The conversion of cognitive interjections in classical English literature into Indonesian

Nadia Khumairo Ma'shumah[1], Arif Nur Syamsi[2], Susana Widyastuti[2]*
[1]Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia; [2]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author; Email: susana_widyastuti@uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Translating interjections is notoriously challenging. Aside from their ambiguous and context-dependent meanings, they also express emotions through broadly suggestive sensations, attitudes, and states of mind. This study examines the challenges of translating interjections, known for their ambiguous and context-dependent meanings that convey emotions through suggestive sensations, attitudes, and states of mind. It aims to uncover emotional meanings in cognitive interjections, explore conversion strategies, and assess their impact on correspondence and equivalence. The data analyzed are interjective expressions in the classic English literature "Charlotte's Web" and its Indonesian translation "Laba-Laba and Jaring Kesayangannya," using content-based mixed methods. Emotional meanings are explored based on Jovanović's (2004) theory, while conversion strategies are identified using proposals by Cuenca (2006) and Baker (1992). The results reveal the presence of various emotional meanings in both the source text (ST) and target text (TT), including anger, disagreement, inquiry, ensurement, hesitation, irritation, pleasure, realization, relief, soothe, and triumph. Four conversion strategies are observed, with the most frequently used being conversion through a similar form and meaning. While the first two strategies generate equivalent expressions and maintain formal correspondence, the third strategy results in some degree of deviation in emotional meaning. This study underscores the importance of employing appropriate translation strategies to preserve the author's original ideas and uphold emotional expressiveness in the text.

Keywords: conversion, cognitive interjections, literary translation, translation equivalence

Konversi interjeksi kognitif dalam sastra Inggris klasik ke dalam bahasa Indonesia

Abstrak

Menerjemahkan interjeksi atau kata seru merupakan tantangan yang terkenal sulit. Selain maknanya yang ambigu dan bergantung pada konteks, kata seru juga mengekspresikan emosi melalui sensasi, sikap, dan keadaan pikiran yang bersifat sugestif. Penelitian ini mengkaji tantangan dalam menerjemahkan kata seru, yang dikenal karena maknanya yang ambigu dan bergantung pada konteks serta mengekspresikan emosi melalui sensasi, sikap, dan keadaan pikiran yang bersifat sugestif. Tujuannya adalah mengungkap makna emosional dalam kata seru kognitif, menjelajahi strategi konversi, dan menganalisis dampaknya terhadap korespondensi dan kesetaraan. Data yang dianalisis adalah ungkapan kata seru dalam karya sastra klasik berjudul "Charlotte's Web" dan terjemahan bahasa Indonesia-nya yang berjudul "Laba-Laba and Jaring Kesayangannya", menggunakan metode campuran berbasis konten. Makna emosional dikaji berdasarkan teori Jovanović (2004), sedangkan strategi konversi diidentifikasi dengan menggunakan proposal Cuenca (2006) dan Baker (1992). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya berbagai makna emosional dalam teks sumber (ST) dan teks sasaran (TT), termasuk kemarahan, ketidaksetujuan, pertanyaan, kepastian, keraguan, keresahan, kesenangan, kesadaran, kelegaan, ketenangan, dan kemenangan. Terdapat empat strategi konversi yang digunakan, dengan strategi yang paling umum adalah konversi dengan menggunakan bentuk dan makna yang mirip. Meskipun dua strategi pertama menghasilkan ekspresi yang setara dan menjaga korespondensi formal, strategi ketiga menyebabkan beberapa penyimpangan dalam makna emosional. Penelitian ini menekankan pentingnya menggunakan strategi terjemahan yang tepat untuk menjaga gagasan asli penulis dan mempertahankan ekspresi emosional dalam teks.

Kata kunci: konversi, interjeksi kognitif, terjemahan sastra, kesetaraan terjemahan

INTRODUCTION

The idea that interjections are not a part of grammar has long been disregarded in interjections studies, whether in theoretical or applied linguistics (Ameka, 1992). In contrast to any other aspect of English grammar, interjections do not normally enter into constructions with other word classes (Ameka, 1992; Wierzbicka, 1992; Ameka, 2006). Moreover, according to Jovanović (2004) linguists may not pay enough attention to interjections due to their ambiguous classification as words. Hence, their presence in sentence construction is frequently dismissed as meaningless, vague, and independent of syntax (Burkhardt, 1998; Wharton, 2003). For those reasons, interjections are among the least discussed classes of words and were positioned as shadowy or marginal existences (Burkhardt, 1998).

However, by positioning interjections as "semi-words", Wharton (2003) raises the argument that, historically, interjections can be treated in two dichotomous viewpoints: as part of the language or as non-words signifying feelings or mental states. When talking interjections to convey states of mind, they perhaps should be understood in cognitive, expressive, and communicative rather than grammatical contexts. Despite being dependent on the following clause, interjections are the linguistic element that conveys feelings or emotions via suggestive sensations, attitudes, and states of mind (Ameka, 1992; Wierzbicka, 1992; Kockelman, 2003; Thawabteh, 2010). Thus, interjections have become one of the essential parts of languages worldwide and play an important role in making meaning in verbal communication.

As interjections are fairly heterogeneous class of items (Wharton, 2003), by focusing on literary text translation, this study investigates the emotional meanings embedded in cognitive interjections, the conversion strategies of cognitive interjections, and how the conversion strategies affect equivalence. In the light of Jovanović (2004) and Thawabteh (2010), it investigates the challenges posed by the expressive nature, emotional load, and cultural context of cognitive interjections. Not only that the translators have to deal with the form, meaning, and functions, but they also need to carefully render them to produce a similar sense and effect in the target language.

From the linguistics (conceptualists) perspective, generally, interjections can be understood from formal (focuses on the form), semantic (focuses on the conventionalized linguistic signs), or pragmatic criteria (focuses on context-bound linguistic signs). As for the formal dimension, Ameka (2006) defines interjections as a form of expressions characterized by (1) words that are used to express emotions; (2) words and expressions of greetings; (3) swear words; (4) attention-getting signals; (5) some particles and response words; (6) words directed at animals, as well as (7) onomatopoeic words and iconic depictions. Norrick (2009) further investigates "interjections as pragmatic markers" by observing primary interjections (such as oh, *mhm, mm, um, uh, huh, wow, hm, uh-huh, ah, ooh*) and secondary interjections (such as *yeah, well, okay,* and *hey*). Meanwhile, Kridalaksana (2007) explicitly defines interjections as extra-sentences that always come before utterances of impartial screams and can be classified into simple and derived interjections. For the semantic dimension, Wilkins (1992) has successfully detected semantic contents (either propositional or conceptual) in interjections, although in the preceding study, Leech (1981) claimed that interjections are devoid of any real semantic content and have no inherent conceptual structure. Wierzbicka (1992:159) extends Wilkins' (1992) arguments by claiming that interjections — like any other linguistic elements — have their own meaning. Adversely, the functional or pragmatic standpoint of interjections views interjections from three functional categories. They are (1) those that focus on the speaker's mental state, either on the emotional or cognitive level, like '*ouch*'; (2) those that focus on the interaction and require a response from the interlocutor, like '*hey*'; and (3) those which are used in the establishment and maintenance of communicative contacts, like '*um*' (Ameka, 1992). Similarly, Wierzbicka (1992) postulates that interjections serve to reveal the speaker's mental state or action and can be classified into emotive interjections (*e.g.* "I feel something…" component), cognitive interjections (*e.g.* "I think… or I know something…" component), and volitive interjections (*e.g.* "I want something…" component). Other scholars, like Bühler (2011), Montes (1999), and Jakobson (1960) agree to define interjections based on their functions, like expressive, cognitive, conative, phatic, etc. Based on various parameters of 'interjectionality', Nübling (2004) divides interjections into emotionality and expressiveness interjections. Meanwhile, Jovanović (2004) distinguishing between exclamations and interjections based on their formal qualities, sentence position, and meanings, as there are problems distinguishing both terms.

One thing that must be understood, interjections' forms, meanings, and functions are bound to specific contexts and cultures where the interjections are formed and used (based on culture-specific conventions). Both linguistic and situational context is a critical factors in determining meaning in

cognitive interjections. Linguistic context is essential in the utterances that follow the interjection or even in the initial utterances, as the central idea of the meaning of cognitive interjection is contained in the surrounding utterance fragments. Meanwhile, the situational context is concerned with the parties to the conversation and their thoughts and beliefs, the physical environment, or the setting of the conversation, thus implying that variables external to the conversation affect the meaning (Fromkin et al., 2011), especially in cognitive interjections. Further, interjections are meaningless outside the culture that shapes them. Understanding their forms and how they are used in different cultures can help avoid misunderstandings and mistranslations. Fromkin et al.'s (2011) viewpoint is corroborated by prior research, which indicated that interjections were required in intercultural and cross-cultural communication. These cultural issues have also attracted academics to see how interjections differ from one language to another and change sporadically.

Given the complexities of aspects required for understanding interjections, translating them would pose challenges, particularly in achieving equivalence across language and culture. Since the meaning of each interjection was "intended," translating interjections is not the same as translating words. Within a pragmatic paradigm, translating interjections as linguistic signs means translating language-specific and culturally bound discourse meanings (Wierzbicka, 1992; Cuenca, 2006). However, disposing of translation works' interjections may result in losing emotional markers (Jovanović, 2004). Thus, a translator needs to continually evaluate various factors and make the best decisions when looking for equivalents; interjections should be studied based on their socio-communicative roles rather than any linguistic content they may possess (Wharton, 2003; Hoed in Machali, 2009).

Numerous researchers have researched interjection translation. Thawabteh (2010) examines the translator's choices to translate Arabic interjections into English in subtitles. However, this study focuses exclusively on the translation strategy employed and concludes that omission is the most frequently used in the subtitling translation from Arabic to English. Drzazga (2019) examines Shakespeare's classic Hamlet's interjection translation from English to Polish. This study focuses on the translation strategy and discussion of meaning in general but does not explicitly explain categorizing the discovered interjection. Similar to Thawabteh (2010), omission is the most frequently used translation strategy. Wahid and Basari (2020) investigate interjection by classifying the functions into six categories (greeting, joy, attention, approval, surprise, and sorrow) under primary, secondary, or onomatopoeic interjections. In contrast to previous studies, Wahid and Basari (2020) demonstrate that a literal translation was the most frequently used strategy. Differently, Drzazga (2021) builds on prior research by concentrating on translating the interjection "*oh*." Accompanying its expressive function, the interjection "*oh*" is considered a discourse marker under the primary interjection category. Intriguingly, it is interesting to note that the interjection can perform multiple functions in a single case. The results of this study's analysis of translation strategy are also consistent with those of previous research, namely that omission is the most frequently used strategy.

All the studies on interjection (as mentioned above) discuss meaning in general and its translation strategies. Scant attention has been given to intensely scrutinizing the function of each interjection categorization, especially in the sub-category of cognitive interjection. Based on the hypothesis that although playing with style is essential when translating literary works, translators cannot deny that literature translation must sound natural, almost like the original work, to achieve equal feeling (Venuti in Munday, 2008:184). Therefore, translators must work with an adequate theory of literary translation by not ignoring every literary unit, from the individual sentence to the whole order of words, by drawing the connection between individual works, literary genres, and the entire body of literature (Scholes, 1974; Bassnett, 2005). Although cognitive interjection has a function and context of use related to thought in the characters, interjections generally affect capturing the reader or interlocutor about the atmosphere, speaker's feelings, or situation in a conversation, especially in the context of literary works.

Interjections are essential in definitive or expressive texts, especially in literary works. By correctly rendering the interjections, it is possible to achieve both expressiveness and mood in the text. As the translation is about expressing emotion, the effect on the audience is a crucial indicator of the successful translation of interjections (Cuenca, 2006:21). The translator is responsible for giving the reader the same experience as reading the original text. As a result, this research merits further investigation by examining the relationship between cognitive interjection and its emotional meaning, the strategy used to translate the interjection, and their meaning equivalence.

This study focuses on cognitive interjections as the expressions of cognition, feelings, or thoughts. The intention of cognitive interjections can only be comprehended through the information known by the speaker. Because of that, the comprehension of cognitive interjections requires a relationship between the cognitive domain and its context. Moreover, since they intentionally occur in written discourse as a simulation of spontaneous spoken dialogue (O'Connell et al., 2007), this study used classical English literature entitled "Charlotte's Web," written by Elwyn Brooks White (1952), and its Indonesian translation entitled "*Laba-Laba dan Jaring Kesayangan-nya*" translated by Dina Begum (2020) as the material objects. Charlotte's Web was considered a classic of children's literature which was proven by winning the John Newbery Medal in 1953, Horn Book Fanfare in 1952, Laura Ingalls Wilder Medal in 1970, Massachusetts Children's Book Award in 1984, and listed by Publishers Weekly as the best-selling children's paperback of all time in 2000. It was also adapted into an animated feature by Hanna-Barbera Productions and Sagittarius Productions in 1973. Furthermore, since interjections are most commonly found in informal writing and fiction, the work's numerous interjections and translations became a strong reason why "Charlotte's Web" and its Indonesian translation were used as the objects of this study.

Charlotte's Web's entire story revolves around the plight of a pig named Wilbur. Mr. Arable (the farm owner) once cut him off because of his tiny, small, and weak body as a child. However, the farm owner's daughter, Fern, insists on caring for him until he grows up. Soon, Wilbur's life journey began when he was forced to be relocated to the Zuckerman Barn. He eats voraciously every day until he realizes it is a Zuckerman trick to make him overweight and ready to be slaughtered. Nonetheless, Wilbur is not alone. He had many good friends in Zuckerman's barn. Until one day, his devoted friends attempted various methods to save him. Charlotte, a wise spider, then had an idea to save his life by writing about Wilbur on her web so that he does not perish.

Furthermore, relating to the translator's competency (as the translator's knowledge determines the quality of the translated literature), Dina Begum is well-known as a seasoned linguist and *Himpunan Penerjemah Indonesia* (Association of Indonesian Translators) certified translator with over ten years of English-to-Indonesian translation by providing translation services to domestic and global clients. She has translated more than 80 books, particularly novels, for Indonesian publishers, until now (see Dina Begum - - Fiction, Novel, Human Resources, Scorecard, Management, British Council, Fast Service, Information and Communication Technology, n.d.).

METHOD

The data were cognitive interjections in the English version of classical English literature entitled "Charlotte's Web" (White, 1952, 1980) with 184 pages and 22 chapters as the Source Text (ST) and its Indonesian translation entitled "*Laba-Laba dan Jaring Kesayangannya*" (Begum, 2020) as the Target Text (TT), within 167 pages and 22 chapters.

The data were taken, observed, and documented using purposive-comparative methods focusing on the emergence, emotional meanings, and conversion of cognitive interjections in the ST and the TT. The data were collected by: (1) reading the English and its Indonesian version comprehensively; (2) marking and recording all the cognitive interjections data in both languages; (3) comparing the existing SL and the TL data based on their emotional meanings and conversion strategies; (4) inputting data into the datasheet; and (5) labeling the data.

This study applied mixed methods based on the sequential explanatory design by integrating quantitative and qualitative data into the analysis. Here, the data were numerically examined using descriptive statistical statistics and subjectively assessed using the content analysis approach. Meanwhile, the conclusions were drawn based on the emerging data. Hence, Downe-Wamboldt (1992) underlines that content analysis is more than a counting process by linking the results to their context or the environment in which they were produced. The data were analyzed by: (1) identifying cognitive interjections by stepping on Wierzbicka's (1992) classification; (2) identifying and comparing the cognitive interjection's emotional meanings based on Jovanović (2004) theory containing anger, annoyance, approval, contempt, delight, disgust, enthusiasm, fear, impatience, indignation, irritation, joy, pain, pity, pleasure, relief, sorrow, surprise, sympathy, triumph, and wonder. Thus, the possible equivalents to a single English interjection are directly associated with different translation strategies (Cuenca, 2006); (3) exploring the conversions of cognitive interjections by cultivating Cuenca's (2006) and Baker's (1992) proposals which are divided into (a) literal translation; (b) translation by using an interjection with a different form but the same meaning; (c) translation by using a non-interjective structure with a similar meaning; (d) translation

by using an interjection with a different meaning, (e) omission, and (f) addition of elements; (4) counting the emergence of the data using descriptive statistics; and (5) interpreting the results and comparison by stepping on quantitative and qualitative data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results

Concentrating on translation as a product, the results of this study show that the conversion of interjections has a minimal effect on the target text as long as they have similar emotional meanings. A total of 50 interjective expressions in the source text can be categorized into cognitive types. Interestingly, all of them are rendered into cognitive interjections in Indonesian. Table 1 demonstrates that there are nearly zero changes in emotional meaning, as there is only one change in the state of form and meaning due to omission in the target text. Although we cannot generalize the findings, the translation of this literary text can be an example of translators' loyalty in rendering expressive words or phrases like interjections, which are generally believed to be strenuous to translate.

Table 1. ST and TT's cognitive interjections' emotional meanings

ST's Interjection Relations	Occurrence(s)	TT's Interjection Relations	Occurrence(s)
Cognitive-Anger	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Anger	1 (2.00%)
Cognitive-Disagreement	4 (8.00%)	Cognitive-Disagreement	4 (8.00%)
Cognitive-Enquiry	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Enquiry	1 (2.00%)
Cognitive-Ensurement	8 (16.00%)	Cognitive-Ensurement	8 (16.00%)
Cognitive-Hesitation	24 (48.00%)	Cognitive-Hesitation	24 (48.00%)
Cognitive-Hesitation	1 (2.00%)	[omitted]	-
Cognitive-Irritation	2 (4.00%)	Cognitive-Irritation	2 (4.00%)
Cognitive-Pleasure	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Pleasure	1 (2.00%)
Cognitive-Realization	5 (10.00%)	Cognitive-Realization	5 (10.00%)
Cognitive-Relief	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Relief	1 (2.00%)
Cognitive-Soothe	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Soothe	1 (2.00%)
Cognitive-Triumph	1 (2.00%)	Cognitive-Triumph	1 (2.00%)
Total	50 (100.00%)		49 (98.00%)

In both texts, 'hesitation' is dominant as the data are found in conversation in which the flow may be dynamic. As most of the conversation is about discussion, a specific tone is used in this emotional meaning. The occurrences of this type of meaning are found in the interjection "well" which is translated into "*yah*". As illustrated in Table 1, most interjections on the ST are transferrable to the TT. One interjection is omitted. Additionally, while the meaning and function are nearly identical, minor details have changed due to differences in the interjection of English and Indonesian cultures. These are demonstrated by the interjection "well," which is then translated as "*yah*," a word with a different verbal meaning. Nonetheless, when viewed from a larger image, the two interjections share a high degree of similarity in their usage. Thus, one could assert that the ST and the TT meanings are identical.

The conversion of cognitive interjections

This study's conversion of cognitive interjections was identified based on formal correspondence and meanings equivalence (see Table 2). Meanwhile, meanings equivalence is measured based on the similarity of emotional meaning between the SL and the TL.

Table 2. The conversion of cognitive interjections from the ST to the TT

Form of Cognitive Interjections' Conversion from the ST to the TT	Occurrence(s)
Conversion by using a similar form and meaning	48 (96.00%)
Conversion by using a similar form, meaning, and literal translation (triplets)	1 (2.00%)
Conversion by omission or deletion	1 (2.00%)
Total	50 (100.00%)

The first two strategies are attempts to maintain similar or the same meaning. The omission of interjections is used only in a single datum. The form in this context refers to the interjection's functional grounding form. As a result, the problem appears in a formal correspondence problem based on

emotional meaning equivalence. In this case, the source language interjection uses the form "well" to mean "wait, let's see the situation around" or "considering the previous discussion…" or "let me think…" whereas the target language interjection uses the form "*yah*" to denote the same meaning. The two interjections in different languages are grouped as cognitive interjections because they serve the same purpose: to allow the translator to maintain the target text's meanings by considering the same emotional effect that is to feel something.

Discussion

Since Catford (1965) states that "the central problem of translation is finding target language translation equivalents," it initially appears that the translator must produce the same (or at least similar) effects on the TT's readers that the original work does on its readers because the decision made by the translator in translating the text will subsequently be reflected in the translated text. Therefore, the translator should propose an audience design and set the usage of appropriate translation strategies during translation. The following are the translator's decisions in rendering the ST's cognitive interjections into the TT, manifested through various conversions.

Every translator aims to achieve equivalence between the translated text and the translation. As a result, formal correspondence, defined as structural alignment between the ST and the TT, is forfeited in translation. Hoed in Machali (2009) calls this "the equivalence over formal correspondence." Thus, since the equivalent is fundamental, the translator frequently uses formal adjustments or shifts to solve the equivalency problem. Meanwhile, Catford (1965:32) also claims that the SL and the TL items rarely have 'the same meaning' in the linguistic sen but can function in the same context. As a result, the source text's form may be changed. In line with the theory, through the conversion by using the dissimilar form but the exact meaning, even if the forms of two distinct languages' interjections change, the translator can still express and retain the exact meaning. The following are examples of the conversion from this cognitive interjection.

Conversion by using a similar form and meaning

Translation has been defined in various ways through various theoretical backgrounds and approaches from time to time. Nonetheless, since Nida and Taber (1974:12) defines translation as "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and then in terms of style" and Newmark (1988) defines it as "the process of rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text"; translators, as well as practitioners, have concerned to the effort to transfer meaning and the style as accurate as possible besides focusing on the forms. Thus, the conversion using a similar form and meaning was implemented as part of the translator's efforts to minimize the number of variations and deviations. The following are examples of the conversion from this cognitive interjection.

(1) ST: "Sorry, sonny, sorry," said the goose.

"I'm sitting- sitting on my eggs. Eight of them. Got to keep them toasty-oasty-oasty warm. I have to stay right here, I'm no flibberty-ibberty-gibbet. I do not play when there are eggs to hatch. I'm expecting goslings."

"**Well**, I didn't think you were expecting wood-peckers," said Wilbur bitterly. (CW, 1952, 1980:28a)

TT: "*Maaf, nak, maaf," sahut si angsa.*

"Aku sedang mengerami telur-telurku. Ada delapan. Harus membuat mereka amat-sangat sangat hangat. Aku harus diam disini, aku bukan tukang mengoceh. Aku tidak main-main kalau ada telur yang harus ditetaskan. Aku menunggu kedatangan anak angsa."

"Yah, aku kan tidak mengatakan kau sedang menanti burung pelatuk," kata Wilbur dengan pahit.' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021:27)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meanings: irritation → irritation

The word "*well*" as a cognitive interjection has a brusque or annoyed connotation in the original language. Wilbur used this sentence to express his annoyance over "the goose" incubating her eggs and declaring, "I'm expecting goslings." As a result, Wilbur responded with sarcasm. Meanwhile, in the target language, the word "*yah*" as a cognitive interjection serves an equal purpose, notably for showing irritation.

(2) ST: "I think you're beautiful," said Wilbur.
"**Well**, I am pretty," replied Charlotte. (CW, 1952, 1980: 37b)
TT: "*Kurasa kau cantik," kata Wilbur.*
"**Yah**, *aku memang cantik," jawab Charlotte.* (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 35b)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: pleasure → pleasure

In excerpt (2), the cognitive interjection "well" conveys Charlotte's agreement and flattery regarding Wilbur's praise. The interjective word "*well*" is used as a pause or break before boasting by reinforcing the prior assertion as if it were self-evident in a situation of pleasure. This interjection is similar to the target language culture using a cognitive interjection "*yah*" as a response to an interlocutor's assertion that is deemed unavoidable by the speaker with a proud or haughty expression due to the speaker's perception of possessing positive values (pleasure) acknowledged by others.

(3) ST: "It's cruel," replied Wilbur, who did not intend to be argued out of his position.
"**Well**, you can't talk." said Charlotte.
"You have your meals brought to you in a pail. Nobody feeds me. I have to get my own living (CW, 1952, 1980: 40)
TT: "*Itu kejam," jawab Wilbur, yang tak bermaksud berdebat dari posisinya.*
"**Yah**, *kau boleh saja bicara begitu." kata Charlotte.*
"*Makananmu dibawakan untukmu dalam ember. Tak seorang pun memberiku makan. Aku harus mencari makan sendiri…"* (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 38)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: disagreement→ disagreement

The cognitive interjection word "*well*" is used in excerpt (3) in the same way as it is in excerpt (2), by suggesting something abundantly evident but with a different sense. Charlotte uses the cognitive interjection "well" to reject Wilbur's expression because their circumstances are diametrically opposed. This exclamation conveys Charlotte's displeasure and rejection of Wilbur's attempt to empathize with her. Charlotte is upset because Wilbur does not have to work as hard as a spider must spin its web, and a pig must find its food. Thus, Wilbur's empathy is dismissed since it is indirect. This context also applies to the interjective word "*yah*," which is the preferred translation for the word "*well*" in the target language (Indonesian) culture. The data shows that even though the word form alters between the two languages, the context and meaning of the interjection stay the same.

(4) ST: Charlotte stood quietly over the preparing to eat it. Wilbur lay down and closed his eyes. He was tired from his wakeful night and from the excitement of meeting someone for the first time. A breeze brought him the smell of clover-the sweet-smelling world beyond his fence.
"**Well**," he thought, "I've got a new friend, all right. But what a gamble friendship is! Charlotte is fierce, brutal, scheming, bloodthirsty-everything I don't like. How can I learn to like her, even though she is pretty and, of course, clever?" (CW, 1952, 1980: 41)
TT: '*Charlotte berdiri tenang di atas lalat, bersiap untuk menyantapnya. Wilbur berbaring dan memejamkan matanya. Ia letih karena terus menerus terbangun, ditambah karena kegembiraan bertemu seseorang untuk pertama kalinya. Embusan angin membawa keharuman semaggi—dunia beraroma manis di luar pagarnya.*

"***Yah***," *pikirnya, "aku memang mendapat teman. Tapi rupanya berteman itu mirip dengan berjudi! Charlotte buas, brutal, licik, haus darah--semua yang tak kusukai. Bagaimana aku bisa menyukainya, walaupun ia catik dan, tentu saja, pandai?*' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 39)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: hesitation → hesitation

The word "*well*" in excerpt (4) implies a stop for doubt caused by thought. The subsequent narration also explicitly states this using the utterance "he thought." This type of cognitive interjection considers Wilbur's dilemma as he describes his friend as a figure he admires and despises. This interjection was equal to "*yah*" in the Indonesian context.

(5) ST: "We're holding a directors' meeting," replied the old sheep.
"**Well**, break it up! " said Templeton. "Meetings bore me." And the rat began to climb a rope that hung against the wall. (CW, 1952, 1980: 90a)
TT: "*Kami sedang mengadakan rapat direktur," jawab domba tua.*
"***Yah***, *bubarkan!" kata Templeton. "Pertemuan membuatku bosan." Tikus itu pun mulai memanjat tambang yang menggantung di dinding.*' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 82)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: anger → anger

The word "*well*" in excerpt (5) denotes Templeton's rage or impatience, as evidenced by the interjection's continuation with "break it up." In this situation, the animals awaited all sides' convergence to convene a meeting to save Wilbur. This interjection could also be used to describe Templeton's cynicism regarding Wilbur. Excerpt (5) has the same meaning as "*yah*." In Indonesian, the word "*yah*" can also be used with a high tone to convey or demonstrate someone's fury. In order to show the intention of displeasure, the interjection must also be followed by the next word, phrase, or clause, as the interjection "*yah*" enhances the emotion.

(6) ST: "Do you?" said Charlotte, looking at him with affection.
"**Well**, you're a good little pig, and radiant you shall be. I'm in this thing pretty deep now-I might as well go the limit." (CW, 1952,1980: 101c)
TT: '"*Benarkah?" kata Charlotte, sambil menatapnya penuh kasih sayang.* "***Yah***, *kau babi kecil yang baik, dan kau memang cemerlang. Aku sangat menyukai ini sekarang—aku akan berusaha dengan sebaik-baiknya."*' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 92)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: soothe → soothe

In excerpt (6), the cognitive interjection "*well*" refers to a calming pause. This interjection acts as a pause, allowing the conversation to continue naturally with a low intonation and slow cadence. Thus, the interlocutor is calmed by the enlightened mood. The translation uses this context, notably the Indonesian cognitive interjection word "*yah*." Unlike "*well*," which can be used with either a long or short vowel, the cognitive interjection word "*yah*!" is typically employed as a relaxing pause with a rather long vowel "*yaaah*!." As a result, this interjection creates a delay or pause in the discourse for both parties, allowing them to relieve tension or feel more relaxed.

(7) ST: "Have you heard about the words that appeared in the spider's web?" asked Mrs. Arable nervously.
"Yes," replied the doctor.
"**Well**, do you' understand it? asked Mrs. Arable. (CW, 1952, 1980: 108a)
TT: '"*Pernahkah Anda mendengar tentang kata-kata yang muncul di jaring laba-laba?" tanya Bu Arable dengan gugup.*

"Ya," jawab dokter.
*"**Nah**, apakah Anda memahaminya?"' tanya Bu Arable.'* (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 99a)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meanings: ensurement → ensurement

(8) ST: Mrs. Arable shifted uneasily in her chair.
"No," she replied. "But I can crochet doily and I can knit a sock."
"Sure," said the doctor. "But somebody taught you, didn't they?"
"My mother taught me."
"**Well**, who taught a spider? A young spider knows how to spin a web without any instructions from anybody. Don't you regard that as miracle?" (CW, 1952, 1980: 110a)
TT: *Bu Arable bergeser dengan gelisah di kursinya. "Belum," jawabnya. "Tapi kau bisa merajut kaus kaki."*
"Tentu saja," kata dokter. "Tapi seseorang mengajari Anda bukan?"
"Ibuku yang mengajarkannya."
*"**Nah**, siapa yang mengajari laba-laba? Laba-laba muda tau bagaimamana memintal jaring tanpa petunjuk dari siapapun. Tidakkah kau menganggapnya keajaiban?"'*(LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 99c)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: enquiry → enquiry

While the two terms appear to have a similar meaning, a deeper examination reveals a minor distinction. In excerpts (7) and (8), the cognitive interjection "*well*" acts as a pause to allow the other person to process "what is stated." In contrast to the preceding example, "*well*" is rendered as "*nah*." The strategy is used to indicate the end of a statement or concept. However, when asking questions or concluding a conversation to assure the other person understands what was said, the cognitive interjection "*well*," which translates to "*nah*," is allowed to capture the target language culture's meaning equivalence. While both excerpts can be used in the same way, the emotional meaning may vary. Extract (7) ensures the interlocutor's knowledge, whereas excerpt (8) encourages the interlocutor to think. In other words, extract (7) summarizes what has already been discussed with existing statements, and excerpt (8) collects remarks while the discourse is ongoing.

(9) ST: "…If Fern says that the animals in Zuckerman's barn talk, I'm quite ready to believe her. Perhaps if people talked less, animals would talk more. People are incessant talkers-I can give you my word on that."
"**Well,** I feel better about Fern," said Mrs. Arable. "You don't think I need worry about her?" (CW, 1952, 1980: 110b)
TT: "…*Kalau Fern mengatakan binatang-binatang di lumbung Zuckerman bicara, aku siap untuk mempercayainya. Mungkin kalau manusia tidak terlalu banyak bicara, hewan akan bicara lebih banyak. Manusia gemar bicara tiada hentinya—aku bisa memberikan kesaksian terhadap hal tersebut."*
*"**Nah**, saya merasa lebih baik tentang Fern." kata Bu Arable. "Menurut Anda, saya tidak perlu mengkuatirkannya?"'* (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 100a)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: relief → relief

The cognitive interjection "*well*" is used similarly in excerpt (9) as it is in excerpt (6). Excerpt (9) also serves as a pause in the speech. It allowed the speaker to relax a little more during the pause. The distinction is that the speaker uses extract (6) to reassure others, whereas excerpt (9) is intended to reassure the speaker himself. Furthermore, excerpt (9) is frequently used with a slow exhalation pace. While the translation, "*nah*," is spoken in a rapid cadence in one breath. Although the form and pronunciation vary, the concept is the same: it pauses the speaker to rest for a moment.

(10) ST: Fern nodded. "I had the best time I have ever had anywhere or any time in all of my whole life."
"**Well**!" said Mrs. Arable. "Isn't that nice!" (CW, 1952, 1980: 143b)
TT: 'Fern mengangguk. "Ini hari terbaik yang pernah kulalui di mana saja atau kapan saja sepanjang hidupku."
"**Nah**!" kata Bu Arable. "Bagus sekali, bukan!"' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 130)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: triumph → triumph

In excerpt (10), the cognitive interjection "*well*" refers to a good environment or enthusiasm resulting from a scenario. In contrast to the preceding excerpts, excerpt (10) uses the cognitive interjection "*well*" in a quick rhythm out of eagerness. Translating the cognitive interjection "*well*" into "*nah*," retains the source language's context and meanings.

(11) ST: "Who is Templeton?" asked Mrs. Arable.
"He's the rat," replied Fern.
"None of us like him much."
"Who's 'us'?" asked Mr. Arable.
"**Oh**, everybody in the barn cellar. Wilbur and the sheep and the lambs and the goose and the gander and the goslings and Charlotte and me. " (CW, 1952, 1980: 52)
TT: "'*Oh, semuanya di lumbung. Wilbur dan domba-domba, angsa jantan dan betina dan anak-anak angsa, Charlotte dan aku.*'" (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 50)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: realization →realization

(12) ST: "What were we talking about, Wilbur, when we were so rudely interrupted?"
"**Oh**, I don't remember," said Wilbur.
"It doesn't make any difference. (CW, 1952, 1980: 59a)
TT: "'*Apa yang sedang kita bicarakan, Wilbur, ketika kita disela dengan kasarnya, tadi?*"
"***Oh**, aku tidak ingat,*" kata Wilbur.
"*Tidak ada bedanya…*'" (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 59)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: realization → realization

The emotional meaning of the interjection in excerpts (11) and (12) can be indicated in the following clauses as they appear to be a response. The exclamation "*oh*" has numerous meanings, but in this context, that interjection acted as the atmosphere builder, which means "I understand what is being spoken by the speaker" or, in other words, a point of realization. The intonation used in this interjection varies from sincere and casual to sarcastic. However, " *oh* " is used to realize a question with a low intonation and a short vowel. The interjection works similarly in both the source and target languages. Because of that, the translator can reserve the sense of the emotional meaning in both texts.

(13) ST: "How is the plan coming, Charlotte? Have you got very far with it? Is it coming along pretty well?" Wilbur was trembling again, but Charlotte was cool and collected.
"Oh, it's coming all right," she said lightly. "The plan is still in its early stages and hasn't completely shaped up yet, but I'm working on it." (CW, 1952, 1980: 63b)
TT: "'Bagaimana rencananya. Charlotte? Apakah kau sudah cukup jauh merencanakan? Apakah rencananya tersusun rapi?" Wilbur gemetar lagi, tetapi Charlotte tampak tenang dan terkendali.

"**Oh**, rencananya mulai tersusun," katanya dengan enteng. "Rencana itu masih dalam tahap awal dan belum benar-benar membentuk tapi aku sedang mengusahakannya."' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 60b)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: ensurement → Ensurement

(14) ST: "I'd be only too glad to help in any way I can."\
"**Oh**, I'll work it out alone," said Charlotte. "I can think better if I think alone." (CW, 1952, 1980: 64a)
TT: '*Aku akan senang sekali kalau bisa membantumu dengan cara apa saja."*
*"**Oh**, aku akan melakukannya sendirian," kata Charlotte. "Aku bisa berpikir dengan lebih baik kalau berpikir sendirian."*' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 61a)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meanings: ensurement → ensurement

The interjection in excerpts (13) and (14) is used to gather the attention of the interlocutors as "I understand and believe me…" with a stomping intonation. As the interjection makes the interlocutors pause, the vowel is short and fast to show confidence. Excerpt (13) shows Charlotte's confidence in her plan out of Wilbur's questions, while excerpt (14) shows Charlotte's confidence in her skill in doing her work individually. Given that the interjection is performed similarly in both languages, the emotional meaning in both texts is preserved.

As Wills (1982) defines translation as "the procedure of turning a written SL text into an optimally equivalent TL text," the translator strives to transmit the form and meaning to the target text as optimally as possible. Through the findings, the conversion using a similar form and meaning is deemed the safest technique to employ, stipulating that both source and target languages' references had similar or identical forms, functions, and effects.

Conversion by using a similar form, meaning, and literal translation (triplets)

In most translation practices, translators commonly use couplets, triplets, or quadruplets to generate the natural form and obtain a suitable translation. Thus, the data findings show that the translator used a similar form, meaning, and literal translation to substitute the original by combining three strategies to deal with a single problem. The following example shows this conversion.

(15) ST: "I notice that it's always me you come to when in trouble. But I've never heard of anyone's heartbreaking on my account. **Oh, no**. Who cares anything about old Templeton?" (CW, 1952, 1980: 168b)
TT: '"*Kulihat akulah yang kau andalkan saat kau terlibat masalah. Tapi aku tak pernah mendengar ada yang patah hati demi aku. "**Oh, tidak**. Siapa yang peduli pada Templeton tua?"*' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 153)

Form: cognitive → cognitive
Emotional meaning: disagreement → disagreement

Excerpt (15) was discovered differently than the others, particularly using triplets strategies. The "*oh*" contains the same form, while the "*no*" contains the literal translation. While the two previously mentioned terms have the same meaning, this interjection can have several meanings when used alone— surprise, sympathy, or sarcasm. Templeton's rejection to grant Wilbur's request is sarcastic in this context. As a result, its use has sarcastic and gentle tones. Although interjection is rarely used as sarcasm in the target language, as opposed to the source language, the meaning and why it is conveyed can be retained in the target language text. The use of triplets in translating cognitive interjections is undoubtedly beneficial to maintaining the source text's emotional meaning because of the absence of significant shifts.

Conversion by omission or deletion

To some extent, literary translation is risky since it is essential in facilitating cultural reconciliation and contributes significantly to enriching literature and civilizations. This problem takes place because no two languages are identical. Hence, the translator's decisions in accommodating language may contradict those made by the author in the original work. One of the decisions that translators often make is to apply an omission or deletion strategy. However, unlike Thawabteh (2010) and Drzazga (2019) findings, which indicate that omission is the most frequently used strategy, the data in this study proves that the conversion of interjection by omission could be dynamic (since it only occurred once in the data).

The conversion by omission or deletion is found in the data findings. It occurs when the target language's interjection is omitted or deleted in the TT. Nevertheless, omitting source cognitive interjection can undoubtedly alter and potentially deviate from the meaning. Since there is only a single datum, the following datum illustrates this conversion.

(16) ST: "I don't see why he needs an ax," continued Fern, who was only eight.
"**Well**," said her mother, "one of the pig is a runt. It's very small and weak, and it will never amount to anything. So, your father has decided to do away with it." (CW, 1952,1980: 1)

TT: "*"Aku tak mengerti mengapa Papa perlu kapak," lanjut Fern, yang baru berumur delapan tahun.*
"[ə] Babinya kerdil, Nak," kata ibunya. "Sangat kecil dan lemah. Tidak akan pernah laku dijual. Jadi, ayahmu memutuskan untuk membereskannya."' (LLDJK, 2020, 2021: 3)

Form: cognitive → ə
Emotional meaning: hesitation → ə

Excerpt (16) shows that the cognitive interjection "well" has been deleted. This omission can ultimately disrupt the flow of the dialogue. In ST, the cognitive interjection "well" denotes hesitancy in conveying the following expressions. The portrayal of a mother seeking to understand her child becomes more straightforward without this element. Based on the evidence that slight changes in literary works impacted how the reader interprets the message or regards the characters, the slightly hesitant pronunciation, like the ST's interjection "well," will convey that he is speaking slowly and clearly. Thus, when the translator removes the mother's tone of voice in the target text, the representation of the characters' emotions is quite fuzzy. This finding aligned with what Punga did in Abdullatief (2020). He states that "the outcome of omissions is much more serious at the level of expressive meaning since a dramatic drop off in the number of emotionally loaded text units and, at the same time, the cancellation of a captivating flow of the text influences the readers' emotional reactions negatively (moreover, no compensation strategies are applied for the loss of emotional force)."

Translator's decision-making to transfer interjections from English to Indonesian frequently involved conversion using a similar form and meaning. As stated by Nida and Taber (1982), translators took particular delight in being able to reproduce stylistic specialities to reproduce the source text/language's meaning as understood by the author/writer. Therefore, since interjections are manifested by cognitive/mental states and must be understood beyond context, the availability of formal correspondence (as demonstrated by equivalent form) and meaning equivalence (as shown by equivalent/identical emotional meaning) leads to an optimal transfer of the source's interjection to the target text. The inability or failure to capture the context of utterances containing interjections impacts the loss or blurring of the essence of emotion and sensation that the author wants to convey through conversations and pools between characters in his or her original work.

CONCLUSION

In translation, particularly in translating interjections, maintaining formal correspondence and meaning equivalence in the sense of functional ground is significant to sustain the meaning and flow of engaged conversation. That situation also applies when translating cognitive interjections, for example, the cognitive interjection "*well*," which was translated as "*yah*" or "*nah*." The conversion or preservation

of form and meaning becomes critical in interjection translation due to cultural differences between languages. Thus, the meaning of each utterance (as shown in 15 excerpts) can be retained in the source language while still receiving full marks in the target language. Nonetheless, finding correct interjections as linguistic items (which are not considered vital in sentence formation) is not easy but is crucial for meaning-making in communication. One key point that derives the meaning in cognitive interjections analysis is the context since the main idea of the interjection is in other utterance fragments. Therefore, selecting appropriate conversion in translating cognitive interjection is needed by considering senses and effects in different cultures.

Through our investigation, we must admit that the findings of this study are limited to the conversion of cognitive interjections found in a literary work. Therefore, this study becomes dynamic and transformational since there are three types of interjections: emotive, cognitive, and volitive interjections; or based on their function, such as expressive, cognitive, conative, phatic, etc.; a follow-up study is suggested by involving more diverse discourses and applying different perspectives and theories to the investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Abdullatief, M. (2020). Omission as a Problem and a Solution in Literary Translation: A Study of Hemingway's Hills Like White Elephants and Joyce's The Sisters and Their Arabic Translations. *Journal of Languages and Translation*, 7(1), 16–42. https://doi.org/10.21608/jltmin.2020.143453.

Ameka, F. K. (1992). Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2–3), 101–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90048-G.

Ameka, F. K. (2006). Interjections. In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (pp. 743–746). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00396-5.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2005). *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Bühler, K. (2011). Theory of language: The representational function of language. In *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language*. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.164

Burkhardt, A. (1998). Interjektionen: Begriff, Geschichte(n), Paraphrasen. In T. Harden & E. Hentschel (Eds.), articulae particularum: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Harald Weydt (pp. 43–73). Tubingen.

Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.

Cuenca, M. J. (2006). Interjections and Pragmatic Errors in Dubbing. *Meta*, 51(1), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.7202/012991ar.

Dina Begum - - *Fiction, novel, human resources, scorecard, management, British Council, fast service, Information and Communication Technology.* (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2022, from https://www.proz.com/translator/919774.

Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13(3), 313–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/07399339209516006.

Drzazga, A. (2019). Interjections in Shakespeare's Hamlet and their Polish translations. *Linguistica Silesiana*, 40, 83–98. https://doi.org/10.24425/linsi.2019.129403.

Drzazga, A. (2021). The English interjection oh in specialist literature and translation. *Linguistica Silesiana*, 42, 239–259. https://doi.org/10.24425/linsi.2021.137239.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language* (9th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Jakobson, R. (1960). *Style in Language Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics*. Style in Language.

Jovanović, V. Ž. (2004). *The form, position and meaning of interjections in English* (Vol. 3, Issue 1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298344430.

Kockelman, P. (2003). The Meanings of Interjections in Q'eqchi' Maya. *Current Anthropology*, 44(4), 467–490. https://doi.org/10.1086/375871.

Kridalaksana, H. (2007). *Kelas Kata dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. PT. Gramedia Pusaka Utama.

Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning* (2nd ed.). Pelican Books.

Machali, R. (2009). *Pedoman Bagi Penerjemah*. PT. Mizan Pustaka.

Montes, R. G. (1999). The development of discourse markers in Spanish: Interjections. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(10). https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(98)00106-4.

Munday, Jeremy. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies : Theories and Applications*. Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.

Nida, E., & Taber, C. (1974). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. E. J. Brill.

Norrick, N. R. (2009). Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(5), 866–891. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.005.

Nübling, D. (2004). Die prototypische interjektion: Ein definitionsvorschlag. *Zeitschrift Fur Semiotik*, 26(1–2).

O'Connell, D. C., Kowal, S., & King, S. P. (2007). Interjections in literary readings and artistic performance. Pragmatics. *Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA),* 17(3), 417–438. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.17.3.04con.

Scholes, R. (1974). *Structuralism in Literature: An Introduction*. Yale University Press Publication.

Thawabteh, M. A. (2010). The translatability of interjections: A case study of Arabic-English subtitling. *Meta*, 55(3), 499–515. https://doi.org/10.7202/045067ar.

Wahid, M. I., & Basari, A. (2020). Techniques of Translating Interjection in the Novel "Looking For Alaska" in Terms of Functions, Meanings, and Categories. *E-Structural*, 3(01), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.33633/es.v3i01.3854.

Wharton, T. (2003). Interjections, language, and the 'showing/saying' continuum. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 11(1), 39–91. https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.11.1.04wha.

White, E. B. (1952). *Charlotte's Web*. Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited.

White, E. B. (1980). *Charlotte's Web* (2nd ed.). HarperCollins Publishers.

White, E. B. (2020). *Laba-Laba dan Jaring Kesayangannya* (D. Begum, Ed.). Kakatua.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). The semantics of interjection. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(2–3), 159–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90050-L.

Wills, W. (1982). *The Science of Translation*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tubingen.

Wilkins, D. P. (1992). Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *18*(2–3), 119–158. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90049-H.