

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Andreja Grbić

**Textual-linguistic Norms in Travel Brochures
in Croatian and English**

Supervisor: Dr. Nataša Pavlović

Zagreb, 2017

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Literature overview.....	5
3	Previous research.....	6
4	Key concepts.....	7
4.1	Positive adjectives and superlatives.....	7
4.2	Imperatives and modal verbs expressing possibility.....	8
4.3	Strategies of inclusion.....	9
4.4	Tourist vs. visitor.....	11
5	Research objectives and hypotheses.....	11
6	Methodology.....	12
7	Findings - lexical and syntactic level.....	13
7.1	Positive adjectives.....	13
7.2	Superlatives.....	15
7.3	Imperatives.....	16
7.4.	Modal verbs expressing possibility.....	17
8.	Strategies of inclusion.....	17
8.1	Dividing recipients into categories.....	17
8.2	Personal pronoun you.....	19
8.3	Impersonal pronouns.....	20
8.4	Deixis.....	22
9.	Tourist vs. visitor.....	23
10.	Constraints.....	24
11.	Conclusion.....	28
12.	Primary sources.....	30
13.	References.....	30

Abstract

Tourism is for Croatia's economy today one of the most important generators of revenue and much is being invested in infrastructure and services. Tourist texts are one component of the services. They are written for domestic visitors and translated for foreign visitors. Since visitors often receive first information and impressions from travel brochures, their functionality is of great importance. This master's thesis in the form of a descriptive study explores discursive practices of this type of texts written in Croatian, translated into English, and originally written in English. Considering the lack of this kind of analysis for the Croatian-English language pair, this paper aims to explore the topic, show whether there are differences between the originals, and whether these differences are visible in translations or rather adapted to the target cultures. A parallel Croatian-English and English-Croatian corpus has been compiled from four travel brochures. The analysis is based on previous research for other language pairs, such as English-Spanish and English-Italian, and some initial light is shed on practices of writing and translating travel brochures in Croatia.

Key terms

tourist text, travel brochure, norm, translation, culture

1 Introduction

A tourist text is defined as “any text published by a public or private organisation of any kind intended to give information to any kind of visitor or to advertise a destination (city, hotel, restaurant, etc.) and encourage visitors to go there” (Kelly 1997:35). This definition covers a wide range of text types, but the focus of this paper will be on travel brochures. Since tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in Croatia, I have wondered, as a student of translation, how much importance is given to the production of travel brochures. When we think of travel brochures, what first comes to mind is probably a paper copy of one. They are still an important source of information for visitors, despite living in the age of Internet and brochures often being available online. Tourist texts have specialised discourse due to their specific features and conventions. If translators wish for a tourist text to fulfil its functions and meet readers’ expectations, they should take into consideration these features and conventions in the process of translation. The English language being a vehicle of communication (Kelly 1997:40), I am interested in discursive practices that characterise travel brochures written in Croatian and in English for English-speaking countries, as well as their translations, because, as Kelly (1997:35) puts it, “there is a lack of systematic analysis of the source text in its communicative situation”.

In the first part of the paper I will present an overview of previous research on the topic of tourist text translation, followed by key concepts that will form the basis for this research. The main classifications of discursive practices of tourist texts mainly in English will be given in order to use them later for the analysis of our travel brochures written both in Croatian and in English. Having formulated the hypotheses and explained the methodology for the research, I will present the findings. The accent will be put on the distribution of discursive practices across the travel brochures and on their function. I would like to see whether there are considerable differences in use or if the brochures originally written in Croatian and in English are characterised by the same textual-linguistic norms. Another thing I will examine are the constraints present when transferring a tourist text from one culture to another.

2 Literature overview

Translation is a norm-governed activity. The concept of norms was introduced to translation studies by Gideon Toury, so his work will be used as a theoretical framework for this paper. In his book “Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond” (1995), writing about the nature and role of norms, he gives his definition of norms and accentuates the importance of cultural set-up. Every culture has its own set of norms and non-adherence to them in texts or translations is felt by the reader. He states that “not only are there norms associated with translation, but people-in-the-culture know how to, and actually do activate them; not only while producing translations themselves but while consuming them as well” (Toury 1998:31, cited in Schäffner 1999:29-30). Certain regularities of translation activity can be observed within a culture, and if translators do not adhere to these practices, it will often be recognised by members of the culture (1995:56). Toury states that norms always imply sanctions, so these practices can be sanctioned, whether actually or potentially, negatively as well as positively (1995:55). In the context of my research, I can interpret this situation as recipients of a travel brochure, potential visitors, recognising adherence or non-adherence of the text to the norms, the text fulfilling its function or not and finally the potential visitor becoming a real visitor or not. Which features of the source culture translators will transfer into the target culture depends on what recipients in the target culture assign importance to, under the assumption that translators are operating in the interest of the target culture (1995:12).

According to Kelly (1997:36), readers have differing expectations because of different textual conventions, although arguably it may be the other way around. Since it is not the language that determines the norms, but a specific society, ideally tourist texts should be produced for each target culture, but that is rarely the case.

Since studies on norms of Croatian tourist texts and translations are, at this moment and to the best of my knowledge, non-existent, all the works cited and used for the analysis in this paper are based on the analysis of tourist texts in English and another language, such as Italian and Spanish.

3 Previous research

Kelly (1997:34) makes a point that for some tourists the first contact they have with a tourist destination is via a travel brochure, pamphlet or guide. She is of the opinion that tourist translations are under-researched, considering the size of the market and the specific communicative situation (1997:34). Further, Kelly comments on the constraints a translator needs to adapt to and analyses and illustrates some mistakes made in tourist texts, discussing the ways content and style should be adapted for a translation to retain its function. Kelly also writes about reader expectations regarding content and style of tourist texts, and states that they vary in tenor in that Spanish texts are more formal and the relationship with the reader is more distant since the reader is rarely addressed directly (1997:36). On the other hand, she describes English as less formal and states that direct communication is established in tourist texts by using imperative verbs, among other devices (1997:36). Kelly concludes that there is a need to professionalise translations in the tourist sector and to include this type of translation training into university programmes (in Spain) (1997:41).

Agorni (2012a) discusses and exemplifies some of the linguistic strategies used when translating in the field of tourism. Her corpus is composed of 20 relatively short tourist brochures in English, of approximately 20 pages each. The brochures are published by the British Tourist Authority and most refer to areas in the South-East of England. The strategies that are important for my research are those that have a persuasive function, and which are used for identification of tourist text recipients and their specific needs and expectations. Those strategies attract readers' attention and draw them into the discourse (2012a:6). For Agorni "the force of tourism communication lies in its capacity to develop a language capable of satisfying the needs of diverse components of this field" (2012a:10). She also highlights that a significant degree of intervention by translators is often needed to establish successful communication (2012a:10).

Durán-Muñoz (2011) investigated tourist text translations and tourist discourse. She accentuates the important function that translations in the tourist sector have in mediating between local and foreign cultures, because translators are not only linguistic, but also cultural, or rather intercultural, mediators (2011:31). This type of translation has a meaningful role for the economy of many countries and Croatia is one of them. High quality tourist texts and translations are essential for optimal communication with the target audience (2011:31), but the attention that

translations in the tourist sector are given in the academic context of specialized translation is not in accordance with their importance (2011:31). She finds that the language of tourism is a specialised discourse because of the specific lexical, syntactic, functional and textual features and conventions (2012:336), which she enumerates and exemplifies. Since tourists can be categorised as potential and real (2012:336), what is needed for the potential ones to become real are trigger elements which have a persuasive function, and some of these are non-linguistic or non-verbal elements, such as photographs, pictures and symbols (2012:338). What is also important for the production of a tourist text, in my case of a travel brochure, and of its translation is communicative situation and tourist expectations regarding content and style, because author, audience, channel and mode determine a tourist text (2011:37). Durán-Muñoz shares Kelly's opinion and concludes that there is an urgent need to improve university training for translators in order to "professionalize translations in the tourist sector" (2012:348).

Zain Sulaiman (2014) conducted a study on stylistic differences between tourist texts in English and in Malay, relating them to certain cultural values of Anglophone societies and the Malay society. He expresses the opinion that ways of communicating differ among different cultures and that writing tourist texts is a "dual-level" process in which the macro-level (cultural) is the factor which determines the micro-level (linguistic) (2014:504). Having analysed target texts in Malay, Zain found that the tourist texts were generally translated from English literally, and that the native Malay speakers that formed his focus groups unanimously perceived the texts negatively (2014:506). He concludes that it is important to adopt a culturally appropriate style when translating tourist texts because these texts have a function and a purpose which need to be transferred into the target culture (2014:509). However, the translator has some space for creativity and can keep some of the discursive practices in the translation to transfer some of the specific stylistic features from the source culture, since the overall stylistic effect is also important, not solely the function of individual linguistic devices and features (2014:509-510).

4 Key concepts

4.1 Positive adjectives and superlatives

The abundant use of positive adjectives and emphatic language creates what Capelli (2007:6) calls "language euphoria". For Durán-Muñoz (2012:337), positive adjectives "give beauty and

distinction to the text”, which is important because travel brochures need to be attractive to readers to spark interest in a destination, activity, etc. This is also why “the language of tourism tends to speak only in positive and glowing terms of the services and attractions it seeks to promote” (Dann 1996:65). Maasalmi (2013) compared American, Canadian and British travel brochures, and based on a tourist text corpus that included a total of 101 travel brochures, concluded that British travel brochures contained the most adjectives.

Superlatives are another important feature of tourist texts. Destinations, attractions, activities, local food, etc. are described in superlatives because of their persuasive function, since readers must choose one over the other. Not only are superlatives persuasive, they are also informative since they tell the potential tourist that something is the oldest, the highest, the biggest, the most popular, best-preserved or the most famous in a destination.

4.2 Imperatives and modal verbs expressing possibility

According to Eastwood (2005:11), “there are many different ways of getting people to do things in English”, and the form used depends on the situation. Among other uses, imperative is used in slogans and advertisements, suggestions and instructions and directions (2005:16), which are all part of tourist texts and promotional discourse. Sulaiman (2014:505) writes that “the most distinctive feature of the ST at the general level of English communication is directness and explicitness” which is strongly motivated by individualism, a characteristic of the Anglophone culture. He finds that orality is the most prominent stylistic feature of the source text of English tourism promotional discourse and that it is reflected in the dialogic oral style (2014:505). The imperative mood is used as a device of linguistic expression and it indicates in a text a pretended already existing relationship of friendship or of familiarity between the author and the readership, while its verbal function is less that of an order and more of an invitation (2014:505-506). Sulaiman says that “the direct imperative style of persuasion draws the reader into the discourse” (2014:509), but he also gives one other very important function of imperatives and that is to “evoke a sense of action and adventure” (2014:506). Durán-Muñoz states that imperatives are a feature of the specialized language of tourism used to “urge the tourist to avail him/herself of the opportunities which are on offer” (2012:337). However, not all imperatives denote the same type of action. Sulaiman (2014:508) makes a difference between two groups of imperative verbs - those which name specific physical actions and/or imply energy consumption,

and those which name general actions and/or do not imply energy consumption and do not name specific physical actions. As an example of the latter group of imperative verbs, he gives the verbs that denote mental and emotional actions, such as “experience”, “discover”, “enjoy”, “explore”, “relax”, “escape”, while the examples of the former group would be “swim”, “dive”, “climb”, “jump”, “fly” (2014:508).

When it comes to modal verbs in travel brochures, they indicate flexibility, as well as politeness (Sulaiman 2014:509). They are used to “formulate mitigated imperative structures and address the (...) reader in a less aggressive and less direct style (2014:509). As Agorni (2012a:8) puts it, modal verbs “contribute to creating the notion of choice”, and the verbs both authors are referring to are *can* and *may* (Agorni 2012a:8; Sulaiman 2014:509).

4.3 Strategies of inclusion

Agorni (2012a) writes about the strategies that are used in tourist texts for the reader to feel included in the discourse. These strategies include the following: dividing recipients into categories, use of the personal pronoun *you* and use of impersonal pronouns (2012a:7). Apart from these three main strategies she also mentions the use of spatial deictics in the form of a binary opposition *here-there*. She claims that “discursive strategies [are] promoting the identification of the recipient with the images and services offered” (2012a:8).

Agorni (2012a:7) describes the use of the personal pronoun *you* as a “very effective strategy of reader-identification”. The same trait of the textual content intended for tourists was remarked upon by Hogg et al. (2014), who discuss genre conventions in tourist texts, more precisely tourist websites, and their translation. From their two corpora of English and Chinese museum websites they made a list of 100 most frequently occurring words in both languages. They found that there are differences in the way visitors are addressed, that is, that interpersonal relationships are formulated differently (2014:161). They write that “in the English museum websites, first person plural and second person pronouns (we, our, you, your) are on the 100 most frequent words list” and that “the word *visitor* is the fifth most frequent word in the Chinese corpus, but has a much lower frequency on the English list” due to Chinese museums having often adopted a third person voice (2014:161), which they illustrated with the following example: *Visitors can find information...* as opposed to *You can find...* (2014:161). By adopting

a third-person voice, the relationship that is established between the text on the Chinese websites and their recipients is more detached and serves the purpose of providing “clear guidelines or regulations to the visitor” (2014:161). Further, the authors give the reason for the frequent use of second person pronouns and it is “to manage the relationship with the visitors”, “to narrow the distance between the museum and the visitors” and “to make visitors feel that they are valued in this interaction” (2014:161).

Another discursive strategy of inclusion according to Agorni is the use of impersonal pronouns. She enumerates *anyone*, *no one* and accentuates the importance of *they*. She says that these pronouns are usually used in impersonal expressions, but that in tourist texts their function is “to include recipients into discourse, rather than distancing them” (2012a:7). Further she explains that the “so-called impersonal pronouns are in fact employed to demonstrate that tourist experience is described in such general terms as to accommodate any type of visitors” (2012a:7). Apart from *they*, other pronouns that can refer to people in general are *you*, *we* and *one* (Eastwood 2005:240).

Regarding deictics, Cairn writes the following:

The devices used to encode deictic information in language are systems of demonstratives (in English this/that), prepositions and other locating expressions (here/there; in front of/behind), personal pronouns (I/you) and systems of motion verbs. These grammatical elements have other functions besides their deictic ones but the deictic category of use can be distinguished from the other uses. (1991:20).

Spatial deixis is particularly important in tourist texts because “the speaker and addressee find themselves occupying a mutual space and use this space and its boundaries as their term of reference” (Cairn 1991:21). According to Marmaridou (2000:86), deixis is egocentric, meaning that it shifts the position of the speaker to the centre of the utterance, while Cairns (1991:24) points out that one of the functions of deixis is to draw attention. Agorni (2012a:7) explains how in a tourist text *here* can be opposed to *there*. By using *here*, the place in question is perceived as inviting and with positive characteristics that could appeal to the recipient, while at the same time being opposed to *there*, to some other undefined place which potential visitors would regard

as inadequate for visiting (2012a:7). She notes that “the recipient travellers [...] are identified by their presumed choice of a rather selective destination” (2012a:7).

4.4 Tourist vs. visitor

According to the definition of the United Nations World Tourism Organization (2008:10) “a visitor (domestic, inbound or outbound) is classified as a tourist (or overnight visitor), if his/her trip includes an overnight stay, or as a same-day visitor (or excursionist) otherwise”. However, Agorni (2012a:5) states that the term *tourist* in tourist texts is being substituted by other terms, such as *visitor*, *guest* and *traveller*. She describes it as a “well-known lexical phenomenon which is taking place not only in the English language” (2012a:5). It is taking place because the term *tourist* “is increasingly being associated with the notion of mass tourism” while these other terms “appear to be more consonant with contemporary practices and expectations” (2012a:5). Again, she states, for the purpose of the identification of the receiver (2012a:5). Using the term *visitor* serves the purpose when opposed to the use of impersonal constructions, but when opposed to the use of the second-person pronoun *you*, it creates a detached relationship with the receiver of the tourist text.

5 Research objectives and hypotheses

The aim of this paper is to gain insight into textual-linguistic norms of travel brochures written in Croatian, since there has been no previous research on this topic, and to compare the findings to the textual-linguistic norms of travel brochures originally written in English. My first hypothesis is that travel brochures originally written in Croatian tend to be oriented towards the destination and its description, while travel brochures originally written in English tend to be more oriented towards a potential tourist. Secondly, I hypothesise that translations of travel brochures from Croatian into English and vice versa tend not to adapt to the discursive practices of the target culture. The final hypothesis is that some of the textual material in Croatian is lost in its translation due to the restricted space in travel brochures.

6 Methodology

For the purpose of this research, I have compiled two occasional parallel corpora based on travel brochures published by the Zagreb Tourist Board. I have chosen brochures from this publisher because Zagreb, as the capital of Croatia, has seen steady growth in the number of visitors over the last few years, which is the result of continuing efforts in the tourism industry. I wanted to see whether travel brochures would be of good quality, that is, thoughtfully written, which one would expect considering the development of tourism in my country. One brochure is titled *Korak po korak*; it was written in Croatian by Martina Petrinović and translated into English as *Step by step* by Mediatranslations, a Croatian translation company, which did not provide the name of the actual translator. The other travel brochure is titled *Surrounding*, and was written in English by Jonathan Bousfield and translated into Croatian as *Okolica*, again by Mediatranslations. Martina Petrinović is a Croatian art historian and Jonathan Bousfield is a historian and a guidebook writer from the United Kingdom with special interest in South-East Europe. I find the choice of text authors important and indicative of possible differences between the brochures.

The description of textual-linguistic norms is based on a qualitative analysis as well as on a quantitative analysis, which involved the calculation of frequencies of particular linguistic elements. Because of the data that I will present later in the paper, it is important to note that the brochure *Korak po korak* has 8,930 words in its original Croatian form, while its translated English version has 11,738 words. The brochure *Surrounding* has 5,022 words in its original English form, while its translation into Croatian has 4,719 words.

For the purposes of qualitative analysis, I have mainly used the classifications of most common features of tourist texts proposed by Agorni (2012), Kelly (1997) and Sulaiman (2014). I will operationalise the first two hypotheses by using examples of positive adjectives and superlatives, imperatives and modal verbs, as well as of all the strategies of inclusion found in the brochures, according to above mentioned classifications of Agorni and Sulaiman, while the final hypothesis will be operationalised with Kelly's description of the constraints.

7 Findings - lexical and syntactic level

7.1 Positive adjectives

Having counted manually all the adjectives in the brochures, I came to the number of 85 positive adjectives in the brochure *Korak po korak*, (0.951%) and 121 positive adjectives in its translation into English (1.03%). There were 101 positive adjectives in the brochure *Surrounding* (2.011%), and 103 in its translation into Croatian (2.182%). A clear overview of the number of positive adjectives and their share in the total number of words is given in the table below:

	<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>	<i>Surrounding</i>	<i>Okolica</i>
positive adjectives	85 / 0.951%	121 / 1.03%	101 / 2.011%	103 / 2.182%

Based on these figures from my travel brochures, I can conclude that the number of positive adjectives is two times higher in the British brochure than in the one originally written in Croatian. Of the 48 positive adjectives added in the English translation of the Croatian brochure, 36 were added only as embellishment to the existing original text (Table 1) and 12 were added as part of the explanation (Table 2). Regarding positive adjectives in the English brochure *Surrounding* and its Croatian translation, *Okolica*, only four were not translated in any way and eight were rephrased in some way and toned down. (Table 3). There are 10 positive adjectives added in the Croatian translation for embellishment, and another nine that are added as a result of rephrasing (Table 4). I can thus say that the proportion of positive adjectives has stayed almost the same both in source brochures and their translations, despite the obvious difference in occurrence between the originals.

Table 1 – Examples of positive adjectives added to *Step by step* as embellishment

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p.14 - svježe voće i povrće, meso i riba	mouth-watering array of irresistible foodstuffs
p.22 - ograda od lijevanog željeza	ornate wrought-iron fence
p.49 - mirisi	wonderful scents
p.55 - u samo 79 radnih dana	in a record-breakingly short period

p.71 - inozemni umjetnici	internationally recognized artists
---------------------------	------------------------------------

Table 2 – Examples of positive adjectives added to *Step by step* as part of explanation

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p.15 - Petrica Kerempuh lik je iz hrvatske književnosti	A much-loved character from Croatian literature, Petrica Kerempuh is...
p.33 - /	the famous Croatian miniature painter Julije Klović
p.40 - ovo mjesto	this neat quadrangle of flowerbeds
p.56. - /	a popular meeting point
p.60 - /	super-sleek futuristic-looking vehicles

Table 3 – Examples of rephrasing of positive adjectives from *Okolica*

<i>Surrounding</i>	<i>Okolica</i>
p.7 - warming (bean stew)	grije
p.20 - stately oak	stari hrastovi
p.45 - rich variety of insects, frogs and fish	obilje hrane - kukaca, žaba i riba
p.62 - lovingly-preserved	brižno se čuva
p.82 - stately home	obiteljska palača

Table 4 – Examples of positive adjectives added as result of rephrasing from *Okolica*

<i>Okolica</i>	<i>Surrounding</i>
p.24 – vesele karnevalske povorke	masked revels
p.28 – blagi brežuljci	undulating hills
p.38 – znamenite drvene crkvice i kapelice	timber masterpieces
p.60 – veličanstvene europske prirodne ljepote	natural wonders of Europe
p.66 – nezaboravna ljepota	stick in a visitor's memory for a lifetime

7.2 Superlatives

Again, the British brochure, *Surrounding*, has the highest proportion of superlatives, 35 to be exact (0.696%). Its translation contains 39 superlatives (0.826%), the difference in number mostly being due to different formulation (Table 5) and because of a different degree of adjective comparison in the description in only a few examples (p. 43 *najbolje očuvane* - well-preserved). The proportion of superlatives in the Croatian brochure *Korak po korak* is almost the same as in *Surrounding* - 55 (0.615%) examples, while it is lower in its translation, *Step by step* - 56 (0.477%). There are three examples where superlatives are only added to the English translation as part of the explanation (Table 6), and all the other differences result from various ways of formulating the same image or because of different degree of description (Table 7).

However, one superlative is introduced as part of culturally relevant information for the Croatian audience. Introduction of culturally relevant information is another characteristic of tourist texts that I will discuss later in more detail. The historical concept that is explained is the Battle of Trafalgar because the readers might not be familiar with this historical fact or the explanation can simply serve as a reminder since this battle is an important part of British history (p. 20 - (...) u bitci kod Trafalgara, **najvažnijoj** pomorskoj bitci...).

Table 5 – Examples from *Okolica* of superlatives formulated differently

<i>Okolica</i>	<i>Surrounding</i>
p.6 najveća kaznionica	central penitentiary
p.56 najljepša zgrada	architectural highlight
p.24 - izvrsno odabran trenutak za posjet Samoboru	one of the best times to visit Samobor
p.37 rustikalnim se izgledom izdvaja	most rustic-looking

Table 6 – Examples from *Step by step* of superlatives added as part of explanation

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p.17 - /	one of the best preserved industrial buildings
p.22 - /	building's most famous reception room

p.61 - /	poet and educator best-known for
----------	---

Table 7 – Differences in superlatives resulting from various formulations

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p.30 - najnoviji dio grada	a newer part of town
p.34 - najutjecajnija ličnost	an immensely influential figure
p.34 - najromantičnija panorama Zagreba	soak in the view of central Zagreb
p.16 - živopisna gradska ulica	Zagreb's most colourful downtown street
p.41 - fascinantna, još neistražena povijest	the most enigmatic item
p.55 - jedan od pionirskih pothvata	one of the highest achievements

7.3 Imperatives

In the Croatian brochure, there are no examples of imperatives, and none are added in the English translation, while there are seven imperatives in the British brochure, although it is almost two times shorter. Of the seven imperatives, six were translated into Croatian. The seven imperatives are: “visit” (p.7), “call” (p.51), “go” (p.51), “contact” (p.51), “enjoy” (p.57), “consider” (p.64) and “head for” (p.81). If I use Sulaiman’s (2014:508) classification, I can say that all imperative verbs from the brochure belong to the group of those verbs that denote mental and emotional actions and do not imply energy consumption. There is also no particular target audience in terms of the activities visitors could do, so the imperatives used denote general activities which do not name specific physical actions.

Based on my findings from the brochures regarding imperatives, I could draw a parallel between Spanish (Kelly 1997:36-37) and Croatian when it comes to the level of formality since I have not found a single imperative verb in the Croatian brochure.

7.4. Modal verbs expressing possibility

Regarding the occurrence of the modal verb *can/moći* in the brochures, there are 4 examples (0.044) in *Korak po korak* and 6 (0.051%) in the translated brochure, while there are 5 examples (0.099%) in *Surrounding* and 5 (0.105%) in its translation. Given the length of the text, the proportion is two times higher in the British brochure; however, I can conclude that it is not a device that is frequently used in my corpus. Some of the examples would be: “Visitors can take a 40-minute guided tour...” (*Surrounding*, p. 69), “Visitors can even visit a replica mine-shaft or take part in...” (*Step by step*, p. 70), “(...) igraonice za djecu koja se mogu natjecati...” (*Okolica*, p. 35). By giving options, visitors feel included and they are more likely to decide on a destination if there is an activity that will appeal to them.

When it comes to the modal verb *may*, it is not used either in the travel brochure *Surrounding* or in *Step by step*.

8. Strategies of inclusion

8.1 Dividing recipients into categories

The categories the recipients are divided into are “usually defined in terms of specific activities” (Agorni 2012a:7). If readers can identify with one or more categories, they will feel that they have a sense of choice and they will opt for a destination or an activity more easily. The British brochure and its translation contain an equal number of examples of categories (7) (0.139% and 0.148% respectively), and more than the Croatian brochure (5) (0.055%). The categories imply both activities (hikers, recreational hikers, golfers, pilgrims) and interests (lovers of horticultural spectacles, fans of arts and crafts), as shown in Table 8. They are translated somewhat differently, with certain gains and losses. “Hikers” have become “izletnici” (excursionists), which is vaguer and lacks the notion of physical effort. On the one hand, the category of “recreational hikers” has been replaced by “jednodnevni rekreacijski izleti” (recreational day trips), a phrase which offers no sense of inclusion to the reader, and the category of “golfers” from the original was replaced by “igralište za golf” (golf course), losing the category (Table 9). On the other hand, two categories have been added in the translation (Table 10): one example is the description of an area which is “perfect for cycling” being rephrased in the translation into “biciklisti” (cyclists), and the other is the following phrase “*izletnici* koje očekuju i druga lijepa

iznenađenja” (author’s translation: excursionist who can expect other pleasant surprises) as the translation for “those who venture into the surrounding countryside”, the latter evoking a sense of uncertainty and adventure.

Table 8 – Examples of categories from *Surrounding* and their translations

<i>Surrounding</i>	<i>Okolica</i>
p. 6 and 7 - hikers	izletnici
p. 10 - pilgrims	vjernici
p. 23 - fans of arts and crafts	ljubitelji umjetnica, rukotvorina i starih obrta
p. 54 - lovers of horticultural spectacle	ljubitelji hortikulture

Table 9 – Loss of categories in *Okolica* due to rephrasing

p. 19 - golfers	igralište za golf
p. 26 - recreational hiker	jednodnevni rekreacijski izleti

Table 10 – Categories added in *Okolica* as a result of rephrasing

p. 43 - perfect for cycling	biciklisti
p. 49 - those who venture into the surrounding countryside	izletnici

There are five examples of categories in the Croatian brochure *Korak po korak* (Table 11) and four in *Step by step* (0.034%). One important category is added in the translation and that is “families”. Although “children” are already mentioned, “families” would be a superordinate term that could work even better in the text when targeting potential visitors since it could create an image of closeness and spending quality time together. In one example the category of “šetači” (strollers or walkers) is translated as “visitors” (Table 12), even though the context is that of a promenade. Unlike “stroller” or “walker”, “visitor” is a general term and there is no category for the recipient to identify with because it does not denote a specific activity.

Table 11 – Categories from *Korak po korak*

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p. 47 - pažljivi promatrači	careful observers
p. 62 - ljubitelji antikviteta, umjetnina, starih ploča i stripova	lovers of antiques, old postcards, vinyl records and comics
p. 72 - djeca	families, children
p. 73 - ljudi željni zabave	people looking for a fun night out

Table 12 – Loss of the category in *Step by step* due to generalisation

p. 34 - šetači	visitors
----------------	----------

8.2 Personal pronoun *you*

As I have already mentioned, one of the methods for making the recipient feel included in the discourse is by addressing him or her directly, using the second person pronoun *you*.

As far as my tourist brochures are concerned, the brochure *Surrounding*, originally written in English, contains more examples (14 or 0.278%) of the second person pronoun *you* than the Croatian brochure *Korak po korak* (5 or 0.055%). However, there is a considerably higher occurrence of the personal pronoun *you* in the Croatian translation of the British brochure – 27 examples or 0.572%, two times more than in the source brochure. The brochure *Step by step* also has more examples than its source brochure in Croatian – 9 or 0.076%. We can note a discrepancy in the count of the pronoun between the Croatian brochure and the Croatian translation, meaning that the translator did not abide by the textual-linguistic norm. In the Croatian original one example of *you* (*Vam* in Croatian) is lost and translated as *visitor*, and this translator's choice creates a detached relationship at the very beginning of the brochure:

Table 13 – *You* replaced by *visitor* in the introduction to *Step by step*

p. 1 - Ovaj izbor kulturnih i povijesnih znamenitosti pomoći će Vam pri upoznavanju grada.	This selection of Zagreb's cultural and historical sights will help each <u>visitor</u> to get to know the city better.
---	---

However, there are also four examples of *you* that were added to the English translation which contribute to reader identification, unlike the impersonal constructions that are in the original:

Table 14 – Impersonal constructions replaced by *you* for direct address in *Step by step*

p. 40 - <u>Zastati</u> pored mramornog stupa, <u>uvjeriti se</u> u temperaturu i tlak zraka te <u>uskладiti</u> ručni sat s brojčanikom koji prikazuje 24 sata je obavezno.	You can stand next to the marble post and check the temperature and air pressure and coordinate your watch with a 24-hour dial.
p. 56 - Opuštena atmosfera kafića i njihovih terasa na trgu i u obližnjim ulicama <u>je primjer</u> zagrebačke kulture dnevnog boravka.	Both the square and the surrounding streets are lined with pavement cafes, and it is here that you can get a true sense of Zagreb’s “outdoor lounge” culture.
p. 70 - pa <u>se</u> i o njima <u>može</u> u Tehničkom muzeju nešto <u>naučiti</u> .	and you can learn something about all of them in the Technical Museum.

Table 15 – Examples of direct address transferred from *Korak to korak* to its translation

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p. 1 - Nećete se izgubiti u labirintu ulica jer uvijek možete stati i pitati za smjer.	You won’t get lost in the labyrinth of streets because you can always stop and ask for directions.
p. 1 - Oduševit će Vas gostoprimstvo Zagrepčana.	You will be delighted by the hospitality of people in Zagreb.
p. 60 - kada se u popodnevnim satima krećete u smjeru zapada.	it is famous for the bright sunlight that hits you as you walk westward in the late afternoon.

8.3 Impersonal pronouns

There is only one example of *they* used in my corpus with the function of including, rather than distancing readers, and it is in the British brochure: “When people say Zagorje is a land of fairy-tale castles, Trakošćan is what **they** probably have in mind” (p. 15). The Croatian translation is

more detached with an impersonal construction at the beginning of the sentence and with a slightly different nuance in meaning: “Kad se kaže da je Zagorje predio dvoraca iz bajke, većina vjerojatno najprije pomisli na Trakošćan” (p. 15). As to the impersonal pronoun *one*, there are only two examples and they are in the brochure *Step by step*, that is, in the English translation. Once again, the Croatian text is more impersonal due to impersonal constructions (Table 16).

Table 16 – Examples of the impersonal pronoun *one* from *Step by step*

p. 20 - One enters the Upper Town	U Gornji grad ulazi se kroz
p. 42 - One should not miss the unforgettable	U razgledavanju je nezaobilazna

We can see from the findings that this type of use of pronouns *they* and *one* is not highly represented in the brochures which could be explained by a rather small corpus or by author’s (translator’s) choice of other discursive strategies.

Regarding pronouns *we* and *our*, they are used differently on the museum websites (Hogg et al. 2014:161) and in my brochures. On the English websites, first person plural pronouns are used in reference to the facilities in the museum (our collections, our galleries, our café) which in this way “contribute to the personification of the institution” (2014:161). In the brochures, pronouns *we* and *our*, as well as the plural object form *us* refer to people in general, with the meaning of “all of us” (Eastwood 2005:241) and they are used so that the narrator would relate to potential visitors and include them in the discourse. Recipients feel as if they are a part of a specific group. I can note that there are 6 (0.067%) examples in the Croatian brochure and 5 (0.042%) in its translation (Table 17), but none in *Surrounding*, and 2 (0.042%) examples in the translation of the British brochure (Table 18):

Table 17 – Examples of pronouns *we* and *our* in *Korak po korak* and its translation

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
p. 22 - tako nas palača (...) vraća u	the palace (...) takes us back to
p. 55 - Bez obzira priznajemo li ju kao	Whatever we might want to call it
p. 55 - danas koristimo internet	we can use the internet

p. 18 - ime nas podsjeća na	/
p. 30 - Restauratori su nam ispod	/
p. 59 - pa ju i danas tako zovemo	/
p. 34 - /	contributing greatly to our knowledge
p. 70 - /	we can also mention

Table 18 – Examples of the pronoun *we* in the Croatian translation of *Surrounding*

<i>Surrounding</i>	<i>Okolica</i>
p. 52 - /	koji nas svojom velebnom arhitekturom
p. 54 - /	makete koje nam pokazuju

8.4 Deixis

Our brochures make use of deictics, more specifically of the demonstrative *this* and of the adverbial of place *here*. As Cairn (1991:21) says, “English (...) divides space in terms of a binary opposition”, but Croatian divides it in three categories depending on the distance from the addresser or the addressee, or both. Thus, it differentiates *ovdje*, *tu* and *ondje*, e.g. demonstratives denoting a place near the addresser, a place near the addressee and a place at a distance from both the addresser and the addressee. There is 1 (0.011%) example of *ovdje* (near the addresser) and 19 (0.212%) examples of *tu* (near the addressee) in the brochure *Korak po korak*, and 21 (0.178%) examples of *here* in its translation (Table 19). The British brochure *Surrounding* contains 9 (0.179%) examples of *here*, while the translation has 3 (0.063%) examples of *ovdje* and 6 (0.127%) examples of *tu* (Table 20). The more frequent use of *tu* (a place near the addressee) in the brochures in Croatian can be indicative of the implied intention to make recipients feel included in the discourse and as if they were already there at the destination in question.

Table 19 – Examples of spatial deictics from *Korak po korak* and its translation

<i>Korak po korak</i>	<i>Step by step</i>
-----------------------	---------------------

p. 12 - Danas su ovdje egzotične biljke	Ribnjak now offers exotic plants
p. 12 - Prema legendi tu je živio	St Francis Assisi himself resided here
p. 40 - Tu započinje šetnja po Donjem gradu	An outdoor gallery (...) is a convenient starting point for a walking tour
p. 14 - Na njoj proizvođači (...) prodaju svježe voće i povrće	Here people sell fresh fruit, vegetables

Table 20 - Examples of spatial deictics from *Surrounding* and its translation

<i>Surrounding</i>	<i>Okolica</i>
p. 6 - Here you can see the bones	Ovdje možete vidjeti kosti
p. 37 - South of here at Lukinić Brdo	Malo dalje prema jugu, u Lukinić Brdu
p. 45 - 500 pairs of storks come here	Tu se okuplja oko 500 parova roda
p. 64 - There is a fascinating maze (...) to explore	Posjetitelj se tu može prošetati
p. 65 - the Kupa, which rushes its way	tok Kupe, koja ovdje brzo protječe

As for the deictic *there*, only two examples are found in the brochure *Step by step* and only one in *Surrounding*. This suggests that the binary division of space is not accentuated in these brochures. Only two examples of the deictic *ondje* in the brochures in Croatian, one in each, also indicate that only the space close to the addressee is accentuated, without making a direct opposition.

9. Tourist vs. visitor

There is only one occurrence of *tourist* in the brochure *Surrounding* and it is also found in its translation, as *turist*. In the brochure *Korak po korak*, there are four examples of *posjetitelj* (Croatian word for “visitor”) and two of *gost* (Croatian word for “guest”), and six examples of *visitor* in its translation. As for the brochure *Surrounding*, there are seven examples of *visitor*. Nine examples of *posjetitelj* and one example of *gost* can be found in its translation.

However, if we use Google to search “visitor attraction(s)”, we get about 489,000 (466,000) results, while “tourist attraction(s)” yields about 184,000,000 (49,300,000) results (on March 30, 2017). Edelheim (2015:8) advocates the use of *tourist attraction* as opposed to *visitor attraction* because the former is a “global signifier” and it is clear and descriptive enough for the readers to know what it refers to. He states further that the use of *visitor attraction* is quite common in the United Kingdom, probably because “day-trippers outnumber tourists staying overnight by a ratio of 11:1” (2015:5) and because the word “tourist” is associated with mass tourism and low-class entertainment (2015:7). Despite this, he concludes that “it is an unnecessary complication in English to change a known concept in order to be ‘more inclusive’” (2015:8) and because, for example, *tourism management* is used as a term and not *visitor management*. In my research, I found one example of “tourist attraction” in the brochure *Surrounding* (p. 66) in the context of Plitvice National Park, which was not translated as “turistička atrakcija”, but as “turistička destinacija” (tourist destination).

10. Constraints

Translators are responsible for mediating the source culture to the reader, and they should bear in mind possible communication breakdowns since target text recipients have varying previous knowledge and expectations. Presumably, Croat visitors will want more detailed and explicit information, for example on history or history of art, in their travel guide or brochure, but it could result in information overload for the foreign visitor if translated in entirety. For that reason, the amount of information needs to be considered (Kelly 1997:35). The target text “must be interpretable as coherent with the target text receiver’s situation” (Reiss and Vermeer 1984:113). To achieve that, during the process of translating “strategies will range from introduction of detailed explanation to drastic omission of any type of reference” (Agorni 2012b:10).

One of the constraints that is often imposed on translators refers to publishing editions of the same travel brochure in several languages (Kelly 1997:37). If the brochures have to contain the same photographs and have the same layout, that means that there is also the same amount of space for the text. This implies that the translation needs to be of similar length, although the

translated text is often shorter or longer, depending on the language pair, which can pose a problem for the translator. There are situations in which they should add some explicitation of implicit information when translating, omit some information to avoid information overload or introduce culturally relevant information which is not included in the source text (Kelly 1997:39). In my study, source brochures and their translations have slightly different layouts, but the differences are almost unnoticeable. In both English-language brochures, *Surrounding* and *Step by step*, the texts are a little longer than in their Croatian-language versions. The brochure *Step by step* is longer than its Croatian source text because it has many additions for the purpose of explanation. After a detailed comparison, I have concluded that some information was not included in the translation so that the layout would not change.

Kelly writes about mistakes translators make relating to adaptation or non-adaptation of tourist texts. She notes a lack of explicitation of implicit information as one of them, explicitation being one of the important strategies for adapting travel brochures for foreign visitors. There are many added explanations for visitors in the English-language translation which familiarise them with Croatian culture. However, there are also references which are left unexplained or are explained later in the text, which could lead to a communication breakdown because it is hard for members of other cultures to keep track of such an abundance of new information. References explained are, for instance, about politics, history, language and its history, literature, architecture and history of art, all of which are important for the contextualisation of Croatian culture (Table 21).

Table 21 – Explanations of references bearing important information from *Step by step*

politics	p. 7 - (...) only to be removed [the statue] by the communist authorities in 1947
history	p. 8 - The expansion of the Ottoman Empire put Zagreb within range of enemy raids
language	p. 7 - The Croatian word for “to scoop water” is “zagrabiti”.
literature	p. 14 - Croatia’s leading 20 th -century writer Miroslav Krleža
architecture	p. 17 - one of the best preserved industrial buildings in Zagreb
art history	p. 43 - pre-World War I artists such as Oton Iveković and Vlaho Bukovac

References unexplained refer to geography and history, but these examples are not numerous (Table 22). There are also some examples of unexplained references in the brochure *Surrounding*, but also only a few.

Table 22 – Unexplained references from *Step by step*

geography	p. 16 - “a woman from the Zagorje ”
history	p. 19 - a gift from the Mažuranić family ; p. 26 - and from Yugoslavia in 1991

It is important to note, though, that in *Step by step* some street and park names were introduced without pragmatic explanations until later in the text. This could cause confusion since it is not easy for the visitor to infer the reference. For example, on page 9 the text mentions “the stairs that connect Tkalčićeva [street] and Opatovina [park]”.

Another mistake Kelly writes about is information overload not resolved by omission or generalisation. I will note information overload, but also the cases where the translator decided to omit something or make a generalisation to adapt the text to the receiver’s situation. There are several cases where there is information overload in the brochure *Step by step*, information that can be interpreted as irrelevant to the foreign visitor. Examples refer to a mural in a church depicting a local noblewoman (p. 12), a historic event in Belgrade without explanation (p. 19), plot summary of an important Croatian novel (p. 21) and the exact date of execution of one of the historical figures (p. 28). Of the several omissions from the source brochure, I find one unjustified, and it is a short note on the closeness of a certain church on foot from one of the most important institutions and attractions in Zagreb (p. 63 in *Korak po korak*), which is information that could be useful to visitors. One of the three instances of generalisation I have found I also find unjustified. One refers to the exhibits in the Croatian History Museum as well as the periods they cover. The translator decided to put a general description instead, hence depriving potential visitors of some fairly important information (Table 23).

Table 23 – Unjustified omission from *Step by step*

p. 29 - Bogate zbirke portreta, odora, zastava, oružja, karata i fotografija vode	There is no permanent collection on display, but seasonal exhibitions on key themes of
--	--

posjetitelje kroz kulturnu, gospodarsku I političku povijest Hrvatske **od srednjeg vijeka do danas.**

local history provide a wealth of insights into the country's past.

When it comes to omission in the other translated brochure, *Okolica*, there are two descriptions of source culture references that are dysfunctional in the text. One is the description of bean stew, which is a common dish in Croatia: “Grah je gusto varivo obogaćeno okusom dimljenog mesa, a poslužuje se s kobasicom ili s malo slanoga kiselog zelja. Jelo je ukusno, grije, možda je čak i zdravo, a uz hladno pivo pravi je užitek (p. 7)”. The other refers to the bright red hearts “licitari” which are described as “at least in theory, edible” (p. 11), which Croatian people know is not the case. A possible reason for these infelicitous choices is that “the translators fail to distinguish ST audiences from TT audiences with their different culture-specific world knowledge, expectations, and communicative needs” (Wang 2013:257).

The last mistake Kelly notes is non-introduction of culturally relevant information. I have not found any such examples in my research, but I have found two cases in which culturally relevant information was introduced. This was the case in the Croatian translation, meaning the information was considered important to native visitors. One introduces the premodifier “gospodarski” (economic) to the description of an area characterised by viticulture (p. 28), and the other defines the village of Krašić as “središte hrvatskoga katoličkog nasljeđa” (the centre of Croatian catholic heritage) (p. 31).

Further, when translating a tourist text, it is sometimes necessary to introduce source language terms in a guide or a brochure, which poses another constraint. Visitors receive visual information via signposts on roads and signs outside monuments and public buildings. Those elements would not normally be in the text, but are important in this case because they facilitate identification (Kelly 1997:37). In my corpus, there are names of squares or important buildings written in Croatian in parentheses, as visitors would see them written in the street (Ban Jelačić Square - Trg bana Jelačića, the Bloody Bridge - Krvavi most, St Mark's Church - Trg svetog Marka, mountain lodge - planinarski dom) or the translation is incorporated in the text (ex. the Banski dvori or “Governor's Palace”). Kelly also notes that is important to include source language terms when writing about local cuisine so that visitors can recognise them in menus (1997:37). Some of the examples from the corpus would be “grah”, “kremšnite”, “bermet”,

“muštarda”, “portugizac”. Aside from “grah” which is also mentioned in *Step by step*, all of these terms are from the brochure *Surrounding* and they are explained in short. Pragmatic explicitations of implicit cultural information are needed because “members of the target language cultural community may not share aspects of what is considered general knowledge within the source language culture” (Klaudy 1998:83). Apart from food and drink, Klaudy (1998:83) gives examples of villages and rivers, which “are well known to the target community [but which] may mean nothing to the target language audience” if left in the text without a common noun that would serve as explanation. There are examples in my brochures such as “mount Medvednica”, “Medveščak creek”, “village of Belec”, “town of Zaprešić”, “Gradna stream”, “Sava and Kupa Rivers”. As for the most famous streets for pedestrians in Zagreb, a passage is dedicated to each of them in the brochure *Step by step*. Titles of the passages consist of street names, and they are all first named as locals call them - Tkalčićeva/Tkalča, Radićeva, Opatička, Masarykova and Jurišićeva - later to be explained in the text that those are streets. It is the same with “Dolac” (market) and “Zrinjevac” (park).

11. Conclusion

To conclude, due to the specific nature of tourist texts or, to be more specific, travel brochures, the translator should be more concerned with the pragmatic effects of his/her solution than with semantic accuracy (Agorni 2012b:9). Across all cultures, travel brochures have the same two functions, informative and persuasive; it is just the language norms that differ. Understanding and working under the target culture conventions is key to rendering the source text as fully functional and fulfilling its purpose. Nord (1997:75) points out that “cultural translation errors are due to the translator’s inadequate decision with regard to reproduction or adaptation of culture-specific conventions”.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the second part of the paper. When it comes to the orientation of the travel brochure towards the destination and its description or towards a potential tourist, based on my findings I can conclude that the brochure originally written in Croatian, *Korak po korak*, is destination-orientated, while the brochure originally written in English, *Surrounding*, is focused on the potential tourist. I have also shown that, in my corpus, translations of travel brochures from Croatian into English and vice versa generally tend not to

adapt to the textual-linguistic norms of the target culture. Apart from that, I have found that some textual material is lost in the English translation due to the restricted space in the brochure, along with the layout that needed to remain unchanged.

Considering the lack of comprehensive research on this topic for the Croatian-English language pair and taking into account the fast development of tourism in Croatia and its importance, as well as the lack of specific training in this field, I hope that this paper will spark some interest among researchers but also among my colleague translators, and motivate them to explore the norms and conventions of this type of discourse, which could consequently lead to better understanding and higher quality of tourist texts.

12. Primary sources

Bousfield, Jonathan. *Surrounding*. Zagreb: Zagreb Tourist Board.

Mediatranslations. *Okolica*. Zagreb: Zagreb Tourist Board.

Mediatranslations. *Step by step*. Zagreb Tourist Board.

Petrinović, Martina. *Korak po korak*. Zagreb Tourist Board.

13. References

Agorni, Mirella. 2012a. "Questions of Mediation in the Translation of Tourist Texts." *Altre Modernità* 02: 1-11

2012b. "Tourism Communication: The Translator's Responsibility in the Translation of Cultural Difference." *PASOS - Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage* Vol. 10, No. 4: 5-11.

Cairns, Barbara. 1991. "Spatial Deixis: The Use of Spatial Co-ordinates in Spoken Language." *Working papers* 38: 19-28.

Dann, Graham. 1996. *The Language of Tourism*. CAB International.

Durán Muñoz, Isabel. 2011. "Tourist translations as a mediation tool: misunderstandings and difficulties." *Cadernos de Tradução* Vol. 1, No. 27: 29-49.

---. 2012. "Analysing Common Mistakes in Translations of Tourist Texts (Spanish, English and German)." *Onomázein* Vol. 2, No. 26: 335-349.

Eastwood, John. 2005. *Oxford Learner's Grammar: Grammar Finder*. Oxford University Press.

Edelheim, Johan R. 2015. *Tourist Attractions: From Object to Narrative*. Channel View Publications.

- Hogg, Gillian; Liao, Min-Hsiu; O'Gorman, Kevin D. 2014. "Reading between the Lines: Multidimensional Translation in Tourism Consumption." *Tourism Management*, Vol. 42: 157-164.
- Kelly, Dorothy. 1997. "The Translation of Texts from the Tourist Sector: Textual Conventions, Cultural Conventions, Cultural Distance and Other Constraints." *TRANS: revista de traductología*, No. 2: 33-42.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 1998. "Explicitation". In Baker, Mona & Malmkjær, Kirsten (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Routledge, London and New York. 80-84.
- Marmaridou, Sophia S. A. 2000. *Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. St. Jerome, Manchester.
- Reiss, K.; Vermeer, H.J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sulaiman, Mohamed Zain. 2014. "Translating the Style of Tourism Promotional Discourse: A Cross Cultural Journey into Stylescapes." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 118: 503-510.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- . 1998. "A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'". In: Schäffner, Christina (ed.). 1999. *Translation and Norms*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. Clevedon.
- Wang, Xiao-yan. 2013. "Translating Tourism Texts in the Light of the Skopos Theory." *US-China Foreign Language*, Vol. 11: 254-258.
- Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti Hrvatske. 2013.
<http://www.dpuh.hr/index.php?show=news.php&idNews=255> (accessed May 17, 2016)

Kuštović, Tanja. 2009. "Prilozi za izražavanje prostora." *Zagrebačka slavistička škola*
<http://www.hrvatskiplus.org/article.php?id=1827&naslov=prilozi-za-izrazavanje-prostora>
(accessed March 23, 2017)

Piteša, Adriana. 2010. *b92*.
<http://www.b92.net/mobilni/putovanja/429445> (accessed May 17, 2016)

United Nations. 2010. *International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics*.
https://unstats.un.org/unsd/publication/Seriesm/SeriesM_83rev1e.pdf#page=21 (accessed March 30, 2017)