

ANNA DRZAZGA
University of Silesia
anna.drzazga@us.edu.pl

INTERJECTIONS IN SHAKESPEARE'S *HAMLET* AND THEIR POLISH TRANSLATIONS

The present paper aims at investigating the problem of translating interjections from English into Polish. William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and its Polish translations by J. Paszkowski (1961), M. Słomczyński (1978), and S. Barańczak (1990) are chosen as the corpus for the present study. The analysis of the translations of the original English interjections will reveal the translational strategies followed by the translators. The first part of the paper is devoted to a short discussion concerning the definition and taxonomy of interjections. Next, the problem of the role interjections play in drama is discussed on the basis of the specialist literature. Finally, different translation strategies are presented followed by the analysis of the corpus material.

Keywords: *Interjections, translation, translation strategies*

1. Definitions and taxonomies

Interjections are a problematic word class. Quoting Cuenca (2006: 20), they form “a peculiar word class, peripheral to language and similar to nonlinguistic items such as gestures and vocal paralinguistic devices.” Interjections have been seen as marginal, and one of the least discussed classes of words (Ameka 1992, Wilkins 1992, Jovanović 2004). Latin grammarians treated interjections as a separate part of speech due to the fact that they are independent of the verb and constitute independent expression of emotions. For twentieth-century linguists they belonged to non-linguistic phenomena. Müller (1996) wrote that “language begins where interjections end.” Many contemporary linguists shared this point of view describing interjections as emotive words that do not enter into any syntactic relations (e.g. Quirk, Greenbaum et al. 1985, Crystal 1995, Trask 1993).

However, in present day linguistics we may observe two distinct approaches to interjections. On one side, there is a group of linguists, non-conceptualists, who, like Goffman (1981) earlier, consider interjections as not being a part of language, as they do not encode concepts the way verbs or nouns do. Although they refer to the speaker, as well as to the external world, the way in which they do so is different than in the case of other lexical units (e.g. verbs, nouns, etc.). Interjections are characterized by their indeterminacy and openness, i.e. the interpretation of interjections is highly context-sensitive, and the result of their interpretation may be a whole array of propositions which may differ from the speaker's informative intentions. Even if the speaker very clearly has an informative intention while uttering interjections such e.g. as *Oh my God* or *Damn it*, the interlocutor very often has to deduce its meaning, which may vary considerably from the intended one. It is still more difficult to assign meaning appropriate to the speaker's informative intentions in the case of interjections which are impulsive reactions to various stimuli, as e.g. *Oh*, *Ow*, etc. Thus, according to non-conceptualists, the meaning of interjections is 'occasional' and 'non-natural' (Grice 1957) as they depend on what the speaker wants to communicate in a particular situation. In fact, according to Świątkowska (2006), one and the same interjection may be assigned two opposing senses depending on the context in which it has been used. For Goffman, they play certain socio-communicative roles but possess no semantic content. "Response cries", as he calls them, are expressions such, e.g., as *oh*, *aha*, which he describes as non-words and since "non-words as a class are not productive in the linguistic sense, their role as interjections being one of the few that have evolved for them ... [they] can't quite be called part of language" (1981: 115). Wharton (2003) also claims that interjections are not part of language, but the showing/saying continuum does offer some kind of framework within which they may be regarded as peripheral to language.

On the other hand, conceptualists (Wilkins 1992, Wierzbicka 1992) view interjections as having a conceptual structure, thus constituting a part of language. Both linguists, Wilkins and Wierzbicka, hold the position that interjections have some conceptual content, although it may be very general or vague, but which may be specified by the context they are used in and the information concerning their previous occurrences. According to these linguists, interjections are incomplete speech acts whose implicit content must be deduced through inference. Wierzbicka (1991: 185) agrees with Goffman in that ordinary people perceive primary interjections like *Ow*, *Oops* as "a natural overflowing, a flooding up of previously contained feelings, a bursting of normal restraints, a case of being caught off guard." (Goffman 1981: 99). But, on the other hand, she claims that if these interjections were only natural noises produced by human beings, then the same noises would be found, having the same or very similar uses, in every language, which is not true. She supports her claim with the example of English interjections *Gee* and *Wow* which are not found in Polish, and vice versa, there are interjections in Polish like *Hejże*

or *Nuże* which are not found in English. Thus, according to her, these and similar interjections are not natural and universal, but they are rather highly culture specific. Even if some languages share similar interjections, e.g. Polish *Aha!* and English *Aha!* they usually differ in their range of use, as well as they have slightly different meanings. Concluding, on the example of some English interjections and their Polish nearest counterparts, she shows that interjections are meaningful language elements and can be analysed from the semantic point of view. At this point it is worth quoting Jovanovič (2004: 22), who maintains that “It has to be taken for granted that all interjections have some kind of meaning, otherwise they would probably not find their way in the language jungle and be soon discarded as redundant. [...] The meaning of interjections has been fairly established since each and every interjection is uttered in particular language and situational context.”

Despite the opposing views on interjections, there is some agreement between conceptualists and non-conceptualists in that interjections refer to emotional and mental states or attitudes, and that they are utterances formed by themselves in a non-elliptical manner (for a more thorough discussion over the question of whether or not interjections encode some conceptual content see Wharton 2003, Ameka 1992, Wierzbicka 1992, Wilkins 1992).

A survey of the research study devoted to interjections shows that this is an area where there are no clearly defined criteria for the analysis. In the specialist literature, interjections are classified and described taking into consideration morphological, syntactic, semantic, or pragmatic criteria. Due to the fact that there are different approaches to interjections, there is no consensus about this category, and there is no commonly accepted definition of interjections (Kryk 1992, Krzempek 2014, Bednarczyk 2014, Cram 2008). Some linguists treat interjections as either words, phrases or complete sentences. For example, for Jodłowski (1976) interjections are ‘embrios of individual sentences’. For Świątkowska (1979), they are ‘elliptical sentences’, Wilkins (1992) treats them as sentence substitutes, and finally Orwińska-Ruziczka (1992: 71) claims that interjections symbolize complete semantic content. In spite of many differences among linguists concerning the treatment of interjections, there is some common ground on which most of them agree. Most linguists agree that interjections are at the same time word and sentence though many point to the considerable role of context in determining the meaning of interjections. There is also general agreement about the fact that one of the distinctive features of interjections is a lack of inflexion. Ameka (1992) points to the fact that the existing confusion in the present day treatment of interjections is attributed partly to the history of the research on interjections, and partly to their very nature.

As far as the classification of interjections is concerned, it must be emphasized, that there is a large diversity of classifications based on various theoretical assumptions and arbitrarily accepted criteria. A review of the specialist literature allows us to single out classifications based on morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic criteria.

From a formal point of view, interjections are typically classified into *primary* and *secondary* categories. The German psychologist and philosopher Wilhelm Wundt (1904), in his classification based on formal criteria assuming the differences in the morphological structure of interjections, includes in the first category interjections such e.g. as *oh*, *ach*, or *au*, i.e., traces of noises made by people and animals that have remained in human language. The second group comprises expressions such as *Jesus Christ*, and expressions which are formed out of primary interjections and autosemantic words, e.g. *Oh God!* Similarly, Ameka (1992) and Ameka and Wilkins (2006) distinguish *primary interjections* which are not based on independently existing words (*ah*, *oh*, etc.) and *secondary interjections* which are based on regular nouns or verbs (*Christ!*, etc.). They also distinguish so-called *interjectional phrases* which are composite expressions such e.g. as *My goodness!* Jovanovič (2004) also distinguishes two large groups of interjections on the grounds of their origin, phonemic contents and general formal characteristics. These are *interjections proper*, i.e. words like *oho!* *ooh!* *uh-uh!* and the like, and interjections that originate from other parts of speech (nouns, verbs, etc.), e.g. *indeed!* *look!* *woe!* etc. Primary and secondary interjections may also be found in Milewski's classification (1965), where *primary interjections* are primitive acoustic symptoms like *ah!*, *secondary interjections* are expressions of an independent semantic value like *Jesus Christ!* To these two groups, Milewski adds *appeals* whose function is to attract attention, e.g., Polish *hop-hop!*, and *onomatopoeic expressions* which are conventionalized forms of sounds, e.g., English *hush!* *hush!*

From a semantic point of view, it would seem worth mentioning the classification adopted by Wierzbicka (1991), who singles out three basic groups of interjections:

1. *emotive* ones whose primary function is to express feelings (e.g. anger, disgust, etc.) and which include in their meaning the component 'I feel something' (e.g. *yuk*),
2. *volitive* ones whose primary function is to express directive messages and which include in their meaning the component 'I want something' (e.g. *sh!*),
3. *cognitive* ones whose function is to express messages related to information state (to what one knows) and which include in their meaning the component 'I think something' or 'I know something' (e.g. *aha!* meaning 'I understand').

Orwińska-Ruziczka (1992) points out that from a semantic point of view, interjections are a very heterogeneous group of lexemes due to their highly diverse semantic structure. Since interjections express a whole array of semantic content and are characterized by a wide scale of shades of meaning, they should be considered in three categories based on the type of information they express: *impulsive*, *imperative* and *representational*. Impulsive interjections include those expressing emotions and feelings (e.g. *au!*), imperative ones include those expressing will (e.g. *sh!*), and finally those that imitate sounds are classified as representational (e.g. *miaow*).

On functional grounds Ameka (1992) classifies interjections according to the types of meaning they predicate with reference to the functions of language proposed by Bühler (1934) and Jakobson (1965). He identifies three categories that are relevant for the classification (which overlap with Wierzbicka's semantic classification, 1991, 1992), i.e.,

- *expressive interjections* which are vocal gestures further subdivided into *emotive* expressing emotions and sensations (e.g. *Yuk!*, *Wow!*) and *cognitive* interjections (e.g. *Aha!*) expressing knowledge and thoughts,
- *conative interjections* which are used to get somebody's attention or demand an action or response on the part of the receiver (*sh!*),
- *phatic interjections* which are used to establish and maintain contact (e.g. *mhm*, *yeah*).

Ameka stresses the point that a particular interjection may have several functions and accordingly be classified into several categories. For him, it is natural that interjections are classified according to the functions they serve in discourse.

2. Functions of interjections in drama

Although interjections have received less attention than other parts of speech and very often are treated as peripheral to language (Cuenca 2006), they are important elements in the process of communication. They are particularly characteristic of the spoken mode. Thus, when used in written texts they are likely to occur in direct speech quotations, monologues, soliloquies, and while addressing readers. According to Schulze and Tabakowska (2004: 558), interjections in written texts are commonly used as "spatial" and "temporal" pointers. As spatial pointers, they serve the function of psycho- and sociolinguistic indicators. The proper choice and a constant use of a given interjection by a protagonist may help to create a personal style, simultaneously, but indirectly, pointing to the character's mental and psychological make-up, assigning the character to a given social group or subculture. By choosing interjections that are regarded typical of a given nation, the character is immediately assigned a particular cultural background. Interjections can become obsolete quite quickly as in the case of e.g. English *lo!* (Schulze and Tabakowska 2004: 558) which was used to draw the interlocutor's attention. For a contemporary writer the use of this obsolete interjection may serve as either a temporal pointer, or e.g. it may point to a contemporary character's attitude.

Generally, interjections are used by writers to create a particular aesthetic atmosphere of a text. In children's literature the use of interjections usually serves to reflect children's emotional and impressive attitude toward the world that surrounds them (Schulze and Tabakowska 2004: 558).

Interjections are those language devices which have an expressive function, i.e. they function to express emotions directed at listeners or readers. Their

purpose is to carry to a listener information about the speaker's emotions, perspective, and attitude towards the extra linguistic reality (Wierzbicka 1969, O'Connell et.al. 2007). Moreover, they change the meaning of other words in discourse, as they bring out richness and subtlety "that the otherwise very important content words are incapable of imparting to a listener." (O'Connell, et.al. 2007: 435)

3. Translation strategies and problems

According to many researchers, interjections are highly language-specific and translating them is not just a matter of word translation. Translating interjections in fact necessarily involves translating discourse meanings which are characteristic of a given language and are culturally bound. Thus, the task of the translator seems to be the interpretation of their semantic and pragmatic meaning and the context they appear in. Then, applying one of several translation strategies, the translator may seek an appropriate form, whether it be an interjection or not, which would convey that particular meaning and have an identical or at least a very similar effect on the reader. Cuenca (2006: 27-28) distinguishes six translation strategies with reference to interjections, which are as follows:

1. literal translation,
2. using an interjection with dissimilar form but having the same meaning,
3. using a non-interjective structure but with similar meaning,
4. using an interjection with a different meaning,
5. omission,
6. addition of usually a primary interjection.

Interjections as a peculiar word class are challenging not only from a theoretical and descriptive point of view, but they also cause many problems in the process of translation. Although many languages share exactly the same forms of interjections, the conditions of their use are not the same. Cuenca (2006 after Baker 1992) discusses two major problems in the translation of interjections. In the case of primary interjections (i.e. simple vocal units) the main problem is the existence of identical or very similar forms cross-linguistically which differ in the conditions of their use as well as their frequencies. Schulze and Tabakowska (2004: 558) point to the fact that primary onomatopoeic interjections, due to their origin in "natural sounds", would seem to be universal and as such should not pose problems in translation. However, even within this category there is no overlap and any attempt at applying literal translation may result in pragmatic errors. Consider the example of the interjection *Och*, which in Irish and Scottish expresses surprise at something, or emphasizes agreement or disagreement with what has just been said (Collins Cobuild 1995: 1140 after Thawabteh 2010), whereas in Arabic it is used to tell a child off for inappropriate behaviour (Thawabteh 2010).

Secondary interjections, which are grammaticalized¹ forms that have undergone a process of semantic change, are polysemous forms that, similarly to idiomatic units, may imply two meanings: an interjectional idiomatic meaning, and phrasal non-idiomatic meaning. Because of their polysemous nature, the translator may not recognize and interpret the meaning of the interjections correctly, which in consequence again leads to pragmatic errors in translation (Cuenca 2006). Such errors may occur in two cases: when an idiomatic unit (here interjection) has a reasonable literal interpretation, and when it has a close counterpart in the target language, but with a different meaning, context, or frequency of occurrence (Baker 1992).

Schulze and Tabakowska (2004) point to problems which originate from systematic differences between grammatical systems. According to the authors, part of the meaning of a given expression resides in the grammar, and the differences between the source language grammar and the target language grammar may be the source of translation losses. The vocative of noun phrases, e.g. *My God!*, or the imperative of verbs, e.g. *Look!* are relatively easy to translate cross-linguistically, but there are forms which appear to be very difficult to render into the target language, or even often untranslatable as e.g. Slavic diminutivized interjections such as Polish *jejciu* (English *geez*) (see Lockyer 2015).

Another problem arises from the fact that some types of interjections become obsolete. And if this is the case, the translator may replace these interjections which are no longer in use with their modern equivalents, or decide on the use of anachronistic interjections risking the distortion of the author's literary conception. On the other hand, leaving such an obsolete interjection in translation may serve as a time pointer or it may indicate the contemporary speaker's attitude.

Whatever the choice, the fact remains that the way translators render the words that cause translation problems, (i.e. whether they decide to omit them in translation, or replace by other words that can have more or less similar effect on the reader), influences the semantics of the whole literary work. Translators in their translation choices play several roles. First of all, they are the readers of the literary work, secondly, they are experts who possess the knowledge concerning this literary work with respect to the social and historical circumstances under which it was written. And finally, they are the literary critics who interpret the author's intentions (Legeżyńska 1999). According to Gibińska and Tabakowska (1993), apparently small things, such as the choice of a personal pronoun, the addition or omission of only one word whose role in the work seems not important, or the use of the word which seems to carry a very similar meaning to its synonym, make up the whole of the literary work transferred by words. In a nutshell, translation is the art of interpretation, and the translator's choices

¹ According to Cuenca (2006: 21) secondary interjections are grammaticalized elements as they "are words or phrases which have undergone a semantic change by pragmaticization of meaning and syntactic reanalysis..."

concerning the word layer of the literary work influence the perception of the translated text.

From the point of view of different translation strategies and translators' potential choices, the prospect of analyzing the three Polish translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is intriguing, especially when such sensitive communicative elements of literary texts as interjections are taken into consideration. As interjections are very important in creating aesthetic sense, and belong to "the language code of [...] theatrical genres" (cf. Schulze and Tabakowska 2004), *Hamlet* and its Polish translations, seem to be a good corpus on the basis of which such analysis may be carried out. *Hamlet* is also one of Shakespeare's plays most often translated into Polish, which provides a rich source of corpus material for the present analysis. Moreover, as far as literary translation studies are concerned, the translation of interjections is "largely *terra incognita*" (Schulze and Tabakowska 2004), so the results of the analysis may constitute one of the first attempts of comparative translation studies.

4. Translating primary interjections

For the purpose of the present analysis, Ameka's definition of interjections is adopted (1992: 106): "interjections are relatively conventionalized vocal gestures (or more generally, linguistic gestures) which express a speaker's mental state, action or attitude or reaction to a situation." The object of the analysis is a group of primary interjections defined as "little words or non-words which in terms of their distribution can constitute an utterance by themselves and do not normally enter into construction with other word classes, for example, *Ouch!*, *Wow!*, *Gee!*, *Oho!* *Oops!*, etc." (Ameka 1992: 105). As in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* the amount of interjections used by his protagonists is huge, I have therefore decided to restrict myself to primary interjections as defined above, and primary interjections combined, i.e. those consisting of two or more primary interjections appearing together, as e.g. *Hillo, ho, ho!* The table below shows the translation equivalents of the selected interjections into Polish, selected on the basis of the three Polish translations of the play.

Table 1. Primary interjections in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and their Polish translational equivalents

English	Polish		
	Paszkowski	Słomczyński	Barańczak
Ah	A, Ach	Ach	Ach
Ah, ha	Ha, Cha! Cha!	Ach, Ha,	Ha, Aha

English	Polish		
	Paszkowski	Słomczyński	Barańczak
Buzz, buzz	Ejże? Ejże?	Hejże? Ejże?	To nowina już nie nowa.
Foh	Fuj	Hańba	Ohyda
Ha	A jednak, He	Ha	–
Ha, ha	Cha-cha-cha	Ha, ha	Ha
Hillo, ho, ho	Hop, hop	Hillo, ho	Hej, hej
Ho	Hola	Hej	–
Holla	Hola	Hej	Hej tam
Hum	Hm! hm	Hm	Hm
Illo, ho, ho	Hop, hop, hop	Illo, ho, ho	Hej
Oh	O, Ach	O, Ach, Och, Cóż, Jakże	O, Och
O, ho	Och! Och!	Oho	Och
Oh, ho	Och! Och	Oho	Oho, Och
Pooh	Hm, hm	–	Eee!
Tush, tush	Nic z tego	Ej, ej	Zawracanie głowy
What ho	Hola	Hejże	–

A quick glance at the table reveals that all the three translators selected Polish interjections that are closest translational equivalents to the English ones, taking into consideration both their form and meaning. Let us take the example of *ah*, or *hum* which are rendered into Polish with the use of interjections with similar forms and meanings:

- (1) Queen: [...] **Ah**, my good lord, what have I seen to-night! (H. Act IV, Scene I)
 In Słomczyński: **Ach**, panie, na co patrzyłam tej nocy!
 In Paszkowski: **Ach**, panie cóżem widziała tej nocy!
 In Barańczak: *Mężu mój, co ja przeżyłam dziś wieczór!*

- (2) Hamlet: *My excellent good friends! How dost thou Guildenstern? – Ah, Rosencrantz? Good lads, how do ye both?* (H. Act II, Scene II)
 In Barańczak: *Najmilsi przyjaciele! Jak się masz, Guildenstern? Ah, Rosencrantz! Drodzy moi, jakże się macie?*
 In Paszkowski: *Kochani, dobrzy przyjaciele! Jak się masz, Gildensternie? A, Rozenkranc! Jak się macie, moi chłopcy?*

In Słomczyński: *Moi znakomici, dobrzy przyjaciele! Jakże się miewasz, Guldenstern? – Ach, Rozenkranc! Mili chłopcy, jakże się miewacie?*

- (3) Hamlet: *There's another; why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be quiddits now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery? **Hum!** This fellow might be in's time a great buyer of land, [...].* (H. Act V, Scene I)

In Słomczyński: [...] *Czemu zezwala, by ów nieokrzesany gbur walił go w pałę brudną łopatą, i nie zapowiada mu wszczęcia postępowania o czynną napaść? **Hm!** Człowiek ów mógł być w swoim czasie wielkim nabywcą ziemi, [...].*

In Paszkowski: [...] *Jak może znieść, aby go ten grubianin bił w ciemię swoją plugawą motyką, i nie wystąpić przeciw niemu z akcją o czynną obelgę? **Hm! hm!** A może też to był swojego czasu jaki wielki posesjonat, [...].*

In Barańczak: [...] *Czemu znosi potulnie, że go tępy cham tłucze po łbie brudną łopatą, i nie pozwie go przed sąd za napaść? **Hm!** A może był to w swoim czasie wielki spekulant dobrami ziemskimi, [...].*

Ah is an interjection expressive of various affections, mostly an exclamation of mental suffering, pity, complaint, painful surprise, or many other emotions. In this short dialogue *ah* signals that the Queen is deeply moved by what she saw at night. In all the cases this interjection was translated by a cognate or near-cognate interjection *ach*, *a*, and all the Polish translations correspond to the speakers' intentions well. Similarly, *hum* is translated by its cognate *hm* in Polish. Both the interjections, English and Polish, signal Hamlet's being lost in thought.

The interjection *oh* seems to be rendered into Polish with the greatest variety of translational equivalents, i.e. *o*, *ach*, *och*, *cóż*, *jakże*. It is also one of the interjections which, as Ilyish (1965: 172) rightly claims, expresses merely feeling in general, "without being attached to some particular feeling." It may express a wide range of feelings from joy and happiness, through disappointment or surprise, to e.g. fear, thus being quite vague as far as the meaning is concerned and consequently rendered into Polish by a greater number of equivalents each expressing a slightly different meaning depending on the context. What is also worth pointing out is the fact that Paszkowski and Barańczak limit themselves to only two Polish equivalents of *oh*, contrary to Słomczyński who rather seems to diversify his translation in this case. Another observation is that both Barańczak and Paszkowski often decide to omit *oh* in translation: Barańczak in 25 cases, Paszkowski in 22 cases out of 33 instances of the use of this form; whereas Słomczyński in the majority of cases is faithful to the original.

In some cases Słomczyński is so faithful to the original that he transfers some of the interjections directly into Polish. Such is the case with *Hillo*, *ho*, *ho*

left in translation as *Hillo, ho*, and *Illo, ho, ho* transferred literally without the change of form, in spite of the fact that such interjections do not exist in Polish. The other two authors rendered both the interjections as *Hop, hop, hop, Hej, hej*, and in this context both the interjections express the same meaning, i.e. call for attention, and what is more, these forms are more comprehensible for the Polish reader:

(4) Horatio: ***Illo, ho, ho, my lord!***

Hamlet: ***Hillo, ho, ho, boy! come, bird, come.*** (H. Act I, Scene V)

In Słomczyński: Horatio: ***Illo, ho, ho, Panie!***

Hamlet: ***Hillo, ho, chłopcze! Chodź tu, ptaszku, chodź tu!***

In Paszkowski: Marcellus: ***Hop, hop, hop, mości księżę!***

Hamlet: ***Hop, hop, chłopcze!***

In Barańczak: Marcellus: ***Hej, panie!***

Hamlet: ***Hej, hej, moi mili, Tu jestem, chodźcie.***

Barańczak (2004) claims that the decision to leave the original form of any expression in the translated text is not a good idea, as such an expression may be completely incomprehensible for the director of the play, as well as for the actor and the audience. It may also distort the perception of not only the piece of the text that includes the untranslated form, but the whole work as well.

However faithful to the original the translators tried to be, they also resorted in their translations to other linguistic devices, e.g., the use of a non-interjective structure expressing a very similar meaning. Let us take as an example the interjections *tush, tush, foh*, or *buzz, buzz*:

(5) Horatio: ***Tush, tush, 'twill not appear.*** (H. Act I, Scene I)

In Paszkowski: ***Nic z tego; ręczę, że nie przyjdzie.***

In Barańczak: ***Zawracanie głowy; nic się nie zjawi.***

In Słomczyński: ***Ej, ej, nie przyjdzie.***

Tush, tush is an interjection expressing contempt for what has been said by another (Schmidt 1902) or impatience (PWN Oxford), which is very well rendered by the two non-interjective structures in the situation when Marcellus talks about the appearance of the ghost, and Horatio by the use of *tush, tush* expresses a kind of impatience and contempt connected with its appearance. Słomczyński uses here the Polish interjection of the same meaning, but different form, which is: ***Ej, ej, nie przyjdzie.***

Also the interjection *foh* is rendered by non-interjective structures *hańba* and *ohyda* and by its Polish equivalent of the same meaning, i.e. *fuj*. Arguably, all the three translational decisions are appropriate and render the author's intentions well.

Buzz, buzz is very well rendered by *Ejże? Ejże?* and *Hejże? Ejże?* which if spoken with the appropriate tone of voice and intonation reflect the speaker's

impatience or contempt, when being told something already known. *To nowina już nie nowa* is the translation proposed by Barańczak who seems to be very economical with the use of interjections in the Polish translation of the play.

The contents of Table 1 give the impression that generally all the three translators resorted to the use of Polish interjections, either of the same form and meaning or different form and the same meaning, as translational equivalents of the ones used by Shakespeare, which is true, but only to some extent. Table 2 shows which translation strategies were actually used in the translations of the chosen interjections:

Table 2. Translation strategies used in the translations of the chosen interjections

	Literal translation – strategy a	Interjection with dissimilar form, the same meaning – strategy b	Non-interjective structure with similar meaning – strategy c	Interjection with a different meaning – strategy d	Omission – strategy e	Addition – strategy f
Paszkowski	4	25	2	1	31	0
Słomczyński	14	32	1	1	15	0
Barańczak	5	16	3	0	39	0
Total	23	73	6	2	85	0

What can be inferred from Table 2 is the following:

- the strategy e is the most frequent one (45%),
- strategy b is the second most often used one (39%),
- strategy a is chosen by the translators in 12% of cases,
- strategies c, d are used in only 4% of cases,
- and strategy f is not used in the analysed corpus.

All the three translators very rarely used other non-interjective structures expressing the same intention, or interjections with different meanings. As far as the strategy of omission is concerned, a sizable discrepancy among the translators may be observed, i.e., Barańczak seems to employ this strategy to a large extent (62%), whereas Słomczyński uses this strategy only in 24% of cases. On the other hand, Słomczyński in his translational decisions seems to be the closest to the original, as he translates original interjections either literally (22%), or with the use of interjection with a dissimilar form but the

same meaning (51%). It can be observed that as far as the choice of translation strategies is concerned Barańczak and Słomczyński occupy the positions on the two ends of the scale, where Słomczyński seems to be the closest to the original text and Barańczak drifts away from the original, which in some cases means a loss of intended meaning. Paszkowski in his translational choices occupies a position quite close to that of Słomczyński, although he is not so faithful to the original due to a frequent choice of omission as the translational strategy.

Thus far in our analysis, it has been observed that, technically speaking, in the case of the selected group of primary interjections, the translation of target language interjections into source language counterparts did not pose particular problems, as they were translated mostly with the use of their cognates (or near-cognates) or just omitted. The translators did not have special problems rendering interjections that seem obsolete now, *ho*, *holla*; In the Polish versions of the play they were replaced by their modern counterpart *hej*. Only Paszkowski used *hola* as the Polish translation which is described as obsolete in PWN dictionary, but it should be born in mind that his translation was published in 1862, which is when this form was commonly used.

Clearly, there is a difference between the translation by Barańczak and the two other translations in that Paszkowski and Słomczyński seem to be closer to the original text and Barańczak interprets the text more freely, which may be due to the fact that translating interjections as a peculiar group of words is one thing, and translating drama in general is another thing. In translating drama the task of the translator is not only to interpret the author's intentions, language, theatrical vision, but also to modernize the work in order to enable the audience to fully apprehend the sense of a play. Among other matters, it has to do with the adaption of the language layer and the semantics of the text to a modern audience. The work of a translator should be to fuse the horizons of the past and the present, but without causing distortion. Of course the three translators published the Polish translations of *Hamlet* at different times: Paszkowski in 1862, Słomczyński in 1978, and Barańczak in 1990. To conclude, it is worth adding that if translation is regarded as the art of interpreting a literary work, then these particular translators' interpretations should reflect nationwide perceptions of the literary work, as well as trends existing in Polish theatre at different periods of time.

5. Conclusions

On the basis of the analysis of the corpus material, it can be concluded that three interjection translation strategies were ordinarily employed. Those strategies align with Cuenca's (2006). The three strategies are: avoiding translating source language interjections (85%), using the interjection with dissimilar form and similar or the same meaning in the target language (73%), and literal translation (23%). It may also be observed that in the majority

of the cases analysed, English and Polish primary interjections are cognate, which probably lightens the task of the translator, thus making the problem of translating interjections minimal.

Languages and cultures define reality in different ways, and numerous interjections are culture-specific, and because of this quality they can pose many and varied problems, as well as challenges for translators. Quoting Schulze and Tabakowska (2004: 555) that interjections “In literary translation studies [...] are largely *terra incognita*.”, it seems that interjections, regarded as a very sensitive constitutive element of literary texts, deserve further investigation from the point of view of translation theory and practice.

Although, the results of the present analysis illustrate the relevancy of well thought-out translator strategies, it does not necessarily mean that the translation of other interjections may not reveal some semantic contrasts and translation problems stemming from linguistic and cultural asymmetries between languages, which provides a good reason for my further research.

References

- Ameka, F.K. 1992. Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 101-118.
- Ameka, F.K., and D.P. Wilkins 2006. Interjections. *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. no pagination
- Baker, M. 1992. *In other words. A coursebook on translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barańczak, S. 2004. *Ocalone w tłumaczeniu. Szkice o warsztacie tłumacza poezji z dodatkiem małej antologii przekładów – problemów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Kraków “a5”.
- Bednarczyk, M. 2014. Klasyfikacje wykrzykników w badaniach polskich i niemieckich. *Lingwistyka Stosowana* 11: 83-89.
- Bühler, K. 1934. *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fischer. (Reprinted Stuttgart: Fischer, 1965).
- Cram, D. 2008. The exceptional interest of the interjection. *Henry Sweet Society Bulletin* 50: 57-66.
- Crystal, D. 1995. *The Cambridge encyclopaedia of linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuenca, M.J. 2006. Interjections and pragmatic errors in dubbing. *Meta* LI 1: 20-35.
- Gibińska, M., and E. Tabakowska 1993. Duch ojca Hamleta a duch tekstu. In J. Ciechowicz and Z. Majchrowski (eds.), *Od Shakespeare’a do Szekspira*, 60-73. Gdańsk: Centrum Edukacji Teatralnej.
- Goffman, E. 1981. Response cries. In E. Goffman (ed.), *Forms of talk*, 78-123. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grice, H. 1957. Meaning. *Philosophical Review* 66: 377-388.

- Ilyish, B. 1965. *The structure of modern English*. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatelstvo "Prosvescenie".
- Jakobson, R. 1965. Linguistics and poetics. In T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*, 350-377. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jodłowski, S. 1976. *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Jovanović, V.Ž. 2004. The form, position and meaning of interjections in English. *Facta Universitatis. Series: Linguistics and Literature* 3(1): 17-28.
- Kryk, B. 1992. The pragmatics of interjections: the case of Polish *no*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 193-207.
- Krzemppek, M. 2014. Miejsce wykrzyknika w systemie części mowy – wykrzyknik w ujęciu kognitywnym. *Prace Filologiczne* 64(2): 187-201.
- Legeżyńska, A. 1999. *Thumacz i jego kompetencje autorskie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Lockyer, D. 2015. Diminutive interjections in Polish: the case of (O)Jejku and (O)Jejciu! *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 10(4): 197-221.
- Milewski, T. 1965. *Językoznawstwo*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Müller, M. 1996. The theoretical stage, and the origin of language. In R. Harris (ed.), *The origin of language*, 7-42. Bristol: Thoemmes Press.
- O'Connell, D.C., S. Kowal and S.P. King 2007. Interjections in literary readings and artistic performance. *Pragmatics* 17(3): 417-438.
- Orwińska-Ruziczka, E. 1992. *Funkcje językowe interiekcji w świetle materiału słowackiego i polskiego*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych „Universitas”.
- PWN Oxford English Dictionary 2, CD-ROM 1992, version 1.01. Oxford: OUP.
- Quirk, R. et.al. 1985. *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Schmidt, A. 1902. *Shakespeare lexicon*. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
- Schulze, B., and E. Tabakowska 2004. Interjections as a translation problem. In H. Kitel, A.P. Frank, N. Greiner, T. Hermans, W. Koller, J. Lambert, L. Paul (eds.), *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction*, Vol. 1, 555-562. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Świątkowska, M. 1979. Quelques considerations sur la nature de l'interjection. *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ* 63: 49-62.
- Świątkowska, M. 2006. L'interjection: Entre deixis et anaphore. *Langages* 161: 47-56.
- Trask, R.L. 1993. *A Dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Wharton, T. 2003. Interjections, language and the 'showing'/'saying' continuum. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 11(1): 39-91.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1969. Problemy ekspresji. Ich miejsce w teorii semantycznej. In A. Wierzbicka (ed.), *Dociekania semantyczne*, 3-61. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: the semantics of human interaction*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1992. The semantics of interjections. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 159-191.

Wilkins, D.P. 1992. Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 119-158.

Wundt, W.M. 1904. *Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythos und Sitte*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Verlag Von Wilhelm Engelmann.

Polish translations of W. Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

Barańczak, S. 1990. *Hamlet*. Poznań: „W drodze”.

Paszkowski, J. 1961. *Hamlet*. Warszawa: PIW.

Słomczyński, M. 1978. *Tragiczna historia Księcia Hamleta*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie Kraków.