

Unique items in translation: Translating 'and' from English into Croatian

Vrhovski, Lucija

Master's thesis / Diplomski rad

2019

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:550488>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-22**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of English

Lucija Vrhovski

UNIQUE ITEMS IN TRANSLATION:
TRANSLATING “AND” FROM ENGLISH INTO CROATIAN

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Nataša Pavlović

Zagreb, September 2019

Abstract

The translation process entails a variety of cognitive processes, including the unconscious ones. Such an example is the phenomenon according to which translators, due to source language interference, tend to choose translation solutions similar to the source, even if it means neglecting less “obvious”, but possibly more adequate solutions. In this context, the aim of this paper is to test the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002) on translating the English “and”, whose possible Croatian translation solutions, conjunctions “a”, “pa”, “te” are considered unique items. Furthermore, this paper tends to examine the influence of translation skills and time limit on the representation of unique items in translation. The research is conducted on graduate students of English, who take a test comprised of an EN-CRO translation task and a cloze test in Croatian. In accordance with the hypothesis mentioned, Croatian unique items are under-represented in translation. Moreover, translators with higher translation skills use more unique items in translation and translators under time pressure use less unique items in translation. The results provided with this research facilitate better understanding of the translation process and highlight the importance of making translators aware of translation procedures in order to improve translation quality.

Key words: translation process, source language interference, English, Croatian, unique items

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical framework.....	2
2.1. Translation process	2
2.2. Translation universals.....	3
2.3. Interference in translation.....	5
2.4. Unique items hypothesis.....	6
3. Key terms	8
4. Previous research	10
5. Aims and hypotheses	12
6. Methodology	14
6.1. Participants	14
6.2. Tools and materials.....	14
6.3. Procedure	15
7. Results.....	16
8. Discussion	19
8.1. Opting for literal translations by default.....	19
8.2. Under-representation of unique items in translation	20
8.3. Differences between translation and non-translation students	22
8.4. Translating with or without time limit.....	23
9. Conclusion	26
10. References	28
11. Appendix: test used in the research.....	31

1. Introduction

For every translator, in every situation, the process of translation entails a vast variety of different cognitive processes; analytical thinking, problem solving, decision making, choosing the best translation strategy, etc. Many of these complex processes call for translators' constant reassessment, careful scrutiny and full commitment to the task. However, many of the processes mentioned can also occur subconsciously, or even unconsciously, with translators nearly automatically making decisions and opting for solutions. This phenomenon might prove beneficial for saving time and energy, but it might also affect the overall quality of the translation.

One such example of a cognitive process occurring unconsciously is the phenomenon that translators, under the influence of the source text and source language, tend to opt for the most "obvious", literal translation solutions. More precisely, translators sometimes automatically choose those translation solutions that are similar to the source, rather than thinking about alternatives and choosing other less "obvious" but perhaps more adequate solutions. This tendency can be noted, for instance, when translating source language expressions that have both straightforward formal correspondents and less straightforward textual equivalents in the target language, with the latter being the less frequent translation choice.

Since the phenomenon in question is quite frequent and can affect the quality of the translation, it is highly important to further investigate it in different translation contexts and on different language combinations. In this way, various linguistic and translation research studies may offer a better insight into the translation process itself and lead to new discoveries pivotal for its understanding. Moreover, these research studies also highlight the importance of considering all possible translation solutions and of making translators aware of their actions throughout the translation process, which might prove crucial for the quality of the final product of the process; the translation.

2. Theoretical framework

With the rise of descriptive translation studies and empirical research, translation researchers strive to identify, explore and explain various language and translation phenomena, including the process of translation itself, (possible) translation universals, source text interference and the representation of unique items in translation.

2.1. Translation process

According to Jiří Levý, the process of translation can be discussed from two points of view; as a communication process, where “the objective of translating is to impart the knowledge of the original to the foreign reader” (2004: 148), and as a decision process, which implies “a series of a certain number of consecutive situations—moves, as in a game—situations imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain [...] number of alternatives” (2004: 148). The former view is thus focused on the social aspect of translating, while the latter is focused on translators’ cognitive processing and decision making, which is one of the focal points of this paper.

Furthermore, Birgitta Englund Dimitrova highlights only the cognitive nature of the translation process defining it as “the cognitive activity of producing a target text in one language, based upon a source text in another language” (2010: 406). This cognitive activity does not imply a simple process but rather a vast variety of different complex cognitive processes such as analytical thinking, problem solving, decision making, opting for the best translation solutions, choosing the best translation strategy, etc. (Pavlović 2015). These processes may occur both consciously, where translators meticulously plan, analyse and reassess their choices and actions, and unconsciously, where translators automatically make decisions and opt for solutions without realizing it. These conscious and unconscious cognitive processes are often fast-paced and interactive, which leads to the fact that translators normally do not easily attend to their own cognitive processing. This, in turn, raises great difficulties in research on translators’ mental activity.

However, there are various methods for process-oriented research, such as think-aloud protocol, verbal reporting with retrospection, key-stroke logging, eye-tracking, etc. (Englund Dimitrova 2010). The results of these process-oriented research methods, often combined with the results of product-oriented research, i.e. analysis of the target text, offer great insight into translators’ cognitive processing. Although it is evident that the translation process is

very variable, i.e. different for each individual translator or translation task in question (Pavlović 2015), there are certain general tendencies regarding translators' mental activity. For instance, translators tend to regard common, familiar translation tasks and actions as normal and hence perform them routinely, automatically and without conscious thinking (Schön 1987 in Pavlović 2015). Only when some kind of a translation problem occurs do translators start assessing the situation and consciously evaluate every possible action and solution (2015). Similar to this theory is the concept of monitor model of translation and literal translation automaton (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005).

According to Tirkkonen-Condit, "literal translation is a default rendering procedure, which goes on until it is interrupted by a monitor that alerts about a problem in the outcome. The monitor's function is to trigger off conscious decision-making to solve the problem" (2005: 407). In other words, translators tend to unconsciously, automatically opt for literal translation solutions as long as it does not pose problems with the desired equivalence in the target text. This theory is easily comparable to Vladimir Ivir's quote from Toury (1995: 191):

The translator begins his search for translation equivalence from formal correspondence, and it is only when the identical-meaning formal correspondent is either not available or not able to ensure equivalence that he resorts to formal correspondents with not-quite-identical meanings or to structural and semantic shifts which destroy formal correspondence altogether (Ivir 1981: 58).

Therefore, translators unconsciously strive to achieve equivalence by using formal correspondents, i.e. literal translation solutions. Only when this is somehow not possible do they start monitoring their own cognitive processing and consciously look for and analyse alternative solutions. Since this phenomenon can be found in both experienced and less experienced translators' work (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005), it could be said that it is a possible translation universal.

2.2. Translation universals

In linguistics, language universals are general notions true for all languages in the world, all 6 000 – 7 000 of them (Chesterman 2010). In translation studies, however, the situation is slightly different. The overall number of all translations in the world is beyond comprehension and analysing all of them, as well as all "existing and possible forms of translational behaviour" (Toury 2004: 28), would simply not be possible (Chesterman 2010).

Therefore, it might be more accurate to discuss “general tendencies”, “regularities” or “laws” in translation instead of “universals” (2010), in order to leave open the possibility of exceptions to a law explained by “another law operating on another level” (Toury 2004: 29).

Still, despite the discrepancies in terminology, “seeking generalities means looking for similarities, regularities, patterns, that are shared between particular cases or groups of cases” (Chesterman 2004: 33) and it can be argued that translations do show some general features that distinguish them both from source texts and from comparable non-translated texts. In the words of Gideon Toury, “the question facing us is not really whether translation universals exist [...] but rather whether recourse to the notion is in a position to offer us any new insights” (2004: 22). In other words, translation universals could and should be explained, possibly in terms of probability and likelihood:

if X, then the greater/the lesser likelihood that Y (Toury 1995: 265),

where “X” is a possible variable influencing the translator while translating and “Y” is the translational behaviour the translator opted for, which includes both the notion of translation as a process and as a product. According to Andrew Chesterman (2010), the variables, or reasons for translation universals, could be sought in different areas: translators’ cognitive processing, their professional training, their desire to avoid risks and opt for “safer” solutions or situational factors such as a tight deadline. Since “it must be something in the nature and process of translation that causes translation laws” (Eskola 2004: 86), each of these variables could be further investigated, individually or in various combinations, and thus offer new insights into the understanding of translation universals.

Moreover, in the context of descriptive translation studies Chesterman (2004) distinguishes between two types of universals; S-universals and T-universals. The former denote claims about “universal differences between translations and their source texts, i.e. characteristics of the way in which translators process the source text” and the latter denote “claims about universal differences between translations and comparable non-translated texts, i.e. characteristics of the way translators use the target language” (2004: 39). Building on Gideon Toury’s laws of translational behaviour (1995) and investigations of translation studies researchers such as Baker (1993), Laviosa-Braithwaite (2001), Mauranen (2004) or Tirkkonen-Condit (2004), Chesterman further exemplifies both S- and T-universals offering a list of potential translation features; lengthening, dialect normalization, explicitation,

reduction of repetition; simplification, untypical lexical patterning, under-representation of TL-specific items, etc. (2004).

In addition, it is important to mention Mona Baker's differentiating between translation universals and translation norms, since the latter can vary across different cultures and change over time (1993). In her definition of translation universals as "features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems" (1993: 246), she also distinguishes between translation universals and the phenomenon of interference, unlike other authors such as Toury (1995), Chesterman (2004) or Laviosa-Braithwaite (2001). The phenomenon of interference can be considered a somewhat complicated matter and, at least for the purpose of this paper, it needs to be further discussed.

2.3. Interference in translation

According to Weinreich, interference supposes "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language" (1953: 1 in Mauranen 2004). In other words, interference occurs in language contact situations. Since translation is beyond doubt a language contact situation, it is not surprising that interference occurs. However, as opposed to second language acquisition, where interference is mostly observed as transfer from one's first language to one's second language, in translation studies it is the source language that influences the target language, which is often the translator's first language (Mauranen 2004). More accurately, transfer in translation studies is "a relation between texts" (2004: 68), hence the influence can be noted from the source text to the target text.

Javier Franco Aixelá defines interference in translation even more precisely, as "the importation into the target text of lexical, syntactic, cultural or structural items typical of a different semiotic system and unusual or non-existent in the target context, at least as original instances of communication in the target language" (2009: 75). Therefore, it is evident that interference can occur on every level of language and include importation of words and phrases, forms, cultural items or genre conventions (2009). Franco Aixelá (2009) also states that this kind of interference can be intentional or not, which would include both deliberate strategies of a foreignizing approach to translation and translators' unconscious decision making processes influenced by the source text.

Focusing on the latter, Gideon Toury (1995) recognizes the law of interference as a translation universal, or more precisely, as one of the two fundamental laws of translational behaviour. His law of interference reads:

in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text (1995: 275),

including instances of both positive and negative transfer. In other words, translators do not tend to focus on their own knowledge of the target language but rather on the very source utterance (Laviosa-Braithwait 2001). Toury further states that this kind of translational behaviour is based on our mental apparatus and this kind of transfer is, in turn, related to “mental processes involved in translation, especially the series of rapid switchings between source and target codes, alternating in both directions” (1995: 275). However, as with all translation universals, other socio-cultural factors have to be considered as well, for instance, translators’ training and translation skills, purification tendencies, text-type, the prestige of particular cultures and languages (1995), etc.

What is also interesting to note is the fact that most authors discuss the *importation* of certain elements from the source text into the target text, but interference can also be observed in the *lack* of certain elements in the target text. One such example is Tirkkonen-Condit’s (2002) hypothesis which postulates that target language specific items are usually under-represented in translations.

2.4. Unique items hypothesis

According to Mona Baker, there is “a general tendency to exaggerate features of the target language” (1993: 245) in translation in order to somehow compensate for the fact the text is not originally written in that target language and for that target culture. However, this hypothesis seems to lack empirical evidence to hold ground, thus another one, a completely contrary one, emerges – the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002).

The unique items hypothesis postulates that unique linguistic elements specific for the target language appear less frequently in translated texts than in comparable non-translated texts (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004). This is to be expected due to their “uniqueness”; they do not have obvious linguistic equivalents in the source text so they are not immediately chosen as translation solutions. Since “there is no formally corresponding material in the source text to

trigger them off” (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 411), the phenomenon of choosing literal translation solutions over alternative choices corresponds to the notion of literal translation automaton (2005). Consequently, straightforward linguistic and translation equivalents, literal translations, tend to be automatically activated by the source text in translators’ mind and thus be over-represented in translation (Eskola 2004).

In the words of Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit, unique items are lexical, phrasal, syntactic or textual items “which lack linguistic counterparts in the source language in question” (2004: 177), which does not mean they cannot be translated, but that they are simply not lexicalized in the same way in other languages. This, in turn, leads to the conclusion that uniqueness is not an absolute, but a relative phenomenon. More precisely, unique items in this sense are not globally unique linguistic elements specific for just one particular language in the world as opposed to all the others. They are rather unique in given language pairs in translation, or more accurately, they are unique with respect to the source text in question (Chesterman 2004a). This means that the same particular linguistic characteristic of, for instance, Spanish might be unique when translating English or Croatian into Spanish, but it might not be unique when translating Portuguese or French into Spanish. In short, “unique means present in the target language, but not present in a similar way in a given source language” (Chesterman 2004a: 5).

Furthermore, Chesterman (2004a) argues that unique items are to be understood in terms of formal equivalence and linguistic difference. In other words, unique items are not concepts that translators perceive as being different in different languages, but rather the same concepts expressed differently in an objective manner; with different lexical or grammatical means in different languages (in the specific language pair in question). Unique items in this sense can be compared to other terms in translation studies: “lacuna”, “semantic void” or “lexical gap”, which denote completely the opposite (Chesterman 2004a). While these terms imply “the absence in the *target* language of [an] equivalent of some word or expression in the source language” (2004a: 7, emphasis mine), unique items imply the absence of an equivalent in the *source* language and the “void” is not semantic or conceptual, but rather formal, linguistic. However, although this uniqueness is evidently based on objective, linguistic features, it is still subject to cognitive processing; translators automatically opt for expressions that are formally, linguistically similar to the source text and unique items are not even triggered in their minds (2004a). In other words, “the greater the formal (syntactic) distance between a given source-language item and an appropriate corresponding target-language item, the less likely it is to be selected by translators” (2004a: 12).

3. Key terms

For the purpose of this paper, it is necessary to offer an overview and precise definitions of the notions discussed above, important for conducting the research and interpreting the results.

Regarding the *translation process*, it is important to highlight that this paper focuses only on the cognitive aspect of the translation process. In this sense, the translation process entails translators' mental activity from the moment they start working on the source text until they finish the target text, including the stage of revision (Pavlović 2015). The focal point of translators' cognitive activity important for this research is the literal translation automaton hypothesis, according to which both experienced and less experienced translators choose literal translation solutions unconsciously, by default (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005). This, in turn, is in accordance with the unique items hypothesis, which suggests that translators more readily opt for literal translation solutions than less obvious alternative choices in the form of target language specific items (2004).

With respect to *translation universals*, it should be noted that they are neither an absolute truth nor socio-cultural norms but rather “globally observable tendencies and regularities of behaviour that can be found in translations irrespective of the languages involved” (Eskola 2004: 85). This definition represents a descriptive perspective and an empirical approach to research, namely product-oriented research (Toury 1995). However, the results of such product-oriented research in the form of target text analysis could prove to be indicative of cognitive processing and decision making in the process of translation. In this way, for instance, numerous research studies on the under-representation of unique items in translation could lead to conclusions that this hypothesis, together with the literal translation automaton hypothesis, is correct and thus beneficial for understanding the very translation process better. In addition, the more such research studies, and on different language pairs, there are, the more likely the phenomenon is to be regarded as a translation universal, namely a T-universal (Chesterman 2004).

Furthermore, it is necessary to stress the role of *source text interference* and the law of interference (Toury 1995) on the under-representation of unique items in translation. For the purpose of this research, source text interference is viewed and discussed as non-deliberate, unconscious transfer of source text linguistic features into the target text (Toury 1995), which excludes instances of a foreignizing approach to translation. More precisely, source text interference in this sense is manifested as translators' unconscious choosing of translation

solutions motivated by the source text utterances instead of their knowledge of the target language, i.e. their mother tongue. These translation solutions are thus formal correspondents of the source text items, which leads to the under-representation of other, alternative translation choices that are not so obvious but could be more suitable in the target text. Therefore, interference in this sense does not include instances of a positive transfer, but is rather perceived as a neutral or even negative phenomenon.

The very central point of this paper, *unique items*, can be defined as “such linguistic elements in the target language that are not triggered off as formal correspondents or literal translation equivalents by any elements in the source language texts” (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005). It is important to note that unique items are only unique with respect to that specific source text in question. For instance, when translating English conjunction “and” into Croatian, possible translation solutions include the conjunction “i”, but also “a”, “pa” and “te”, depending on the context and the intended meaning of the source text utterance. The Croatian conjunction “i” would be the formal correspondent or literal translation equivalent of “and” (and thus over-represented in translation), while “a”, “pa” and “te” would be unique items, i.e. specific only for the Croatian language (with respect only to English in this translation situation). Therefore, since English “and” includes four Croatian conjunctions (one formal correspondent and three textual equivalents) and since there are thus no formal correspondents in the English language that would trigger “a”, “pa” and “te” as immediate translation solutions, it is highly probable they will be under-represented in translation.

4. Previous research

Although the unique items hypothesis is a relatively newly discussed phenomenon, there are numerous research studies on this topic. All of them focus on different unique items in various, mostly Indo-European, languages.

The author who first postulated the unique items hypothesis, Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit, tested the hypothesis on translations from English into Finnish (2004). The focus of her paper are Finnish unique items which lack formal correspondents in many Indo-European languages (2004); verbs of sufficiency and clitic pragmatic particles. The author compares the frequencies of both types of unique items using the Corpus of Translated Finnish and original Finnish texts. She examines texts of two different genres; academic and fiction, each of which is further divided into translated and non-translated sub-corpus. The comparison shows that Finnish unique items in question are less frequent in translated than non-translated Finnish in both genres, which is in correspondence with the unique items hypothesis. Moreover, the unique items that do appear in translated texts behave syntactically differently than in non-translated texts. In conclusion, apart from being more frequent, unique items are used more variedly in original texts.

Another author who examined Finnish unique items, but in translations from both English and Russian, is Sari Eskola (2004). In her paper, she focuses on syntactic unique items, Finnish non-finite structures (referative, temporal and final), in narrative prose originally written in Finnish and narrative prose translated from English and Russian into Finnish. The results of the research show that linguistic features of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text, which is manifested in the under-representation of target language specific items, Finnish non-finite structures, and in the over-representation of literal translation equivalents in translation.

Further testing of the unique items hypothesis was offered by Pekka Kujamäki (2004) in the form of challenging students' self-confidence regarding their knowledge of Finnish as their mother tongue. The aim of his linguistic experiment is to make students aware of the translation process and highlight some of their translation mistakes that may not be so straightforward. The students translated texts from German and English, which were themselves translations of a fabricated text in Finnish containing Finnish lexical unique items regarding the expressions for snow and some weather conditions. The translated texts were then compared with students' usage of native language in a cloze test. The results of the experiment show that students indeed tend to use literal translation solutions motivated by the

source text and not by their own knowledge of Finnish, which is in correspondence with the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004), literal translation automaton hypothesis (2005) and Toury's law of interference (1995).

Moreover, Bárbara Martínez Vilinsky (2012) further investigated the unique items hypothesis on the example of English-Spanish translations and Spanish verbal periphrases. Although some Spanish verbal periphrases do have a formal correspondent in English, they are still regarded as unique items because their meanings are more varied and there are numerous periphrases that cannot be translated by a similar form into English. The author's research on Spanish verbal periphrases is conducted on the corpus of contemporary literary texts divided into sub-corpora of comparable translated and non-translated texts. The frequencies from both sub-corpora are compared for each periphrasis. The results of the research support the unique items hypothesis; Spanish verbal periphrases are significantly under-represented in the sub-corpus of translated texts. Additionally, some Spanish verbal periphrases are used more variedly in terms of syntax and collocations in original, non-translated texts.

Apart from the authors and research studies discussed above, several other authors conducted similar research and reached similar conclusions regarding the representation of target language specific items in translation. Some of them are Bert Capelle (2012) on French/German-English translations, Lidun Hareide (2017) on Norwegian-Spanish translations, David Špetla (2018) on English-Czech translations, etc. Most of the research studies on this topic include Indo-European languages, with Finnish as the only exception, and with at least one of the two languages in question being a Germanic or a Romance one. Therefore, it may prove beneficial to conduct more research studies with different language combinations, including Croatian as a Slavic language. In this way, the phenomenon in question could be one step closer to becoming a widely-accepted translation universal.

5. Aims and hypotheses

The aim of this research is to examine and determine the interference of English as the source language on Croatian as the target language, in the context of research on the literal translation automaton hypothesis and the unique items hypothesis as a potential translation universal. Therefore, taking Croatian unique items into consideration, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H1: English conjunction “and” is more frequently translated as “i” than “a”, “pa” or “te” into Croatian.

H2: Conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are less frequently used in translations from English into Croatian than in comparable non-translated texts in Croatian.

The former hypothesis would correspond to the literal translation automaton hypothesis, since “i” is the formal correspondent, or literal translation, of “and”. On the other hand, “a”, “pa” and “te” are textual equivalents, or non-literal, less transparent translation solutions. Consequently, the latter hypothesis would correspond to the unique items hypothesis, since “a”, “pa” and “te” can be regarded as unique items and are thus expected to be under-represented in translation.

Furthermore, since the point of research on universal tendencies is not only to validate or invalidate the hypothesis but rather to explore under which circumstances it does or does not occur, this research also focuses on examining the role of some situational and socio-cultural factors present during the translation process. More precisely, this research also tends to determine the influence of translation skill level and translation time limit on the representation of unique items in translation. Therefore, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H3: Conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are more frequently used in translations from English into Croatian by translation students than students of other English graduate programmes.

H4: Conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are less frequently used in translations from English into Croatian if the translator has limited time to translate than if the translator has enough time to consider alternative translation solutions.

The former hypothesis focuses on the difference in translation skills, with translation students being regarded as more proficient translators and thus using more unique items in translation, while the latter hypothesis focuses on time limit during translating, which is expected to favour the under-representation of unique items in translation.

6. Methodology

The section on methodology includes information on the participants, tools and materials and procedure of the research.

6.1. Participants

The research is conducted on graduate students of English at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, more precisely, on students of all four English graduate programmes; Literature and Culture, Linguistics, Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Translation. There are 70 students who took part in this research; 20 men and 50 women between the ages of 22 and 29. Most of the respondents are first year graduate students, with only seven of them enrolled in the second year. However, the difference in their academic level does not pose a considerable difference in their English language proficiency, which is why they can be grouped together. On the other hand, the difference in their study programmes is an indicator of the difference in their translation skills, which is why the students are divided into two major groups: translation students and students of other English graduate programmes. Almost half of the total number of respondents, namely 32 students out of 70, are enrolled in the Translation graduate programme.

6.2. Tools and materials

Tools and materials necessary for conducting this research include the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), colour pens, a stopwatch and a test designed for the purpose of the research.

The test is comprised of two assignments, a translation one and a linguistic one. The first assignment includes 12 sentences in English that are to be translated into Croatian. The sentences are mostly (adapted) examples of English language usage taken from English grammar books and corpora. They differ in semantic and syntactic complexity but each of them contains the conjunction “and”. In order to achieve the most natural tone of the target text, none of the 12 conjunctions “and” is to be translated as the conjunction “i”, which is its formal correspondent in the Croatian language, but rather as one of the other three possible translation solutions: “a”, “pa”, “te”. More precisely, out of 12 conjunctions “and”, four of them are to be translated as “a”, four as “pa” and four as “te”.

The second assignment is a cloze test in Croatian, which tests students' usage of their native language, namely the usage of conjunctions. More precisely, 12 conjunctions, four times "a", four times "pa" and four times "te", have been removed from the text, the Goldilocks fairy tale, originally written in Croatian. According to their own native language intuition, the students have to fill in the gaps with missing words. Several other function words (mostly prepositions and some adverbs) have also been removed from the text in order to distract the students, i.e. make the research topic less obvious. In addition, in order to avoid bias, commas before or after certain conjunctions (for instance before "a") have also been removed from the text and the students are instructed to insert commas together with the missing word wherever they deem necessary.

6.3. Procedure

The students take the test in the paper-pencil form, without additional tools and materials. The duration of the test is precisely ten minutes and the students are instructed to do the assignments rather rapidly, without hesitating and spending too much time on considering other possible solutions. After the first ten minutes, the students are given extra five minutes and colour pens. They are then instructed to revise their solutions, re-evaluate them and change them if necessary. They are to cross out the old solution and write the new one using a colour pen.

7. Results

The data gathered in this research is analysed quantitatively, statistically, with the help of the SPSS software package, version 20.0. The data does not include any missing values or outliers. The data distribution is normal, which is determined by central tendency measures, as well as skewness and kurtosis measures, as shown in the following table:

	N	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
<i>i</i> in translation	70	6.11	2.30	.03	-.86
<i>a, pa, te</i> in translation	70	4.51	1.88	.05	-.49
<i>a, pa, te</i> in translation with additional time	70	4.81	1.93	.07	-.68
<i>a, pa, te</i> in original	70	9.00	1.78	-1.12	2.34

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Since the data distribution is normal, and for the purpose of inferential data analysis, a t-test for independent samples is used. The results of the statistical analysis show that all four hypotheses are confirmed:

Hypothesis 1

	t	df	p	M	SD
<i>i</i> in translation	22.24	69	< .01	6.11	2.30
<i>a, pa, te</i> in translation	20.11	69	< .01	4.51	1.88

Table 2. Frequencies of “i” and “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation

The results of the statistical analysis show that English conjunction “and” is statistically significantly more frequently translated as “i” (M= 6.11, SD= 2.30) than as “a”, “pa” or “te” (M=4.51, SD=1.88) into Croatian.

Hypothesis 2

	t	df	p	M	SD
<i>a, pa, te in translation</i>	20.11	69	< .01	4.51	1.88
<i>a, pa, te in original</i>	42.36	69	< .01	9.00	1.78

Table 3. Frequencies of “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation and original

The results of the statistical analysis show that conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are statistically significantly less frequently used in translations from English into Croatian (M=4.51, SD=1.88) than in comparable non-translated texts in Croatian (M=9.00, SD=1.78).

Hypothesis 3

	F	df	p	M	SD
<i>a, pa, te by translation students</i>	2.44	68	< .05	5.13	1.66
<i>a, pa, te by other students</i>		68	< .05	4.00	1.92

Table 4. Frequencies of “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation by translation students and in translation by other students of English

The results of the statistical analysis show that conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are statistically significantly more frequently used in translations from English into Croatian by translation students (M=5.13, SD=1.66) than students of other English graduate programmes (M=4.00, SD=1.92).

Hypothesis 4

	t	df	p	M	SD
<i>a, pa, te with time limit</i>	20.11	69	< .01	4.51	1.88
<i>a, pa, te with additional time</i>	20.89	69	< .01	4.81	1.93

Table 5. Frequencies of “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation done with time limit and in translation done with additional time

The results of the analysis show that conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te” are statistically significantly less frequently used in translations from English into Croatian if the translator has limited time to translate (M=4.51, SD=1.88) than if the translator has enough time to consider alternative translation solutions (M=4.81, SD=1.93).

8. Discussion

The discussion on the results of the analysis follows the hypotheses proposed and confirmed in this research, focusing on four underlying thematic sections.

8.1. Opting for literal translations by default

Since English “and” entails the meanings of four Croatian conjunctions, the first hypothesis proposed in this paper focuses on the frequencies of different possible translation solutions for “and” in English-Croatian translations. The translation in question included 12 sentences containing “and”, whose expected translations excluded “i”. However, comparing the frequencies of “i” and the frequencies of “a”, “pa” and “te” in the translation, it is evident that the former is statistically significantly used more frequently. In other words, translators more readily choose “i” as the translation equivalent of “and”, even when “a”, “pa” or “te” would be better suited. One possible explanation is that translating the conjunction that is so common in both languages can be viewed as a rather easy and familiar task and is thus performed routinely, automatically, which is in correspondence with Schön’s (1987 in Pavlović 2015) reasoning behind translators’ cognitive processing during translation. Such easy tasks are most often performed unconsciously, which is why translators tend to choose the most obvious translation solutions, literal translations, that do not require additional cognitive effort.

Moreover, since “i” is the formal correspondent of “and”, this tendency could also be explained by the literal translation automaton hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005), according to which translators opt for literal solutions by default, without considering alternative solutions as long as the desired equivalence is achieved in the target text. Only if that equivalence cannot be reached does a monitor trigger off conscious thinking and the translator starts assessing other possibilities, or in this case conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te”. For this reason in some of the cases the translators did use those alternative conjunctions, i.e. non-literal translation solutions. The most frequently used conjunction of the three alternatives is “a”, which could be explained by the desired equivalence already mentioned. More precisely, “a” is the only Croatian conjunction that does not belong to the same group as “i”, “pa” and “te”, which makes it grammatically and semantically different. Although English “and” encompasses all of them, “i”, “pa” and “te” are more often used to denote addition and successiveness, while “a” is focused on comparison and contrast. For this reason, it is possible

that translators more readily note the semantic and pragmatic difference between “i” and “a” than “i” and “pa” or “te” and hence use it more often in translation in order to achieve the equivalence in the target text. However, taking the overall results into consideration, in most cases translators either feel that the most obvious “i” is adequate to reach the desired translation equivalence or they do not activate conscious decision making to perform this task and hence opt for the literal solution.

On the other hand, in some of the cases the translators did not opt for “i” as a translation solution, but they did not opt for “a”, “pa” or “te” as well. More precisely, in some of the cases the translators used other conjunctions, such as “ali” or “međutim”¹ instead of “a” and “tako da” or “stoga”² instead of “pa”. Moreover, sometimes they inversed the sentence syntactically (for instance “Razbolio se *jer* je trčao po kiši.” instead of “Trčao je po kiši *pa* se razbolio.”³) or divided the sentence into two shorter ones instead of linking them with “te”. All these instances can be viewed as examples when translators did not believe the most obvious “i” was a suitable translation equivalent and thus opted for something else. However, in these cases “a”, “pa” or “te” were still not activated as potential solutions. In short, since “there is no formally corresponding material in the source text to trigger them off, and [since] there are other lexical and syntactic vehicles to convey the semantic content expressed in the source text” (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 411), the unique items, conjunctions “a”, “pa” and “te”, are ultimately under-represented in translation.

8.2. Under-representation of unique items in translation

The second hypothesis compares the frequencies of “a”, “pa” and “te” in the translation and in an original, non-translated text, or in this case, in a cloze test. The point of the cloze test is to examine the translators’ usage of Croatian as a native language, namely the usage of the conjunctions in question, in a natural, everyday language situation. According to the results of the analysis, the translators used “a”, “pa” and “te” in the cloze test twice as much more often than in the translation, which confirms the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002).

These results can be considered proof that the translators are familiar with these conjunctions in their native language, that they know how and when to use them and that they

¹ “Ali” could be considered the equivalent of English “but” and “međutim” of English “however”.

² “Tako da” and “stoga” could be considered the equivalents of English “so”, “hence”, “thus”, “therefore” etc.

³ “He got sick *for* running in the rain.” instead of “He was running in the rain *and* he got sick.”

readily opt for them in everyday native language usage. However, when it comes to translation, the translators seem to forget about them or disregard them as potential solutions, which ultimately leads to their under-representation. This, in turn, leads back to Toury's law of interference (1995). More precisely, the translators focused on the source text and unconsciously transferred its linguistic features into the target text; translating "and" as its formal correspondent "i" instead of considering "a", "pa", "te" as alternative and better suited solutions although they are undoubtedly familiar with their existence and usage in Croatian. In other words, the source text interference had more influence on the decision-making process and hence on the final translation as well than their native language intuition. Since they (unconsciously) focused on the source text and source language forms, it is not surprising that unique items, target language words that lack formal correspondents in the source text, were overlooked and under-represented. In comparison, it is not surprising that the same target language words were not overlooked in the cloze test, when the translators focused only on the text written in Croatian and their own native language intuition without any kind of influence from other languages. In short, it can be said that the unique items hypothesis is confirmed on English-Croatian language combination, which contributes to its status as a potential translation universal.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that this research, apart from the under-representation of unique items in translation, also revealed other instances of source text interference. The source text interference can be noted in different levels of language; grammatical, syntactical or lexical. For example, grammatical interference can be noted in the use of Croatian *pluskvamperfekt* when translating English past perfect, which is its formal correspondent but it is not common or even necessary in Croatian. Moreover, syntactical interference can be noted in sentences such as "... i odlučila ne napraviti to", which is an example of literal word order rendering ("... and decided not to do it.") that results unnatural in the target language. Additionally, perhaps the most often type of source text interference is lexical, evident in the examples such as "siromašna plesačica" instead of "loša plesačica", "napravi zadaću" instead of "napiši zadaću" or "komerc" instead of "trgovina"⁴. All of these examples can be viewed as potential topics for further research on source language influence and the law of interference.

⁴ "Destitute dancer" instead of "bad dancer", "write your homework" instead of "do your homework" and using a foreign word instead of a common Croatian word.

8.3. Differences between translation and non-translation students

Since the point of the research on any kind of potential translation universal is not only to validate or invalidate the tendency, but rather to explore it and determine the influence of various factors on it, it is necessary to discuss the remaining two hypotheses.

The third hypothesis in this research explores the influence of translators' translation skills on the representation of unique items in translation. Translation students of English are presumed to have higher translation skills than students of other graduate programmes, as they have both theoretical and practical knowledge of translation. According to the results of the analysis, translation students, i.e. translators with higher translation skills, used unique items, conjunctions "a", "pa", "te", statistically significantly more often than non-translation students, i.e. translators with lower translation skills.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon is the fact that educated translators have "self-awareness and monitoring skills" (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 407), which enables them to always monitor their own performance and be in control of their actions (2005). In other words, translation students are aware of their own work and its quality, they can recognize whether a particular task is done well or not (2005). Therefore, they can more easily recognize the semantic, syntactic or stylistic difference between the conjunctions in question and the effect they produce in the target text, which is why they tend to search for the very best solution. Moreover, since there is always more than one way to translate a text, translators are trained to consider various options, analyse possible solutions and in the end choose the one that best suits the context and the desired purpose. They are also trained to understand the language as a system (for instance what kind of conjunctions there are and when to use them) and to employ different strategies to achieve semantic, syntactic and stylistic coherence in the target text. In addition, according to Tirkkonen-Condit, more experienced translators also tend to "improve" the source text in such a way that "the translation manifests greater precision and better coherence than the source text" (2005: 407). Consequently, if English "and" includes even four Croatian conjunctions, translation students are more likely to take all of them into account and choose the most precise one, the one that will convey the nuances of the source text meaning even if this is not so obvious in the source text itself. In contrast, in less experienced translators' performance, "translation tends to proceed word by word, phrase by phrase, sentence by sentence" (2005: 408), which is why non-translation students more often opt for literal solutions and thus disregard the unique items.

In short, going back to Toury's (1995) formula for translation universals, it could be said that:

if a translator has lower translation skills, then there is greater likelihood that unique items will be under-represented in translation

or simply: translators with higher translation skills use unique items in translation more often. Consequently, since the use of unique items in translation can be linked to perceived originality and natural tone of the target text (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002), it can be concluded that one of the most important prerequisites of good translations is translators' education. Both theoretical and practical knowledge regarding translation as both a process and a product can and should improve translators' translation skills, make them recognize and assess different stages and procedures of the translation process and ultimately teach them to always strive for excellence, which undoubtedly leads to high-quality translations.

8.4. Translating with or without time limit

The fourth hypothesis in this paper compares the frequencies of "a", "pa" and "te" as unique items in the first version of the translation done with time limit and in the second, revised version of the translation done with additional time. The results of the analysis show that despite the fact that the difference in arithmetic mean of the two variables is not very big, it is still statistically significant and hence needs to be taken into consideration. Therefore, it could be stated that conjunctions "a", "pa" and "te" are statistically significantly less often used in translation done with time limit. In other words, going back to Toury's (1995) formula for translation universals once again, it could be said that:

if a translator has limited time to translate, then there is greater likelihood that unique items will be under-represented in translation.

This phenomenon could be linked back to the literal translation automaton hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005) and Schön's (1987 in Pavlović 2015) explanation of translators' cognitive processing. In other words, if there is not enough time to consider and evaluate all possible translation solutions, translators will opt for the most obvious one, the literal one. For

this reason, since unique items are not automatically triggered by the source text, they will be overlooked and under-represented.

On the other hand, if translators are given enough time and an opportunity to go back to their translation solutions, they will reassess their own work. They will note if a sentence is syntactically awkward or semantically ambiguous and will consciously look for ways to “repair” the sentence. Since they are actively looking for possible alternative solutions, they will pay less attention to the form of the source text and focus more on the desired outcome in the target text and, hence, unique items will be activated as potential solutions. This, in turn, leads to their more frequent use in translation and, consequently, better translation quality. In addition, it also confirms the fact that translators indeed know how and when to use “a”, “pa” and “te” but they simply neglect them as potential solutions under the influence of the source text and, of course, time pressure. For this reason, it is important to note and highlight the role of revision in the process of translation. Detailed revision and proofreading undoubtedly helps correct mistakes, inadvertent omissions and typographical errors but it also helps re-evaluate taken decisions and choose better suited solutions, which again leads to high-quality translations.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note another aspect of translating under time pressure. Apart from not having enough time to consider other possible and perhaps better solutions, time limit can also lead to carelessness and misinterpretation. For instance, some of the translators in this research misread the following sentence: “Do your homework and you’ll play later.”, confusing the verb “play” with “pay”. In consequence, they misinterpreted the sentence and translated it as “Napiši zadaću i platit ću ti kasnije.”⁵. Another similar example is the sentence “He was running in the rain and he got sick”, which was translated as “Trčao je u vlaku i razbolio se.”⁶. These examples further confirm the importance of revision and offer an interesting topic for potential research.

Other potential topics for further research can also be found in examining what else did the translators change and correct in the stage of revision. For instance, some of them corrected careless mistakes such as missing letters (“potrča” into “potrčao”) or “Sarah je dobra pjevačica i dobra plesačica.” into “Sarah je dobra pjevačica i loša plesačica.”⁷. Additionally, some of them inversed the sentences or changed word order, most often the position of adverbs (“Poznajem Dannyja bolje od tebe, a čak ga ni ja uvijek ne razumijem.”

⁵ Do your homework and I'll pay you later.

⁶ He was running in the train and he got sick.

⁷ “Sarah is a good singer and a good dancer.” into “Sarah is a good singer and a poor dancer.”

into “Poznajem Dannyja bolje od tebe, a čak ga ni ja ne razumijem uvijek.”⁸ or vice versa). However, the most often type of corrections is lexical or stylistic one: “vidio” into “ugledao” or “spazio”, “centar” into “središte”, “...da surađuju poput tima” into “...na timski rad” or “Tražim nekoga tko bi mogao volontirati...” into “Tražim volontera...”⁹, etc.

⁸ “I know Danny better than you do, and I don’t always understand him.” into “I know Danny better than you do, and I don’t understand him always.”

⁹ “saw” into “noticed”, “...work together as a team” into “...team work”, “I’m looking for someone who could volunteer” into “I’m looking for a volunteer...”.

9. Conclusion

The research presented in this paper tends to explore the translation process and the law of interference by testing the unique items hypothesis on translating “and” from English into Croatian. The results of the research confirm the hypothesis; unique items “a”, “pa” and “te” are less frequent translation solutions than the formal correspondent “i”, which leads to their under-representation in translation in comparison to original, non-translated texts. This, in turn, further confirms the claim that the unique items hypothesis is in fact a potential translation universal. In consequence, if this is then a general tendency present in different translational behaviour, it undoubtedly offers useful guidelines for both translator training and practice, as well as better understanding of the translation process itself.

Moreover, the confirmation of the remaining hypotheses proposed in this research offers additional insight into the translation process and different socio-cultural factors influencing it; translators with higher translation skills use more unique items in translation and translators under time pressure use less unique items in translation. In other words, translators’ cognitive processes and unconscious, often hurried, translation actions can greatly affect the representation of unique items in translation, and hence the overall quality of the translation. For this reason, this research tends to highlight the importance of revision and both theoretical and practical translator education. Furthermore, this research also focuses on highlighting the importance of making (future) translators aware of different cognitive processes and translation actions occurring throughout the translation process, which may prove pivotal for achieving high-quality translations.

However, it is important to note that this research was conducted on a rather small sample with unbalanced men-to-women ratio and a fairly wide age range. For this reason, further research on this topic may include a bigger and more representative sample, including students of English at other faculties and universities. Moreover, it would be interesting to test and compare the results of both the student population and well-experienced translation practitioners. Future research on the unique items hypothesis may also focus on examining the representation of a particular unique item with respect to others (for instance, comparing the frequencies of “a” with “pa” or “te”) or it may focus on a completely different set of unique items and thus further investigate the tendency. In addition, since this research was only conducted on respondents, it may prove beneficial to investigate different corpora of translated and original language and compare the respondents’ result with the results of

corpus-based research. In this way, the research may also offer insight into the influence of text-type and genre on the representation of unique items in translation.

In the end, every research on any kind of unique items and language combination, with any kind of different hypotheses and variables, is valuable and beneficial for understanding the phenomenon better and thus understanding the very nature of translation, both as a process and as a product. In the words of Sari Eskola, “studying [translation] is like trying to solve a jigsaw puzzle. Every piece of information about the use of any single pattern is part of the whole when we try to find out what translations are really like.” (2004: 86). For this reason, we should always strive for better understanding, new insights and, of course, improvement.

10. References

- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies — Implications and Applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Ed.) *Text and Technology*. (233-252). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cappelle, B. (2012). English is less rich in manner-of-motion verbs when translated from French. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13 (2), 173–195.
- Chesterman, A. (2004). Beyond the particular. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (33-50). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chesterman, A. (2004a). What is a unique item? In Y. Gambier, M. Shlesinger & R. Stolze (Ed.) *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies*. (3-14). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chesterman, A. (2010). Why study translation universals? *Acta Translatologica Helsingiensia (ATH)*, 1, 38–48.
- Englund Dimitrova, B. (2010). Translation process. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Ed.) *Handbook of Translation Studies*. (406-411). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Eskola, S. (2004). Untypical frequencies in translated language: A corpus-based study on a literary corpus of translated and non-translated Finnish. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (83-100). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Franco Aixelá, J. (2009). An overview of interference in scientific and technical translation. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 11, 75-88.

- Hareide, L. (2017). The Translation of Formal Source-language Lacunas: An Empirical study of the Overrepresentation of Target-Language Specific Features and the Unique Items Hypotheses. In M. Ji, M. Oakes, L. Defeng, & L. Hareide (Ed.) *Corpus Methodologies Explained: An empirical approach to translation studies*. Routledge.
- Kujamäki, P. (2004). What happens to “unique items” in learners’ translations? “Theories” and “concepts” as a challenge for novices’ views on “good translation”. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (187-204). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Laviosa-Braithwaite, S. (2001). Universals of Translation. In M. Baker (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. (288-291). London & New York: Routledge.
- Levý, J. (2004). Translation as a decision process. In L. Venuti (Ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*. (148-159). London & New York: Routledge.
- Martínez Vilinsky, B. (2012). On the lower frequency of occurrence of Spanish verbal periphrases in translated texts as evidence for the unique items hypothesis. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13 (2), 197-210.
- Mauranen, A. (2004). Corpora, universals and interference. In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (65-82). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pavlović, N. (2015). *Uvod u teorije prevodenja*. Zagreb: Leykam international d.o.o.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2002). Translationese—a myth or an empirical fact? A study into the linguistic identifiability of translated language. *Target*, 14 (2), 207–220.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2004). Unique items – over- or under-represented in translated language? In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (177-184). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2005). The Monitor Model Revisited: Evidence from Process Research. *Meta*, 50 (2), 405-414.
- Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Toury, G. (2004). Probabilistic explanations in translation studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as translation universals? In A. Mauranen & P. Kujamäki (Ed.) *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* (15-32). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Špetla, D. (2018). Frequency of unique items in translation from English into Czech. Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts. Brno, the Czech Republic.

11. Appendix: test used in the research

1. Prevedite sljedeće rečenice s engleskoga na hrvatski jezik.

Sarah is a good singer and a poor dancer.

I'm looking for a volunteer who has a lot of free time and a big heart and who drives a car.

He saw them on the street, and he ran to catch up with them.

She thought about it for a while longer and decided not to do it.

I know Danny better than you do, and I don't always understand him.

He was running in the rain and he got sick.

For centuries it has been a centre of culture and science, and now of commerce and industry as well.

It was raining and I had to go out to do some errands.

I had checked his reference the first time he had applied for this job and there was no need to do it again.

I cleaned the house and washed the car and I mowed the lawn.

Do your homework and you'll play later.

It is very important to make students feel comfortable and safe and to encourage them to work together as a team.

2. Prema vlastitoj intuiciji, dopišite riječi koje nedostaju. Na svaku crtu upišite jednu riječ. Ako smatrate da je potrebno, dodajte zarez ispred ili iza dopisane riječi.

Nekada davno ____ šumskoj kolibici živjela je obitelj medvjeda. Tata medvjed bio je velik, mama medvjedica nešto manja _____ treći, mali medvjedić, bio je najmanji. Jednoga jutra, mama medvjedica _____ doručak je skuhala finu kašu. No, kaša je bila jako vruća _____ je obitelj medvjeda odlučila poći u šetnju _____ se kaša ne ohladi.

U kućici _____ šume stanovala je jedna djevojčica. Imala je plave oči i dugu zlaćanu kosu, zbog čega su je prozvali Zlatokosa. Voljela je šetati šumom i igrati se na šumskoj livadi _____ po čitav dan brati cvijeće. Toga jutra, Zlatokosa je htjela ubrati malo šumskog cvijeća _____ se odmah vratiti kući. Međutim, lijepog šumskog cvijeća bilo je posvuda, stoga je Zlatokosa sve dublje ulazila u šumu. Odjednom se Zlatokosa našla pred nekakvom kolibicom. Provirila je _____ prozor i ugledala zdjelice s hranom. Bila je jako gladna _____ je otvorila vrata i ušla u kolibicu.

Kašica je mirisala _____ Zlatokosa bila sve gladnija. Priđe najvećoj zdjelici i malo okusi. Bila je prevruća. Priđe srednjoj zdjelici _____ jelo u njoj već je bilo hladno. Zato i nju ostavi i uzme zalogaj iz najmanje zdjelice. Ta je bila baš kako treba _____ je djevojčica pojela svu kašu. Tako sita, legla je na najmanji krevet u kolibici i brzo zaspala.

_____ je ona tako spavala, u kolibicu su se vratili njezini stanovnici. Tata medvjed i mama medvjedica ugledaju žlice u svojim zdjelicama _____ poviču: „Netko je dirao našu kašu!“ _____ kad je mali medvjedić ugledao svoju zdjelicu praznu, zaplakao je i povikao: „Netko je pojeo moju kašu!“ _____ mali medvjedić priđe svojem krevetiću i povika slabašnim glasom: „Netko je zaspao u mom krevetiću!“

Na te se riječi Zlatokosa probudi i ugleda tri medvjeda. Uplašena skoči _____ jurne niz stepenice što je brže mogla i projuri kroz vrata _____ počne trčati sve dok nije ugledala svoju kuću na kraju šume. _____ toga, Zlatokosa više nije lutala šumom i nepozvana ulazila u tuđu kuću i jela tuđu kašu _____ tata medvjed, mama medvjedica i mali medvjedić više nisu ostavljali kašu samu da se hladi.