

UNIQUE ITEMS IN TRANSLATION: TRANSLATING "AND" FROM ENGLISH INTO CROATIAN

Lucija Vrhovski

Abstract

The translation process entails various, often nonconscious, cognitive processes. Due to source language interference, translators may choose translation solutions similar to the source and neglect less obvious but possibly more adequate solutions. This paper, based on the author's M.A. thesis, aims at testing the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002) on the English conjunction "and", whose possible Croatian correspondents, "a", "pa" and "te" can be considered unique items, i.e. linguistic elements specific to the target language. The use of these items in an English-Croatian translation task is compared to that in a monolingual Croatian cloze test. The influence of translation skills and time constraint on the representation of unique items in translation are examined. The research is conducted on two groups of graduate students of English: those specializing in translation and those in non-translation tracks. As expected, the Croatian unique items are under-represented in translation when compared with their use in a monolingual task. In the translation task, participants with more developed translation skills use the unique items more frequently. Time pressure impacts negatively on the use of unique items. In addition to contributing to our understanding of translation universals, the results offer insight into the nonconscious cognitive processes in translation, and as such can be relevant for translator education.

1. Introduction

For every translator the process of translation entails a 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 nonconsciously, 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 cognitive process occurring nonconsciously is the observed phenomenon (Toury 1995: 275) that translators transfer some aspects of the source text make-up to the target text even though a less literal rendering would represent a better translation equivalent in a given situation. This interference happens under the influence of the source text in spite of the translator's linguistic knowledge of the target language.

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, studies may offer better insight into the translation process itself and lead to new discoveries pivotal for its understanding. Moreover, such studies may also highlight the importance of considering more than the most obvious translation solutions, thus making translators – especially novices – aware of their actions throughout the translation process, which might prove crucial for the overall quality of the translation.

2. Theoretical framework

This study¹ is conducted within the descriptive translation studies (DTS) theoretical framework, drawing mostly on Toury's (1995) law of interference and the subsequent research on translation universals. Insights from translation process research are referred to where appropriate.

2.1 Translation process

According to Levý (2004: 148), 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" and as a decision process, which implies "a series of a certain number of consecutive

¹ The study was conducted as the author's M.A. thesis at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. This paper is a revised version of that thesis.

situations [...] imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain [...] number of alternatives". 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, Englund Dimitrova (2010: 406) 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". This cognitive activity does not imply a simple process but rather a variety of different complex cognitive processes such as analytical thinking, problem solving, decision making, opting for the best translation solutions, etc. (Pavlović 2015). These processes may occur both consciously, where translators meticulously plan, analyse and reassess their choices and actions, and nonconsciously, where translators automatically make decisions and opt for solutions without realizing it. These conscious and nonconscious cognitive processes are often fast-paced, 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: 407). 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 valuable insight into translators' cognitive processing. Although the translation process is 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 as normal and hence perform them routinely, without conscious thinking (Schön 1987 in Pavlović 2015). Only when a translation problem occurs do translators start assessing the situation and consciously evaluate every possible action and solution (Hansen 2003 and Neubert 1994, both in Pavlović 2015; cf. *cruse vs. bump mode* in Pym 2016). Similar to this theory is the concept of monitor model of translation and literal translation automaton (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005).

According to Tirkkonen-Condit (2005: 407), "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". In other words, translators tend to opt for literal translation solutions nonconsciously, as long as this does not pose problems with the desired equivalence in the target text. This theory is easily comparable to Ivir's (1981) reasoning as quoted in 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.

We could posit that a formal correspondent of either kind is cognitively easier than a shift, and that an obvious ("identical-meaning") formal correspondent is cognitively the least demanding of the three options. In cognitively demanding situations, such as under time pressure, translators may fail to advance to more demanding processing steps, going for the easier solutions instead. On the other hand, training and experience may counter this tendency to some extent.

2.2 *Translation universals*

In linguistics, language universals are general principles 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 would not be possible (Chesterman 2010). Therefore, it might be more accurate to discuss "general tendencies", "regularities" or "laws" in translation rather than "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. According to Toury, "the question facing us is not really whether translation universals exist [...] but rather whether [they can] offer us any new insights" (2004: 22). In other words,

translation universals could and should be explained, possibly in terms of likelihood:

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

where "X" is a variable influencing the translator while translating and "Y" is the translational behaviour the translator chose, which includes both the notion of translation as a process and as a product. According to Chesterman (2010), the variables could be sought in different areas: translators' cognitive processing, professional training or situational factors such as a tight deadline. Each of these variables could be further investigated and thus offer new insights into the understanding of translation universals.

In addition, it is important to mention Baker's (1993) differentiating between translation universals and translation norms, since the latter can vary across different cultures and change over time. 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. The phenomenon of interference can be considered a rather complicated matter, which needs to be further discussed.

2.3 Interference in translation

According to Weinreich (1953: 1 in Mauranen 2004), interference supposes "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". Therefore, 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, which is usually (although not necessarily) the translator's second language, that influences the target language, which is usually 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.

Interference was conceptualized by Toury (1995) as one of the two fundamental laws of translational behaviour: "in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text" (1995: 275). 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 (1995: 275) further states that this kind of translational behaviour is based on "mental processes involved in translation, especially the series of rapid switchings between source and target codes". However, as with all translation universals, other socio-cultural factors have to be considered as well, for instance, translators' training, purification tendencies, text-type, etc. (1995).

Franco Aixelá (2009: 75) 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". The author (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' nonconscious decision making processes influenced by the source text. It is of course difficult to distinguish between deliberate and non-deliberate decisions, especially in a product-oriented study, but we could suppose grammatical words may be more influenced by non-deliberate interference than, say, the choice of how to render a culturally specific item.

It is also interesting to note 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*

The unique items hypothesis postulates that unique linguistic elements specific to 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 counterparts 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 the most literal translation solutions over alternative choices can be explained in terms of literal translation automaton (2005). Consequently, the most obvious formal correspondents tend to be automatically activated by the source text in the translator’s mind and thus be over-represented in translation (Eskola 2004).

In the words of Tirkkonen-Condit (2004: 177), unique items are lexical, phrasal, syntactic or textual items “which lack linguistic counterparts in the source language in question”. This does not mean they cannot be translated, but rather that they are not lexicalized in the same way in the other language. This, in turn, leads to the conclusion that uniqueness is a relative phenomenon. More precisely, unique items in this sense are not globally unique linguistic elements specific to just one particular language in the world as opposed to all the others. They are rather unique with respect only to the source language in question (Chesterman 2004a). This means that the same linguistic characteristic of, for instance, Spanish might be unique in translation from English into Spanish, but it might not be unique in translation from Portuguese 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 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. Unique items in this sense can be contrasted 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 conceptual, but rather linguistic. Therefore, “the greater the formal [...] 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 that are relevant 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 translators choose literal translation solutions 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 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 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, studies on the under-representation of unique items in translation could show whether the unique-items hypothesis is correct, and thus enhance our understanding of the translation process. The more such studies confirm the hypothesis, the more likely the phenomenon is to be regarded as a translation universal.

Furthermore, it is necessary to stress the role of *source text interference* on the under-representation of unique items in translation. For the purpose of this research, source text interference is viewed as non-deliberate, nonconscious transfer of source text linguistic features into the target text (Toury 1995). Since it is of course impossible to distinguish with certainty between deliberate and non-deliberate choices, the focus is on grammatical words rather than e.g.

cultural elements, as the former are less likely to be influenced by a deliberate translation strategy. The choice, presumably unintentional, of obvious, identical-meaning correspondents of source text items thus leads to the under-representation of alternative translation choices that are not so obvious but could be more suitable in the given target text.

The very central point of this paper, *unique items*, can be defined as “linguistic elements in the target language that are not triggered off as formal correspondents [...] by any elements in the source language texts” (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005). It is important to note two things here. First, as was stressed above, unique items are only unique with respect to a specific language pair and direction (for instance, in translation from English into Croatian). Secondly, although the formal correspondence relationship need not be one-to-one, there can nevertheless be a difference in the salience of the various correspondents. For instance, Croatian formal correspondents of the English conjunction “and” include the conjunctions “i”, “a”, “pa” and “te”, with “i” being the most salient one. The remaining correspondents – “a”, “pa” and “te” – can thus be considered as unique items if English is the source language, i.e. those less likely to be triggered off by the English “and”.

4. Previous research

Although the unique items hypothesis is a relatively newly discussed phenomenon, there are numerous studies on this topic, several of which are presented in this paper. They focus on different unique items in various, mostly Indo-European, languages.

The author who first postulated the unique items hypothesis, Sonja Tirkkonen-Condit, tested it 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 texts of both genres, which is consistent with the unique items hypothesis.

Another author who examined Finnish unique items, in translations from both English and Russian, is Sari Eskola (2004). In her paper, she focuses on syntactic unique items, Finnish non-finite structures, 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 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 was 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 compared with students' usage of native language in a cloze test. The results 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 consistent with the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004), literal translation automaton hypothesis (2005) and Toury's law of interference (1995).

Bárbara Martínez Vilinsky (2012) further investigated the unique items hypothesis on the example of English-Spanish translations and Spanish verbal periphrases. The research was 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 were compared for each periphrasis. The results of the research support the unique items hypothesis: Spanish verbal periphrases are under-represented in the sub-corpus of translated texts.

Several other authors conducted similar research and reached similar conclusions. 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 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 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 an 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: The English conjunction "and" is more frequently translated into Croatian as "i" than "a", "pa" or "te".

H2: Conjunctions "a", "pa" and "te" are less frequently used in translations from English into Croatian than in monolingual usage in Croatian.

The first hypothesis would correspond to the literal translation automaton hypothesis, since "i" is the most obvious formal correspondent which can be regarded as the literal translation of "and". On the other hand, "a", "pa" and "te" are less obvious, non-identical-meaning correspondents. Although there are meaning nuances between the three conjunctions ("te" is most often used to denote addition, "pa" usually expresses successiveness, and "a" generally conveys comparison and contrast), all of them can be considered possible, albeit less obvious, correspondents of "and", which carry similar meaning in different contexts. The second 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 is valid, this research also focuses on examining the role of some situational and socio-cultural factors present during the translation

process. More precisely, this research tends to determine the influence of translation skill and 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. Time limit is expected to favour the under-representation of unique items in translation since time pressure can impact on the translator's cognitive load, leading to cognitively less demanding solutions (in this case, the most obvious correspondent) being chosen over cognitively more demanding ones.

6. Methodology

6.1 Participants

The research was 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. Seventy students took part in this research; 20 male and 50 female between the ages of 22 and 29. The difference in their study programmes was taken as an indicator of the difference in their translation skills, which is why the students were divided into two major groups: translation students and students of other English graduate programmes. Almost half of the total number of respondents, 32 students, were translation students.

6.2 *Tools and materials*

Tools and materials necessary for conducting this research included the SPSS statistical package, colour pens, a stopwatch and a test designed for the purpose of the research.

The test was comprised of two assignments, a translation one and a linguistic one. The first assignment included 12 sentences in English that were to be translated into Croatian. The sentences were mostly (adapted) examples of English language usage taken from the British National Corpus (BNC) and the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). They differed in semantic and syntactic complexity but each of them contained the conjunction "and". In order to achieve the most natural tone of the target text, none of the 12 conjunctions "and" was expected to be translated as the conjunction "i", which is its obvious formal correspondent in the Croatian language, but rather as one of the other three possible translation solutions: "a", "pa", "te". More precisely, of the 12 conjunctions "and", four were expected to be translated as "a", four as "pa" and four as "te".

The second assignment was a cloze test in Croatian, which tested students' usage of their native language, more specifically the usage of said conjunctions. Twelve instances of conjunctions – four times "a", four times "pa" and four times "te" – were removed from a text, the Goldilocks fairy tale in the Croatian language. According to their own native language intuition, the participants had to fill in the gaps with missing words. Several other function words (mostly prepositions and some adverbs) were also removed from the text in order to distract the participants, i.e. make the research topic less obvious. In addition, in order to avoid bias, commas before or after certain conjunctions were also removed from the text, with the participants instructed to insert commas together with the missing word wherever they deemed necessary.

6.3 *Procedure*

The participants took the test in the paper-pencil form, without additional tools and materials. The duration of the test was precisely ten minutes and the participants were instructed to do the assignments rather rapidly, without hesitating and spending too much time on considering possible solutions. After

the first ten minutes, the participants were given extra five minutes and colour pens. They were then instructed to revise their solutions, re-evaluate them and change them if necessary. They were to cross out old solutions and write new ones using a colour pen.

7. Results

The data gathered in this research was analysed quantitatively, statistically, with the help of the SPSS software package. Since the data distribution was normal, and for the purpose of inferential data analysis, a t-test for independent samples was used in order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two conditions/groups. The results of the statistical analysis show that all four hypotheses are confirmed, as can be seen below.

7.1 Hypothesis 1

Table 1. Frequencies of "i" and "a", "pa", "te" in translation

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

The results of the statistical analysis show (Table 1) that the 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.

7.2 Hypothesis 2

Table 2. Frequencies of "a", "pa", "te" in translation and a monolingual task

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

The results of the statistical analysis show (Table 2) 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 a comparable monolingual task in Croatian (M=9.00, SD=1.78).

7.3 Hypothesis 3

Table 3. Frequencies of “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation by translation students and in translation by other students of English

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

The results of the statistical analysis show (Table 3) 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 by students of other English graduate programmes (M=4.00, SD=1.92).

7.4 Hypothesis 4

Table 4. Frequencies of “a”, “pa”, “te” in translation done with time limit and in translation done with additional time

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

The results of the analysis show (Table 4) 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 the 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 task in question included 12 sentences containing "and", such as "Sarah is a good singer *and* a poor dancer.", "She thought about it for a while *and* decided not to do it." or "He saw them on the street, *and* he ran to catch up with them." etc. 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. The previously mentioned sentences were thus generally translated as "Sarah je dobra pjevačica *i* loša plesačica.", "Razmišljala je o tome neko vrijeme *i* odlučila da neće to učiniti." and "Vidio ih je na ulici *i* potrčao da ih sustigne." Since the expected translations of "and" in these examples included "a", "pa", and "te" respectively, it can be said that 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, 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 nonconsciously, which is why translators tend to choose the most obvious translation solutions that do not require additional cognitive effort.

Moreover, since "i" can be regarded as the most obvious 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 meaning nuances and the desired equivalence already mentioned. More precisely, "a" is the only Croatian conjunction that does not belong to the same linguistic group as "i", "pa" and "te", which makes it grammatically and semantically different. Although the English "and"

encompasses all of them, "i", "pa" and "te" more often denote addition and successiveness, while "a" usually denotes 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 the translators either felt that the most obvious "i" was adequate to reach the desired translation equivalence or they did not activate conscious decision making to perform this task, opting for the literal solution instead. Therefore, the results of the research correspond to Eskola's (2004) conclusion that literal translation solutions tend to be over-represented in translation.

On the other hand, while not opting for "i" as a translation solution, the participants occasionally did not opt for "a", "pa" or "te" either. Rather they used other conjunctions "with not-quite-identical meanings" (Ivir 1981 in Toury 1995: 191), such as "ali" or "međutim"² instead of "a", and "tako da" or "stoga"³ instead of "pa". Moreover, they sometimes used "structural and semantic shifts which destroy formal correspondence altogether" (Ivir 1981 in Toury 1995: 191) and, for instance, inversed the sentence syntactically (for instance "Razbolio se jer je trčao po kiši." instead of "Trčao je po kiši pa se razbolio."⁴) 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 that the most obvious "i" was a suitable translation equivalent and thus opted for another option. 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.

² "Ali" could be considered the equivalent of the English "but" and "međutim" of the English "however".

³ "Tako da" and "stoga" could be considered the equivalents of the English "so", "hence", "thus", "therefore" etc.

⁴ "He got sick *for* he was running in the rain." instead of "He was running in the rain *and* he got sick."

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 monolingual usage, or in this case, in a cloze test. The point of the cloze test is to examine the translators’ activation of the conjunctions in question in a language situation free from source-text interference. Some of the sentences used in the cloze test included “Tata medvjed bio je velik, mama medvjedica nešto manja, a treći, mali medvjedić, bio je najmanji.”⁵ or “Uplašena skoči *pa* jurne niz stepenice što je brže mogla i projuri kroz vrata *te* počne trčati sve dok nije ugledala svoju kuću na kraju šume.”⁶ The participants generally provided the expected conjunctions. Therefore, according to the results of the analysis, the translators used “a”, “pa” and “te” in the cloze test twice as often as in the translation, which confirms the unique items hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit 2002).

These results can be considered as evidence that the translators are familiar with these conjunctions in their native language, that they know how and when to use them and that they readily opt for them in monolingual language usage. However, when it comes to translation, the translators seem to overlook them as potential solutions, which ultimately leads to their under-representation. This, in turn, leads back to Toury’s law of interference (1995). The translators, focusing on the source text, nonconsciously transferred its linguistic features into the target text; translating “and” as its most obvious formal correspondent “i” instead of considering “a”, “pa”, “te” as alternative and more suitable solutions. This happened although they are undoubtedly familiar with the conjunctions, as shown by the monolingual Croatian task. In other words, in the translation task, the source text interference had more influence on the decision-making process and hence on the final translation than their native language intuition. These results further highlight Kujamäki’s (2004) aim to challenge translators’ views on their L1 knowledge and Laviosa-Braithwait’s (2001) conclusion that translators often focus on the source text utterances rather than their own knowledge of the target language. Since they nonconsciously focused on the source text and

⁵ Daddy Bear was the biggest, Mommy Bear was somewhat smaller, *and* the third one, Baby Bear, was the smallest.

⁶ She was startled *and* rushed down the stairs and out the door as fast as she could *and* she ran until she saw her house at the end of the forest.

source language forms, it is not surprising that unique items were overlooked and under-represented. 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. For example, grammatical interference can be noted in the use of Croatian *pluskvamperfekt* when translating the English past perfect, which, despite being its formal correspondent, is not common 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 sounds unnatural in the target language. Additionally, perhaps the most frequent 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"⁷. All of these examples can be viewed as potential topics for further research on source language influence and the law of interference.

8.3 Differences between translation and non-translation students

The third hypothesis in this research explores the influence of translators' 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. These results confirm Chesterman's (2010) suggestion that professional training is one of the factors that influence the translation process.

One possible explanation for this phenomenon is that trained translators have "self-awareness and monitoring skills" (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 407), which

⁷ "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.

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, 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" (Tirkkonen-Condit 2005: 407). Consequently, if the English "and" covers 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 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 more unique items in translation. 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 translator 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 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,

which also corresponds to Chesterman’s (2010) claim that social factors such as a tight deadline can influence the translation process. 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. For instance, while revising, the translators quite often noticed the repetition of the conjunction “i” in sentences such as “Vrlo je važno da se učenici osjećaju ugodno i sigurno i da ih se potiče na timski rad.”⁸ and thus changed the last “i” into “te”, according to syntactical and stylistic rules of the Croatian language. They also noticed the semantic nuances between “i” and “a” and often changed the “i” into “a” in sentences such as “Padala je kiša, a ja sam morao ići nešto obaviti.”⁹. In other words, if translators have enough time, 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

⁸ It is very important to make students feel comfortable and safe and to encourage them to work together as a team.

⁹ It was raining and I had to go out to do some errands.

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. 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."¹⁰ 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."¹¹ These examples further confirm the importance of revision and offer an interesting topic for potential research.

Other potential topics for research can also be found in examining what else the translators changed and corrected 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."¹² 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." into "Poznajem Dannyja bolje od tebe, a čak ga ni ja ne razumijem uvijek."¹³ or vice versa). However, the most frequent type of correction was lexical or stylistic: "vidio" into "ugledao" or

¹⁰ Do your homework and I'll pay you later.

¹¹ He was running in the train and he got sick.

¹² "Sarah is a good singer and a good dancer." into "Sarah is a good singer and a poor dancer."

¹³ "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."

"spazio", "centar" into "središte", "...da surađuju poput tima" into "...na timski rad" or "Tražim nekoga tko bi mogao volontirati..." into "Tražim volontera..."¹⁴, etc.

9. Conclusion

The research presented in this paper explores 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 obvious formal correspondent "i", which leads to their under-representation in translation in comparison to monolingual usage. This, in turn, further confirms the claim that the unique items hypothesis is in fact a potential translation universal. In consequence, if this is 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 nonconscious, 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 highlights 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 of non-professional translators. For this reason, further research on this topic may include a larger and more representative sample, including experienced professionals. Future research on the unique items hypothesis may

¹⁴ "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...".

also focus on examining a completely different set of unique items and thus further investigate the tendency. In addition, since this research was only conducted with an experimental method, it may prove beneficial to investigate different corpora of translated and non-translated language, comparing the results from experiments with results of corpus-based research. This may also offer insight into the influence of text-type and genre on the representation of unique items in translation.

In the end, every study 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 (2004: 86), "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." For this reason, we should always strive for better understanding, new insights and, of course, improvement.

References

- Baker, Mona. 1993. "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies — Implications and Applications". In: Baker, Mona, Francis, Gill & Tognini-Bonelli, Elena (ed.), *Text and Technology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 233-252.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2012. "English is less rich in manner-of-motion verbs when translated from French". *Across Languages and Cultures* 13(2): 173-195.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2004. "Beyond the particular". In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 33-50.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2004a. "What is a unique item?" In: Gambier, Yves, Shlesinger, Miriam & Stolze, Radegundis (ed.), *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 3-14.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2010. "Why study translation universals?" *Acta Translatologica Helsingiensia (ATH)* 1: 38-48.

- Englund Dimitrova, Birgitta. 2010. "Translation process". In: Gambier, Yves & van Doorslaer, Luc (ed.), *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 406-411.
- Eskola, Sari. 2004. "Untypical frequencies in translated language: A corpus-based study on a literary corpus of translated and non-translated Finnish". In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 83-100.
- Franco Aixelá, Javier. 2009. "An overview of interference in scientific and technical translation". *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 11: 75-88.
- Hareide, Lidun. 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: Ji, Meng, Oakes, Michael, Defeng, Li & Hareide, Lidun (ed.), *Corpus Methodologies Explained: An empirical approach to translation studies*. Routledge.
- Kujamäki, Pekka. 2004. "What happens to 'unique items' in learners' translations? 'Theories' and 'concepts' as a challenge for novices' views on 'good translation'". In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 187-204.
- Laviosa-Braithwaite, Sara. 2001. "Universals of Translation". In: Baker, Mona (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge. 288-291.
- Levý, Jiří. 2004. "Translation as a decision process". In: Venuti, Lawrence (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge. 148-159.
- Martínez Vilinsky, Bárbara. 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, Anna. 2004. "Corpora, universals and interference". In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 65-82.
- Pavlović, Nataša. 2015. *Uvod u teorije prevođenja*. Zagreb: Leykam international d.o.o.
- Pym, Anthony. 2016. *Translation Solutions for Many Languages. Histories of a flawed dream*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Špetla, David. 2018. *Frequency of unique items in translation from English into Czech*. Unpublished MA thesis. Brno: Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts.

- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. 2002. "Translationese—a myth or an empirical fact? A study into the linguistic identifiability of translated language". *Target*, 14(2): 207–220.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. 2004. "Unique items – over- or under-represented in translated language?" In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 177-184.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. 2005. "The Monitor Model Revisited: Evidence from Process Research". *Meta*, 50(2): 405-414.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Toury, Gideon. 2004. "Probabilistic explanations in translation studies: Welcome as they are, would they qualify as translation universals?" In: Mauranen, Anna & Kujamäki, Pekka (ed.), *Translation Universals – Do they exist?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 15-32.