text in terms of textual ele-

ments, grammar and lexis. This implies that the translator should be familiar with the meaning of signs in both languages, in order to avoid using signs taken from a source-culture in the target language, thus compromising the cross-culture communicative process.

This article takes into account the language of tourism as it is used by Italian and British farmhouse owners to promote their farmhouse holidays in the internet.

The website is nowadays a powerful promotional tool which has radically changed the way in which companies do business. Farmhouse owners, for example, may promote the holiday they offer all around the world while people may click and book their holiday from every part of the globe. E-tourism, though, would not be so powerful if websites would not be translated. Information can be conveyed because it is translated and made available to an international audience.

Most of Italian *agriturismi* (farmhouse holidays) websites provide information and descriptions in English, French and German. These translations, therefore, perform the role of promoting tourist accommodation abroad and attracting customers from all around the world. The task of a translator translating tourist brochures is not an easy one: their translations have not only to be successful in terms of communication but also to be effective in terms of successful promotion.

The main purpose of this article is to compare and contrast the language used in original Italian websites of *agriturismi*, the language used by translators in their translations into English, and the language used in original British websites of farmhouse holidays. For lack of space, the main focus of this article will be lexical choice, collocations and phraseology, while some proposals of translation equivalents on the basis of frequency analysis will also be provided.

2. COLLOCATION AND PHRASES

The increasing use of corpora has allowed researchers to identify systematically sets of words frequently co-occurring in language, that is to say collocations. As showed by Gledhill (2000) collocations of high frequency words are also useful indicators of the prototypical phraseology of genres. For this reason, words should be studied in their linguistic context and their patterns of occurrence should be systematically taken into account.

Firth (1957) assumes that the meaning of words is not fixed and independent but is strictly correlated with the context it occurs within. His well-known “you shall know a word by the company it keeps” (Firth [1935] 1957: 11) exemplifies this strong dependence of words on their use and on their possible collocations:

The habitual collocations in which words under study appear are quite simply the mere word accompaniment, the other word-material in which they are most commonly or most characteristically embedded. It can safely be stated that part of the ‘meaning’ of

cows can be indicated by such collocations as *They are milking the cows*, *Cows give milk*. The words *tigresses* or *lionesses* are not so collocated and are already clearly separated in meaning at the *collocational level*. (Firth 1957, in Palmer 1968: 180)

Firth ([1951]1957: 195-196) observes that the collocation of a word is not just a juxtaposition but it is an order of *mutual expectancy*. This is why he refers to “meaning by collocation”, defining it as an abstraction at the syntagmatic level. He makes the example of *dark* and *night* in that one of the meanings of *night* is its collocability with *dark*; and of *dark*, of course, its collocation with *night*.

Similar approaches to Firth’s definition of collocation have been adopted by later writers. However, whilst there is some general consensus on what collocation is, the concept has been defined and used differently by its researchers.

In fact, this unit of words has been variously defined: prefabricated units, prefabs, phraseological units, lexical chunks, multi-word units, or formulaic sequences (see Wray 2002 for a full account).

The common denominator for all these definitions is the co-occurrence of words, that is to say those lexical items on each side of a node that we consider relevant to that node (Sinclair 1966: 415).

The phenomenon of collocation has not only been differently defined but it has also been described from different perspectives. In fact, some scholars define it as a lexical phenomenon, others as grammatical. Some scholars consider collocation as the frequent co-occurrences of words. This approach is defined as the “statistically oriented approach” or “frequency based approach” (see Herbst 1996: 380; Nesselhauf 2005: 12; see also Nesselhauf 2004). Others see collocation as ‘a type of word combination, most commonly as one that is fixed to some degree but not completely’. This approach has been referred to as the “significance oriented approach” (Herbst 1996: 380) or the “phraseological approach” (Nesselhauf 2005: 12).

The frequency-based approach began with J.R. Firth and was later adopted and enlarged by M.A.K. Halliday and J. Sinclair. The phraseological approach, as Nesselhauf (2005: 12) explains, mainly developed under the influence of Russian phraseology. The most representative researchers who adopted this approach are A.P. Cowie (1981, 1994; Cowie *et al.* 1983), I. Mel’čuk (1995) and F.J. Hausmann (1989; 1997).

We will consider here only Sinclair’s approach, in that his theory of collocation is at the basis of the idiom principle which describes the phraseological tendency of language.

In fact, what we want to show here is that the language of tourism is phraseological and translating this language also means becoming familiar with its recurrent pre-constructed phrases.

2.1 SINCLAIR: COLLOCATION AND THE PRINCIPLES AT THE BASIS OF LANGUAGE

As seen above, the Firthian tradition was taken on and developed by Sinclair, who was a student of Firth’s at Edinburgh University. As the title of his book

Corpus Concordance Collocation (1991) clearly shows, he considers the notion of collocation in the light of corpus evidence and defines collocation as follows:

Collocation is the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text. The usual measure of proximity is a maximum of four words intervening. Collocations can be dramatic and interesting because unexpected, or they can be important in the lexical structure of the language because of being frequently repeated. (Sinclair 1991: 170)

Words, therefore, do not exist in isolation but “enter into meaningful relations with other words around them” (Sinclair 1991: 71). For this reason, complete freedom in the choice of the words is rare: other patterns cut across them and constrain them. The constraints may be either grammatical or lexical. Lexical constraints operate at the level of word choice and since they provide evidence through repeated events, they can be systematically counted and analysed.

Determination and freedom of choice are at the basis of the two principles of language elaborated by Sinclair (1991; 1996): the *open-choice principle* and the *idiom principle*. He suggests that some features of language patterning tend to favour one, while some the other. The *open choice* principle sees language as it has always been described in traditional reference books where the word was considered as the primary unit of lexical meaning. According to this principle, language is the result of a number of complex choices: when a unit (a word, a phrase, or clause) is completed, a large range of choice opens up where, virtually, any word may occur, the only restraint being grammaticality.

The tendency towards the open choice principle is labelled by Sinclair (1996) *terminological tendency*, that is to say the tendency for a word to have a fixed meaning in reference to the world. But as said above, language has to be interpreted in terms of patterned strings, in that words frequently and systematically attract each other. Sinclair (1991: 110), therefore, elaborates a second principle, the *idiom principle*: “The principle of idiom is that a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analysable into segments.”

Sinclair explains that the existence of such pre-packed sentences may be due to a number of reasons, but however it arises, it acts massively and predominantly with respect to the open-choice which functions only alternatively.

He points out that frequent words have a broad general tendency to lose their independent meaning.

Following this generalization, he observes that if two words collocate significantly, they are the result of a single choice.

The idiom principle is, therefore, at the basis of the phraseological tendency of language, where words tend to go together and make meanings by their combinations. This phenomenon is also known as “collocation”. Although the concept of collocation suggests a process of crystallization of words, this fixedness is rarely absolute.

Language is seen, therefore, as a dynamic process, where words do not remain perpetually independent in their patterning but they “begin to retain

traces of repeated events in their usage, and expectations of events such as collocation arise” (Sinclair 1996: 82).

The idiom principle suggests, therefore, that language is not stored as individual morphemes but as chunks which are retrieved in these pre-packed sentences.

Biber *et al.* (2002: 443) support the idiom principle and maintain, for example, that the formulaic nature of speech is reflected in “lexical bundles”, that is to say, sequences of words which are frequently re-used, and therefore become “prefabricated chunks” that speakers and writers can easily retrieve from their memory and use again and again as text building blocks. The authors consider conversation as being more repetitive than written registers, which means that lexical bundles may be more identifiable in speech. It needs to be said, however, that academic prose and other types of languages make considerable use of prefabricated blocks of text as well, but different linguistic features are involved. Lexical bundles in academic prose, for example, typically involve parts of noun phrases and prepositional phrases, whereas lexical bundles in conversation typically involve the beginning of a finite clause – especially with a pronoun as subject followed by a frequent verb of saying or thinking.

Hunston and Francis (2000: 231) suggest that one of the advantages of looking at language according to the idiom principle is that the artificial barrier between the phrase and the non-phrase can be broken down. This barrier is replaced by the concept of “more and less”, that is to say, two or more lexical items can occur together by exerting a major or minor attraction over each other. This leads to a type of phraseology that is more or less fixed and more or less in conformation with the idiom principle.

Stubbs (2002b: 58) says that it is implausible that routine phrases are created individually on each occasion of use in that they are conventional ways of saying things or of expressing, for example, questions, complaints, and greetings. He makes the example of some phrases containing the word *age* (Stubbs 1996: 217): one can say both *at a young age* and *at an old age*; but although one can say *in his old age*, one cannot say *in his young age*.

However, what is of utmost importance in this article is the theory according to which collocations are said to vary idiosyncratically across languages (Stubbs 1996). Sentences may be fully grammatical but simply do not sound natural, native-like, authentic, typical and representative of a given language. Every native speaker has thousands upon thousands of multi-word units stored in memory (Pawley & Syder 1983; Stubbs 2002a) which are characteristic for each language in that they are influenced by the language system and other socio-cultural aspects.

Collocations are also arbitrary and in many cases it is almost impossible to explain the reason behind the attraction of two or more words.

Baker (1992: 47) notices that the word *cheque*, for example, is more likely to occur with *bank*, *pay*, *money* and *write* than with *moon*, *butter*, *playground* or *repair*. Meaning cannot always be the reason for collocational patterning. This is why she points to the arbitrariness of collocational restrictions:

These are semantically arbitrary restrictions which do not follow logically from the propositional meaning of a word. For instance, laws are *broken* in English, but in Arabic they are 'contradicted'. In English, teeth are *brushed*, but in German and in Italian they are 'polished', in Polish they are 'washed', and in Russian they are 'cleaned'. Because they are arbitrary, collocational restrictions tend to show more variation across languages than do selectional restrictions. (Baker 1992: 14-15)

Baker (1992: 54) deals with collocation in relation to pitfalls and ways of avoiding misunderstandings and confusions in the process of translation. Although some collocations have very similar equivalents in the target language, sometimes translators produce very odd collocations for no justifiable reasons.

One reason could be the fact that translators misunderstand a collocation in the source language because it is similar to a common collocation in his/her native language. Baker (1992: 56) provides the example of an incorrect translation from English into Arabic where the collocation "modest means" is wrongly considered as suggesting 'modesty and simplicity' and not 'lack of affluence'.

Furthermore, she highlights the difficulty in rendering source language collocations preserving completely the meaning:

The nearest acceptable collocation in the target language will often involve some change in meaning. This change in meaning may be minimal, or not particularly significant in a given context. On the other hand, it may be significant; for example, a *good/bad law* in English is typically a 'just/unjust law' in Arabic. The significance of this difference in meaning depends on whether the issue of 'justice' is in focus in a given text and whether the context favours avoiding explicit reference to justice.' (Baker 1992: 56)

The advantage in using established patterns of collocation would make the translated text sound more 'original', although sometimes at the expenses of accuracy.

Collocations also strongly depends on the cultural settings they occur within, and if source and target languages come from very different cultures, the task of the translator will be much more difficult when rendering culturally unusual associations of ideas.

As Sinclair *et al.* (1996: 177) point out, corpus linguistic research has repeatedly demonstrated the strict relationship between the item, its meaning, and its environment. This aspect of meaning can also be extended to cover translation equivalence. They (1996: 175) argue that

Translation equivalence at word level is not by any means the whole methodology. In many instances (...) there is no translation equivalent for the chosen word. Translation can only be achieved by first of all combining the word with one or more others; the whole phrase will then equate with a word or phrase in the other language.

It has been shown in translation studies

that the most effective strategy is to translate in chunks, rather than word by word. Interestingly too, research shows that idioms are processed as wholes, complete with their metaphorical meanings, more rapidly than they could be processed on a word-by-word basis. (Coulthard *et al.* 2000: 82).

3. THE ANALYSIS

As mentioned above, the main concern of this paper is the analysis of English translations of *agriturismi* websites by comparing and contrasting them with original websites of Italian *agriturismi* and original websites of British farmhouse holidays. The analysis will be carried out by using two types of corpora: a parallel corpus made up of original *agriturismi* websites in Italian and their translations in English, and a comparable corpus made up of original *agriturismi* websites in Italian and original *farmhouse holidays* websites in English. From now on, we will refer to the Italian set of texts as the *Agriturismi* corpus, to the English translations as the *Agriparallel* corpus and to the British texts as to the *Farmhouse* corpus.

What we would like to examine here is whether the translators of the Italian websites have adapted collocations to the target culture or whether, in the process of translation, their search for the right translation equivalent has been influenced by the source text. We start from the assumption, of course, that translating not only means choosing the right translation equivalent but also adapting the text according to the target context of culture, context of situation, and language system.

In this article, however, our main focus will be collocations and lexical choice and not the process of translation as a whole.

3.1 DESCRIBING LOCATIONS

The websites were downloaded in the period ranging from 2000 to 2006. The *Farmhouse* corpus currently has 700,000 running words while the *Agriturismi* corpus has 600,000 words. The parallel corpus is smaller, containing 100,000 words of translated texts.

British and Italian websites have a very similar structure. The homepage almost always have a standard list of the sections constituting the website: there is a *cottage/farm/room description* followed by *activities/facilities*, *attractions/location*, *price and availabilities*, *map and directions*, and *booking/enquiries/contact us*. These section names correspond to the Italian *Home*, *Descrizione*, *Attività/Servizi*, *Il luogo/I dintorni/Il territorio*, *Prezzi e Disponibilità*, *Come arrivare/Come raggiungerci*, and *Contatti*. However, in some cases the translations taken into account show some differences with the original English section names. Let us discuss the examples.

The section devoted to *map and directions* is also called *How To Find Us* which, translated literally, would correspond to the Italian *Come Trovarci*. However, the expression *Come Trovarci* is rarely used in the *Agriturismi* corpus where other expressions, such as *Come arrivare* or *Come raggiungerci* are preferred. In the *Agriparallel* corpus, these latter expressions are translated into English as *How to Reach Us* (very frequently), *How to Arrive* (very frequently), *How to get here/to* (less frequently), *How to Find Us* (less frequently). As can be clearly seen, the English

translation equivalents of the Italian expressions are influenced by the source text collocation. Although they are grammatically acceptable, they cannot be accepted in this context where frequency of usage suggests that the Italian *Come arrivare/Come raggiungerci* are better translated by the expressions *How to Find Us* or *Map and Directions*.

Other mistranslations of collocations can be found in the section of the website used to describe the building where accommodation is offered. This section usually starts with a brief description of where the building is located in terms of the area and the surroundings and also in terms of distance from the main tourist attractions. The first node word investigated is *posizione* (position), which is very frequent in the *Agriturismi* corpus. In the *Agriparallel* corpus we notice that the unit containing *posizione* in Italian has almost always been translated by *position* in English. The word *position* also occurs – although not very frequently – in the *Farmhouse* corpus but a look at both collocational profiles suggests that the word *position* is used with the wrong collocates in the English translations. The item *position* in the *Farmhouse* corpus is used in association with the following adjectives: *commanding*, *elevated*, *south facing*, *idyllic*, *rural*, *secluded*, *beautiful*, and *sunny*.

<p>The property is set in a commanding position on the hillside of a quiet valley with wn is that the hill, which stands in a commanding position where all travellers along the main The elevated position of Ardness gives spectacular views windows open onto slate patios in unique elevated position overlooking the countryside f Cotherstone, in a beautiful, rural, south facing position. uildings and are set in an elevated south facing position on our farm. bed and breakfast accommodation set in an idyllic position in the midst of green fields with The house is in an idyllic position, just off the coastal path Situated in a rural position on the farm We are in a secluded rural position Set in a beautiful and secluded position This cottage also benefits from a sunny position The picnic table outside which is also in a sunny position</p>
--

Table 1: *Position* in the *farmhouse* corpus

The item *position* in the *Agriparallel* corpus is frequently associated with: *central*, *convenient*, *excellent*, *geographical*, *happy*, *panoramic*, *peaceful*, *privileged*, *strategic*. These collocates literally translate the Italian frequent collocations: *posizione centrale*, *comoda posizione*, *posizione eccellente*, *posizione geografica*, *posizione felice*, *posizione panoramica*, *posizione privilegiata*, *posizione strategica*. However, as noticed above, none of the English translation equivalents are acceptable in English in this context. The *Farmhouse* corpus suggests *central location* or *centrally located* as equivalents of *posizione centrale*, whereas *comoda posizione*, *posizione strategica* and *posizione felice* could be translated by *the house is convenient to/for* or *ideally situated/located/placed for* or *ideal base for*; on the other hand, *posizione panoramica* could be better translated by the expression *it has beautiful panoramic views* or *with panoramic views* since *panoramic* is only used in association with *views* in the *Farmhouse* corpus. *Excellent position* could be better translated by *excellent location* as the adjective *excellent* is a frequent collocate of *location*; the adjective *geographical* is used in Italian as a focusing adjective (Sinclair 1992), that is to say, it is not

an independent selection with respect to the noun it occurs with but shares part of the meaning of the noun; and its role is just that of emphasizing the meaning of the noun. In the *Farmhouse* corpus neither *geographic* nor *geographical* ever occur, for this reason in the process of translation the adjective may be eliminated. Manca (2004; 2008) shows that the most frequent items used in the language of tourism to describe the location of a building are *set*, *situated*, *located* and *placed*: they are used in association with general items describing location and general items introducing geographical names (*Set in very peaceful open countryside ...*, *... situated on the River Avon ...*); with items for measuring time and distance (*It is situated 12 miles from Whitby ...*, *We are located one mile from Bradford ...*); with geographical names (*We are located in central Exmoor ...*, *set in the heart of England*), and, as seen above, with fixed structures focusing on the advantages of the location.

The table below will help summarize the examples discussed above:

Agriturismo Corpus	Agriparallel Corpus	Farmhouse Corpus
<i>posizione centrale</i>	<i>central position</i>	<i>central location</i> <i>centrally located</i>
<i>comoda posizione</i>	<i>convenient position</i>	<i>convenient to/for</i>
<i>posizione strategica</i>	<i>strategic position</i>	<i>ideally situated/located/placed</i>
<i>posizione felice</i>	<i>happy position</i>	<i>ideal base for</i>
<i>posizione panoramica</i>	<i>panoramic position</i>	<i>with panoramic views</i> <i>to have panoramic views</i>
<i>posizione geografica</i>	<i>geographic position</i>	<i>set/situated/located/placed</i>
<i>posizione eccellente</i>	<i>excellent position</i>	<i>excellent location</i>

Table 2: Italian units of meanings, English units of translation, English functionally equivalent units

Other examples of source text influenced collocations can be found in the description of the surroundings, particularly in the translation equivalents of the Italian words *panorama* and *paesaggio*. In the *Agriturismo* corpus the word *panorama* frequently occurs with the verb *godere* (enjoy) and some qualifying adjectives such as *bellissimo*, *meraviglioso*, *mozzafiato*, *splendido*, *unico*. The word *paesaggio* frequently collocates with *agricolo*, *collinare*, *incantevole*, *splendido*, *bellissimo*, *incontaminato*, *spettacolare*, *toscano*, *siciliano*. According to dictionaries (Zanichelli 2005) the word *panorama* can be translated into English by the same word *panorama*, which is also an English word; *paesaggio* can be translated by *landscape*, *scenery*, *view* or *panorama*. The next step will, therefore, be to check how these words have been translated and used in the *Agriparallel* corpus.

Translators seem to use *view/s* (very frequently), *landscape* (frequently), *scenery* (less frequently), and *panorama* (less frequently). A look at the *Farmhouse* corpus suggests that the choice of *view* as a translation equivalent of both *paesaggio* and *panorama* is right since it frequently collocates with the verb *enjoy* and with similar qualifying adjectives as those identified for the Italian items. The wrong choice is constituted by *landscape* which in English is rarely modified by a qualifying adjective expressing beauty and is frequently associated with adjectives referring to the configuration of the land. In the *Agriparallel* corpus

landscape occurs with *superb, untouched, unique, wonderful, natural* and *Tuscan*. The following concordance lines will help compare and contrast them:

on a terrace from which you can enjoy a superb landscape . in an incredibly green, untouched landscape . in front of all this a truly unique landscape one passes through Cingoli, with its wonderful landscape , the colours and sounds of a wonderful natural landscape , ntributed to the transformation of the Tuscan landscape	Behind the house Here lie Pievepelago and opens out before you, in the Recanati, Leopardi's hometown the farmhouse through the creation of several
--	---

Table 3: Landscape in the *Agriparallel* corpus

the Atlantic Ocean amid rugged landscape . this wonderful patchwork landscape . the West of Ireland with a landscape Malham Tarn, and the farming landscape The varied landscape of memories – an entire Mediterranean landscape , pond and has views across the rolling landscape	5km. west of Clifden Town, it Cliffs and rocky outcrops to of rugged hills and of miles of ancient dry-stone of the Peak District makes it re-created within to the South Downs. There is a
---	--

Table 4: Landscape in the *Farmhouse* corpus

It needs to be said here that the collocation *stunning landscape* does exist in English and is acceptable; however, in the language of “farmhouse holidays” such collocation is very rarely used (1 out of 700,000 words) and the collocation *stunning views* is by far the most preferred.

Landscape and *paesaggio* are translation equivalents when associated to adjectives describing the land: *paesaggio agricolo* may be translated by *farming landscape*, and *paesaggio collinare* may also be translated by *rolling landscape* or *a landscape of rugged hills*, depending on the type of hills being described, of course.

The English item *panorama* is used too rarely (5 entries out of 700,000 words) in the *Farmhouse* corpus to be a translation equivalent; whereas *scenery* is frequently used with the same qualifying adjectives found in association with *view/s*: *beautiful, breathtaking, magnificent, spectacular, stunning, superb, wonderful, lovely, panoramic* but also *mountain, countryside, coastal*.

The following table summarizes the most interesting results obtained by comparing the three corpora:

Agriturismi Corpus	Agriparallel Corpus	Farmhouse Corpus
<i>(godere di) un panorama meraviglioso</i>	<i>(enjoy) wonderful views wonderful landscape</i>	<i>(enjoy) wonderful views wonderful scenery</i>
<i>paesaggio incontaminato</i>	<i>untouched landscape</i>	<i>unspoilt area/countryside</i>
<i>paesaggio agricolo</i>	<i>(translation not found)</i>	<i>farming landscape</i>
<i>paesaggio collinare</i>	<i>(translation not found)</i>	<i>rolling landscape landscape of rugged hills views over the surrounding hills</i>

Table 5: Italian units of meanings, English units of translation, English functionally equivalent units

3.2 EXPRESSING DISTANCE

The location of the buildings where accommodation is provided is also described in terms of distance from the main cities, nearby villages or tourist attractions. For this reason, we will focus on expressions containing the word *distanza* (distance), containing items for measuring distance (*chilometri, metri, ... kilometres, metres*) and other semi-fixed expressions.

In the *Agriturismo* corpus the word *distanza* occurs in the expressions *a breve/poca distanza* (literally: at a short distance), *a x km di distanza/da*; other expressions which describe distance are *facilmente raggiungibile a piedi, facilmente raggiungibile con l'auto, facilmente raggiungibile da*.

Rinomata e moderna città termale ed a breve distanza dalle maggiori attrattive turistiche della loro piscina privata. A circa 200 metri di distanza si trova il Borgo un nucleo cino per le sue chiese seicentesche, a poca distanza dall' antico centro storico
Conosciuto, ma che fosse facilmente raggiungibile da Borgo Cerro
L'Agriturismo è facilmente raggiungibile perché molto vicino alla città di
minetto, illuminazione con lampade a gas, è raggiungibile solo a piedi o con fuoristrada
li 30 km dal nostro agriturismo, facilmente raggiungibile con l'automobile , con l'autobus (fermata

Table 6: Distance expressions in the *Agriturismo* corpus

In the *Agriparallel* corpus these expressions are almost always translated literally: *within easy distance, 1 km distance from, at a short distance from, x km from / away / far, can be reached by car / on foot, within easy reach*.

The expression *within easy distance* does not exist in the *Farmhouse* corpus: similar, very frequent, English expressions are *within easy driving / travelling / walking distance* of which, however, are absent in the *Agriparallel* corpus. The units containing the items *metres* and *kilometres* are correctly translated by *x km from / away*. Two mistranslations can be found in the units of translation *x km distance from* and *x km far* which are absent in the *Farmhouse* corpus. The expressions *can be reached by car* and *can be reached on foot*, although acceptable in English, are rarely used in our *Farmhouse* corpus where *within easy driving / walking distance* seem to be preferred.

The table below summarizes the findings above discussed:

Agriturismi Corpus	Agriparallel Corpus	Farmhouse Corpus
<i>a breve/poca distanza da</i>	<i>at a short distance (from)</i> <i>within easy distance</i> <i>within easy reach</i>	<i>within easy reach</i> <i>within easy driving/travelling/</i> <i>walking distance</i>
<i>a x km di distanza/da</i>	<i>x km from/away</i> <i>x km distance from</i> <i>x km far</i>	<i>x miles/km away/from</i>
<i>Facilmente raggiungibile</i> <i>in auto/con l'automobile</i>	<i>can be reached by car</i>	<i>within easy driving distance</i>
<i>Facilmente raggiungibile a piedi</i>	<i>can be reached on foot</i>	<i>within easy walking distance</i>

Table 7: Italian units of meanings, English units of translation, English functionally equivalent units

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF COTTAGES AND ROOMS

Examples of mistranslations due to the use of wrong collocations can also be found in the description of the cottage and/or of the rooms where visitors and guests are accommodated.

Cottages and farms offering holidays in the countryside are usually century-old buildings and stables which have been restored and converted. The adjectives frequently used in the *Agriturismo* corpus describing the process of restructuring and refurbishing are mainly *restaurato* and *ristrutturato*. These adjectives have been translated using *restored*, *refurbished*, *renovated*, *renewed*, *restructured*. Apart from *renewed* which does not exist in English, the other adjectives seem to be the right choice since they convey the same meaning intended in the original. The problem is, once again, the choice of collocates, of adverbs in this case.

In the *Agriparallel* corpus *restored* occurs with the following adverbs: *accurately*, *authentically*, ***carefully***, *completely*, *faithfully*, *fully*, ***lovingly***, *masterfully*, *meticulously*, ***newly***, ***recently***, ***skilfully***. Conversely, in the *Farmhouse* corpus *restored* collocates with: *beautifully*, ***carefully***, *extensively*, ***lovingly***, ***newly***, ***recently***, *sympathetically*, *tastefully*, ***skilfully***. The adverbs in common have been reported in bold. As can be seen, two of the most frequent adverbs collocating with *restored* in the *Farmhouse* corpus, that is to say *tastefully* and *beautifully*, are never used by translators. The adverbs *accurately*, *authentically* and *faithfully* may be better replaced by *sympathetically* whereas *masterfully* and *meticulously* and *skilfully* may be substituted by *skilfully*, according to their frequency of occurrence in the original British farmhouse holiday websites. The adverb *completely* in this case could be better translated by *extensively*.

The second adjective considered for analysis is *refurbished*. In the *Agriparallel* corpus it is found in association with: ***recently*** and ***completely***. In the *Farmhouse* corpus the same adjective collocates with: ***completely***, ***recently***, *tastefully* and *beautifully* but it also collocates very frequently with the expression *to a high standard* which is absent in the translations.

The third adjective is *renovated*. As before, its collocational profile in the *Agriparallel* corpus is analysed; it occurs with: ***recently*** and ***tastefully***. In the *Farmhouse* corpus adverbs collocating with this adjective are very similar to those identified for the other adjectives considered for analysis, that is to say: *beautifully*, *fully*, *newly*, ***recently***, *sympathetically*, and ***tastefully***. The restricted range of items used by translators may suggest that they are not aware of the list of adverbs that may collocate with *renovated* and, as a consequence, they are not aware of all the functions it may perform collocating with different items.

The last adjective taken into account is *restructured*. In the *Agriparallel* corpus it collocates with: *recently* and *completely*, whereas in the *Farmhouse* corpus the adjective *restructured* is used only once with the adverb *substantially*. The fact that it is used only once out of 700,000 running words may mean that it is not used in the language of tourism – at least the language of tourism contained in our texts. For this reason, translators should avoid using it and prefer the other adjectives investigated.

The table below will summarize the findings obtained:

Agriturismi corpus	Agriparallel corpus	Farmhouse corpus
<i>restaurato accuratamente / fedelmente / rispettando lo stile originale</i>	<i>accurately / faithfully restored</i>	<i>sympathetically restored / renovated</i>
<i>restaurato con cura e con la massima attenzione</i>	<i>masterfully / meticulously / skilfully restored</i>	<i>skilfully / carefully restored</i>
<i>completamente / totalmente restaurato</i>	<i>completely restored / refurbished / restructured</i>	<i>extensively restored completely refurbished</i>
<i>da poco restaurato</i>	<i>recently / newly restored /</i>	<i>recently / newly restored</i>
<i>di recente restaurato</i>	<i>refurbished / renovated /</i>	<i>recently refurbished</i>
<i>recentemente restaurato</i>	<i>restructured</i>	<i>recently renovated</i>
<i>finemente / elegantemente ristrutturato</i>	<i>accurately / lovingly restored</i>	<i>beautifully / lovingly restored</i>
		<i>beautifully refurbished</i>
		<i>refurbished to a high standard</i>
		<i>beautifully renovated</i>
<i>ristrutturato con gusto</i>	<i>tastefully restructured</i>	<i>tastefully renovated / refurbished / restored</i>

Table 8: Italian units of meanings, English units of translation, English functionally equivalent units

4. CONCLUSION

All the translation equivalents that have been suggested in this article have been chosen according to the frequency of usage identified in the *Farmhouse* corpus. Needless to say that other patterns could also be proposed as functionally equivalent to the Italian units.

The implications of this analysis are several. First of all languages should always been approached and studied phraseologically: as showed in this article, collocations and pre-fabricated sentences are at the basis of language and account for how language works.

Farmhouse owners often do not realise that such unusual associations of words and descriptions made by their “translators” may result in an unsuccessful promotion of the holiday they offer. Furthermore, the promotional strategies adopted in Italy may not be as effective in another country. For this reason, a translator should be familiar with the language of tourism both of the source and the target language and, at the same time, s/he should be also familiar with both cultures in order to understand what may be effective and what needs to be changed in the transfer of information from a language into another language.

Corpora are a valid tool for translators: starting from data means starting from actual evidence and reducing the risk of producing unusual collocations and culture-bound mistakes.

A systematic corpus analysis of promotional material may help those who mediate across cultures to focus not only on register restrictions on language but also on those aspects that are relevant for the particular culture we want to address.

REFERENCES

- Baker M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London, Routledge.
- Biber D., Conrad S. & Leech G. (2002) *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, London, Longman.
- Cowie A.P. (1981) "The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries", *Applied Linguistics* 2:3, pp. 223-235.
- Cowie A.P., Mackin R. & McCaig I.R. (1983) *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English*, vol. 2. (retitled *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms*, 1993), Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Cowie A.P. (1994) "Phraseology", in *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 6. Ed. by R.E. Asher, Oxford/New York, Pergamon, pp. 3168-3171.
- Coulthard M., Deignan A., Knowles M. & Moon R. (2000) *Lexis*, CELS, University of Birmingham.
- Firth J.R. (1957) *Papers in Linguistics*, London, Oxford University Press.
- Firth J.R. ([1935]1957) "The technique of semantics", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, reprinted in *Papers in Linguistics 1934-51*. London, Oxford University Press, pp. 7-33.
- Firth J. R. ([1950]1957) "Personality and language in society", *Sociological Review*, reprinted in *Papers in Linguistics 1934-51*. London, Oxford University Press, pp. 177-189.
- Firth J.R. ([1951]1957) "Modes of meaning", *Essays and Studies*, reprinted in *Papers in Linguistics 1934-51*. London, Oxford University Press, pp. 190-215.
- Gledhill C. (2000) "The discourse function of collocation in research article introductions", *English for Specific Purposes*, 19:2, pp. 115-135.
- Hausmann F. J. (1989) "Le dictionnaire de collocations", in *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries, Dictionnaires. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexikographie*. Ed. by F. J. Hausmann, O. Reichman, H.E. Wiegand & L. Zgusta, Berlin, de Gruyter, pp. 1010-1019.
- Hausmann F.J. (1997) "Tout est idiomatique dans les langues", in *La locution entre langue et usages. Textes réunis par M. Martins-Baltar, Fontenay/Saint-Cloud, ENS Editions*, pp. 277-290.
- Herbst T. (1996) "What are collocations: Sandy beaches or false teeth?" *English Studies*, 77:4, pp. 379-393.
- Hunston S. & Francis G. (2000) *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Katan D. (2004) *Translating Cultures*. 2nd ed., Manchester, St. Jerome.
- Manca E. (2004) "The language of tourism in English and Italian: investigating the concept of nature between culture and usage", *ESP Across Cultures*, 1, pp. 53-65.
- Manca E. (2008). "From phraseology to culture: qualifying adjectives in the language of tourism", *IJCL Special Issue "Patterns, meaningful units and specialized discourses"*. Ed. by U. Roemer and R., 13:3, pp. 368-385.
- Mel'čuk I. (1995) "Phrasemes in language and phraseology in linguistics", in *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*. Ed. by M. Everaert, E.-J. van der Linden, A. Schenk & R. Schreuder, Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 167-232.
- Nesselhauf N. (2004) "What are collocations?", in *Phraseological Units: Basic Concepts and Their Application*. Ed. by D. Allerton, N. Nesselhauf, & P. Skandera, Basel, Schwabe, pp.1-21.
- Nesselhauf N. (2005) *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Nord C. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester, St. Jerome.
- Palmer F.R. (1968) (ed.) *Selected Papers of J. R. Firth 1952-1959*, London, Longman.
- Pawley A. & Syder F.H. (1983) "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency", in *Language and Communication*. Ed. by J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt, London, Longman, pp. 191-225.
- Sinclair J. M. (1966) "Beginning the study of lexis", in *In Memory of J. R. Firth*. Ed. by C.E. Bazell, J.C. Catford, M.A.K. Halliday & R.H. Robins, London, Longman, pp. 410-430.
- Sinclair J. (1991) *Corpus Concordance Collocation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. (1992) "Trust the Text", in *Advances in Systemic Linguistics: Recent Theory and Practice*. Ed. by M. Davies and L. Ravelli, London, Pinter, pp. 5-19.
- Sinclair J. (1996) "The search for units of meaning", *Textus*, IX:1, pp. 71-106.
- Sinclair J., Payne J. & Pérez H. (1996) *Corpus to Corpus: A Study of Translation Equivalence*. Special issue of *International Journal of Lexicography*, 9:3.
- Stubbs M. (1996) *Text and Corpus Analysis: Computer-Assisted Studies of Language and Culture*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Stubbs M. (2002a) "Two quantitative methods of studying phraseology in English", *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7:2, pp. 215-244.
- Stubbs M. (2002b) *Words and Phrases. Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.
- Ulrych M. (1992) *Translating Texts. From Theory to Practice*, Rapallo, Cideb.
- Wray A. (2002) *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Zanichelli (2005) *Il Ragazzino 2005. Dizionario inglese-italiano italiano-inglese*, Bologna, Zanichelli.