

Translation from Croatian into English: Problems and Challenges in Translating Texts of Different Genres

Kregar, Patricia

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2020

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

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:186:032072>

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

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-19**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



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

Patricia Kregar

**TRANSLATION FROM CROATIAN INTO ENGLISH:
PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING TEXTS OF
DIFFERENT GENRES**

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the B.A. in English Language and Literature and Italian Language and Literature at the University of Rijeka

**Supervisor:
Nikola Tutek, Dr. sc. Phil.**

Rijeka, September 2020

ABSTRACT

This thesis deals with difficulties and challenges appearing while translating different genre texts from Croatian into English. In the introductory part I am going to give a brief description of the texts that will be translated later on. Also, I am going to list a few useful tools for translating and qualities that a brilliant translator should possess. The crucial part of the thesis are translations of the source texts in Croatian into the target texts in English. Just as important are the commentary and analysis given after every translation. The analysis will be based on important points such as genre, source, audience, purpose of writing, authenticity, style, level of formality, layout, length, content, lexical cohesion, sentence patterns etc. Moreover, the issues and solutions in the translations will make an essential part of the commentary. Finally, a conclusion will give a short overview of my translating assignment and report on what I have learned as a translator from these three translations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. SOURCE TEXT I.....	2
2.1. TARGET TEXT.....	9
2.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS.....	17
3. SOURCE TEXT II.....	19
3.1. TARGET TEXT.....	26
3.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS.....	34
4. SOURCE TEXT III.....	37
4.1. TARGET TEXT.....	48
4.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS.....	59
5. CONCLUSION.....	62
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	63

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this thesis is not just translating three texts from Croatian into English, but analysing the problems I faced with and tackling the serious challenge of translating. Translators can face numerous difficulties while working on their translations, but as long as the source text is interesting and worthwhile, I find it easier to deal with the issues of such enterprise.

For the purpose of diversity, I aimed for texts of three different topics and genres which are all related to current events and controversies. The first one is a scientific research text which deals with a problem of mass media from a sociological perspective. The second text is in fact an interview in which the topic is discussed from a medical science aspect. The third text is a captivating article which, in my opinion, is fun to read, as well as fun to translate.

As already mentioned, the translators' job is not only to translate the content accurately, but to make sure that the translated text conveys the right spirit of the target language, and uses appropriate vocabulary depending on the style and the level of formality. Having that in mind, we cannot simply translate the text by word-for-word translation because it would be superficial and most probably incorrect. The first thing that is likely to come to mind is *Google Translate* which often makes us laugh with its nonsensical and sometimes way too literal translations. Although it can occasionally come in handy, it is better to use translation tool like *Glosbe* which gives multiple options and places every word in a context. That way it is easier to figure out the exact meaning of a word and its proper use. For better understanding and more detailed information it is smart to use *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary* and *Cambridge Dictionary* as main tools because they are respected and trustworthy.

Finally, for being a successful translator is not enough to use the right translation tools and reliable dictionaries. Firstly, a person has to have a good knowledge and comprehension of the source language. Secondly, is necessary to approach the source text in the right way, to proofread it first, then examine it more thoroughly and only then he/she is ready to start translating. Moreover, it is crucial to have an insight into the culture of both languages and into the vocabulary for specific fields in question. In conclusion, it is not easy to be a brilliant translator, but if we make an effort and invest enough time into research, we just might come up to an excellent translation.

2. SOURCE TEXT I

Pregledni članak UDK 316.774:37.03

Primljeno 25. 2. 2010.

Jasna Burić

Hrvatska radiotelevizija, Prisavlje 3, HR–10000 Zagreb

jasna.buric@hrt.hr

Djeca i mladi kao konzumenti masovnih medija Etika i tržišne manipulacije potrebama mladih

Sažetak

Tržište masovnih medija velikim je svojim dijelom okrenuto djeci i mladima. Sadržaji koji se nude mladima u masovnim medijima, nadilaze, u negativnome smislu, nekoć obrazovne i poticajne školske primjere edukativnih programa ili časopisa za djecu. U medijskome prostoru prevladavaju sadržaji koji vrijeđaju dostojanstvo mlade osobe, koji manipuliraju njihovim potrebama, te koji potiču mlade na izbor lišen svakih vrijednosti, gdje je sve relativno i ništa sigurno. Autorica propitkuje trendove u modernim medijima lišenima svake odgovornosti, obligacija i sankcija. Pokušava definirati značajke medija 21. stoljeća u kojima je čovjek-konzument zatočenik medijske moći i utjecaja te traga za istinskim etičkim obzirom i smislom u medijima koji neće preskočiti čovjeka i njegove potrebe.

Ključne riječi

mediji, masovni mediji, djeca, mladi, konzumerizam, etika

Prostor koji sadržajno popunjavaju masovni mediji današnjice velikim je svojim dijelom okrenut djeci i mladima. Dok je nekoć preokupacija medija i medijskih poslenika prvotno bila usmjerena na demokratizaciju prostora javne riječi, danas je temeljno pitanje kako prostor javne riječi masovnih medija djelotvorno i prije svega dobrovoljno zaštititi od njihovih stvoritelja i ograničiti okvirima koje postavlja etika i opći društveni interes. Teoretičari masovnih medija zamijetili su kako su mediji odavno napustili svoju primarnu svrhu: praćenje, bilježenje i informiranje o relevantnim društvenim zbivanjima. Mediji su naime zakoračili u prostor bitnog čimbenika koji kreira društvene procese, potrebe i trendove. Još su tek poneki mediji, oni klasični poput knjige, zadržali svoju prvotnu svrhu. Masovni elektronski mediji

vode snažnu tržišnu utakmicu u kojoj žele biti dominantan kreator društvenih zbivanja, a ne tek puki prenositelj događaja i društvenih kretanja. Ta je nova zadaća medija osobito snažno izražena u stvaranju sadržaja za djecu i mlade. Običan promatrač lako će uočiti da su npr. nekoć obrazovni i poticajni primjeri školsko-edukativno-obrazovne televizije, radija ili sadržaji dječjih časopisa, danas zamijenjeni prevladavajućim sadržajima *cyber*-svijeta stvorenog za djecu i mlade. Masovni su mediji u svome prostoru informacija spretno utopili elektronske igrice, reklame koje potiču djecu na izbor nezdrave hrane, kupovine točno određenih stvari, igračkaka, odjeće ili obuće, izravnog zahtijevanja od oglašivača i medija koji to objavljuju: da djeca »moraju« sakupiti sve zadane sličice ili igračkice kupnjom određenog proizvoda. Imperativni medijski reklamni zahtjevi koji potiču djecu (»Sakupi ih sve!« ili »Moraš ih imati!«), a odnosi se na *zapovijed kupovanja* točno određenih sličica ili igračkaka, na *zahtijevanje*, dakle i *posjedovanje* određenih stvari, postali su do te mjere agresivni i dominantni na medijskome tržištu da se nerijetko iznova propituje uspješnost edukativnih sadržaja i odgoja koji bi trebali osigurati kritički stav djece prema medijima i medijskoj tržišnoj utakmici.

Masovni mediji zadaju nove i komplicirane zadaće teoretičarima medija: medijski je prostor ispunjen *infozabavom*, *teletabloidima*, *infooglasima*, *pornooglasima*. Njihov se broj u praksi iz dana u dan umnožava, dok u teoretskom smislu njihovo mjesto ostaje nedefinirano i nedovoljno opisano kako bi moglo biti izloženo učinkovitim javnim raspravama, stručnim i znanstvenim promišljanjima. Status tih medijskih oblika postaje nejasan i novinarska zbilja biva doista suočena s novim izazovima, podsjeća Dahlgren.¹ Tako se korak po korak brišu granice između ozbiljnih i popularnih sadržaja u medijima, sve se više gomilaju sadržaji kojima je svrha isprazna kupnja ili prodaja proizvoda i usluga koji su, samorazumljivo, osobito problematični kada se usmjeravaju prema djeci i mladima.

Poler Kovačić misli kako se kriza novinarskog identiteta pokazuje u neprepoznatljivosti novinarskog diskursa zbog miješanja novinarstva (djelatnosti za opće dobro koje ima primarnu funkciju izvješćivanja građana) s takozvanim *neonovinarstvom* (djelatnosti koja služi stjecanju dobiti, moći i vlasti).² Upravo to brisanje granica između novinarstva i *neonovinarstva*, kako vidi Poler Kovačić, upućuje na krizu novinarske etike.

Tržište koje diktira tempo medijima i sami medijski poslenici nalaze se u začaranom krugu uzajamnog djelovanja. Zajedno proizvode učinak koji djeluje razarajuće na ukupni društveni prostor: tržišni trendovi su prevladavajući, sve je roba i sve se može tržiti, novac pokazuje svoju moć i snagu nad svim čovjekovim potrebama. Potreba svih potreba postaje roba, stvar,

potražnja-kupnja. Ne razmišlja se odveć o vrijednostima ili dobrim svrhama. Mediji postaju snažan instrument koji opasno eksperimentira i instrumentalizira s potrebama i idejama mladih. Stvarnost koja se pokazuje oko nas dopušta pitanje: Tko ima pravo poticati mlade da kupuju, zahtijevaju ili slobodno vrijeme provode uz sumnjive *060 telefonske oglase* dostupne u svim dnevnim tiskovinama? Tko snosi društvenu odgovornost za tu objavu: oglašivač, vlasnik medija, inertni i nezainteresirani zakonodavac, pedagog ili možda roditelj koji nije uspio »dobro sakriti« dnevne novine od djeteta?

Tržišno usmjereni mediji hrane vlastiti egoizam koji potkrepljuje njihov krajnji interes: dobru zaradu. Hardt primjećuje da mediji rijetko postižu željenu ravnotežu između odgovornog novinarstva i posla koji donosi zaradu.³ U medijskome prostoru pažljivome analitičaru ne mogu promaknuti sadržaji koji vrijeđaju dostojanstvo mlade osobe, manipuliraju njihovim potrebama te potiču mlade na izbor lišen svake vrijednosti, gdje je sve relativno i ništa sigurno. Trend novinarstva i kreatora koji stvaraju medije lišene svake odgovornosti, obligacija i sankcija postaje dominantna značajka medija novoga doba. U društvenim okvirima zavladao je prešutni konsenzus stvaratelja medija i medijskih normi te civilnih institucija koje bi trebale propitivati odgovornost i slobode medija. Njihovim zajedničkim djelovanjem koje odlikuje visoka razina konsenzusa u proizvodnji novog tržišnog oblika određenja medija na putu prema najmlađim konzumentima moguća je egzistencija takvih društveno i etički neprihvatljivih medija. Čovjek-konzument postaje *zatočenik medijske moći i utjecaja*, a koji ne bi bio moguć bez te potpore i sudjelovanja drugih čimbenika kojima je društvena zadaća stvoriti prihvatljive okvire medijskog djelovanja. Unatoč inflaciji pravnih propisa medijsko zakonodavstvo siromašnije je za neki obligatorni propis koji bi zabranjivao dnevnim tiskovinama kod nas da objavljuju pornooglasne na stranicama dnevnih novina, koje su dostupne i mladima, premda su takvi sadržaji regulirani kao sadržaji koji ne smiju biti dostupni djeci i mladima. Aktualna Međunarodna konvencija o pravima djeteta UN-a za mnoge je medije samo slovo na papiru, a o tim odredbama najčešće javno govori tek Ured pravobranitelja za djecu RH. Naime, unatoč pravnim ograničenjima, takvi su oglasi naša svakodnevnica.

Oni nalaze svoje mjesto u medijima jer su upravo masovni mediji uspješno utemeljili vlastitu zakonitost uvjeta rada i boravka na tržištu. Ta je aktivnost medija sve manje dostupna učinkovitoj društvenoj kritici te potom vidljivim rezultatima takve kritike, a odlikuje je potpuna neosjetljivost na društvene posljedice objavljenih sadržaja. Mediji su se planski zatvorili u egoistični svijet trgovačke norme koja poznaje i prepoznaje jedino jezik novca i moći. Ta će *egoistična zatvorenost* trajati toliko dugo koliko društvene strukture kojima je zadaća nadzirati

medije to budu tolerirale. Ne radi se ovdje ni o kakvim ograničavanjima sloboda medija; upravo suprotno. Nužna je normativna i etička dimenzija medija koja je odgovor na izazove novoga doba kako bi se poticali i štitili interesi od općeg i javnog dobra.

Istinski etički obzor i smisao medija bio bi onaj koji ne preskače čovjeka i njegove potrebe. Ovdje se zasigurno ne može ništa šire izreći bez spominjanja *istine* koja je sastavni dio korektnoga medijskog djelovanja. Mediji koji od stvarnosti nude maglicu, a umjesto istinskih potreba propagiraju kupnju stvari koje nikome ne koriste, osim njihovim proizvođačima, udaljavaju se miljama od bitne ideje medija.

Činjenica je da čovjek današnjice sebe više ne promatra u sklopu stalnih vrednota ili na pozadini stvarnosti koja je veća od njega. Ne proživljavamo samo, kako podsjeća etičar I. Koprek, krizu metafizike – proživljavamo krizu vrednota i dobra.⁴ Krajem modernoga industrijskog doba, nadolazeća epoha nove informacijske i komunikacijske kulture i civilnoga društva postavlja nova pitanja i traži nove etičke odgovore.

Unutar demokratske opcije ili u okvirima civilnoga društva danas se ipak živo raspravlja o biti i značenju medija za čovjeka. No želimo li dohvatiti bit i značenje medija, onda trebamo doseći čovjeka u fenomenu njegove želje za spoznajom. Nema informacije bez medijskog nositelja. Međutim, ne postoji nijedan medij bez informacijskog značaja. Tek informacija čini medij medijem. Pitanje o ophođenju s medijima izražaj je ljudske kulture i zadaća etike.⁵

Koje predstavlja vrijednosti i slike o čovjeku u građanskom društvu implicira proces informatiziranja i što on mijenja? Koje se vrijednosti i slike o čovjeku u medijima multipliciraju? Kako se na svim područjima možemo s tim vrijednostima kompetentno i kritički suočiti?

Teoretičari znanosti u kontekstu društvenih struktura medij nazivaju novcem. Tehničari povezuju pojam *medij* s materijalnim funkcijama između pošiljatelja i primatelja. Filozofija naziva posredovnu instancu između jezika i svijesti *medij*. Riječ ‘medij’ je supstantivirajući izvod neutruma latinskoga pridjeva *medius*, tj. biti u središtu, posredan, ono što je između. Latinska imenica *medium* označava središte, središnju točku, centar. Već je iz govorne upotrebe starih Rimljana jasno da *medium* zapravo označava posredovni put i u prenesenome značenju ‘javnu ulicu’, publiku, javnost, odnosno ono što je svima poznato i pristupačno.

Etika medija kao znanstvena disciplina kritički reflektira življeni moral medija tražeći spoznaje i vrednovanja koji omogućavaju odgovorno djelovanje. Moguće djelovanje se ispituje s obzirom na svoje posljedice i izražava se u okvirima individualne i kolektivne odgovornosti.

K. Wiegerling iz različitih tipova upotrebe riječi ‘medij’ izolira poveznik koji objašnjava značenje etike medija.⁶ Oslanjajući se na Wiegerlingova zapažanja, navodim kriterije pojma ‘medij’:

1. Medij se ne može raspasti u neki idealan i u neki materijalan sastojak. Nema medija bez materijalnosti, isto tako nema medija bez formirajuće, idealne komponente. Medij je kao materijal tehničko ostvarenje i istodobno sastavnik posredne konstrukcije smisla.
2. Medij transcendirira prostornu i vremensku materijalnost. Bez medijalnog transcendiranja nije moguće diakrono i sinkrono posredovanje smisla. Medij oslobađa od neposredne fizičke iskustvene datosti i posredno nadopunjava prostor, odnosno vrijeme uvida kojim se medij služi.
3. Medij stvara javnost mjesta i vremena koje nije moguće nadomjestiti nekim medijalnim prijenosnikom bez medija. Nova proširena javnost znači i proširen prostor i vrijeme skupljene orijentacije.
4. Medij posreduje novu, dodatnu neposrednost onoga, inače na drugi način ograničenoga neposrednoga. Nenazočno nije po sebi posredovano, nego je integrirano u određeni kontekst i tako posredovano.
5. Medij je instanca posredovanja u kojoj se konstituira kvalificirani način prikazivanja nečega što istodobno predstavlja i posredovano distanciranje od posredovanog. Tako se medij uvlači između posredovane stvari i primatelja posredovanoga, tj. medij prezentira i distancira. Medij dakle stvara novu kvalitetu brzine između posredovanog sadržaja i primatelja posredovanja. Ta je blizina umjetna jer strategijski nadilazi naravne granice prostora i vremena. Osim toga ona je i ‘vektORIZIRANA’. Ne približava se primatelj medijalne informacije neposrednom događaju, nego se događaj stavlja u blizinu primatelja. Tako nastaje prisutnost nečega nenazočnog (događaja) pred nečim nazočnim (primateljem).
6. Medij raspolaže nazočnim kao informacijom.

Wiegerling govori o ‘konzervirajućoj preparaciji’ medija. Ako medij preparira scenarij smisla (jer ono posredovano postavlja u scenu što primatelj može shvatiti), onda medij stvara značenje jer postavlja posredovani odnos stvari u principijelno shvaćeni kontekst.

Opisano shvaćanje medija mijenja i ograničava upotrebu riječi ‘medij’. Budući da razvoj i postavljanje medija nikada ne vrijedi kao dovršen pojam medija, treba ga uvijek iznova kontrolirati u ovisnosti kulturnih datosti. Kako se medij sam nikada ne predstavlja kao apstraktan, kao neutralna danost (nego nastaje u definiranom kulturalnom kontekstu i kompleksu značenja pojma medija), treba ispitivati njegovu kulturalnu uvjetovanost. Tako

razvojni potencijal nekog medija postaje objekt ne samo tehničke nego i etičke refleksije. Drugim riječima, pitanje etike usmjereno je na kvalitetu ljudskog djelovanja i na stvarnost koju kao »zadanu« treba djelovanjem ostvariti. Budući da mediji predstavljaju izazov za određenje stvarnosti, svaka refleksija o medijima dovodi i do etičkih izričaja. Moderno medijalno informacijsko društvo tvori nove razine stvarnosti i otvara nove pristupe do razina stvarnosti koje prije nisu utjecale na prostor čovjekova djelovanja, individualnoga i kolektivnoga. Principijelno, ali i situativno područje insceniranja, od blizine do distance, od igre i ozbiljnosti, činjenica i tumačenja slike i isječaka slika u medijalnom kontekstu informacija, dovode do teško kontroliranog premještanja i prožimanja najrazličitijih razina stvarnosti. Kakvu strukturu stvarnosti posreduju mediji, s kakvom je povezanošću ona spojena? Etička relevancija ove strukture (ona nije ništa drugo nego prenošena tvrdnja: takva je, eto, stvarnost!) ovisi o šansi da se verificira (ili falsificira) ta struktura. Kada se razine stvarnosti više ne mogu razlikovati, tj. kada više ne mogu posredovati različiti kriteriji koji omogućuju razlikovanje, onda svako odgovorno djelovanje ne gubi samo svoj okvir orijentacije: onda više nije moguće ni razlikovanje između stvarnosti kakva ona uistinu jest i kakva bi trebala biti. Čudoredno djelovanje postaje nemoguće, postaje potpuno svejedno, degradirano do igre. Sukladno tome, i takozvana stvarnost postaje puka iluzija. Etički relevantni prostor djelovanja postaje igralište samovoljne manipulacije. Etičko se djelovanje gubi u maglovite rekonstrukcije i dekonstrukcije. Ono se zapravo zamjenjuje neodgovornim konstruktima stvarnosti.

Budući da se čovjek u svijetu određuje djelovanjem, i sam medij pripada samoodređenju čovjeka. Ta antropološka činjenica kvalificira čovjeka kao odgovornoga inicijatora i kvalifikatora svojega svijeta, pokazuje ga kao kulturni subjekt u kontekstu svijeta. Prostorno vremenske objektivacije kulturnog samoodređenja čovjeka duhovne su materijalije impregnirane znanjem i voljom. One nose obilježja medijalnih zadaća. Kulturna je povijest identična povijesti medija jer subjekt povijesti u etičkome samoodređenju može medijalno oblikovati svoj svijet kao uključni pojam kultivirane stvarnosti. Mediji su stoga već na početku povijesti bili u službi kulture, ako su izričaj etičkoga samoodređenja. Crteži na stijenama pećine jamačno su informativni medij samoshvaćanja čovjeka kulture kamenoga doba, kao što su gotске katedrale medijske oznake srednjega vijeka u smislu samoshvaćanja kršćana ili kao što je primjerice zabavni program neke televizijske kuće samoshvaćanje civilizacije slobodnoga vremena. Posredovni sadržaj izričitog samoodređenja čovjeka i njegovo vlastito odgovorno kultiviranje ne obuhvaća samo konkretne, posredovane informacije, nego i sam posredovani medij.

Otkriće novih sustava znakova i oblika komunikacija dovodi do novih promjena monopola moći i informacija te time provocira efekte kultiviranja. Mediji utječu na razvoj identiteta djece i mladeži. Informacije moraju imati socijalnu konstrukciju smisla. Novi mediji (poput interneta) mogu kao i gen-tehnologija promijeniti socijalni svijet.

Medijsko-etička rasprava danas se manje odnosi na principijelno medijalnu kulturu čovjeka, a više na ophođenje sa suvremenim medijima. Aktualnost toga pitanja ne može se poreći.

Svakodnevna se novinarska praksa predstavlja kao stvarnost označena normativnošću, a koja je prvotno skup vrednovanja prožet mnogobrojnim uzrocima djelovanja, pisanim i nepisanim zapovijedima i zabranama, prokušanim pravilima profesije i oblicima ophođenja. Etika medija bi se prema tome trebala pokazati kao djelovanje koje određuje razbor i odgovornost. Novinar rijetko eksplicitno razmišlja o svojim uzrocima radnji.

Oni su mu kao življeni moral jednostavno prešli u krv. Riječ je, dakle, o moralu koji ne prati uvid u njegove uzroke i ciljeve, koji se legitimira onime što jest. Očito je da etika živi iz paradoksa prema kojemu se ono po sebi razumljivo više ne razumije samo po sebi.

Filozofska rasprava o medijima, koja domišlja nove načine i svrhe koje moderni masovni mediji pokazuju, pretpostavlja da se iz perspektive društvenoga razbora očekuje, sukladno dobrome cilju, informacija ili drugi sadržaj koji će prije svega težiti istini ili dobrome ljudskome djelovanju. Koliko su različiti sadržaji masovnih medija koji oblikuju naraštaje mladih doista na tome putu, pitanje je koje će još dugo i snažno intrigirati sve strane u medijskoj stvarnosti: one kojima se mediji obraćaju, znanstvenike koje ta tema provocira te same medijske poslenike koji će, kako stvari stoje, nastojati održavati medije sredstvom koje će nerijetko poslužiti za upravljanje potrebama mladih.

Jasna Burić

Croatian Radiotelevision, Prisavlje 3, HR – 10000 Zagreb
jasna.buric@hrt.hr

**Children and Youth as Consumers of Mass Media
Ethics and Market Manipulation of the Needs of the Youth**

Abstract

The mass media market is largely focused on children and young people. Facilities that are offered to young people in the mass media go beyond, in a negative sense, educational and incentive school examples of educational programs or magazines for children. Media space is dominated by content insulting the dignity of young people, manipulating their needs, and encouraging them to make choices deprived of any value, where everything is relative and nothing is certain. Author questions the trends in modern media deprived of any responsibility, obligations and sanctions. She tries to define the characteristics of 21st-century media in which a human as a consumer is a prisoner of media power and influence, and seeks for true ethical consideration and sense in the media that will not neglect humans and their needs.

Keywords

media, mass media, children, youth, consumerism, ethics

The space that is filled by the content of the mass media of today is largely focused on children and young people. While the preoccupation of media and media employees was originally aimed at democratizing the space of public expression, the fundamental question today is how to protect the mass media space of public expression effectively and above all voluntarily from their creators and limit it to the frameworks set by ethics and the general public interest. Mass media theorists have noticed that the media have long since abandoned their primary purpose: to monitor, record and inform about relevant social events. The media have stepped into the space of an essential factor that creates social processes, needs and trends. Only a few media, those classic ones like the book, have retained their original purpose. Mass electronic media are leading a strong market competition in which they want to be the dominant creator of social

events, and not just a transmitter of events and social movements. This new task of the media is particularly strongly expressed in creating content for children and young people. It will be easy for the ordinary observer to notice that, for example, once educational and stimulating examples of school-educational television, radio or the content of children's magazines have now been replaced by the prevailing content of *cyber*-world created for children and youth. In their information space, the mass media have deftly blended in electronic games, advertisements that encourage children to choose unhealthy foods, buy specific items, toys, clothing or footwear, with direct requiring from advertisers and media who publish: that children *must* collect all default stickers or toys by purchasing a specific product. Imperative media advertising requirements that encourage kids ("Collect them all!" or "You must have them!"), and it refers to *dictating purchase* of specific stickers or toys, to *requiring* and *possessing* certain things, have become so aggressive and dominant in the media market that the success of educational content and upbringing that should ensure the critical attitude of children towards the media and the media market competition is often questioned.

The mass media are giving new and complicated tasks to media theorists: The media space is full of *infotainment*, *teletabloids*, *info ads*, *porn ads*. In practice, their numbers are multiplying day by day, while in theoretical terms their place remains undefined and insufficiently described that they could be exposed to effective public discussions, professional and scientific considerations. The status of these media forms becomes unclear and the journalistic reality is actually facing new challenges, recalls Dahlgren. Thus, the boundaries between serious and popular content in the media are being gradually erased, while the content for the purpose of worthless buying or selling products and services that are, self-evidently, particularly problematic when targeting children and young people is increasing.

According to Poler Kovačić the crisis of journalistic identity is manifested in the unrecognizability of journalistic discourse due to the mixing of journalism (activity for the common good which has the primary function of informing citizens) with the so-called *neo journalism* (an activity that serves to gain profit, power and authority). It is this deletion of the boundaries between journalism and *neo journalism*, as Poler Kovačić sees it, that points to the crisis of journalistic ethics.

The market that dictates the pace of the media and the media employees themselves are in a vicious circle of interaction. Together they produce an effect that has a devastating result on the overall social space: Market trends are prevailing, everything is a merchandise and everything can be marketed, money shows its power and strength over all human needs. The

utmost need becomes merchandise, object, demand-purchase. There is not much thought about values or good cause. The media are becoming a powerful instrument, dangerously experimenting and instrumentalising with the needs and ideas of young people.

The reality that emerges around us allows the question: Who has the right to encourage young people to buy, demand or spend their leisure with the suspicious *060 phone ads* available in all daily prints? Who is socially responsible for this publication: the advertiser, the media owner, the inert and disinterested lawmaker, the educator, or perhaps the parent who failed to *successfully hide* the daily newspaper from the child?

Market-oriented media feed their own egoism that underpins their ultimate interest: making good profits. Hardt notes that the media rarely achieve the desired balance between responsible journalism and profit-making business. In the media space, a careful analyst cannot miss content that insults the dignity of young people, manipulates their needs, and encourages them to make choices that are deprived of any value, where everything is relative and nothing is certain.

The trend of journalism and people who create media deprived of any responsibility, obligations and sanctions is becoming a dominant feature of modern-day media. In the social context, tacit consensus has emerged between creators of media and media norms as well as civic institutions that should question the responsibility and freedom of the media. Their joint action, which is characterized by a high level of consensus in the production of a new market form of determining the media on the path to the youngest consumers, makes possible the existence of such socially and ethically unacceptable media. Human as a consumer becomes *a prisoner of media power and influence*, which would not have been possible without the support and involvement of other factors which have a social task to create acceptable frameworks for media to work in. Despite the inflation of legal regulations, media legislation is shorter for some mandatory regulation that would prohibit daily prints in our country from publishing porn ads on pages of daily newspapers, which are also accessible to young people, although such content is regulated as content that should not be accessible to children and young people. The current UN Convention on the Rights of the Child for many media is only a letter on paper, and most often only the Office of the Ombudsman for Children of the Republic of Croatia speaks publicly about these provisions. Namely, despite legal restrictions, such advertisements are a part of our everyday life.

Advertisements find their place in the media because it is precisely the mass media that have successfully established their own legality of working conditions and residing in the market.

Such media activity is less and less open to effective social criticism and afterwards the visible results of such criticism, and it is characterized by complete insensitivity to social consequences of published content. The media have deliberately closed themselves into the egoistic world of a trading norm that knows and recognizes only the language of money and power. This *egoistic closure* will last as long as social structures that are tasked with supervising the media tolerate it. This is not about any restrictions on media freedom; exactly the opposite. The normative and ethical dimension of media that responds to the challenges of modern times is necessary in order to promote and protect interests of the common and public good.

A true ethical principle and meaning of the media would be the one that does not neglect humans and their needs. Certainly nothing broader can be said here without mentioning *truth* which is an integral part of proper media activity. Media that instead of reality offer smoke and mirrors, and instead of genuine necessities propagate the purchase of things that are not useful to anyone other than their manufacturers, are miles away from the essential idea of the media. The fact is that today humans no longer observe themselves within permanent values or in the background of reality greater than them. We are not just experiencing, as the ethicist I. Koprek reminds, the crisis of metaphysics - we are experiencing the crisis of values and good. At the end of the modern industrial age, the rising epoch of new information and communication culture and civil society raises new questions and seeks new ethical answers.

Within the democratic orientation or within the framework of civil society, however, the essence and meaning of the media for humans is being vigorously debated today. But if we want to grasp the essence and meaning of the media, then we need to reach the person in the phenomenon of his/her desire for cognition. There is no information without a medial carrier. However, there is no media without information significance. Only information makes a media the actual media. The issue of media management is an expression of human culture and the task of ethics.

What representations of values and images of a person in civil society are implied by the process of informatization and what does it change? What values and images of human are multiplying in the media? How can we competently and critically confront these values in all areas?

In the context of social structures, science theorists call money a medium. Technicians associate the term *medium* with material functions between the sender and the recipient. Philosophy calls the mediating instance between language and consciousness a *medium*. The

word *medium* is a substantiating derivation of neutrum of the Latin adjective *medius*, that is, to be in the centre, to mediate, to refer to what is between. Latin noun *medium* indicates nucleus, central point, centre. It is already clear from the spoken usage between the ancient Romans that *medium* in fact signifies a mediate path, in the figurative sense, 'public street', audience, public, that is, what is known and accessible to all.

Media ethics as a scientific discipline critically reflects the existing morale of the media by seeking insights and evaluations that enable responsible action. Possible action is examined with regard to its consequences and is expressed in terms of individual and collective responsibility.

K. Wiegerling isolates from the various uses of the word 'media' a linker that explains the meaning of media ethics. Drawing on Wiegerling's observations, I list the criteria for the term 'media':

1. The media cannot be disintegrated into an ideal and a material ingredient. There is no media without materiality, no media without formative, ideal component. As a material, the media is a technical realization and at the same time a component of the indirect construction of meaning.
2. The media transcends spatial and temporal materiality. Without medial transcendence, diachronic and synchronous mediation of meaning is not possible. The media frees from the immediate physical experiential fact and indirectly complements the space, that is, the time of insight used by the medium.
3. The media publicizes places and times that cannot be replaced by some medial transmitter without media. The new extension of publicity also means extended space and time of the gathered orientation.
4. The media mediates a new, additional immediacy of that which is otherwise limited and immediate in a different way. The absent is not mediated per se, but integrated into a specific context and thus mediated.
5. A media is an instance of mediation in which a qualified way of showing something that simultaneously represents a mediated distancing from the mediated is constituted. Thus, the medium gets between the mediated content and the recipient of the mediated, i.e., the media presents and distances. The media therefore creates a new quality of velocity between the mediated content and the recipient of the mediation. This proximity is artificial because it strategically goes beyond the natural boundaries of space and time. Besides, it is also 'vectorized'. The recipient of the medial information is not approaching the immediate event,

but the event is placed close to the recipient. This is how the presence of something absent (event) in front of something present (recipient) is created.

6. The media disposes of things present as information.

Wiegerling talks about the 'conserving preparation' of media. If the media gives a scenario that makes sense (because it places the mediated in a scene that the recipient can understand), then the media creates meaning because it places the mediated relationship of things in principally understood context.

The described understanding of media changes and limits the use of the word 'media'. Since the development and establishment of media is never considered as a complete process, the concept of media should always be controlled repeatedly depending on cultural circumstances. As the media itself is never presented as abstract, as a neutral existence (but arises in a defined cultural context and a complex of meanings of the term media), its cultural conditionality must be examined. Thus, the development potential of a media becomes the object of not only technical but also ethical reflection. In other words, the issue of ethics is focused on the quality of human action and on the reality that is already *given*, but it can be achieved only through action. As the media pose a challenge of determining reality, any reflection on the media also leads to ethical expressions. Modern medial information society is creating new levels of reality and opening up new approaches to levels of reality that have not previously affected the space of human activity, individual and collective. Original, but also situational area of events, whether near or distant, playful or serious, facts and interpretations of the image and clips of images in the medial context of the information. These are all things that lead to the arduously controlled movement and permeation of the various levels of reality. What structure of reality is mediated by the media, what kind of connection is that? The ethical relevancy of this structure (it is nothing more than a transmitted claim: Such is reality!) depends on the chance to verify (or falsify) that structure. When levels of reality can no longer be distinguished, that is, when different criteria that allow differentiation can no longer be mediated, then every responsible action not only loses its orientation frame; it is no longer possible to differentiate between reality as it truly is and what it should be. Moral action becomes impossible, it becomes completely unimportant, degraded to the game. According to this, even the so-called reality becomes a mere illusion. An ethically relevant space of action becomes a playground of arbitrary manipulation. Ethical action is lost in hazy reconstructions and deconstructions. It is actually replaced by the irresponsible constructs of reality.

Since human is determined by action, the media itself belongs to the self-determination of human. This anthropological fact qualifies human as the responsible initiator and qualifier of his world, demonstrating him as a cultural subject in the context of the world. Spatio-temporal objectifications of the cultural self-determination of man are spiritual materials impregnated with knowledge and will. They bear the characteristics of medial tasks. Cultural history is identical to media history because the subject of history in ethical self-determination can medially shape its world as an inclusive notion of cultivated reality. The media were therefore, at the beginning of history at the service of culture, if they were an expression of ethical self-determination. Drawings on cave walls are certainly an informative media of self-understanding of a human of the Stone Age culture, such as Gothic cathedrals being the media label of the Middle Ages in the sense of self-awareness of Christians, or such as, for example, an entertainment program of a broadcaster, self-understanding of the civilization of leisure. The mediated content of the explicit self-determination of human and his own responsible cultivation includes not only concrete, mediated information, but also the mediated media itself.

The discovery of new systems of signs and forms of communication leads to new changes in the monopoly of power and information, thus provoking the effects of cultivation. The media influence the development of the identity of children and youth. Information must make a social construction of sense. New media (such as the internet) can, like gene technology, change the social world.

Media-ethical debate today is less about the principally medial culture of man, and more about dealing with contemporary media. The topicality of the issue cannot be denied.

Everyday journalistic practice is presented as a reality marked by normativity, which is initially a set of evaluations imbued with numerous causes of action, written and unwritten orders and prohibitions, well-tried rules of the profession and forms of demeanour. Media ethics should therefore prove to be an act that determines discernment and responsibility. A journalist rarely explicitly reflects upon the causes of his/her actions.

These actions have, just like morality, simply become a habit. It is, therefore, a matter of morality which does not follow the insight into its causes and goals, but it is legitimized in its own right. It is obvious that ethics live out of a paradox according to which the thing that is self-explanatory can no longer be explained by itself.

The philosophical discussion on the media, which creates new ways and purposes that the modern mass media show, assumes that, from the perspective of social discernment,

information or other content that is primarily aimed at truth or righteous human action is expected in order to achieve a greater good. How different is the mass media content that shapes the generations of young people along the way is a question that will continue to intrigue all sides in the media reality for a long time; those addressed by the media, scholars evoked by this topic, and the very media employees who will, the way things are, strive to maintain the media with a mean that will often serve to manipulate the needs of young people.

2.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS

The genre of this text is scientific, more specifically, it is written from a sociological perspective. Source of the text is *Hrčak* website, where many Croatian scientific and professional papers have been published. This text is semi-formal and is intended for general audience, people who want to get informed and know more about the media and their role in today's world, as well as scientists dealing with similar topics.

The purpose of this text is to draw attention to the mass media and their impact on children and young people. Especially in this modern age when media play a major role in our everyday life. This text also talks about the morality, or rather, immorality of the media, who often look only at their own benefit and profit and therefore have lost their value and their true meaning. This paper raises awareness of the true nature of media.

Given that the paper was published on *Hrčak*, a portal of Croatian scientific and professional journals, this text may be considered authentic. The style of the text is informative and clear, but in some parts writing gets quite difficult and expert. The text is divided into summary, key words, 22 separate paragraphs and 6 points where the author explains criteria for the term “media”. The length is normal for this genre and theme.

The text discusses in detail the manipulation of children and young people, responsibility, morality and the true meaning of the media. In the final part, the author emphasizes the important role of the media in shaping young generations.

The text has a high lexical density and it is not easy to understand all the parts as there are a few relatively long sentences containing complicated words. Lexical cohesion is created by repetition of the key words as *media*, *young people*, *ethics*, *content* and *medial*.

There are some specific words in the text that are fairly easy to translate because they have an equivalent word in English e.g. ‘infozabava’ as ‘infotainment’ or ‘javna riječ’ as ‘public expression’, but on the other hand there are also words and phrases which cannot be literally translated in English or they have two possible translations, such as ‘medijski prostor’ which can be translated either as ‘media area’ or ‘media space’ and ‘društvena kretanja’ which can be translated as ‘social movements’ or ‘social developments’.

This text contains phrases that have a same meaning in Croatian and English, but they sound different, for example: “mediji koji od stvarnosti nude maglicu” which means that media do not show things as they really are, but instead they offer just a small part of the truth, can be

translated as “media that instead of reality offer smoke and mirrors” which is a phrase for obscuring or embellishing of the truth of a situation with misleading or irrelevant information. Same situation with “prešli u krv”, a phrase for which there is no equivalent in English because “cross into blood” doesn’t have the same meaning and therefore a possible translation can be “become a habit”.

A thing I had to keep in mind is that very often plural words in Croatian have to be translated as singular in English and that’s why words as ‘content’ (‘sadržaji’) and ‘freedom’ (‘slobode’) can sometimes be tricky. Also, the word information is uncountable so I could never write ‘informations’ or ‘an information’; therefore, I translated ‘informacije’ as ‘information’ because it is a singular which functions as plural.

Occasionally I had to change a word or two while translating to give a fuller meaning to the translation. For example, if we translate “potkrepljuje njihov krajnji interes: dobru zaradu” in “underpins their ultimate interest: making good profits” or “potreba svih potreba” in “the utmost need” or “kojima je zadaća nadzirati” in “that are tasked with supervising”. The similar thing happens while translating “korektno medijsko djelovanje” because the word ‘korektno’, although it sounds similar as ‘correct’ in English, it doesn’t have the same meaning in this context so the verb has to be changed and it can be translated as “proper media activity”.

When it comes to punctuation, it is necessary to be careful whether to put a capitalized first letter after a colon or not. In some cases, a capital letter is not required because the colon only introduces a list or an incomplete sentence or a phrase e.g.: “their ultimate interest: making good profits” or “their primary purpose: to monitor, record and inform about relevant social events”. In other cases, when colon introduces a complete sentence, I have to capitalize the first letter e.g.: “The mass media are giving new and complicated tasks to media theorists: The media space is full of *infotainment, teletabloids, info ads, porn ads.*”

Lastly, while translating this text I realized the importance of using gender neutral words. In Croatian sentence “...i sam medij pripada samoodređenju čovjeka.” the word ‘čovjek’ can refer both to female and male, the same way the word ‘persona’ in Italian language implies female and male. In other hand, when translating ‘čovjek’ into English I often encounter the word ‘man’, and although it may sound correct at first, it is not gender neutral and it does not apply to both female and male. Accordingly, I used ‘human’ instead of ‘man’ and wrote: “...the media itself belongs to the self-determination of human.”

3. SOURCE TEXT II

Ivan Đikić u velikom intervjuu za Telegram: Zašto danas možemo biti puno mirniji oko koronavirusa

Jedan od najvećih znanstvenih autoriteta detaljno govori o temi koja je okupirala zemlju

Autorica: Dora Kršul

Jučer, u utorak 25. veljače tijekom ranog poslijepodneva, nakon što je potvrđen prvi slučaj zaraze koronavirusom Covid-19 u Hrvatskoj, Telegram je opširnije porazgovarao s **Ivanom Đikićem**, našim priznatim znanstvenikom, molekularnim biologom i profesorom biokemije na Goethe sveučilištu u Frankfurtu. Đikić, koji je svoju karijeru posvetio pronalasku spoznaja koje mogu pomoći u dijagnozi i liječenju mnogih bolesti, primarno tumora, neurodegenerativnih bolesti i upalnih procesa, svakako je relevantan sugovornik o najnovijem virusu koji se munjevito proširio svijetom.

Kao jedan od najvećih znanstvenih autoriteta u Hrvatskoj, Đikić je još jučer uputio javnosti poruku da nema razloga za paniku oko novog koronavirusa. U polusatnom razgovoru koji smo s njime vodili Skypeom, a za koji je pronašao vremena u pauzi znanstvenog skupa u Bilbau, također je stavio naglasak na smirivanje panike i apel građanima da slušaju znanost i struku.

TELEGRAM: Zabilježen je prvi slučaj koronavirusa u Hrvatskoj, što dalje možemo očekivati?

ĐIKIĆ: Sada su ključni angažman i djelotvornost zdravstvenog sustava da ljudi koji su inficirani i kojima je potvrđen virus budu izolirani. Treba vidjeti i provjeriti njihove kontakte u zadnjih tjedan dana tako da se i kod njih potvrdi ili opovrgne zaraza i eliminira daljnje širenje virusa. Naravno, oni koji nisu pozitivni na koronavirus mogu ići raditi, djeca mogu ići u školu; nema potrebe izolirati djecu ako su svi negativni i stigmatizirati ljude koji su inficirani. Sve što se događalo u Kini i Italiji pokazuje da je paničarenje nepotrebno. Virus se može izolirati i o njemu možemo saznati zaista mnogo. Na kraju krajeva, na temelju onoga što dosad o njemu znamo, sada smo puno mirniji jer znamo da nije toliko smrtonosan kako se predviđalo.

TELEGRAM: Što će se dogodati s brojem oboljelih?

ĐIKIĆ: Naravno da će rasti. Hrvatska mora biti svjesna da je virus već neko vrijeme u Hrvatskoj, samo nismo bili svjesni do današnjeg dana jer nitko nije pozitivno testiran ili zaraženi jednostavno nisu došli na testiranje. Velik broj ljudi zaraženih koronavirusom nema nikakve ili ima vrlo blage simptome i te osobe se ne prijavljuju niti se dolaze testirati. Zato se taj virus zapravo i širi van našeg radara. Primjerice, u Italiji se proširio baš zato što ljudi nisu znali odakle je i kako virus došao, mnogi su bili bez simptoma i onda se odjednom proširio na velik broj ljudi. Tek kada je došao do starijih osoba, pojavili su se ozbiljniji simptomi i nažalost smrtni slučajevi. Međutim, širenje virusa trajalo je već sigurno nekoliko tjedana.

TELEGRAM: Spomenuli ste Italiju. Zašto se primjerice u Italiji dogodila takva eksplozija slučajeva zaraze virusom, dok ju neke druge zemlje poput Njemačke drže u određenim granicama?

ĐIKIĆ: Ne treba generalizirati i govoriti o Italiji i drugim zemljama, već treba govoriti o pozitivnom pristupu zemalja u takvim slučajevima. Pozitivan je pristup zemalja kada kažu – čim primijetite neki od simptoma, napraviti ćemo testiranje pouzdanim i brzim testovima i utvrditi postoji li koronavirus. Nakon toga, on se epidemiološki može vrlo brzo izolirati. S druge strane, ako nemate zdravstveni sustav koji je spreman reagirati brzo, onda se događa da se virus širi, a nitko to još ne razumije i ne zna što se događa.

Nitko ne zna ništa o izvoru, nitko ne zna kako spriječiti širenje i onda se događaju ove scene blokada cijelih gradova. Na primjer, kada je u Münchenu došlo do prvog slučaja, odmah je izolirana grupa od 14 ljudi koju je inficirala osoba nedavno pristigla iz Kine. Nakon izolacije zaražene grupe, virus se u Münchenu i Bavarskoj dalje nije širio. U Njemačkoj imate još dva bolnička slučaja, i to u Frankfurtu pored mog instituta. Ti su slučajevi bili asimptomatski, ali su imali virus. Stavljani su u karantenu, nakon par tjedana oni više nisu bili infektivni i nisu uzrokovali takozvanu lančanu reakciju širenja bez znanja.

TELEGRAM: Sve se, dakle, svodi na pripremljenost zdravstvenog sustava i njegovu pravodobnu reakciju.

ĐIKIĆ: Tako je. Stručnost zdravstvenog sustava, epidemioloških službi i rane dijagnoze su ključni.

TELEGRAM: Što se događa kada osoba preboli koronavirus?

DIKIĆ: Kada osoba preboli koronavirus, ona je stvorila određeni imunološki sustav, imunološki odgovor na taj virus i ta je osoba zaštićena od novih reinfekcija. Problem je što se svake godine stvara nova vrsta virusa gripe, a i virusa korone, tako da to ne garantira da će sljedeće godine osobe koje su ih sad preboljele biti imune. Ali znamo, prema iskustvu, da su one otpornije jer se imunološki sustav stvara na nekoliko dijelova virusa i kao takvi, neki virusni dijelovi su zajednički ovoj i sljedećoj godini. Zato primjerice imamo cijepljenje protiv gripe prilikom kojega koristimo antigene nekoliko generacija virusa zajedno jer se smatra da će se pojedini od tih antigena pojaviti u sljedećoj generaciji.

TELEGRAM: Postoji li mogućnost da je osoba koja je preboljela koronavirus, koja je zdrava, i dalje zarazna?

DIKIĆ: Teško je reći eksplicitno *da* ili eksplicitno *ne*, jer u manjem broju slučajeva ljudi koji prebole virus još uvijek mogu biti – napominjem, u vrlo malom broju slučajeva – nositelji i širiti dalje virus tijekom vrlo kratkoga vremena, ali ne dugo nakon što su uklonjeni svi simptomi. No teško je reći da se to događa u tolikom broju slučajeva da takvi ljudi, koji su preboljeli zarazu, moraju biti izolirani dodatnih tjedan dana nakon što su simptomi uklonjeni. Dva dana nakon što su simptomi uklonjeni, ljudi se više ne smatraju izvorom zaraze.

TELEGRAM: Mnogo se priča i uspoređuje koronavirus Covid-19 sa SARS-om iz 2003. Koja je razlika između ova dva virusa što se tiče samih karakteristika virusa, vremena inkubacije, mortaliteta...?

DIKIĆ: To je dosta važno pitanje jer temeljem toga ljudi mogu shvatiti glavnu razliku onoga što smo imali 2003. sa SARS-om ili 2012. s MERS-om. SARS je bilježio smrtnost od 8 do 10 posto ili čak 20 posto, kada govorimo o MERS-u. Oni su izolirani na sličan način, iz deva na Bliskom istoku ili u Kini odakle je opet virus došao od životinja. Oni su se puno slabije širili, a bili su smrtonosniji. Smrtonosnost je bila objašnjena slučajem da su ti virusi vrlo brzo i u velikom broju ulazili u ljudske stanice. Dakle, nije samo bitno da čovjek ima virus nego je relevantno i u kojoj se količini virus ubacuje u ljudske stanice. Postoji protein, on izgleda kao injekcija, i koji se nalazi na površini virusa; taj protein je važan za kontakt s ljudskom stanicom, na čijoj pak površini postoje proteini koji omogućavaju virusu da uđe. Jedan od tih proteina je proteaza; proteazu se proučavalo i vidjelo se da količina proteaze koja se nalazi na ljudskim stanicama određuje koliko će puno virusa ući i koliko će biti težak odgovor kod ljudi.

Primijećeno je tada da kod Europljana, Amerikanaca i Afrikanaca proteaza na ljudskim stanicama ima manje, za razliku od populacije u Aziji gdje je bilo više proteaza na stanicama. I tu leži jedan od odgovora zašto su vrlo često ljudi iz Azije imali težu sliku i jače su reagirali na virus od ljudi iz Europe. To nije jedini, no to je jedan od markera za koje znamo.

Što se tiče koronavirusa 19, on je različit od SARS-a po nekoliko stvari. Prvo, nije toliko smrtonosan. Kada ulazi u stanice, ubija većinom ljude koji su stariji od 60, 70 godina, ljude koji su bolesni ili ljude koji su superinficirani. Superinfekcija se najčešće događa u bolnicama, kod ljudi koji su u kontaktu s nekoliko podvrsta virusa. U tom se slučaju može raditi i o mladim osobama i tu može doći do smrtne posljedice. To se nažalost dogodilo s nekoliko liječnika u bolnicama u Kini. Druga je stvar kod koronavirusa da on ima vrlo blage simptome kod velikog broja ljudi i zato se tako brzo proširio.

Također, treba reći javnosti da se u Kini koronavirus nije inicijalno počeo širiti na tržnici u Wuhanu. To je počelo najmanje mjesec ili dva prije nego što se virus probio na tržnicu u Wuhanu. Dakle, izvor virusa nije bio na toj tržnici, no svakako jest bio u kineskoj pokrajini Hubei odakle su ga zaraženi ljudi širili, imali simptome. Zaraženi su ga donijeli na tržnicu i na tržnici je potom eksplodirao tako da ga je zdravstveni sustav počeo vidati u velikom broju. Tada su krenule izolacije ljudi koji su bili na tržnici i tada kreću tvrdnje da virus dolazi s tržnice. No to sigurno nije točno; kineski znanstvenici su napravili sekvencioniranje i otkrili su nekoliko drugih mjesta u toj pokrajini za koja tvrde da su primarna legla virusa.

TELEGRAM: Koliko su pouzdani testovi koji se rade na koronavirus?

ĐIKIĆ: Sami testovi, a radi se o polimeraznoj lančanoj reakciji, jako su senzitivni i jako sigurni. Ako su pozitivni, oni mogu potvrditi da je stvarno došlo do kontakta ili ulaska virusa u tijelo osobe koja je pozitivna. Testovi su vjerodostojni, međutim može se dogoditi da je uzorak osobe koja je testirana uzet u fazi kada se još uvijek virus nije proširio do te razine da se može detektirati. Kod nekih ljudi se, primjerice, još uvijek nalazio u plućima, a nije došao do krvi. U tom trenutku čovjek može biti lažno negativan, a virus je pritom u osobi. Dakle, ne radi se o tome da je test nevjerodostojan, već je faza bolesti ili prerana, ili se virus još nije proširio u krv.

TELEGRAM: Zaista se puno priča o zaštitnim maskama, ljudi ih mahnito kupuju. Koliko su one zaista djelotvorne, sprečavaju li širenje virusa i služe li čemu u ovome trenutku?

ĐIKIĆ: Korištenje maski ima minimalni efekt na obranu od infekcije virusom. Puno su efikasnije mjere izbjegavanja mjesta s velikim brojem ljudi, izbjegavanje kontakta s ljudima koji su bili u direktnom kontaktu sa zaraženima, važno je držati osobnu higijenu, prati ruke. Uopće nismo svjesni koliko često rukama dodirujemo lice i na taj način, osim samoga udisanja, također možemo prenijeti, odnosno unijeti virus. S druge strane, ako vam netko kiše u lice, naravno da će doći do zaraze, ali po cesti ili u prostranim prostorijama virus vam neće doći ne znam otkuda. Čovjek mora biti u dosta bliskom kontaktu s osobom koja širi virus. Osobno, ja ne nosim tu masku i ako bih je nosio, nosio bih je samo kad bih znao da dolazim u kontakt s osobama koje su zaražene pa im želim pomoći ili tako nešto. Tada se čovjek može zaštititi, ali u takvim situacijama maska mora biti više priljubljena licu i stvarno biti kvalitetnija od ovoga što ljudi samo stave i hodaju s time po cesti.

TELEGRAM: Ugroženije skupine ljudi su stariji, ljudi koji imaju tumore, autoimune bolesti... Koje su preporuke za njih?

ĐIKIĆ: Svi ljudi koji imaju kronične bolesti, primjerice dijabetes je jedna od njih, svi oni imaju veći rizik od zaraze. I za njih je važno da se sada jednostavno malo više paze, da budu oprezni, da ne idu okolo. No to ne znači da se takvi ljudi moraju potpuno izolirati i ne raditi ništa. Ako se pojave simptomi, trebaju odmah doći kod liječnika i testirati se je li došlo do virusa jer se tako, ranijim djelovanjem, i taj manjak imunološkog sustava može kompenzirati.

TELEGRAM: Prema projekcijama, kada se zapravo može očekivati stišavanje cijele priče?

ĐIKIĆ: Postoji prirodna fluktuacija pojave virusa i njihovog nestanka. Možemo stvarno puno naučiti od virusa gripe; virus influence ubije svake godine preko 50.000, 60.000 ljudi, prošle godine 65.000 ljudi, to je ozbiljan broj. Kod koronavirusa je danas oko 3.000, sigurno će biti još mnogo veći broj, ali kod virusa influence imamo taj jedan vrhunac i onda dolazi do nestanka virusa, i to zato što jednostavno dolazi do prirodnog ciklusa širenja kod ljudi, mnogi postaju otporni, preboljeli su virus i on se ne širi dalje. Drugi dio priče je i prirodni ciklus u okolini, gdje s toplim vremenom virus jednostavno pada u svom kapacitetu umnožavanja i širenja.

Kod koronavirusa zaista ne znam točno predvidjeti, ali mogu reći na primjeru Kine; tamo je to krenulo negdje u listopadu ili studenome. Znači, imali smo prosinac, u siječnju je bio vrhunac i sada u veljači već pada, a vjerujem da će u ožujku ili travnju pasti i puno niže.

TELEGRAM: Koje su vremenske procjene za pronalazak cjepiva protiv koronavirusa i igra li ono za aktualnu, ovogodišnju zarazu?

ĐIKIĆ: Jedino medicinsko sredstvo u borbi protiv virusa, zbog njihove promjenjivosti, do danas su multivalentna cjepiva koja se daju unaprijed, prije nego što se infekcija pojavi. Na temelju toga, ove godine mi možemo stvarati cjepiva za borbu protiv aktualnog koronavirusa, no ona neće biti efikasna ove godine. Hoće li cjepiva biti stvorena za četiri, šest ili 10 mjeseci, i tako je irelevantno za ovu godinu. Ta će cjepiva biti puno značajnija za sljedeću sezonu. On se možda neće pojaviti sljedeće godine, ja se nadam, ali se za nekoliko godina možda pojavi nova vrsta koronavirusa. I tada na temelju svih ovih koje smo imali – MERS-a, SARS-a i sada Covid-19 – možemo dosta naučiti i stvarati multivalentna cjepiva koja će imati spektrum borbe protiv različitih karakteristika tih virusa.

TELEGRAM: Dosta se, tijekom pojave i širenja najnovijeg koronavirusa, priča o intenzivnoj suradnji znanstvenika diljem svijeta, Reuters barata brojkom od više od 150 znanstvenih radova koji ispituju aspekte bolesti, rade se klinička ispitivanja na virusu... Kako ta međunarodna suradnja znanstvenika po pitanju koronavirusa izgleda u praksi?

ĐIKIĆ: To je vrlo važno pitanje o kojem se može i treba razgovarati i kada prođe ova medijska pažnja prema koronavirusu. Moramo shvatiti da mi danas nemamo nijedan lijek za virus gripe, korone, ebole, kao ni za mnoge druge viruse. Prema tome, prije nego što se pojavi sljedeća opasnost ili pandemija, društva se moraju prebaciti s abnormalnog ulaganja samo u pojedine bolesti koje su, recimo to tako, lukrativne i gdje se može zaraditi na lijekovima. Nužno je početi ulagati. Prvo, u istraživanje, a nakon toga i u stvaranje uspješnijih cjepiva i uspješnijih lijekova koji će blokirati viruse u budućnosti.

O tome je nedavno bilo govora u velikom članku u *Time magazinu*; jesmo li kao civilizacija spremni za novu pandemiju? Odgovor svih stručnjaka bio je da nismo, i to zato što države niti naše znanstvene institucije ne ulažu dovoljno u istraživanja. To većinom čine različite privatne fondacije i ljudi koji razumiju veliku opasnost. I sada, na temi virusa Covid-19, vidimo kako su se odjednom našla sredstva i iz svjetskih i iz nacionalnih organizacija! Pazite, u Europskoj

uniji postoje ogromni fondovi koji mogu dati mogućnost da sada iskoristimo sve svoje znanstvene potencijale kako bismo doznali što više o ponašanju, promjenama i slabostima koronavirusa.

I zato posebno treba zahvaliti znanstvenicima, ljudima koji su sami, svojim sredstvima počeli istraživati, izolirati virus, njegov genom, proteine. Mi to isto radimo u našem laboratoriju, s obzirom na to da je u zgradi do naše infektivna bolnica u kojoj su bila izolirana dva slučaja koronavirusa u Njemačkoj. Upravo od njih smo dobili izolirane viruse, odmah smo testirali kako djeluju na stanice, gledali smo što se događa s cjelokupnim odgovorom, metabolizmom, transkripcijom...

O virusu možemo saznati jako puno u kratkom vremenu, unutar tri-četiri tjedna i znanstvenici danas svoja zapažanja objavljuju odmah, kako bi znanje podijelili s kolegama. I to je idealno, znanost bi trebala biti upravo takva; orijentirana prema širenju znanstvenih podataka i otkrića tako da ih i drugi znanstvenici mogu iskoristiti za neka nova otkrića. Upravo je situacija s koronavirusom jedan od vrlo pozitivnih primjera kako znanstvenici širom svijeta dijele informacije i spoznaje te uspijevaju puno napraviti i saznati u vrlo kratkom vremenu.

Na kraju našega razgovora, Đikić je još jednom htio naglasiti važnost potrebe da se u aktualnoj situaciji ne šire panika i histerija. Smatra kako je izrazito važno ne stigmatizirati zaražene ljude kojima je prije svega nužna pomoć. Osim toga, oni nose vrijedne informacije o drugima koji su potencijalno inficirani i uz njihovu pomoć, borba protiv virusa je puno efikasnija, poručuje. Dodaje i kako medijska histerija stigmatiziranja pojedinaca može dovesti do prikrivanja zaraze, bržeg širenja, nasilnih napada i nepotrebnih opasnosti za pojedinca i društvo.

Smatra i kako pretjerana revnost i poruke političara ponekad uzrokuju više štete nego koristi. Istup na Telegramu zaključuje opaskom o mogućnosti zatvaranja granica koja se svako malo poteže u javnom prostoru. Virusi ne poznaju granice, poručuje Đikić, već su se proširili u gotovo sve zemlje EU i najave o zatvaranju granica pojedinih država EU su potpuno nepotrebne. "Potreban je jedinstven stav EU službi i zajedničko informiranje i djelovanje", zaključuje naš sugovornik.

3.1. TARGET TEXT

Ivan Đikić in an Exclusive Interview for Telegram: Why We Can Be Much Calmer About Coronavirus Today

One of the greatest scientific authorities discusses in detail the subject that occupied the nation

Author: Dora Kršul

Yesterday, on Tuesday February 25th, early afternoon, after the first case of coronavirus Covid-19 infection in Croatia was confirmed, the Telegram spoke to **Ivan Đikić**, our renowned scientist, molecular biologist and professor of biochemistry at Goethe University in Frankfurt. Đikić, who has dedicated his career to finding insights that can help diagnose and treat many diseases, primarily tumours, neurodegenerative diseases and inflammatory processes, is certainly a relevant interlocutor on the latest virus that has spread rapidly around the world.

As one of the greatest scientific authorities in Croatia, Đikić sent a message yesterday saying there is no reason to panic over the new coronavirus. In a half-hour conversation we had with him on Skype, and for which he found time during the break of the scientific conference in Bilbao, he also placed emphasis on calming the panic and urged citizens to listen to science and the profession.

TELEGRAM: The first case of coronavirus in Croatia was confirmed, what can we expect next?

ĐIKIĆ: Now, the key are the engagement and effectiveness of the healthcare system to keep people who are infected and confirmed with the virus in isolation. Their contacts during the last week should be inspected and checked with the objective of confirming or denying infection and eliminating further spread of the virus. Of course, those who didn't test positive for coronavirus can go to work, children can go to school; there is no need to isolate children if they are all negative and stigmatize people who are infected. Everything that happened in China and Italy shows that panicking is unnecessary. The virus can be isolated and we can really learn a lot about it. After all, based on what we know about it so far, we are now much calmer because we know it is not as deadly as predicted.

TELEGRAM: What will happen with the number of the infected?

ĐIKIĆ: Of course it will grow. Croatia needs to be aware that the virus has been in Croatia for some time, we just weren't aware to this day because no one tested positive or the infected just didn't come for testing. A large number of people infected with coronavirus do not have any or have very mild symptoms and these individuals do not apply or come for testing. That's why this virus actually spreads beyond our radar. In Italy, for example, it spread precisely because people did not know where the virus originated and how it came, many were symptom free, and then it suddenly spread to a large number of people. It was only when he reached the elderly that more serious symptoms and unfortunately fatalities emerged. However, the spread of the virus has already been going on for a couple of weeks.

TELEGRAM: You mentioned Italy. Why, for example, Italy has such an explosion of virus infection cases, while some other countries such as Germany keep it under a certain level of control?

ĐIKIĆ: There is no need to generalize and talk about Italy and other countries, but we should rather speak about the positive approach of countries in such cases. A positive approach is when countries say - as soon as you notice any of the symptoms, we will do testing with reliable and rapid tests and determine if the coronavirus exists. Thereafter, it can be isolated epidemiologically very quickly. On the other hand, if you do not have a healthcare system that is ready to respond quickly, then the virus is spreading and no one understands and knows what is going on.

No one knows anything about the source, no one knows how to prevent it from spreading and then the scenes of entire cities being blocked happen. For example, when the first case occurred in Munich, they immediately isolated a group of 14 people infected by a person recently arrived from China. After isolation of the infected group, the virus didn't spread any further in Munich and Bavaria. In Germany you have two more hospital cases, in Frankfurt close to my institute. These persons were asymptomatic, but the virus was there. They were quarantined, after a couple of weeks they were no longer infectious and did not cause the so-called chain reaction of spreading without knowledge.

TELEGRAM: So, it all comes down to the preparedness of the healthcare system and its timely response.

ĐIKIĆ: That's right. The expertise of the healthcare system, epidemiology services and early diagnosis are the key.

TELEGRAM: What happens when a person recovers from coronavirus?

ĐIKIĆ: When a person recovers from coronavirus, he/she creates a specific immune system, an immune response to that virus, and that person is protected against new reinfection. The problem is that every year a new type of influenza and corona virus is created, so this does not guarantee that people who have now recovered from this illness will be immune next year. But we know from experience that they are more resistant because the immune system is created upon several segments of the virus and as such, some virus segments are common to this year and the next one. That is why we have the flu vaccine, for example, where we use the antigens of several generations of viruses together, because it is thought that some of these antigens will occur in the next generation.

TELEGRAM: Is it possible that a person who recovered from coronavirus, and is now healthy, is still contagious?

ĐIKIĆ: It's hard to say explicitly *yes* or explicitly *no*, because in a small number of cases - I note, in a very small number of cases - people who recover from the virus can still be carriers and spread the virus for a very short time, but not long after all the symptoms have been eliminated. However, it is difficult to say that infectiveness occurs in so many cases that such people, who have already recovered from infection, must be isolated an additional week after the symptoms have been eliminated. Two days after the symptoms have been eliminated, people are no longer considered a source of infection.

TELEGRAM: There is a lot of talk and comparisons between the coronavirus Covid-19 and the SARS from 2003. What is the difference between these two viruses in terms of virus characteristics, incubation time, mortality...?

ĐIKIĆ: This is a very important question because on this basis people can understand the main difference between what we had in 2003 with SARS or in 2012 with MERS. SARS recorded an 8 to 10 percent mortality rate or even 20 percent when it comes to MERS. They are isolated in a similar way, from camels in the Middle East or China, where the virus came from animals again. They spread much less and were more deadly. The lethality was explained by the case

that these viruses entered human cells very quickly and in large numbers. So, it is not only important that the person has the virus, but it is also relevant in what amount the virus is inserted into human cells. There's a protein, it looks like an injection, and it is located on the surface of the virus; this protein is important for contact with a human cell, on whose surface there are proteins that allow the virus to enter. One of these proteins is protease; protease has been studied and it has been noted that the amount of protease found on human cells determines how many viruses will enter and how difficult the response will be in humans.

It was observed at that time that there were fewer proteases on human cells in Europeans, Americans and Africans, unlike in the Asian population where there were more proteases on cells. And therein lies one of the answers to why very often Asian people had more hard time and reacted more strongly to the virus than people from Europe. It's not the only one, but it's one of the markers we know of.

As for coronavirus 19, it is different from SARS in several things. First, it's not that deadly. When it enters cells, it kills mostly people over the age of 60, 70, people who are sick or people who are superinfected. Superinfection usually occurs in hospitals, in people who are in contact with several subtypes of the virus. In this case, it can also involve young people and it can cause a fatal consequence. Unfortunately, this has happened to several doctors in hospitals in China. The other thing about coronavirus is that it has very mild symptoms in a large number of people and that is why it has spread so quickly.

Also, it should be conveyed to the public that in China, coronavirus did not initially start spreading in the Wuhan market. It started at least a month or two before the virus broke into the Wuhan market. Therefore, the source of the virus was not in that market, but it certainly was in the Chinese province of Hubei from where the infected people spread it. The infected people brought the virus to the market and then it exploded from there so that the healthcare system began to see it in large numbers. Then the isolation of the people who were in the market started and then the claims started that the virus was coming from the market. But this is certainly not true; Chinese scientists have done the sequencing and have discovered several other sites in the province that they claim are the primary littermates of the virus.

TELEGRAM: How reliable are coronavirus tests?

ĐIKIĆ: The tests themselves, which work on the principle of polymerase chain reaction, are very sensitive and very reliable. If they are positive, they can confirm that the contact with the virus and entry into the body of the person who is positive has actually occurred. The tests are reliable however, it may occur that the sample of the person tested was taken at a stage when the virus had not yet spread to such a level that it was detectable. In some people, for example, it was still in their lungs and it didn't yet reach the blood. At that point, a person can be falsely negative while the virus is inside. So, it's not that the test is unreliable, but the stage of the disease is either premature, or the virus has not yet spread to the blood.

TELEGRAM: **There is really a lot of talk about protective masks, people are frantically buying them. How effective are they, do they prevent the spread of the virus and do they have any purpose at the moment?**

ĐIKIĆ: The use of masks has a minimal effect on defence against virus infection. It is much more effective to avoid places with a large number of people, to avoid contact with people who have been in direct contact with the infected, it is important to keep personal hygiene, wash your hands. We are not at all aware of how often we touch our face with our hands, and in this way, besides inhalation itself, we can also transmit or enter a virus. On the other hand, if someone sneezes in your face, of course you will get infected, but on the road or in large spaces the virus won't come out of nowhere. One must be in close contact with the person spreading the virus. Personally, I don't wear that mask and if I wore it I would only wear it if I knew I was coming in contact with people who are infected and I wanted to help them or something. In that case one can protect oneself, but in such situations the mask has to be more adherent to the face and really be of better quality than those that people just put on and walk with it in the street.

TELEGRAM: **More vulnerable groups of people are elders, people who have tumours, autoimmune diseases... What are the recommendations for them?**

ĐIKIĆ: All people who have chronic diseases, for example diabetes is one of them, all of them are at higher risk of getting infected. And it is important for them to simply be a little more careful now, to be cautious, not to go around. However, this does not mean that such people must be completely isolated and do nothing. If symptoms occur, they should see a doctor immediately and test for a virus, because by earlier action, this deficiency of the immune system can be compensated.

TELEGRAM: According to projections, when can we expect the whole story to blow over?

ĐIKIĆ: There is a natural fluctuation in the appearance of viruses and their disappearance. We can really learn a lot from the influenza virus; influenza kills over 50,000, 60,000 people each year, 65,000 last year, that's a serious number. So far coronavirus killed approximately 3,000, the number will certainly be much higher, but with the influenza virus we have that one peak and then the virus disappears, because it simply leads to a natural cycle of spread in humans - many become resilient, they have recovered from the virus and it does not expand further. Another part of the story is the natural cycle in the environment, where with warm weather the virus simply falls in its capacity to multiply and spread.

For coronavirus, I really can't predict precisely, but I can say from the example of China; there it started sometime in October or November. So we had December, in January it was the peak and now in February is already falling, and I believe it will fall much lower in March or April.

TELEGRAM: What are the time estimates for finding a coronavirus vaccine and does it play a role for the current, this year's infection?

ĐIKIĆ: The only medical resource to combat viruses to date, due to their variability, are the multivalent vaccines given in advance, before infection occurs. Based on that, this year we can create vaccines to fight current coronavirus, but they will not be effective just yet. Whether vaccines will be created in four, six or 10 months is irrelevant for the current year. These vaccines will be much more significant for next season. It may not appear next year, I hope, but in a few years a new type of coronavirus may emerge. And then, based on all of these we had - MERS, SARS and now Covid-19 - we can learn a lot and create multivalent vaccines that will have the spectrum to fight the various characteristics of these viruses.

TELEGRAM: With the emergence and spread of the latest coronavirus, there is talk of intense collaboration between scientists around the world, Reuters mentioned a figure of more than 150 scientific papers examining aspects of the disease, performing clinical trials on the virus... How does this international collaboration of scientists in terms of coronavirus look like in practice?

ĐIKIĆ: This is a very important issue that can and should be discussed even when this media attention to the coronavirus passes. We need to understand that today we have no cure for influenza, corona, Ebola, as well as many other viruses. Accordingly, before the next danger or pandemic arises, societies must switch from abnormal investment in certain diseases that are, let's say, lucrative and where one can make profit from medications. It is essential to start investing. First, into research and then into creating more successful vaccines and more successful medications that will block viruses in the future.

This was recently discussed in a major article in *Time* magazine; are we as a civilization ready for a new pandemic? The answer from all experts was that we are not, because the states and our scientific institutions do not invest enough in researches. This is mostly done by various private foundations and people who understand the great danger. And now, on the topic of the Covid-19 virus, we can see how suddenly funds have come from both world and national organizations. Look, there are huge funds in the European Union that can give us the opportunity to use all of our scientific potential to find out as much as possible about the behaviour, changes and weaknesses of coronavirus.

That is why we should especially thank the scientists, the people who, by their own means, began to research, isolate the virus, its genome, proteins. We do the same in our lab, since there is an infectious disease hospital in the building next to ours, where two cases of coronavirus in Germany have been isolated. We got isolated viruses from them, we immediately tested how they act on cells, we observed what was going on with the overall response, metabolism, transcription...

We can learn a lot about the virus in a short period of time, within three to four weeks, and today scientists are publishing their observations immediately to share their knowledge with colleagues. And that is ideal, science should be just like that; oriented toward the dissemination of scientific data and discoveries so that other scientists can use it for some new discoveries. The coronavirus situation is exactly one of the very positive examples of how scientists around the world share information and insights and manage to do and learn a lot in a very short time.

At the end of our conversation, Đikić once again wanted to emphasize the importance of the need not to spread panic and hysteria in the current situation. He believes it is extremely

important not to stigmatize infected people who need help first and foremost. In addition, they carry valuable information about others who are potentially infected and with their help, fighting the virus is much more effective, he says. He also adds that the media hysteria of stigmatizing individuals can lead to concealment of infection, faster spread, violent attacks and unnecessary dangers to the individual and society.

He believes that excessive zeal and politicians' messages sometimes do more harm than good. He concludes his appearance in the Telegram with a comment about the possibility of closing borders, which is mentioned every now and then in public sphere. The viruses know no borders, says Đikić, they have already spread to almost all EU countries and announcements of border closures by individual EU countries are completely unnecessary. "What is needed is a unique attitude of the EU services and joint information and action", our interlocutor concludes.

3.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS

The source text used for this translation is an interview found on the official *Telegram* website. Two people who participate in this conversation are *Telegram* author Dora Kršul and our renowned scientist and professor Ivan Đikić. This text was published on the informative web portal for social and cultural affairs and it can be considered as correct and authentic.

This interview is intended to be read by all the people who want to be generally informed about coronavirus, but also about its causes, consequences and future progress or attenuation. The purpose of this text is to deliver information and give a better insight into this topical issue. The interview is semi-formal and the style is informative and straightforward.

The interview consists of introduction, 13 questions (in bold letters) and answers and conclusion. Some answers are very detailed and lengthy, but overall, the length of the interview is standard. Lexical cohesion is achieved by repeating the key words as coronavirus, healthcare system, infection, symptoms, virus etc.

While proofreading this article I thought that it was very clear and fairly simple because sentences are not too long and they contain rather common expressions, but when I started translating, I realized that I will have to deal with a few technical medical words and expressions.

The first problem I encountered was the sentence “...tako da se i kod njih potvrdi ili opovrgne zaraza...” which I translated as “...with the objective of confirming or denying infection...” because although “tako da se” works very well in Croatian, if I used “so that” I would not be able to continue the sentence correctly and it would not sound so good in English.

The second thing I had to adjust were medical phrases and words which I don't encounter very often in everyday language. Some of examples are: “preboljeti zarazu/virus” which is “recover from infection/virus”, “doći kod liječnika” as “see a doctor”, “oni koji nisu pozitivni na koronavirus” as “those who didn't test positive for coronavirus” etc. Furthermore, I had to double check a few technical words to make sure I was spelling them correctly and look into their meanings. Examples of words that I found a bit more challenging than others are ‘littermates’, ‘polymerase’, ‘asymptomatic’, ‘quarantine’, ‘protease’, ‘sequencing’ etc.

Speaking of the adjustment, I also had to alter some verbs which are correct in Croatian, but they cannot be literally translated in English, at least not in that context because it is simply not in the spirit of that language. I will mention a few of them: “stišavanje cijele priče” I wrote as

“the whole story to blow over”, “uzrokuju više štete nego koristi” as “do more harm than good” and “radi se o polimeraznoj lančanoj reakciji” as “works on a principle of polymerase chain reaction”.

Another thing, probably less important, but still worth mentioning is the repetition. I’ll give two sentences in which I changed the words in order to avoid the repetition. 1) “U tom trenutku čovjek može biti lažno negativan, a virus je pritom u osobi.” → “At that point, a person can be falsely negative while the virus is inside him.” Although in Croatian sentence ‘čovjek’ and ‘osoba’ are different words, they refer to the same entity. That is why I used ‘him’ instead of ‘men’ or ‘person’. 2) “Na temelju toga, ove godine mi možemo stvarati cjepiva...no ona neće biti efikasna ove godine. Hoće li cjepiva biti stvorena za četiri, šest ili 10 mjeseci, i tako je irelevantno za ovu godinu.” → “Based on that, this year we can create vaccines...but they will not be effective just yet. Whether vaccines will be created in four, six or 10 months is irrelevant for the current year.” Considering that ‘this year’ is already written in the first sentence, I decided to change it into ‘current year’ in the second sentence. In addition, ‘ove godine’ is repeated twice in the first sentence of the source text and that is why I decided to alter this adverbial phrase and write ‘just yet’ instead of ‘this year’. That way the connotation stayed the same and I bypassed the repetition.

One of the things we always have to bear in mind while translating is the S-V-O agreement. “*Istup na Telegramu zaključuje opaskom o mogućnosti zatvaranja granica...*” → “*He concludes his appearance in the Telegram with a comment about the possibility of closing borders...*”. The sentence in Croatian sounds good as it is, but in order to make it sound more natural in English, we have to create the S-V-O sentence pattern.

There are a few places in the text where I noticed that it would be smarter to use the passive voice instead of active because that way the sentence makes more sense in English. In the example “...i onda se događaju ove scene blokada cijelih gradova.”. the simplest solution was rewriting the word ‘blokada’ by using a verb in active voice “...and then the scenes of blocking entire cities happen.”. Then I realized there is no subject that performs the action and besides, it would be clearer if I used passive voice; therefore, I wrote “...and then the scenes of entire cities being blocked happen.”

The last issue I had was not knowing if I used “whose” correctly in the following sentence: “...a human cell, on whose surface there are proteins...”. The reason for this uncertainty is that “whose” sounded to me like a word that can refer only to living beings, but then I remembered

that “whose” in this case is a possessive form of the relative pronoun “who” and it can be used for people, animals and things (in formal styles).

4. SOURCE TEXT III

17.11.2016

Boris Beck

Čovjek s njuškom i repom – o filmskim životinjama

Autor daje pregled mogućih modusa pojavljivanja životinja na filmu i značenje govora filmskih životinja uz naglasak na mehanizmu metaforizacije.

Životinjski svijet pun je neobičnih činjenica – krokodil ne može isplaziti jezik, slon ne može skočiti, morski pas ne može se razboljeti, žohar može živjeti bez glave. Animirani filmovi, pak, posve su nevjerovatni – Jerry bejzbolskom palicom udari Toma, na Pinka Panthera padne klavir i ne naškodi mu, vlak pregazi Kojota koji potom odmah nastavlja lov na Pticu Trkačicu.

U neobičnostima dokumentarnih filmova o životinjama nema ništa nevjerovatno. U nevjerovatnostima animiranih filmova često nema ništa metaforično. Riječ je o retoričkoj figuri zvanj adinaton ili impossibilia, „argumentacijskom toposu“ kojim se naglašava „nemogućnost da se što dogodi“, a „nerijetko se promeće u kreativno načelo animiranih filmova“ (Bagić 2012:3-7). No Zekoslav Mrkva govori, Kojot odlično poznaje matematiku i fiziku, Snoopy ima ptičicu Woodstocka za ljubimca, a kralj lavova Mufasa vodi metafizičke razgovore (nakon što se najeo mesa zebre). Kada životinja govori i ponaša se kao čovjek, na djelu je personifikacija, „pridavanje ljudskih osobina, misli, osjećaja i ponašanja kakvu predmetu, stvari, pojavi, apstrakciji, biljci ili životinji“ (ibid. 245). I adinaton i personifikacija nemoguće pretvaraju u moguće – životinja padne u ponor, digne glavu i kaže nešto smiješno – ali razlikuju se u smjeru: adinaton životinjski svijet udaljava od svijeta ljudi, a personifikacija ga približava.

Stvarnost, fikcija i prelazak iz jednog u drugo

Na početku filma *Bogovi su pali na tjeme* (Gods must be Crazy, 1980., Južnoafrička Republika) dokumentarno je prikazan život Bušmana i njihov način lova na antilope – milosrdan i uz ispriku. U igranom dijelu, pak, Bušman koji glumi Xija, ne poznajući koncept privatnog vlasništva, ubije kozu iz čuvana stada, na isti način na koji je ubio i divlju životinju. Zbog toga završi u zatvoru, a cijela zgoda ima poučni potencijal te postaje alegorija odnosa civiliziranog i slobodnog čovjeka. Dok je životinja u Lisici bila konvencionalno otjelovljenje lukavosti, koza

je ovdje inventivno otjelovljenje privatnog vlasništva – što znači da je ubijena antilopa u tom kontekstu naknadno postala simbol divljine.

U filmu *Dugi vikend* (The Long Weekend, 2005., Kanada, Velika Britanija, SAD) glavni lik skuplja smiješne kućne videe na kojima životinje rade stvari koje su za ljude tabuizirane – jedu vlastiti izmet, mokre jedna drugoj u usta, ližu stražnjice i slično. Osim što im je uloga da šokiraju i zabave publiku (to je tinejdžerska komedija) ti isječci ulaze u komentatorski odnos s glavnom radnjom (primjerice, glavni lik ima spolni odnos pa se prisjeća snimki parenja, ili se pak sjeti majmunske mokraće kad ga brat ponudi japanskim viskijem) – životinje su tako postale simbol slobodnog ponašanja i razmišljanja.

Ljubimac može biti samo ljubimac, kao što su to psi Lassie (Lassie Come Home, 1943., SAD) ili Beethoven iz istoimena filma (1992., SAD) – iako Beethoven spašava dijete od utapljanja, a Lassie prevali veliki put, njihovo ponašanje nije nezamislivo. Pipi Duga Čarapa ima konja i majmuna i u igranom filmu (Pippi Långstrump, 1969., Švedska) i u crtanom (Pippi Longstocking, 1997., Kanada). Uloga konja i majmuna zvanog Gospodin Nielsen u pripovjednom svijetu je jednostavna – majmun ilustrira pomorsku prošlost Pipi i njezina oca, a također i porijeklo njena bogatstva; konj simbolizira Pipinu slobodu i neuhvatljivost, a usput joj i omogućuje da demonstrira svoju nadljudsku snagu, prenoseći jednom rukom konja s verande u kuhinju; naposljetku, i to što konj živi na trijemu umjesto u štali ukazuje na Pipinu nekonvencionalnost. No kreatori crtanog filma daleko su slobodniji u kreiranju likova tih životinja od stvaratelja igranog filma koji ovise o vještini dresera.

Čak i kada se animirane životinje kreću unutar mogućeg, mogu imati zametke ljudskog ponašanja, poput ljudske gestikulacije majmuna u *Aladinu* (1992., SAD). U *Petru Panu* (1953., SAD) djeca imaju ljubimca, psa Nanu, koji se u svemu ponaša kao pas, ali u jednom trenutku složi dječje kocke s slovima rasute po podu, i još k tome po abecedi. Rakun i kolibrić što prate Pocahontas (1995., SAD), također ne govore, ali poduzimaju razne vragolije.

Animirane životinje mogu imati i dva modusa ponašanja u animiranom filmu – prema ljudima mogu se ponašati kao prave životinje (iako karikirane), a međusobno mogu komunicirati kao ljudi. Film *Balto* (1995., SAD) polazi od stvarnog događaja kada je 1925. na Aljasci psećim

sanjkama donesen lijek za difteriju (usp. Salisbury i Salisbury 2003.), a jednom je od tih pasa podignut i spomenik u New Yorku u Central Parku. Iako je u stvarnosti Balto bio vođa tek jedne od brojnih zaprega, u animiranom filmu je prikazan kao vođa jedine zaprege, i još je k tome sanjke s lijekom za bolesnu djevojčicu (svoju gazdaricu) doveo bez pomoći ljudi (film je uokviren i igranim scenama u kojem, uz spomenik psu, baka priča unučici tu zgodu kao istinitu).

Balto se percipira u dvostrukom ključu: kao čovjek jer je npr. zaljubljen ili prijateljuje i razgovara sa sibirskom guskom Borisom, ali i kao životinja koja vuče sanjke. U odnosu prema ljudima priča se kreće unutar mogućeg, a među životinjama nastaje pseudoljudski svijet – s tim da se ta dva ključa neprestano izmjenjuju. Filmovi tog tipa su npr. *101 Dalmatinac* (1961., SAD), *Dama i Skitnica* (*Lady and the Tramp*, 1955., SAD), *Dumbo* (1941., SAD), *U potrazi za Nemom* (*Finding Nemo*, 2003., SAD). Životinje u njima imaju veliko znanje o svijetu ljudi, ali ga ljudima ne otkrivaju, to jest ljudi ga ne prepoznaju (na sličan nači na koji se igračke igraju kad ih ljudi ne gledaju, što je tema serijala *Priča o igračkama*) – Balto zna da djeca umiru bez lijeka i da ga treba donijeti, dalmatinac Pongo nalazi zaručnicu svojem gazdi, Skitnica na vrlo lukav način prevari čuvara zoološkog vrta, u *Potrazi za Nemom* riba Dora zna čitati, a ribe u akvariju komentiraju rad zubara, miš u *Dumbu* isplanira nastup za svojeg slonovskog prijatelja...

Animirani film *Grom* (Bolt, 2008, SAD) također pokazuje životinje koje intenzivno komuniciraju međusobno, ali ne i s ljudima. Film tematizira osvješćivanje životinje da je objekt ljudske manipulacije. Pas Grom živi u holivudskim studijima gdje je zvijezda akcijskog serijala. Unutar serijala ima čudesne moći – laserski pogled, enormnu snagu i brzinu, poznaje borilačke vještine. Međutim, riječ je o prividu u kojem ga drže producenti kako bi se pas pred kamerama ponašao uvjerljivo; kako kažu autori tog fiktivnog serijala: „Jer ako vjeruje pas, vjerovat će i publika.“ Kada pas slučajno napusti studio, u prvi mah ponaša se kao na setu, ali s vremenom shvaća da su njegove moći bile prividne. Tijekom filma pas napušta ponašanje akcijskog junaka i uživljava se u vještine običnog psa – zakapanje kosti, trčanje za bačenim štapom, igra s drugim psima. Grom je film u filmu – s jedne strane gledamo film o Gromu kao akcijskom junaku, a s druge pseudodokumentarno pratimo njegov ulazak u stvarni svijet.

Miješanje filma i stvarnosti u Gromu jest metaleptično, jer je došlo do „prekoračenja granice između dvaju svjetova (...), onog o kojem pričamo i onog u kojem pričamo“ (Genette 2006:195). Metalepsa je moguća i u dokumentarnim žanrovima – primjerice, u *Neobičnom mungosu* (film Branka Marijanovića iz niza Mala čuda velike prirode, 1972, Jadran film) narator se obraća izravno mungosu i opominje ga da ne gleda u kameru – ali češća je u fikciji. Metaleptičan je, primjerice, serijal *Animanijaci* (Animaniacs, 1993.-1998., SAD) – riječ je o crtanim likovima koji su pobjegli iz svojeg filma i rade kaos u studijima Warner Brothersa, a također ulaze i u druge crtane filmove – a metaleptičan je i igrano-animirani film *Tko je smjestio Zeki Rogeru* (Who Framed Roger Rabbit, 1988., SAD) u kojem ljudski istražitelj vodi istragu među likovima iz crtića. Metalepsa u *Gromu* nije samo dovitljiva dramaturška dosjetka, nego mu iz srži mijenja sudbinu: za Groma prelazak iz svijeta filma u stvarni svijet znači stjecanje kvalitetnijeg životnog iskustva – umjesto da bude biće koje živi klišeizirani život, napisan po scenariju, postaje biće slobode.

Alegorija ljudskog svijeta

Poučljivost nije rijetka u animiranim filmovima. Važan element basne i prilike je „pouka iz ispričanog primjera“ (Rečnik 1985:70). Naime, basna je često dvodijelna – nakon kratke priče, sastavljene pretežno od dijaloga, slijedi pouka kojom se netom ispričana naracija povezuje sa svijetom čitatelja; pouka „proizlazi iz zbivanja i nije neophodna“ (ibid.). Primjerice, u filmu *Život buba* (Bug's Life, 1998., SAD) agresivni skakavci prisiljavaju dobroćudne mrave da im daju određeni dio uroda i na taj ih način iskorištavaju; kada su mravi spoznali da je njihova brojnost tolika da im se skakavci nikako ne mogu suprotstaviti, s lakoćom su okončali tiraniju. Na sličan način ribe ulovljene u mrežu u *Potrazi za Nemom* otkrivaju da ako zajedno plivaju u istom smjeru, tvore silu koja može rastrgati mrežu. Obje te narativne strukture (oba filma su od istog producenta, *Pixar/Disney*) prenose istu poruku – da slabi mogu udružiti snagu i savladati snažnog porobljivača.

U animiranom filmu *Preko ograde* (Over the Hedge, 2006., SAD) skupina divljih životinja nakon hibernacije probudi se okružena ogradama ljudskih naselja – američkih rezidencijalnih predgrađa koja su preko zime nikhula na mjestu njihove šume. Budući da im je naglo sužen

habitat, nemaju gdje skupljati hranu te su suočene sa smrću od gladi. Došljak rakun, međutim, pouči ih da hranu mogu krasti od ljudi – i to u velikom monologu u kojem prikazuje ljudsku opsjednutost hranom kroz razne vidove (prežderavanje, mršavljenje, reklamiranje). Rakunov kritički diskurs previše je opsežan za životinje koje ga slušaju – za njih je dovoljan podatak da u kantama za smeće ima hranjivih otpadaka. Njegova je kritika očito usmjerena ljudskim (odraslim) gledateljima kojima razotkriva apsurdnost razbacivanja hranom. Kao i u dva prethodno navedena filma, i u njemu postoji alegorijska paralelnost ljudskog i životinjskog svijeta; u filmu *Preko ograde* postoji i više, postoji eksplicitni komentar životinje na ljudsko ponašanje; nakon što je prikazao ljudsko mahnitiranje oko hrane i s njom, rakun kaže zapanjenim životinjama: „Zanima vas kada će stati? E, pa, ne može se stati!“

U Pixarovom kratkom animiranom filmu *Zecorog* (*Boundin'*, 2003., SAD) nepostojeća životinja (jackalope) nailazi na mladog ovna koji je nekad veselo plesao, ali ne želi plesati otkad su ga ostrigli. Zecorog ga podučava vještini poskakivanja i tako mu vraća pouzdanje: ovna i dalje svakog proljeća strižu, ali on to sada prima mirno i poslije toga veselo skakuće. Riječ je o ironičnoj basni: šišanje je neugodni životni događaj nakon kojeg je ovan „odbačen, gol i bos“; no ovan je sada „naučio živjeti s tim i više ne mari – jednostavno odskakuje“; zadnja dva stiha govore da je „u svijetu uspona i padova lijepo znati da je zecorog u blizini“ – budući da na kraju filma sve prerijske životinje odskakuju, čini se da se pouka odnosi i na njih – ali u svakom slučaju upućena je gledateljima koji su tužni ako ih je netko ostrigao.

Efekt poučljivosti nastaje na kraju filma *Skakavac i pčelica* (*Mr. Bug Goes to Town*, 1941., SAD). Kukci u velegradu žive idilično na praznom građevinskom terenu nazvanom Bugsville, no među njima ima zlih špekulanata koji ga unište, tako da se tek nakon velikih napora i opasnosti kukci uspiju smjestiti u miran vrt penthousea; jedna od životinjica pogleda s vrha nebodera na ulicu američkog velegrada i izgovori sljedeće riječi: „Pogledajte ljude, kao bubice su!“ Time je na koncu filma pokrenut mehanizam basne koji ga posve preosmišljava: mislili ste da ste gledali životinje, ali gledali ste sebe. Brojni su takvi filmovi: *Životinjska farma* (1954., Britanija) je alegorija totalitarnog sustava, u *Američkoj priči* (*An American Tail*, 1986., SAD) miševi Rusi emigriraju u SAD (kao predvodnika Slobodnog svijeta), u *Hrabrom Peri* (*Valiant*, 2005., Britanija) u ikonografiji Bitke za Britaniju britanski golubovi bore se protiv njemačkih orlova, u *Pobuni u kokošinjcu* (*Chicken Run*, 2000, SAD), kokoši žive u pravom konc-logoru te im prijeti konačno rješenje; životinje u *Žutoj minuti* (*Chicken Little*, 2005,

SAD) žive u gradu kao ljudi, a kad dođu izvanzemaljci imaju iste probleme u komunikaciji s njima kakve bi imala i ljudska rasa; U kralju lavova (Lion King, 1994., SAD) iznosi se metafora o krugu života, a govore samo lavovi, ptičji kraljevski savjetnik Zazu i hijene – lavovi i jednu druge životinje koje nemaju vlastiti glas; Rio (2011., SAD) posvjećuje ilegalnu trgovinu egzotičnim životinjama, Bambi (1942., SAD) pokazuje okrutnost lova, a Čudesni grm (The Secret of NIMH, 1982., SAD) govori o eksperimentima nad životinjama. Gledajući životinje upoznajemo sebe.

Razgovarati sa životinjom, postati životinja

Životinje u svim navedenim animacijama žive organizirane u vlastito društvo, imaju svoj duševni svijet i komuniciraju međusobno. Ako u svojem pripovjednom svijetu i ne govore ljudima, to ne znači da im nemaju ništa za reći. A kada zbilja počnu komunicirati s ljudima, to se ostvaruje na različite načine. Pas Skitnica zna zviždati kao čovjek, ali ne i govoriti. U Dumbu miš šapuće u uho vlasnika cirkusa dok ovaj spava i usađuje mu svoju ideju u snu; taj trenutak u kojem vlasnik menažerije razumijeva govor miša ostaje neobjašnjen. Divlji konj Spirit (Spirit: Stallion of the Cimarron, 2002., SAD), ponaša se u svemu na životinjski način: „nijedna od životinja u Spiritu ne govori. Umjesto toga Matt Damon (...) pripovijeda misli središnjeg karaktera“ (Clifford, Reeling Reviews); animirani film, dakle, metaforizaciju može postići na isti način kao i dokumentarni – realistični crtež uz naratorov glas daje isti efekt kao i npr. već analizirana Lisica.

Čovjek mora govoriti da bismo razumjeli životinju jer „kada bi lav mogao govoriti, ne bismo ga mogli razumjeti“ (Wittgenstein 1998:223). Takav je slučaj eksplicitan u filmu Tarzan (1999., SAD). Dječak je odrastao s majmunima i s njima razgovara na nemuštom jeziku (dakako, da bi gledatelji mogli pratiti radnju, i majmuni i Tarzan govore engleski); kada, međutim, Tarzan sretne ljude, ne zna govoriti i mora proći ubrzani tečaj upoznavanja s civilizacijom. U Knjizi o džungli (Jungle Book, 1967., SAD) taj problem nije eksplicitan, ali jamačno postoji: Mowgli također razgovara sa svojim prijateljima na jeziku životinja, a film završava upravo u trenu kada dječak napušta džunglu i ulazi u ljudski svijet (kada, dakle, počinje nerazumijevanje). Wittgensteinovu misao valja razumijevati u svjetlu iskaza §206:

Zamisli da si došao kao istraživač u neku nepoznatu zemlju s tebi posve stranim jezikom. U kojim bi okolnostima rekao da ti ljudi tamo daju naredbe, razumiju i slijede naredbe, bune se protiv naredba, itd.? Zajednički ljudski način djelovanja je sustav odnosa posredstvom kojega mi sebi tumačimo neki strani jezik (Wittgenstein 1998:82).

U animiranim filmovima s personificiranim životinjama nalazimo upravo „ljudski način djelovanja“ – životinje komuniciraju s ljudima jer je ljudsko već u njima. Lucky Luke (1983., SAD, Francuska) vrlo dobro razumije svoju kobilu Jolly Jumper, pa se s njom prepire ili kladi; mačak Garfield u serijalu Garfield i prijatelji (Garfield and Friends, 1988.-1995., SAD) nikad ne otvara usta, ali čujemo njegov glas, a i njegov ga vlasnik Jon ga razumije; Snoopy (Peanuts, 1965.-2006., SAD) u crtanom filmu ne govori, nego laje, smije se i izražava se pantomimom, a njegove misli formuliraju drugi likovi. U skladu sa svojim ljudskim sposobnostima razmišljanja, sva ta tri lika imaju ljudske sposobnosti činjenja iako nemaju ljudske ekstremitete: konj igra šah, Garfield nemilice maltretira psa Odieja, Snoopy piše i prima pisma. Njihov glas (koji dolazi s neodređenog mjesta) razumijevamo kao alter ego njihovih vlasnika, pri čemu nastaje zamršena igra – riječ je o samorazumijevanju ljudi u intenzivnom suživotu sa životinjama.

Da nije uvijek jasno tko što kaže, a tko što misli, pokazuje serijal o medvjediću Winnieju Poohu započet 1966. godine. U filmovima je riječ je o mješovitoj družbi igračaka i životinja koje sve povezuje dječak Christopher – u družbi su njegove igračke medvjedić, klokan, magarac i tigar (u crtanom filmu imaju uočljive šavove) te šumske i poljske životinje sova, vjeverica i zec (nacrtane realistički) koje je dječak mogao lako uočiti za boravka u prirodi. Činjenicu da dječakove igračke i životinje zajedno sudjeluju u raznim zgodama možemo shvatiti kao plod njegove mašte u kojima ih on svojom maštom animira. Međutim, zgode se tipično prikazuju bez Christophera, kao da su se igračke i životinje osamostalile, kao da se djelo mašte odvojilo od svojeg tvorca.

U igranom filmu *Dan delfina* (The Day of the Dolphin, 1973., SAD) delfini progovore, ali mogu reći tek par jednosložnih riječi, u skladu sa svojim govornim aparatom; riječ je o SF ideji

koja govor shvaća kao izražavanje (i opet ljudske!) inteligencije delfina. U filmu *Nebesa* (UPI, 2009., SAD) pse se može razumjeti jer imaju uređaje koji njihove (vrlo ograničene) misli emitiraju na zvučnik kao ljudski govor, a tako komuniciraju i međusobno. Paradoks je u tome što nemaju uređaje na ušima koji bi pretvarali ljudske riječi u pseće misli – ti su animirani psi, dakle, opet ljudi (simptomatično je da se istovremeno ptica Cajzl samo neartikulirano glasa). Ljupki štakorčić iz filma *Ratatouille* (2007., SAD) može pratiti televiziju i kuhati najrafiniranija jela francuske kuhinje, ali ne može govoriti; međutim, zavučen pod kuharsku kapu, potezanjem određenih pramenova upravlja kretnjama mladog kuhara i tako postaje dionikom ljudskog svijeta – služeći se čovjekom kao protezom (što je obratno od tipične upotrebe životinje, primjerice u Inspektoru Rexu).

No komunikacija ljudi i životinja može biti bogata i dvostrana, primjerice u animiranoj seriji *Doktor Dolittle* (Doctor Dolittle, 1970.-1972., SAD), gdje liječnik razumije govor životinja, ili u *Pčelinu filmu* (Bee Movie, 2007., SAD) u kojem glavni junak neograničeno razgovara s ljudima. U oba ta filma ljudi zahvaljujući govoru dotad nijemih stvorenja saznaju za brojne poteškoće koje imaju životinje – prvi put prelaze granicu nerazumijevanja i saznaju kako žive ne-ljudska bića. To jest, saznali bi da su ta bića doista ne-ljudska, ali pčele u *Pčelinu filmu* imaju automobile, telefone i bazene.

Životinja koja govori nije prava životinja, nego je prošla neku vrstu transformacije. Možda upravo zbog tog fenomena u animiranim filmovima česte su preobrazbe ljudskog u životinjsko i obratno – što je figurativni postupak u kojem se sastaju adinaton i personifikacija. U *Pepeljuzi* (Cinderella, 1950., SAD) miševi i ptičice pomažu siromašnoj djevojci sašiti haljinu, a pod utjecajem čarolije pretvore se u konje, dok se pas pretvori u slugu. Pinokio se počeo pretvarati u magarca, što je realizirana metafora: ponašao se nevaljano, dakle bio je na putu da postane pravi magarac, što je neka vrsta poučnog žanra (Pinocchio, 1940., SAD). Slično je poučna bila transformacija cara u ljamu u filmu *Careva nova ćud* (The Emperor's New Groove, 2000., SAD). Car koji je želio iz hira srušiti dom siromašnog seljaka bio je pretvoren u ljamu i kao takav ovisio je o skrbi tog istog seljaka; iako se ta pretvorba nije dogodila zbog kazne, nego kao nusproizvod nespretno izvedenog državnog udara, djelovala je na cara katarzično. Za svrhu ovog rada vrijedi napomenuti da je kao ljama zadržao moć govora, ali nije mogao hodati na dvije noge. Transformacija kao neugodno iskustvo nakon kojeg transformirani postane bolja osoba prikazana je i u filmu *Princeza i žaba* (The Princess and the Frog, 2009., SAD). Princ

ženskar – također ne zbog kazne zbog svojih djela, nego zbog ljubomore svojeg sluge – bude pretvoren u žabu; kao žaba skakuće i ispušta sluz, ali svoj je razum sačuvao, a također i moć govora.

Iz vizure životinjske tjelesnosti zanimljiv je film *Merida Hrabra* (Brave, 2012., SAD) u kojem je djevojčica Merida nehotice izazvala preobrazbu svoje majke u medvjedicu. Majka u prvi mah ne shvaća da je u tijelu medvjeda i koristi se životinjskim tijelom kao da je još uvijek čovjek – otvara ladice i traži ogledalo, a kada se prepozna, odbaci ga i pokušava se odjenuti; još neko vrijeme nosi krunu, jede nožem i vilicom i nije u stanju uloviti ribu – a kada joj ribu ulovi kćer, zahtijeva je pečenu; ne govori, sve razumije te se sporazumijeva mimikom i gestikulacijom – koliko to kao medvjed može). No malo-pomalo uživljava se u novo tijelo, jede sirovu hranu i počinje pokazivati bijes prema kćeri – ona doista sve više i više postaje životinja i ne može s njom više komunicirati. Film *Ljepotica i zvijer* (Beauty and the Beast, 1991., SAD) još je jedna priča o putu od ljudskog u animalno. Budući da je kraljević bio neljubazan prema prosjakinji, ona ga je za kaznu pretvorila u zvijer. Tijekom godina zatočeništva on je doista i podivljao, pa kada se pojavila Ljepotica, trebalo mu je vrijeme da se počne opet ponašati kao ljudsko biće. Najprije je napustio životinjske kretnje i glasanje, a potom je ponovno naučio jesti za stolom i plesati; nakon stjecanja tjelesnih sposobnosti, stigle su i ljudske – postao je galantan, a na kraju i nesebičan, te je opet zadobio ljudsko tijelo.

Dramatično prepoznavanje prikazano je u filmu *Brat medvjed* (Brother Bear, 2003., SAD). Inuitski lovci su u filmu ubili medvjeda, ali po cijenu pogibije jednoga od njih. Kenai, brat poginulog, biva pretvoren u medvjeda i u šumi upoznaje medvjedeg mladunca Kodu; nota bene, Kenai je, stekavši moć komuniciranja sa životinjama, izgubio moć komuniciranja s ljudima. Kada je Koda drugim medvjedima ispričao kako su njegovu mamu ubila čudovišta, Kenai, u tijelu medvjeda, shvatio je da je čudovište iz priče upravo njegov brat, pa da je, dakle, čudovište i on sam. Za razliku od princa koji je bio sretan da se oslobodi obličja zvijeri, Kenai se odbio vratiti u ljudsko obličje i dobrovoljno je nastavio živjeti kao medvjed. Ono što je bilo nijemo, progovorilo je – ali se na kraju vratilo u šutnju.

Zaključak

Ovdje su dosad izloženi razni modusi pojavljivanja životinja na filmu koji se mogu sistematizirati na sljedeći način: životinja je snimljena dokumentarno te se predstavlja u skladu s određenom ljudskom koncepcijom prirode; dokumentarne snimke mogu se kombinirati s igranim pri čemu dolazi do metaforizacije; životinja može u igranom filmu predstavljati samu sebe, što povećava dramaturške potencijale, u skladu s tretiranjem životinje kao proteze; i, naposljetku, animirana životinja može biti personificirana. U svim nabrojenim slučajevima filmovi koriste ne-ljudske životinjske habitate i mogućnosti kako bi predstavili nešto neobično; u animaciji se tome dodaje i adinaton, kao iskaz nemogućeg, i personifikacija kao postupak očovječenja životinje. Uočava se da pri personifikaciji životinje nije presudno je li film dokumentarni ili režirani, je li igrani ili animirani, govori li životinja ili narator – svaki od tih žanrova i modusa može životinju uključiti u ljudske mreže označivanja.

Tamo gdje je na djelu personifikacija, otvaraju se nove mogućnosti za pozicioniranje animirane životinje u odnosu na ljudsko, a kao temeljno razgraničenje postavlja to ima li u pripovjednom svijetu ljudi ili nema. Ako ljudi nema, životinje su organizirane kao ljudsko društvo te među njima nastaje nova podjela – na pseudoljude i životinje (Miki ima ljubimca Plutona; iako su i Šiljo i Pluton karikirani psi, Šiljo se ponaša kao čovjek, a Pluton ne); ako se u dijegetičkom svijetu nalaze i ljudi životinje se pojavljuju u dvostrukoj ulozi: s jedne su strane životinje u ljudskom svijetu, a s druge razumna bića u pseudoljudskom svijetu u kojem komuniciraju s drugim personificiranim životinjama. Što se tiče komunikacije ljudi i životinja, ona može biti jednosmjerna ili dvosmjerna: ili životinje razumiju ljude, a ljudi životinje ne, ili životinje uspijevaju komunicirati s barem nekim čovjekom.

Personificirana životinja može vrlo lako sudjelovati u basni, paraboli ili alegoriji. Značenje se u takvim slučajevima prenosi dvaput: kada životinja progovori, to shvaćamo figurativno, a onda figurativnost pokušavamo dokinuti i pronaći doslovni smisao jer prihvaćamo da je životinja zapravo čovjek. Budući da je dovoljno da očovječena životinja počne govoriti ili djelovati na ljudski način, pa da u njoj vidimo odraz sebe, mehanizmi metaforizacije mogu se pokrenuti pri svakoj animaciji životinja.

U animaciji ljudski recipijent i životinjski likovi kreću se jedni prema drugima: životinja govori kao čovjek, a čovjek u životinji traži sliku sebe. Na filmu se taj susret može dovesti do krajnosti u transformaciji ljudskog u životinjsko (i obratno), u retoričkom postupku u kojem se spajaju adinaton i personifikacija.

Animirana životinja kreće se između ljudskog i neljudskog, nemogućeg i realnog. I mi kao gledatelji približavamo joj se preko granice koja dijeli stvarnost i uprizoreni svijet. Taj nas prijelaz uvijek iznova privlači jer u svakom prijelazu nastane novo značenje. Na koncu se vraćamo u svoj svijet, ali iskusili smo kako je to biti u tijelu životinje.

4.1. TARGET TEXT

17.11.2016

Boris Beck

A Man with a Muzzle and a Tail - About Movie Animals

The author gives an overview of possible modes of animal appearance in films and the meaning of animal discourse, with an emphasis on the mechanism of metaphorization.

The animal world is full of unusual facts - a crocodile cannot stick out its tongue, an elephant cannot jump, a shark cannot get sick, a cockroach can live without its head. The animated films, however, are absolutely amazing - Jerry hits Tom with a baseball bat, the piano drops on Pink Panther and does no harm to him, the train runs over Wile E. Coyote, who then immediately continues chasing Road Runner.

There is nothing incredible about the oddities of documentaries about animals. There is often nothing metaphorical about the improbabilities of animated films. It is a rhetorical figure called adynaton or impossibilia, an *argumentative topos* which emphasizes the "inability to make something happen" and "often turns into the creative principle of animated films" (Bagić 2012: 3-7). However, Bugs Bunny speaks, Wile E. Coyote has a great knowledge of math and physics, Snoopy has a bird Woodstock as a pet, and the lion king Mufasa conducts metaphysical conversations (after eating zebra meat). When an animal speaks and behaves like a human, personification is at work, "the attribution of human qualities, thoughts, feelings and behaviour to an object, thing, phenomenon, abstraction, plant or animal" (ibid. 245). Both adynaton and personification make the impossible possible - the animal falls into the abyss, lifts its head and says something funny - but they differ in direction: Adynaton moves away the animal world from the world of humans, and personification brings it closer.

Reality, fiction and the transition from one to the other

At the beginning of the movie *The Gods Must Be Crazy* (1980, South Africa) Bushmen's life and their way of hunting antelope - merciful and apologetic- is presented as a documentary. In continuation of the film, however, Bushman, who plays Xi, unaware of the concept of private

property, kills a goat from a guarded herd, the same way he killed a wild animal. Because of this, he ends up in prison, and the whole thing has an instructive potential and becomes an allegory of the relationship between civilized and free man. While the animal in *Lisica* was the conventional embodiment of cunning, the goat here is an inventive embodiment of private property - meaning that the slain antelope in this context subsequently became a symbol of wildlife.

In the movie *The Long Weekend* (2005, Canada, UK, USA) the main character collects funny home videos where animals do things that are tabooed for humans - eat their own feces, wet each other in the mouth, lick their buttocks and the like. In addition to their role of shocking and entertaining the audience (it's a teen comedy), these clips are here as a commentary relating to the main plot (for example, the main character has intercourse so he recalls mating shots, or remembers the monkey urine when his brother offers him Japanese whiskey) - animals thus became a symbol of free behaviour and thinking.

A pet can be only a pet, such as the dogs Lassie (*Lassie Come Home*, 1943, USA) or Beethoven from the eponymous movie (1992, USA) - although Beethoven saves the child from drowning and Lassie travels a long way, their behaviour is not unthinkable. Pippi Longstocking has a horse and a monkey in both feature film (*Pippi Långstrump*, 1969, Sweden) and cartoon (*Pippi Longstocking*, 1997, Canada). The role of the horse and monkey called Mr. Nilsson in the storytelling world is simple - the monkey illustrates the maritime past of Pippi and her father, and also the origin of her wealth; the horse symbolizes Pippi's freedom and elusiveness and, by the way, enables her to demonstrate her superhuman strength, carrying the horse from the porch to the kitchen with one hand; finally, the fact that the horse lives on the porch instead of living in the barn indicates Pippi's unconventionality. But cartoon makers are far more free in creating the characters of these animals than the creators of the feature film, who depend on the skill of the trainer.

Even when animated animals move within the possible, they can have the germs of human behaviour, such as the human monkey gesture in *Aladdin* (1992, USA). In *Peter Pan* (1953, USA) the children have a pet, dog Nana, who acts like a dog in every way, but at one point arranges toy cubes with letters scattered on the floor, and moreover alphabetically. The raccoon

and hummingbird accompanying *Pocahontas* (1995, USA) also do not speak, but they get involved in various mischief.

Animated animals can also have two modes of behaviour in animated film - towards humans they can behave as real animals (though cartoonishly), and with each other they can interact as humans. Movie *Balto* (1995, USA) is based on the actual event when diphtheria drug was brought to Alaska with a dog sled in 1925 (cf. Salisbury and Salisbury 2003), and one of these dogs was erected a monument in New York in Central Park. Although in reality Balto was the leader of only one of the many sleds, in the animated film he was portrayed as the leader of the only sled, and additionally he brought the sled with a cure for a sick little girl (his landlady) without the help of people (the film is framed with feature scenes in which, beside the monument to the dog, the grandmother tells her granddaughter that story as truth).

Balto is perceived in two ways: as a human being, for example, because he is in love or he befriends and talks with the Siberian goose Boris, but also as an animal pulling a sled. In relation to humans, the story moves within the possible, and a pseudo-human world is created among animals - with these two keys constantly interchanging. Movies of this type are e.g. *101 Dalmatians* (1961, USA), *Lady and the Tramp* (1955, USA), *Dumbo* (1941, USA), *Finding Nemo* (2003, USA). Animals in these movies have a great knowledge of the world of humans, but they do not disclose it to humans, i.e. humans do not recognize it (in a similar way that toys are playing when people are not looking at them, which is the theme of the *Toy Story* series) - Balto knows that children are dying without a cure and that it needs to be brought, the Dalmatian Pongo finds a fiancée to his master, the Tramp deceives the zoo keeper in a very cunning way, in *Finding Nemo* the fish Dora knows how to read, and the fish in the aquarium comment on the work of the dentist, the mouse in *Dumbo* is planning a performance for his elephant friend...

Animated film *Bolt* (2008, USA) also shows animals that interact intensely with one another, but not with humans. The film focuses on raising awareness that the animal itself is the object of human manipulation. Dog Bolt lives in Hollywood studios where he is the star of an action series. Within the series, he has marvellous powers - laser vision, enormous strength and speed, he knows martial arts. However, it is an illusion in which he is held by producers to make the

dog in front of the cameras behave convincingly; as the authors of this fictional series say: "If the dog believes it, the audience believes it." When the dog accidentally leaves the studio, at first, he acts as if he was on set, but over time he realizes that his powers were ostensible. During the movie, the dog abandons the action hero behaviour and plays along the skills of an ordinary dog - burying a bone, running after a stick, playing with other dogs. Bolt is a movie within a movie - on the one hand, we watch a movie about Bolt as an action hero, and on the other, we pseudo-documentarily track his entry into the real world.

The blending of film and reality in *Bolt* is metaleptic, for it has come to "crossing the boundary between two worlds (...), the one we are talking about and the one in which we are talking" (Genette 2006: 195). Metalepsis is also possible in documentary genres - for example, in *The Unusual Mongoose* (Neobičan mungos, Branko Marijanović's film from the series *Small Miracles of Great Nature (Mala čuda velike prirode)*, 1972, Jadran film) the narrator addresses the mongoose directly and warns him not to look at the camera – but it is more often in fiction. Metaleptic, for example, is a series *Animaniacs* (1993-1998, USA) - it is about cartoon characters which escaped from their film and cause chaos in Warner Brothers' studios and also enter other cartoons - and metaleptic is also a feature-animated film *Who Framed Roger Rabbit* (1988, USA) in which a human investigator conducts an investigation among cartoon characters. Metalepsis in *Bolt* it is not only an ingenious dramaturgical wit, it changes his destiny from the core: For Bolt, transition from the world of film to the real world means gaining a better quality of life experience; instead of being a creature who lives a clichéd scripted life, he becomes a creature of freedom.

The allegory of the human world

Didactics is not uncommon in animated films. An important element of the fable and the occasion is the "lesson from the story told" (Rečnik 1985: 70). Namely, the fable is often two-part - a short story composed mostly of dialogue, followed by a lesson which connects the recently told narrative with the world of the reader; the lesson "comes from happening and is not essential" (ibid.). For example, in a movie *Bug's Life* (1998, USA) aggressive grasshoppers force good hearted ants to give them a certain amount of yield and thus exploit them; when the ants realized that their numbers were so great that grasshoppers could in no way oppose them,

they easily ended the tyranny. Similarly, fish caught in the net in *Finding Nemo* reveal that if they swim together in the same direction, they form a force that can tear the net. Both these narrative structures (both films are from the same producer, *Pixar/Disney*) convey the same message - that the weak can join forces and overcome the powerful enslaver.

In the animated movie *Over the Hedge* (2006, USA) a group of wild animals wakes up after hibernation surrounded by enclosures of human settlements - American residential suburbs that have sprouted up over the winter at the site of their forest. As their habitat is abruptly narrowed, they have nowhere to collect their food and face starvation death. The newcomer raccoon, however, teaches them that food can be stolen from humans - in a large monologue in which he depicts people's obsession with food through various aspects (overeating, slimming, advertising). Raccoon's critical discourse is too extensive for the animals who listen to it; information that the trash cans contain nutrient waste is enough for them. His criticism is clearly directed at human (adult) viewers who are exposed to the absurdity of food scattering. As in the two films above, there is an allegorical parallel with the human and animal world; there is more to the movie *Over the Hedge*, there is an explicit comment by an animal on human behaviour; after displaying human frenzy around food and with it, the raccoon tells the startled animals, "So, you think they have enough? Well, they don't! "

In Pixar's short animated film *Boundin'* (2003, USA), a non-existent animal (jackalope) encounters a young ram who used to dance cheerfully but has not wanted to dance since he was sheared. The jackalope teaches him the skill of bounding, thus restoring his confidence: The ram continues to be sheared every spring, but he now receives it calmly, and afterwards jumps gleefully. It is an ironic fable: Shearing is an unpleasant life event after which the ram is "dumped, naked and bare"; but the ram has now "learned to live with it; he didn't care - he'd just bound"; the last two verses say that "now in this world of ups and downs, so nice to know there are jackalopes around" - since at the end of the film all prairie animals bound, the lesson also seems to apply to them - but in any case it is addressed to viewers who are sad if someone has sheared them.

The teachable effect appears at the end of the movie *Mr. Bug Goes to Town* (1941, USA). The big city insects live idyllically on an empty construction site called Bugsville, but there are evil

speculators who destroy it, so only after great effort and danger do the insects manage to settle in a quiet penthouse garden. One of the little animals looks down from the top of a skyscraper on the street of an American metropolitan and says the following words: "Look at all the human ones down there. They look just like a lot of little bugs!" This triggers a fable mechanism at the end of the film that completely rethinks it: You thought you were looking at animals, but you were looking at yourself. There are many such films: *Animal Farm* (1954, Britain) is an allegory of the totalitarian system, in *An American Tail* (1986, USA) Russian mice emigrate to the USA (as leader of the Free World), in *Valiant* (2005, Britain) in the iconography of the Battle of Britain, British pigeons fight German eagles, in *Chicken Run* (2000, USA), chickens live in a real concentration camp and are threatened with a final solution; the animals in *Chicken Little* (2005, USA) live in the city like humans, and when aliens arrive they have the same communication problems with them as the human race would; *The Lion King* (1994, USA) provides a metaphor of the circle of life, and only lions, king's advisor bird Zazu and hyenas speak - lions eat other animals that have no voice of their own; *Rio* (2011, USA) raises awareness on the illegal trade of exotic animals, *Bambi* (1942, USA) shows the cruelty of hunting, and *The Secret of NIMH* (1982, USA) talks about experiments on animals. By looking at animals we get to know ourselves.

Talk to an animal, become an animal

In all these animations animals live organized into their own society, have their own mental state and interact with each other. If they don't talk to people in their storytelling world, that does not mean they have nothing to say. And when they really start communicating with people, it happens in different ways. The dog Tramp can whistle like a human, but he cannot speak like one. In *Dumbo*, the mouse whispers into the ear of the circus owner as he sleeps and instils an idea in his dream; that moment at which the owner of menagerie understands the speech of the mouse remains unexplained. A wild stallion Spirit (*Spirit: Stallion of the Cimarron*, 2002, USA), behaves like an animal in every way: "None of the animals in Spirit speak. Instead, Matt Damon (...) narrates the thoughts of the central character" (Clifford, Reeling Reviews); animated film, therefore, can achieve metaphorization in the same way as documentary - a realistic drawing with the narrator's voice gives the same effect as, for example, already analyzed *Lisica*.

Man must speak so that we could understand the animal because "if the lion could speak, we could not understand it" (Wittgenstein 1998: 223). Such a case is explicit in the film *Tarzan* (1999, USA). The boy grew up with monkeys and talks to them in animal language (of course, so that viewers could follow the story, both monkeys and Tarzan speak English); when, however, Tarzan meets people, he does not know how to speak and must pass an accelerated course in familiarising with civilization. In the *Jungle Book* (1967, USA), this problem is not explicit, but it certainly exists: Mowgli also talks to his friends in animal language, and the film ends just as the boy leaves the jungle and enters the human world (when therefore, misunderstanding begins). Wittgenstein's thought must be understood in light of statement §206:

Imagine coming as a researcher to an unknown country with a language completely foreign to you. In what circumstances would you say that these people there give orders, understand and follow orders, rebel against orders, etc.? The common human mode of action is a system of relationships through which we interpret a foreign language to ourselves (Wittgenstein 1998: 82).

In animated films with personified animals, we find precisely the "human mode of action" - animals interact with humans because the human is already in them. *Lucky Luke* (1983, USA, France) understands his mare Jolly Jumper very well, so he argues or bets with her; the cat Garfield in the *Garfield and Friends* series (1988-1995, USA) never opens his mouth, but we hear his voice, and his owner Jon understands him; Snoopy (*Peanuts*, 1965-2006, USA) does not speak in a cartoon, but barks, laughs, and expresses himself through pantomime, and his thoughts are formulated by other characters. In accordance with their human thinking abilities, all three of these characters have human abilities of doing, although they have no human extremities: The horse plays chess, Garfield mercilessly harasses dog Odie, Snoopy writes and receives letters. We understand their voice (coming from an unspecified place) as an alter ego of their owners, creating an intricate game - it is about self-understanding of humans in intense coexistence with animals.

It is not always clear who is saying what and who is thinking what, as we can see from the series about *Winnie the Pooh* bear initiated in 1966. The films are about a mixed company of toys and animals, all connected by the boy Christopher - the company includes his toys Teddy Bear, Kangaroo, Donkey and Tigger (in the cartoon they have noticeable stitches) and forest and field animals Owl, Squirrel and Rabbit (drawn realistically) that the boy could easily spot in nature. The fact that the boy's toys and animals participate in different stories together can be understood as a figment of his imagination in which he animates them. However, the stories are typically shown without Christopher, as if toys and animals had become independent, as if the work of imagination had separated from its creator.

In a feature film *The Day of the Dolphin* (1973, USA) dolphins speak, but they can only say a few monosyllabic words, in accordance with their speech apparatus; it is a sci-fi idea that interprets speech as expressing (and again human!) the intelligence of dolphins. In the movie *UP!* (2009, USA), dogs can be understood because they have devices that transmit their (very limited) thoughts on the speaker as human speech, and thus they communicate with each other. The paradox is that they do not have devices on their ears that would turn human words into canine thoughts - these animated dogs are therefore anthropomorphic (it is symptomatic that at the same time the bird Kevin is only making inarticulate sounds). Lovely rat in the movie *Ratatouille* (2007, USA) can watch television and cook the finest French cuisine, but cannot speak; however, tucked under the cook's hat, by pulling certain strands of hair he controls the movements of the young chef and thus becomes a part of the human world - by using a man as a prosthesis (which is the opposite of the typical use of an animal, for example in *Inspector Rex*).

But communication between humans and animals can be rich and bilateral, for example in an animated series *Doctor Dolittle* (1970-1972, USA), where the doctor understands animal speech, or in *Bee Movie* (2007, USA) in which the protagonist talks to people unlimitedly. In both of these films, thanks to the speech of previously mute animals, people find out about many difficulties that animals face - for the first time they overcome misunderstandings and learn how non-human beings live. That is, they would find out if these creatures were indeed non-human, but the bees in the *Bee Movie* have cars, phones and pools.

The talking animal is not a real animal, but it has gone through some kind of transformation. Perhaps it is because of this phenomenon that the transformation of human to animal and vice versa is frequent in animated films - which is a figurative process in which adynaton and personification meet. In *Cinderella* (1950, USA) mice and birds help a poor girl sew a dress, and under the influence of magic they turn into horses, whereas the dog turns into a servant. Pinocchio began to transform into a donkey, which created a metaphor: He behaved badly, so he was on his way to becoming a real ass, which is a kind of didactic genre (Pinocchio, 1940, USA). Similarly didactic was the transformation of an emperor into a llama in film *The Emperor's New Groove* (2000, USA). The emperor who wanted to tear down the poor peasant's home on a whim was turned into a llama and as such he depended on the care of that same peasant; although this conversion did not occur as a result of punishment, but as a by-product of a clumsily executed coup, it affected the emperor cathartically. For the purpose of this paper it is worth mentioning that as a llama he retained the power of speech, but could not walk on two legs. Transformation as an unpleasant experience after which the transformed becomes a better person is also shown in the film *The Princess and the Frog* (2009, USA). The womanizer prince - also not for punishment for his deeds, but for the jealousy of his servant - is turned into a frog; like a frog he jumps and releases slime, but he retains his reason and also the power of speech.

From the perspective of animal physicality, *Brave* (2002, USA) is an interesting film in which a girl named Merida inadvertently caused her mother to transform into a bear. At first, the mother does not realize that she has the bear's body and uses her animal body as if it were still human - she opens the drawers and searches for a mirror, and when she recognizes herself, she throws it away and tries to dress herself; she wears the crown for some time, eats with a knife and fork, and is unable to catch the fish - and when her daughter catches the fish, she demands it roasted; she doesn't talk, she understands everything and communicates by mimicry and gestures - as much as she can being a bear). But little by little she gets into her new body, eats raw food and begins to show rage towards her daughter - she really becomes more and more an animal and can no longer communicate with her. Movie *Beauty and the Beast* (1991, USA) is another story about the transition from human to animalistic. Because the prince was unkind to the female beggar, she turned him into a beast for punishment. During his captivity years he really went wild, so when Beauty showed up, it took him a while to start acting like a human

being again. He first abandoned animal movements and sounds, and then learned to eat at the table and dance again; after acquiring physical abilities, human abilities arrived as well - he became gallant and eventually selfless and he gained the human body again.

Dramatic recognition is shown in the film *Brother Bear* (2003, USA). Inuit hunters killed a bear in the movie, but at the cost of one of them dying. Kenai, the brother of the deceased, is transformed into a bear and meets the bear cub Koda in the forest; note bene, Kenai, having gained the power to communicate with animals, lost the power to communicate with humans. When Koda told the other bears that his mother had been killed by monsters, Kenai, in the bear's body, realized that the monster in the story was his brother, and therefore he was the monster himself. Unlike the prince who was happy to get rid of the beast form, Kenai refused to return to human form and voluntarily continued to live as a bear. What was mute spoke - but eventually returned to silence.

Conclusion

Various modes of the animal appearance in the film have been exposed here, which can be systematized as follows: The animal is filmed documentarily and presented in accordance with a particular human conception of nature; documentary footage can be combined with a feature film footage which results in metaphorization; the animal can represent itself in the feature film, which enhances the dramaturgical potential, consistent with treating the animal as a prosthesis; and, finally, the animated animal can be personified. In all of these cases, films use non-human animal habitats and opportunities to present something unusual; in the animation, adynaton is used as a testimony of the impossible, and personification as the process of humanizing an animal. It is noted that when it comes to personifying an animal, it is not crucial whether the film is documentary or directed, whether it is a feature or animated film, whether an animal or a narrator speaks - each of these genres and modes can include the animal in human identification nets.

Where personification is at work, new possibilities open for positioning the animated animal in relation to humans, and a basic demarcation is whether or not there are humans in the narrative world. If there are no humans, the animals are organized as a human society, and a

new division appears between them - the pseudohumans and the animals (Mickey has a pet Pluto; although both Goofy and Pluto are caricature dogs, Goofy behaves like a human and Pluto does not); if there are also humans in the film, animals appear in a dual role: on the one hand, they are animals in the human world, and on the other, they are reasonable beings in a pseudohuman world in which they interact with other personified animals. Regarding the human-animal communication, it can be one-way or two-way: Either animals understand humans and humans do not understand animals, or animals manage to communicate with at least one human.

A personified animal can very easily participate in a fable, parable, or allegory. In such cases, meaning is conveyed twice: When the animal speaks, we understand it figuratively, and then we try to eliminate the figurativeness and find the literal meaning because we accept that the animal is actually human. Since it is enough for a humanized animal to start speaking or acting in a human way, so that we can see a reflection of ourselves in it, the mechanisms of metaphorization can be triggered at every animal animation.

In animation, the human recipient and the animal characters move toward each other: the animal speaks like a human, and the human seeks in the animal a picture of himself. In films, this encounter can be taken to the extreme in the transformation of the human into the animal (and vice versa), in a rhetorical process in which adynaton and personification are combined.

The animated animal moves between human and nonhuman, impossible and realistic. We, as viewers, are approaching it across the border that divides reality and the stage world. We are constantly being attracted to this transition, because each transition creates a new meaning. In the end, we return to our world, but we have experienced what it is like to be in the body of an animal.

4.2. COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS

This text is an article published on official website of *Zarez* magazine. It is a Croatian biweekly newsprint magazine that writes about literature, arts, social and cultural events, and therefore this text can be considered as authentic. The text is intended to be read by general audience.

The article conveys information about animal appearance in animated films and documentaries. The author draws attention to the importance of animal personification and mutual understanding between man and animal.

The style of this article is informative and it aims to be clear, direct and unambiguous. The text is semi-formal because the writing takes a quite cheerful and positive tone, as if addressing to a person whom the author already knows.

The text is divided into five parts, including the introduction and conclusion. Each part has a title in bold capital letters. The whole text is easy to read and follow, although it is quite long for an article. There are not many difficult words or phrases, and sentences are not long.

In the introduction part author gives us a clue of what is going to be discussed in the article and he mentions names of a few cartoon characters as example. In the second part he writes about films in which animals are presented realistically, as well as animated films in which animals think they have superpowers. In the third part we find out how much we can learn from an animated film. In the fourth part author explains relationship between animals and humans in animated films and their mutual (mis)understanding. In the last part he sums up different modes of animal appearance throughout the film.

Considering that this text contains names of many cartoon characters I had to make sure that characters get their real, authentic name in English. Some of examples are: 'Kojot i Ptica Trkačica' as 'Wile E. Coyote and Road Runner', 'Zekoslav Mrkva' as 'Bugs Bunny', 'Grom' as 'Bolt' etc.

Some specific words and phrases from the article I had to look up a bit more thoroughly. Examples of those words are: 'karikiran' and 'nemušti'. Both words don't have an equivalent when translated in English, that's why I translated the first one as 'cartoonish' and the second one as 'animal'. Cartoonish describes something unrealistically simplified and involving humorous exaggeration, while animal here specifies a type of language that is used when talking to animals, that is, a language that is non-human.

The interesting fact is that sometimes we need just one or two words in target text to translate more words or entire phrase from the source text, and the other way around. That's how from "smrt od gladi" we get "starvation death" or "život napisan po scenariju" we can translate as "scripted life" and "jela francuske kuhinje" as "French cuisine". In the other hand, "osvješćivanje životinje" has to be explained with more words in English as "making the animal aware" or "dokumentarno je prikazan" as "is presented as a documentary".

One of the problems I faced with was the order of subject verb and object in the beginning of the sentence: "Adinaton životinjski svijet udaljava od svijeta ljudi..." which works perfectly fine in Croatian, but while translating I had to make a S-V-O agreement so it became: "Adynaton moves away the animal world from the world of humans...". The same thing with the sentence "...za njih je dovoljan podatak da u kantama za smeće ima hranjivih otpadaka." which, for better understanding, I translated as "...information that the trash cans contain nutrient waste is enough for them."

Sometimes finding an adequate verb which will suggest the same meaning in both source text and target text can be challenging. Of course, I needed to consider more possible solutions and avoid literal translations in order to find a verb that will remain in the 'spirit' of English language. The first example is 'uživljavati se u vještine' translated as 'play along the skills', the second one 'iznijeti metaforu' as 'provide a metaphor' and finally 'poduzimati vragolije' I wrote as 'get involved in mischief'. This last example can be compared with Italian language where the translation would be 'fare bricconate' i.e. 'raditi vragolije' which is correct in Italian and Croatian. On the other hand, literal translation 'do mischief' cannot work in English.

The last but not least is the punctuation. As already mentioned in the analysis of the first text, sometimes it is difficult to decide whether to put a capitalized letter after a colon or not. For this purpose I used two examples: 1) "Pinocchio began to transform into a donkey, which created a metaphor: He behaved badly, so he was on his way to becoming a real ass..."; 2) "In animation, the human recipient and the animal characters move toward each other: the animal speaks like a human, and the human seeks in the animal a picture of himself." In the first example a colon is followed by a capital letter because it begins a complete sentence that semantically does not depend that much on the part before the colon. In the second example I did not use a capitalized letter after a colon because it introduces an incomplete sentence that is meant to add information to the sentence before (it explains how human recipient and animal

characters move toward each other). But after all, capitalizing after a colon is more matter of a personal style.

5. CONCLUSION

Upon working on my thesis, I realized how much time and effort needs to be put into producing a quality translation. Despite the fact that I would describe the writing of this thesis as time-consuming and strenuous, I can proudly say that I have learned many things that will definitely help me in future translations and that I have enjoyed discovering an array of possibilities when it comes to problem-solving.

Surely, respecting the style, audience and level of formality helped me analyse each text and finally come out with a good translation. The important thing I had to bear in mind was conveying the same impression and sense from the source text into the target text. It is also one of the reasons why translators have to be creative, inspired and often think outside the box. Literal translation has to be avoided at all costs, as well as internet sources that are unreliable and questionable. A smart thing to do is consulting dictionaries and not settling for the first translation you may come across.

Only when I started translating, I got an idea of what translators' job looks like. It is demanding and it requires dedication, patience, persistence and knowledge. It is necessary to be acquainted with both source language and target language and keep in mind their qualities such as semantics, pragmatics, and syntax. In some cases, if I have not used a different verb or changed the arrangement of words in the English sentence, the meaning of the whole sentence in question would be altered, or even worse, it would not make any sense.

Altogether the first text is quite demanding because some sentences are fairly long and the vocabulary is complex, while the second and the third article are less challenging and a bit more straightforward. Nonetheless, while translating all three texts there were moments when I had to make more effort and rethink possible solutions. Some technical words were more difficult, but with a help of dictionaries it was possible to understand their meaning and translate them correctly. In conclusion, as a person who has not much experience in translating, I had to invest a lot of time and effort to make this translation good and adequate, but then again, I enjoyed learning and gaining new insight into the job of a translator.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bilinić-Zubak, Jasna (1997). *Univerzalni rječnik englesko-hrvatski & hrvatsko-engleski*. Zagreb: Mozaik knjiga.

Ivanček, Suzana (2006). *Englesko-hrvatski, hrvatsko-engleski rječnik s gramatikom engleskog jezika*. Bjelovar: Rosae Maris.

Drvodelić, Milan (1996). *Hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Božić, Damir (2006). *Rječnik hrvatsko-engleski englesko hrvatski s gramatikom*. Split: Marjan tisak.

Samuelsson-Brown, Geoffrey (2010). *A Practical Guide for Translators*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Burić, Jasna (2010). “Djeca i mladi kao konzumenti masovnih medija. Etika i tržišne manipulacije potrebama mladih”. Hrčak: portal hrvatskih znanstvenih i stručnih časopisa, Filozofska istraživanja, Vol. 30, No. 4. Web. Accessed August 2020.
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/68567>

Kršul, Dora (2020). “Ivan Đikić u velikom intervjuu za Telegram: Zašto danas možemo biti puno mirniji oko koronavirusa”. Telegram. Web. Accessed August 2020.
<https://www.telegram.hr/zivot/ivan-dikic-u-velikom-intervjuu-za-telegram-zasto-danas-mozemo-biti-puno-mirniji-oko-koronavirusa/>

Beck, Boris (2016). “Čovjek s njuškom i repom – o filmskim životinjama”. Zarez: dvotjednik za društvena i kulturna zbivanja. Web. Accessed August 2020.
<http://www.zarez.hr/clanci/covjek-s-njuskom-i-repom-s-kime-i-zasto-govori-filmska-zivotinja>

“Multilingual Dictionary Glosbe”. Google Commerce Ltd. Web. Accessed August 2020.
<https://glosbe.com/en/hr>