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1. INTRODUCTION—RESEARCH QUESTION AND RESEARCH PLAN

The present paper contributes to the holistic analysis of the lexical class of interjections in Biblical Hebrew (BH). Given the scarcity of studies dedicated to the form of BH interjections, we will particularly be concerned with their formal aspects, whether phonological, morphological, or syntactic. The study will be developed within the frame of canonical typology (Corbett 2005, 2007)—in our opinion, the most promising approach to studying linguistic categories that is fully compatible with a non-essentialist cognitive perspective on categorization (Janda 2015), to which we also adhere. Specifically, we aim to determine the extent with which the BH interjectional category conforms, in its entirety, to the formal profile associated with the prototype of an interjection in linguistic typology, and that prototype’s extra-systematicity (Ameka 1992a, 2006; Nübling 2001, 2004; Ameka and Wilkins 2006; Stange and Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). In other words: Are BH interjections canonical representatives of the interjectional prototype as far as their phonology, morphology, and syntax are concerned, being thus formally extra-systematic? Or are their canonicity and extra-systematicity less manifest?

To achieve this objective, the paper will be structured in the following manner. In section 2, we will explain the background of our study: First, we will introduce the framework underlying our research and, next, we will familiarize the reader with previous works dedicated to the formal properties of BH interjections. In section 3, we will present empirical evidence related to the phonology, morphology, and syntax of BH interjections. In

---

1 The terms ‘canonicity’ and ‘canonical’ refer to the (degree of) compliance with a prototype. The terms ‘extra-systematicity’ and ‘extra-systematic’ refer to (in our case, formal) irregularity, oddity, or abnormality in comparison to other components of the language (see section 2.1 for a detailed discussion).
section 4, this evidence will be evaluated within the adopted framework and the results of that analysis will be positioned within BH scholarship and the broader theory of interjections. In section 5, main conclusions will be formulated.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE—THE FORMAL PROTOTYPE OF INTERJECTIONS

Typological research demonstrates that the lexical class of interjections is heterogenous and internally complex. It comprises lexemes and constructions that differ considerably from a pragmatic, semantic, and structural perspective (Ameka 1992, 2006; Nübling 2004; Stange and Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). Given these differences, not all types of interjections entertain an equal status in the category. Some are central, while others are peripheral (Nübling 2004; Ameka 2006, 743; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 10, 13, 17–19).

Generally speaking, interjections are “conventionalised vocal gestures” (Ameka 1992, 106) that encode emotional states, mental attitudes and, in some models, communicative intentions (Wierzbicka 1991[2003], 290–91; 1992, 164; Ameka 1992a, 106–7, 110–13; 2006, 743–44; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982; see also Nübling 2004, 17–18; Stange 2016, 20). Interjections expressing feelings and sensations experienced by a speaker, the so-called emotive interjections (Wierzbicka 1991, 302–25; 1992, 165–66; Ameka 1992a, 113; 2006, 744) are regarded as core or proper from a pragmatic-semantic perspective—they entertain the highest degree of interjectionality (Nübling 2004, 17; Ameka 2006, 743; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 13, 18–19). The interjectionality of the other types—cognitive, conative, and phatic—is lower (Nübling 2004, 17–19, 34–35; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982–83; Stange 2016, 17–18). As a result, those three types are only viewed as “interjections formally speaking” (Stange 2016, 18–19), the latter two being occasionally denied membership in the interjectional category entirely. In case of cognitive interjections, which provide insights into the speaker’s mental processes (Wierzbicka 1991, 326–36; Ameka 1992a, 113; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 13), interjectionality decreases only minimally (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982–83; Stange 2016, 18). Therefore, they are usually treated jointly with emotive interjections, both being referred to as expressive.

---

2 The present article has been developed within a wider research project dedicated to interjections in ancient North-West Semitic languages (see Acknowledgements). All papers written within that project—i.e. the current study devoted to Biblical Hebrew, as well as the studies devoted to Ugaritic (Andrason forthcoming), Canaan-Akkadian (Andrason and Vita forthcoming), and Aramaic (Andrason and Hutchison forthcoming)—share their theoretical foundations. Therefore, without being reproduced verbatim, the theoretical section of the present article (i.e. section 2.1) and the theoretical sections of the other articles are inevitably similar.
the structure of interjections

(Ameka 1992, 113; 2006, 744). In contrast, conative interjections, which convey wishes and commands, being uttered “to provoke a reaction on the part of the listener” (Wierzbicka 1992, 291–301; Ameka 1992a, 113; see also Ameka 2006, 744; Wierzbicka 1991; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 13) exhibit much lower degree of interjectionality. Consequently, they tend to be excluded from the lexical class of interjections and classified as attention getters, response elicitors (Kaltenböck, Keizer and Lohmann 2016, 1), or (parts of) vocatives (Meinard 2015, 153)—substantially different taxa of “parallel markers” (Fraser 1996, 176, 185). For phatic interjections, which are used to initiate, disrupt, or sustain contact through backchanneling (Ameka 1992a, 114; 2006, 744; Norrick 2009, 876; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983), being also employed as means of apologizing, thanking, welcoming, and leave-taking (Velupillai 2012, 150), this exclusion is even more pervasive (see Wierzbicka 1991, 1992, who does not consider phatic interjections as members of the category at all) due to the minimal degree of their interjectionality (cf. Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 18–19). Indeed, response words (yes/no), expressions of welcoming, leaving-taking, apologizing, and thanking are commonly classified as routines or formulae (Ameka 1992b, 153; Kaltenböck, Keizer and Lohmann 2016, 1), while backchanneling devices are frequently included into the category of fillers (O’Connell, Kowal and Ageneau 2005).

Interjections also differ with regard to their grammaticalization status. This difference is reflected in a distinction commonly made in scholarship between primary and secondary interjections (Ameka 1992, 111; 2006, 744; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982–83; Stange 2016, 9, 19). Primary interjections are elements that are exclusively employed as interjections. Some primary interjections have been used as such from the beginning of their grammatical life, having emerged as semi-automatic—sometimes onomatopoetic—reflexes (Nübling 2001; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982, 1986–88; Stange 2016, 48–49). Other primary interjections derive from non-interjectional lexical classes and constructions. However, due to the entrenchment of their interjectional use(s), such input structures have been grammaticalized into interjections—or interjectionalized. At a final stage of interjectionalization, any relationship with the original non-interjectional lexical classes and non-interjectional uses is no longer recoverable. In contrast, for secondary interjections, the relationship with the non-interjectional input expressions remains largely transparent. Some of secondary interjections coincide formally with lexemes that belong to other lexical classes, and thus attest to a range of non-interjectional meanings and uses. Others may even exhibit phrasal or clausal structures. They are composed of several lexemes and/or morphemes and allow for compositional readings apart from the constructional one, typical of their interjectional usage (Nübling 2001; Ameka and Wilkins 2006, 3–4; Meinard 2015, 154; Norrick 2009, 867–69; Stange 2016, 18–19). Accordingly, the inclusion of secondary interjections in the interjectional class is problematic (Meinard
2015, 154). Instead of being included in the *lexical* category of interjections, at least some secondary interjections (especially those characterized by a lower interjectionalization degree) are viewed as instantiating a *functional* category of exclamations—a category that contains any lexical class or their combination into constructions when they are employed in an exclamatory manner (Ameka 1992).³

As a result of the above characterizations which typify contemporary scholarship, emotive (or sometimes, expressive) primary interjections are regarded as the most uncontroversial members of the interjctional lexical class (Nübling 2004, 17; Ameka 2006, 743; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 10, 19). They are the most common representatives of the interjectional category, being also the most salient among all interjectional lexemes. In contrast, the position of the other types of interjections is categorially unstable and largely depends on the model used. Therefore, in the remaining parts of this paper—whether describing the formal behavior of interjections across languages or studying them in Biblical Hebrew—interjections will be understood in this narrower sense, i.e. as emotive and primary.

Apart from being defined in semantic and pragmatic terms, interjections exhibit a number of formal properties pervasive across languages. By applying the principles of canonical typology (Corbett 2005, 2007), these properties are currently viewed as cumulatively depicting the formal prototype of an interjection. Drawing on Ameka (1992a, 2006), Nübling (2001, 2004), Ameka and Wilkins (2006), Stange and Nübling (2014) and Stange (2016), fifteen prototypical features relating to phonology (P), morphology (M), and syntax (S) can be posited.

**PHONOLOGY:**

P-1 Interjections contain sounds that are aberrant, odd, or anomalous from the perspective of the language in which they (i.e. those interjections) occur (Ameka 1992a, 112; 2006, 745; Nübling 2004, 25; Stange 2016, 34-35). Such sounds are either absent or rare outside the interjectional category itself. Some of them may be “non-speech” sounds, e.g. humming or whistling (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1985).

P-2 Interjections contain sound combinations that are aberrant, odd, or anomalous (Nübling 2001, 23–24; 2004, 25; Ameka 2006, 745; Velupillai 2012, 149), thus transgressing the phonotactic rules and/or constraints of

³ As is typical of grammaticalization in general (Hopper and Traugott 2003), the process of interjectionalization is gradual and the line separating secondary interjections from primary interjections is fuzzy (for details, consult Nübling 2001 and Stange and Nübling 2014). Furthermore, interjections—whether primary or secondary—may be borrowed (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1987; Stange 2016, 49; Ameka and Wilkins 2006, 15). Overall, interjections constitute a renewable and “open-ended” class (Norrick 2009, 889).
the language in which they appear (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982, 1985).

P-3 Interjections are vocalic in nature (Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 26; Andrason and Dlali forthcoming).

P-4 Interjections bear a full accent due to their exclamatory pronunciation characterized by increased energy, louder volume, or greater intensity (Nübling 2004, 22; Stange 2016, 20).

P-5 Interjections exhibit a simple phonetic structure. They are mostly mono-syllabic (Nübling 2001, 23; 2004, 24), either V or CV (Nübling 2004, 25).

P-6 Interjections that are not mono-syllabic exhibit harmonious patterns: reduplication and vocal harmony/consonantal (Nübling 2004, 26–27).

P-7 Interjections are phonologically—and thus graphically—unstable. They exhibit a number of variants (Nübling 2004, 26; 2001, 24), being for instance lengthened or shortened (Nübling 2001, 23; 2004, 24).

**MORPHOLOGY:**

M-1 Interjections exhibit a simple morphological structure (Ameka 1992a, 111; 2006, 744). They are mono-morphemic (Ameka 1992a, 111; 2006, 743–44; Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 29; Velupillai 2012, 149; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1985), and thus indivisible into more fragmentary meaningful components (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1985). They “resist […] all morphological processes” (Stange 2016, 36) which may otherwise be available in the language, whether

M-1(a) inflection
M-1(b) derivation
M-1(c) or compounding (Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 29; Ameka 2006, 743–44; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1985; Stange 2016, 36).


---

4 However, non-vocalic interjections are also common across languages.

5 The role of reduplication is not morphological but phonological (Nübling 2004, 26–27).

6 Additionally, interjections may exhibit “a fair amount of sound symbolism,” some being onomatopoeic (Ameka 1992, 112; see also Nübling 2001; 2004). They may also be marked for tones (Nübling 2001, 22; 2004, 22–23). In some interjections, tones may have a functional/phonemic role (Nübling 2001, 22-23).
S-1 Interjections are holophrastic—they are non-elliptical (not shortened), complete (self-contained), and autonomous (independent) utterances fully equivalent to genuine sentences (Ameka 1992a, 107–8; 2006, 743–44; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 20, 30; Velupillai 2012, 150; Stange and Nübling 2014, 1982–83; Stage 2016, 20, 48).

S-2 Interjections may be used as words, appearing in a sentence (Ameka 2006, 745). In such cases, however, they fail to be integrated syntactically in that sentence/clause’s grammar—or their integration is “loose” (Ameka 1992a, 108, 112; 2006, 745; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31; Stange 2016, 48). That is, they “do not form an integral part of sentences or clauses” (Stange and Nübling 2014, 1985), nor are they assigned a specific syntactic function (Stange 2016, 20).

S-3 Interjections do not participate in syntactic operations such as negation or interrogation (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 30).

S-4 Interjections do not form constructions with other elements (Ameka 1992a, 112; 2006, 743–44), the sole exception being other interjections themselves (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31; see also Norrick 2009).

S-5 Interjections that are associated with a sentence or clause, are found in left or—albeit less commonly—right periphery, thus occupying an initial or a final position (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31; Nordgren 2015, 44).

S-6 Interjections are separated from the remaining parts of the sentence by “extrametrum”: pause, intonation, or contouring (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 30; Nordgren 2015, 45). They constitute, therefore, a separate prosodic or intonational entity (Ameka 1992a, 108; 2006, 745; Nübling 2004, 30).

Overall, in light of the features listed above, the prototype of interjection is viewed as linguistically extra-systematic (or, even, para-linguistic) (Ameka 2006, 745; see also Nübling 2004; Stange and Nübling 2004, 1986), i.e. “peripheral to language as a whole” (Ameka 1992, 112; Stange 2016, 6).

Canonical typology allows one to test systematically language-specific interjections, as well as the entire interjectional category, for their—in this case, formal—interjectuality, and to ultimately position them in the possible interjectional categorial space. That is, depending on a greater or lesser compliance

---

7 They are however fully integrated in discourse (Norrick 2009, 888-89).

8 Compare with Norrick (2009, 888) who argues that interjections “are not [...] loosely integrated into the linguistic system.” On the contrary, according to Norrick, interjections “are fully integrated into the system of everyday spoken language” due to their profound lexicalization and the ability to structure information in discourse (ibid.).
with the formal prototype, language-specific instantiations of interjections may be more canonical or less canonical as far as their form is concerned. The more features listed above are fulfilled, the more canonical an interjunctional token—or its particular use—is. Inversely, the fewer features are met, the less canonical a given interjection is. Overall, canonical interjections are extra-systematic, while the extra-systematicity of non-canonical interjections may be minimal. The summation of such individual canonicity and extra-systematicity ranges makes it, in turn, possible to assess the canonicity and extra-systematicity of the entire interjunctional lexical class, first locally (in phonology, morphology, and syntax separately) and next globally (in the three modules jointly).

2.2 THE FORMAL PROFILE OF INTERJECTIONS IN BIBLICAL HEBREW SCHOLARSHIP

Interjections are probably the least researched lexical class in Biblical Hebrew. Sections dedicated to interjections in BH grammars, as well as encyclopedias and learning manuals, usually do not exceed one or two pages. More importantly, they neither provide a holistic view of the category nor do they offer an explanatory analysis of the data attested. That is, the interjunctional category is not approached in its integrity—it is not regarded as an internally coherent, albeit certainly diverse, phenomenon. This lack of coherence concerns the meaning of interjections (and thus their pragmatics and semantics) as well as their formal aspects (whether phonology, morphology, or syntax). Instead, scholars tend to adopt a taxonomical perspective, confining the analysis to a mere list of interjunctional lexemes and their respective meanings and uses (Davidson 1910[1976], 162–63; Gesenius 1910, 307–8; Jouion 1947, 105–6; Bauer and Leander 1922[1962], 652–54; Davidson and Mauchline 1966, 212; Jouion-Muraoka 2006, 321–22; Di Giulio 2013, 875; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483–845). The systemic marginalization of interjections is evident in the denial of their categorial individuality. In BH grammars, primary emotive interjections are not only treated indiscriminately with secondary interjections and interjections only formally (cf. Stange 2016, 19) but are also regularly grouped with exclamations and/or vocatives (Richter 1980, 158), being sometimes considered their sub-class (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 681–83). Even more questionably, the category of interjections includes—or is considered jointly with—routines, particles, and/or discourse markers (Bauer and Leander 1922[1962], 652–54; Gesenius 1910, 307–8; Broekelmann 1956, 6, 8, 28, 54,

9 A symptomatic case is the chapter dedicated to Biblical Hebrew in the volume on Semitic languages edited by Weninger (2011). In that chapter, the mention to interjections is limited to one sentence enumerating two interjections (Edzard 2011, 502).

10 The only potential mention to primary interjections is made by Murtonen (1990) and Jenni (1997, 483), who distinguish “pure interjections” (Murtonen 1990, 32) or “pure exclamations” (Jenni 1997a, 483; 1997b, 117) from those that are derived from other lexical classes.
When describing the lexical class of interjections, the semantic and pragmatic properties are generally given prominence, while those relating to phonology, morphology, and syntax are either ignored (Bauer and Leander 1922[1962], 652–54; Davidson and Mauchline 1966, 212; Di Giulio 2013, 875; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 321–22) or treated marginally (Davidson 1901[1976], 162–63; Gesenius 1910, 470; Brockelmann 1956, 8; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483). Indeed, the analysis of formal aspects typifying the interjectional category in its entirety can be confined to a few phonological and syntactic observations.

With regard to phonetics, interjections are viewed as “vocal gestures” (Gesenius 1910, 307). They allegedly contain “natural” (ibid.) or “odd sounds” (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683), which leads to their phonological extra-systematicity (ibid.). An equivalent extra-systematic behavior apparently characterizes the syntax of interjections (ibid.). That is, interjections are loosely bound (Richter 1980, 158). On the one hand, they “do not form part of […] a clause” (van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483) nor do they entertain a syntagmatic role in a sentence (Richter 1980, 158). On the other hand, they do not modify and complement constituents (van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483), being overall unable to enter into constructions with other grammatical elements (Richter 1980, 158). The syntactic extra-systematicity of interjections is related to their ability to appear isolated, i.e. without a complementing sentence or a sentence-substitute (Richter 1980, 158) or to form their own—in such a case, “incomplete” (Gesenius 1910, 470–71)—sentences. The only morphological generalizations pertinent to primary interjections are the lack of morphological derivability and unstable orthography (Jenni 1997b, 117).

Despite featuring in highly influential works on the BH language (Gesenius 1910; Richter 1980; Waltke and O’Connor 1990; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017), the phonological, morphological, and syntactic generalizations presented above cannot be viewed as reliable. On the contrary, their validity may seriously be questioned. First, each of those generalizations is limited to one or two enigmatic sentences (e.g. van der Merwe and...
Naudé 2017, 483; Jenni 1997b, 117) often relegated to supplementary remarks (Gesenius 1910, 470) or footnotes (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683). Second, none of the above-mentioned generalizations is supported by original empirical data. Third, most of them lack even references to previous studies that would substantiate the respective claims (Gesenius 1910, 470; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483; and Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683 as far as phonological statements are concerned). Fourth, in cases where such references are provided (Richter 1980), these draw on dated works in which Biblical Hebrew interjections are dealt with minimally, and again with no further evidence supporting the bold statements sufficiently. The view of interjections as syntactically extra-systematic illustrates this perfectly. Richter (1980), who is its author and the more fervent proponent, fails to offer empirical evidence, instead referring the reader to Lambert (1897) and Brockelmann (1913[1961], 35). However, those grammarians—apart from being theoretically obsolete—either fail to provide original data related to Biblical Hebrew, or the evidence provided does not support what is being claimed. Subsequently, Richter’s views were restated without questioning by Waltke and O’Connor (1990) and van der Merwe and Naudé (2017), at the end acquiring an authoritative character.12

The alleged extra-systematicity of BH interjections is even more problematic in light of the analyses dedicated to individual interjectional lexemes. To begin with, while holistic treatments of the interjectional category are scarce, individual interjectional lexemes—in particular חוי and אוֹי—have been studied relatively extensively. Such studies comprise entries in dictionaries (Zobel 1978; Jenni 1997a), journal articles (Gerstenberger 1962; Janzen 1965; Wanke 1966; Clifford 1966; Williams 1967; Krause 1973; Wolff 1977; Vermeylen 1978; Hillers 1983; Del Barco and Seijas 2010; Slager and Zogbo 2014), and chapters in monographs (Westermann 1967; Weir 1971; Janzen 1969; 1972). As usual, the analysis of meaning has been in focus (e.g. Gerstenberger 1962; Zobel 1987; Jenni 1997a; Del Barco and Seijas 2010; Slager and Zogbo 2014), although determined formal aspects—related exclusively to syntax—have also received certain attention (Wanke 1966; Wolff 1977).13 Nevertheless, the syntactic properties observed are generally understood in a flat linear manner, thus failing to make use of structural hierarchical representations.

To be exact, several studies have demonstrated that חוי tends to be juxtaposed with nominals: nouns, adjectives, and especially (active) participles (Gerstenberger 1962, 251; Wanke 1966; Wolff 1977, 242–43; Zobel 1987, 359–60; Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 682; Jenni 1997a, 483; Del Barco and Seijas

---

12 This is an excellent example of academic “gossips”—not an uncommon practice among scholars—whereby a claim unsupported by evidence becomes a “fact” due to grammars echoing one another.

13 Most studies (Wanke 1966; Zobel 1987; Jenni 1997a; Del Barco and Seijas 2010; Slager and Zogbo 2014) focus on dissimilarities between חוי and אוֹי and the semantic disambiguation of these two lexemes.
The nominal following הוֹי may also be headed by a preposition, e.g. זוֹלֲא, זוֹלִוע, and זוֹל, although this occurs only sporadically (Wanke 1966; Williams 1967; Wolff 1977, 242; Zobel 1987, 359–60; Jenni 1997a, 483; Del Barco and Seijas 2010, 164; Slager and Zogbo 2014, 5). With הוֹי, the situation is inverse. וּל is mostly preceded by a nominal element, typically a pronominal suffix (Wanke 1966; Wolff 1977, 242; Zobel 1987, 359–60; Jenni 1997a, 483; Del Barco and Seijas 2010, 163; Slager and Zogbo 2014, 5). Less frequently, a noun phrase is juxtaposed to הוֹי directly (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 682). The nominal element juxtaposed to הוֹי and/or וּל is usually analyzed as a vocative (Gesenius 1910, 470; Hillers 1983, 187; Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 682) marked by the definite article (Janzen 1972, 13, 19–23). Both the sequences composed of הוֹי and וּל can be expanded by larger syntactic structures, in particular verbal clauses (Wanke 1966; Zobel 1978, 360; Del Barco and Seijas 2010, 173; Slager and Zogbo 2014, 5). With הוֹי, such further verbal elaborations typically involve causal כִּי clauses (Wanke 1966; Zobel 1978, 360), also understood in terms of strong affirmation (Slager and Zogbo 2014, 5). Other types of constructions are independent main clauses, interrogative clauses, or infinitival constructions (Wanke 1966; Zobel 1978, 360). Sporadically, הוֹי is used independently with no words accompanying it (Wolff 1977, 242–43), while וּל may, on the contrary, be combined with particles, in particular נָא (Slager and Zogbo 2014, 5). As far as its position is concerned, הוֹי occurs “oracle-initially” (Del Barco and Seijas 2010, 167, 174), typically at the beginning of a phrase, sentence, or “une unité littéraire” (Slager and Zogbo 2014, 4, 10–12). Sporadically, it closes “une unité littéraire,” whether a strophe or section (ibid. 12).

The formal properties of the remaining interjections are barely noticed. The interjection הוֹי appears in three construction types. It can be used independently; it can be juxtaposed to a (vocative) noun; or it can be followed by a prepositional phrase composed of ע and a noun (Gesenius 1910, 470; Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683). The same types of constructions (independent, vocative, and prepositional) are grammatical with את and אח (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683; Jenni 1997a, 483–84). The interjection אָה partakes in a single syntactic construction, being followed by the preposition ע and a pronominal suffix (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 683). Similarly, את combines with a prepositional phrase composed of ע and a suffixed pronominal, being additionally followed by a vocative, itself qualified by a relative clause (ibid. 682–83). Lastly, הנֶבּו and הנָא exhibits a composite morphology (Jenni 1997b, 117).

Given the absence of evidence that would support the claim of the formal extra-systematicity of the lexical class of interjections in Biblical Hebrew and, on the contrary, given the availability of evidence suggesting that, at least, some specific interjectional lexemes need not be extra-systematic, our research will address the following issue: How extra-systematic is the lexical class of BH interjections? To respond to this question, we...
will use the framework outlined in section 2.1, thus studying how canonical BH interjections are, first locally in the three language modules separately and next globally in all of them combined. By answering to the research question and in particular by analyzing the compliance of BH interjections with the typological prototype, we will provide a comprehensive, principled, and holistic formal profile of the interjectional category in Biblical Hebrew.

3. EVIDENCE

For the purpose of this research we have identified twelve lexemes that, given their treatment in scholarly literature and despite certain discrepancies with regard to their meaning, can be viewed as the most reliable primary emotive interjections.

A. אֲבוֹי — interjection of intimidation (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 322), pain (BDB 1906, 5), and sorrow (NASB). Translated as ‘ah, woe’ (Jenni 1997a, 484; HALOT 1994-2000; Slager and Zogbo 2014, §4), ‘alas’ (Clines 1993, 102), ‘oh’ (BDB 1906, 5) and ‘oy’ (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 682).14

B. אֲהָה — interjection of sorrow (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 321), regret (Di Giulio 2014, 875)—or both sorrow and regret (van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483)—fear (Jenni 1997b, 117; HALOT 1994-2000), and alarm (Murtonen 1990, 32), uttered in the context of lamentation and prayers (Jenni 1997b, 117). Translated as ‘alas’ (BDB 1906, 13; Clines 1993, 142), ‘oh’ (van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 483), and ‘ah’ (Jenni 1997b, 117; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 321).


14 We will follow the transcription system used by Edzard (2011, 482–84) with the distinction of the word-final mater lectionis, which will be noted with the circumflex, as is traditionally done in Hebrew studies (Lambdin 1971, xxv; Fox 2003, xvii; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 21). The word-final נ and ח will not be noted as consonants (i.e. as ‘ and ḥ respectively) since they were not pronounced as such (van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 17, 22–23; see also Edzard 2011, 484).

15 Some postulate that אֲבוֹי could be a noun meaning ‘discomfort’ (Clines 1993, 102).
D. אוֹי ‘øy—a lengthened or expanded form of אוֹי ‘øy (Jenni 1997a, 483; see also BDB 1906, 17 and HALOT 1994-2000) expressing lamentation and translated as ‘woe’ (Gesenius 1910, 307; Clines 1993, 151; HALOT 1994-2000).


F. אוֹא ‘ô—a interjection translated as ‘alas’ (BDB 1906, 33; Clines 1993, 204) or ‘woe’ (Gesenius 1910, 307; Klein 1987, 20; Jenni 1997a, 483–84; HALOT 1994-2000).


L. Additionally, we include in our list אָנָה/אָנָא, commonly treated as an interjection (Gesenius 1910, 307; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 322; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 484).  

16 Sometimes, an additional emotive interjection is postulated, namely בֶּן הָל (Schökel and Holm 2000, 9), which is rendered by 'woe' in HALOT (1994-2000) and by the Greek interjection ωδίν in LXX. This BH hapax legomenon is most likely a noun "echoing a cry of pain" (Block 1997, 125) and signifying 'lamentation', 'wailing' and 'mourning' (BDB 1906, 223; Lee Petter 2009, 70). בֶּן הָל could be another primary emotive interjection (see Duke 2013). However, the exact meaning of this lexeme is obscure (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 684). In fact, most scholars analyze it in terms of a presentative or demonstrative particle equivalent to 'lo' and 'behold' (BDB 1906, 210).

17 We follow the phonetic transcriptions proposed by Khan (1997, 86–100) and Edzard (2011, 483–85) for the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew.

3.1 PHONETICS

BH interjections do not contain sounds that would be phonologically or phonetically anomalous (see feature P-1). First, interjections do not make use of non-speech sounds. This fact may however—at least, to an extent—be related to the written character of the Bible, which practically precludes the presence of sounds that could not be represented with the language’s standard orthography. To put it simply, sounds non-representable in Biblical Hebrew would either not have been represented at all or would have been represented with systematic sounds, being thus adapted to the standard phonetic inventory of the language. Second, interjections do not host sounds that would be rare in other parts or modules of Biblical Hebrew, in particular in other lexical classes. On the contrary, all the consonants (i.e. א [ʔ], ה [h], ל [l], נ [n], ב [v]; see Khan 1997, 86–87, 99; Edzard 2011, 482), vowels (י [iː], א [aː], נ [a], ע [e], נ [a], א [a]), and vocalic glides (see γ [j] in diphthongs in ôy [oːj] and ay [a]; see Khan 1997, 87, 99; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 18–19, 24–25) used in interjections are common features of the BH sound system in general, being present in all the remaining lexical classes (see Khan 1997, 86–100; Edzard 2011, 482–85; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 13–26).
Interjections do not contain sound combinations that would transgress phonotactic rules and/or phonotactic constraints operating in Biblical Hebrew (see feature P-2). First, the combinations of consonants and vowels exhibited in interjections occur commonly in other parts of the BH grammar. Second, the syllable structures present in interjections are also regular, appearing in all the other lexical classes. To be exact, the syllables found in interjections exhibit mainly the structure CV. The vocalic component may be a short vowel (e.g., the first syllables in יהָּה heʾāh, יהָּּּשׁ ʾāsh; and the second syllable in יהָּנָה ʾānalay), a long vowel (e.g., אֲהָי ʾāhây and אֲוֹי ʾāvōy; see also the last syllable in יהָּנָה ʾānalay and יהָּּּּּנָה ʾānānā), or a diphthong (e.g. יהָּי ʾāhiy and יהָּּי ʾāhiy); see also the last syllable in יהָּנָה ʾānalay and יהָּּּנָה ʾānānā).

In fewer instances, interjections exhibit the structure CVC, typically with a long vowel (e.g. יהָּא ʾāha and יהָּּא ʾāhâ; the first syllable in יהָּא ʾānānâ, as well as the second syllables in יהָּא ʾāhâ; יהָּא ʾānānâ). Both types, i.e. CV(ː) and CV(ː)C, are fully systematic in Biblical Hebrew, constituting the most common types of syllables in this language (Edzard 2011, 487). Even though complex onsets (e.g. CCV) and complex codas (e.g. VCC) are possible in Biblical Hebrew, they are highly uncommon, the former type being virtually limited to a single lexeme, i.e. יהָּנָה ʾānalay 'two' (ibid.). This means that the absence of complex onset or coda structures in interjections is not significant from the BH system’s perspective.

The only significant—in our view—divergence from Biblical Hebrew, as far as sound combinations are concerned, is the presence of the consonant h [h] in coda in a word-final position, attested by two interjections: יהָּא ʾāhâ and יהָּא ʾāsh. This usage is exceptional in other types of lexemes. That is, with a few exceptions, lexemes do not usually end in h [h] in Biblical Hebrew.\(^{18}\)

Interjections in Biblical Hebrew are vocalic in nature (see feature P-3). The interjectional lexemes examined exhibit a rich variety of vowels, both as far as their quality and quantity is concerned. To be exact, seven different types of vowels—long, short, and extra-short—are used. These are presented here in order of their frequency: ה [h]—6x: יהָּא ʾāhâ, יהָּא ʾāsh, יהָּא ʾāhâ; יהָּא ʾāhâ, יהָּא ʾāsh; יהָּא ʾānānâ and יהָּא ʾāvây; ה [h]—5x: יהָּא ʾāhâ.

---

\(^{18}\) Such exceptions are the very few forms of the equally limited roots with the consonantal b as the third radical, e.g. יהָּא ʾāhâ (see also the derived nominal forms יהָּא ʾānâ and יהָּא ʾānîb 'height'), יהָּא ʾāhâ 'long for, long to be', יהָּא ʾāhâ 'to be high' (see also the derived nominal form יהָּא ʾānîb 'height'), and יהָּא ʾāhâ 'be astonished'; three nouns יהָּא ʾāhâ 'eminency', יהָּא ʾāhâ 'god; God', and יהָּא ʾāhâ 'God'; and a few proper names containing the 3rd sg. suffix of or the above-mentioned noun for deity: יהָּא ʾāhâ 'Hephzibah' lit. 'my delight is in her', יהָּא ʾāhâ 'Aholibah' lit. 'my delight is in her', יהָּא ʾāhâ 'Aholah' lit. 'her own tent'), and יהָּא ʾāhâ 'Jechidah' lit. 'beloved of Yah'. Most cases in which יהָּא ʾāhâ is found in codas in a word-final position in Biblical Hebrew arise due to the suffusion of the 3rd sg. suffix to verbs and nouns, as well as, very sporadically, prepositions (Gesenius 1910, 56–57, 156–57, 265). In fact, “it is doubtful that every יהָּא with mappiq is given a consonantal value [h]” (Lambdin 1971, xsv).
A pure vowel. It

In languages that tolerate BH interjections would be fully equivalent to interjections found in recipient Semitic systems. Similarly, start with a vowel, are regularly initiated by a glottal stop in recipient Semitic systems. Therefore, loanwords that in their donor languages begin with a consonant from the articulatory perspective of Semitic languages in Nübling 2001, 23; 2004, 482) appears in two interjections, which argue, in interjections, which are common. The consonants

In African languages in general lexicon, a widespread presence of gutturals is noticeable. Indeed, in three lexemes, two gutturals are used:

The number and, especially, the variety of consonants is lower. Six different consonants are used: Ν [ʔ], נ h [h], נ h [h], ב b [v]. Three of those consonants (Ν [ʔ], נ b [h], נ h [h]) are gutturals. The remaining ones are: a lateral approximant, a nasal, and a fricative—all of them voiced. Out of all the consonants attested, only Ν [ʔ] and נ b [h] are common. The consonant Ν [ʔ] appears nine times. In eight cases, it is found in the onset, in a word-initial position: יא ʿy, יי ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy. The consonant נ b [h] features seven times, mostly in the onset in a word-initial position: נח høy, נח høy, נח høy and נח høy. Once, it is found in a word-medial position: נח høy. The consonant נ h [h] appears twice) and נ h [h] is particularly evident in a word-initial position. That is, all BH interjections begin with either [ʔV-] or [hV-]. As mentioned above, the word-initial onset composed of Ν [ʔ] is found eight times: יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy, יא ʿiy. The word-initial onset composed of נ h [h] is found four times: נח høy, נח høy, נח høy, נח høy. These two types of onsets further contribute to the vocalic nature of BH interjections. In the case of Ν [ʔ], one deals with a minimally “obstructive” consonant from the articulatory perspective of Semitic languages. In Biblical Hebrew and in other Semitic languages, such as Arabic, a syllable cannot usually begin with a pure vowel. It must begin “at least” with the glottal stop Ν [ʔ] (Procházková 2006, 425). Therefore, loanwords that in their donor languages start with a vowel, are regularly initiated by a glottal stop in recipient Semitic systems. Similarly, in interjections, which arguably represent vocal reflexes and are thus similar across languages, Ν may function as a mere vowel “releaser”. Accordingly, these BH interjections would be fully equivalent to interjections found in languages that tolerate word-initial vowels in general lexicon and, thus, in interjections themselves (see Indo-European languages in Nübling 2001, 23; 2004, 25; and African languages in
The relationship between K b [h] and vowels is also patent. Given that [h] generally has an unstable place of articulation, it is often described phonetically as a voiceless counterpart of an accompanying vowel. Indeed, [h] and prototypical voiceless vowels share the features of [+] sonorant, [-] constricted glottis, and [+] spread glottis (Blevins 2018, 31). The main difference is the absence of a [place] feature in the case of [h] contrary to vowels (ibid.). Therefore, from a phonetic perspective, BH interjections beginning with K b [h] could equally be represented as [ɛ̆ ɛ], [ɔ̆ ɔ], or [ŏ o].

In nearly all cases, BH interjections bear a full accent (see feature P-4) marked in the Biblical texts by an accentuation sign—either conjunctive or disjunctive (see section 3.3 dedicated to syntax). However, the presence of such accentuation signs does not allow us to infer whether BH interjections were actually pronounced in an exclamatory manner, i.e. with increased energy, louder volume, or greater intensity, as all such prosodic features are not encoded in the written text. In the case of two interjections, two accents may be present—the respective word being stressed twice. Five cases of this involve בֵּן לוּזַת ‘annâ (out of 13x): בֵּן (Gen 50:17), בֵּן (Exod 32:31), בֵּן (Ps 118:25), בֵּן (Neh 1:5), בֵּן (Ps 116:16). This usage most likely stems from the composite origin of this interjection (see section 3.2 below). Once, two accents are also hosted by בֵּן לֹא (out of 12x)— בֵּן (Ps 70:4). Contrary to this tendency, in a few instances, interjections lose their accentuation—the main accent being transferred onto the following element. Two cases involve the interjection ‘וֹי and the transfer of the accent onto the prepositional phrase ‘וֹי־לָּךְ to you’: ‘וֹי־לָּךְ (Num 21:29 and Jer 48:46). Another example involves the interjection בֵּן ‘ל. In the sequence בֵּן where בֵּן is used, the first segment בֵּן loses its accent.

BH interjections exhibit a relatively simple phonetic structure, visibly simpler than structures found in other lexical classes (see feature P-5). Six interjections consist of one syllable: בֵּן, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי. Five interjections consist of two syllables: בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, בֵּן ‘וֹי, and בֵּן ‘וֹי. Lastly, one interjection consists of three syllables: בֵּן ‘ולוֹי (with the movable שִׁבְּט, cf. Jouon-Muraoka 2006, 47–48). This contrasts with the general BH lexicon (nouns, adjectives, participles, and verbs). To begin with, even though mono-syllabic lexemes are found (e.g. the 3rd sg.ms. qatal of hollow verbs or certain nouns), bi-syllabicity is prevalent at the basic-lexicon level due to the tri-consonantal structure of

---

19 See that, in many languages that allow for vowel-initial words (e.g. Spanish, Polish or Xhosa), word-initial vowels regularly are, or at least may be, pronounced with the glottal stop at the beginning of a phonological phrase. This type of [ʔ] is not phonemic, not represented in writing, and in fact not perceived by speakers as a genuine consonant. It merely releases the vowel that follows.
The Structure of Interjections

roots in Biblical Hebrew and Semitic languages in general. Furthermore, because of the synthetic nature of Biblical Hebrew and the extensive use of inflectional and derivational morphology, most nouns, adjectives, participles, and verbs used in the language are actually composed of three, four, and five syllables.\(^{20}\) As illustrated above, for interjections, a mono-syllabic structure is the most common, while structures that would involve more than two syllables are exceptional. Only one tri-syllable interjection is found, and no interjectional lexemes exhibiting four, five, or five syllables are attested.

Two other mono-syllabic interjections have the structure CVC: אָח ‘aḥ and הָה hā. Out of the six interjections that are not mono-syllabic, three exhibit some types of harmonious patterns (see feature P-6). Such harmonious patterns arise due to the presence of vocalic harmony: יָאָנָא יָנָא [ʔɔːnə]; consonantal harmony: הָאָה [ʔahɔːh]; and both (partial) vocalic and consonantal harmony: יָלָלַי [ʔaləlaj]. If the sheva was pronounced as an a-type vowel [a] (Khan 1997, 95; Edzard 2011, 484), יָלָלַי would attest to an even more accurate harmonious pattern, i.e. [ʔaləlaj]. The mono-syllabic interjection הָה hā may also be regarded as exhibiting consonantal harmony, i.e. [ʔahɔːh]. Nevertheless, the three other bi-syllabic interjections (אבוי ‘əbôy, אוֹי ה ‘ôy, and הוֹי hôy) do not exploit any type of harmonious patterns. Harmonious patterns are also visible at a syntactic level where a given interjectional lexeme may be repeated (see section 3).

Several interjections expressing a similar range of emotions exhibit striking phonological and morphological similarities. This suggests that they may constitute graphic and thus phonetic variants (see Jenni 1997b, 117; see feature P-7). For two tokens, the relationship is evident. To be exact, הוֹ ה used in the expression הוֹ הוֹ is a shortened variant of הוֹי hôy (BDB 1906, 214; Slager and Zogbo 2014, 4), while יָאָנָא יָנָא is a lengthened variant of יָאָנָא יָנָא (Jenni 1997, 483; for detail see section 3.2). Furthermore, it has been proposed that יָאָנָא יָנָא and הוֹ ה are related variants (Jenni 1997b, 117), as are יָאָנָא יָנָא and יָאָנָא יָנָא.

---

\(^{20}\) For instance, three syllables are typically found in the qatal form of the vast majority of verbs as well as in various types of feminine nouns, being prevalent in the plural of most nouns, adjectives, and participles due to the presence of endings. In certain derived stems such as בִּתְפִּאֵל, most qatal forms contain four syllables.

\(^{21}\) As explained above, syllables in Biblical Hebrew cannot normally start with a pure vowel.

\(^{22}\) The interjection יָאָנָא יָנָא also exhibits two almost equally distributed spelling variants, i.e. with יָאָנָא יָנָא or יָאָנָא יָנָא (BDB 1906, 58; Jenni 1997b, 117; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 323). This interchangeable use of יָאָנָא יָנָא to indicate vowel length in a word-final position is however a common feature in Biblical Hebrew (and Biblical Aramaic) in general. Therefore, its validity for phonological or graphic instability of interjections is insignificant.
"אֲבֹי" (Jenni 1997a, 483). Certainly, phonological similarities between אֲבֹי 'אֲבֹי and הָאָה and between הֶאָה and הָאָה are noticeable. Nevertheless, the etymological link between them has not been demonstrated successfully. Note for instance that הֶאָה and אֲבֹי differ semantically.

### 3.2 Morphology

Eight interjections, i.e. אֲבֹי, אָה, הוֹי, אָה, אֲבֹי, אֲבֹי, הוֹי, and הֶאָה exhibit a simple morphological structure (see feature M-1). They are mono-morphemic and, thus, indivisible into more fragmentary meaningful components. Similarly, they do not—in fact, they cannot—participate in morphological processes available in Biblical Hebrew whether inflectional (see feature M-1(a)), derivative (see feature M-1(b)), or of a compounding nature (see feature M-1(c)).

Although apparently more complex, the interjections רִבָא אָבָה and אָלָלָי 'אָלָלָי are also, most likely, morphologically simple, being devoid of inflectional and derivational affixes and failing to exploit the mechanism of compounding. The original morphology of רִבָא אָבָה is uncertain. The interjection רִבָא אָבָה may have emerged as an onomatopoeic imitation (BDB 1906, 5) or due to the interjectionalization of an expression that originally belonged to a non-interjectional lexical class. Two such non-interjectional origins have been hypothesized: the noun אָבָה 'need, wish' derived from the root אָבָה 'want, desire' (Genesius 1860, iv; BDB 1906, 5; Klein 1987, 2) and another noun, אָבָה 'father' accompanied by the 1st person possessive suffix, i.e. 'my father!' (Klein 1987, 2). Furthermore, it is possible that the form רִבָא אָבָה was influenced by רָבַי, which occurs at the beginning of the verse (Prov 23:29), through assonance (cf. Jenni 1997, 484), or by רָבַי and הָאָה, together, through analogy. Nevertheless, even if רִבָא אָבָה was originally a secondary interjection and thus possibly pluri-morphemic, its grammaticalization into a primary interjection is completed. Any non-interjectional form and meaning are no longer transparent and accessible—רִבָא אָבָה is synchronically indivisible into a root, on the one hand, and inflectional, derivational, or compounding-related segments on the other hand. The internal structure of אָלָלָי 'alalay is less problematic. As evidenced by the root אָלָלָי 'lament, wail' (pi'el, hiphil, and hithpa'el) in Biblical Hebrew, the verb אָלָלָי 'lament, wail' in Arabic, and the interjection אוֹלָלָי 'woe' in Akkadian (cf. von Soden and Meissner 1965, 37), אָלָלָי 'alalay has most likely onomatopoeic origin, imitating the action of wailing (Klein 1987, 31; see also BDB 1906, 47). Accordingly, the reduplicative pattern exhibited would not be morphological but exclusively phonological—contrary to several reduplicative configurations used for derivative purposes in the nominal and verbal system of Semitic languages. Since אָלָלָי 'alalay also lacks any other inflectional and derivational affixes, as well as morphemes that could stem from compounding, it is overall indivisible into more basic units, being thus mono-morphemic.
Despite the above tendency, not all interjectional lexemes are morphologically simple in Biblical Hebrew. The two noticeable exceptions to the mono-morphemicity of interjections are הָוּיָה and, even more visibly, הָאֹנָה / הָאָנָא. As mentioned in section 3.1, the interjection הָוּיָה is a lengthened variant of הָוִי, extended by הָ (Jenni 1997, 483; see also BDB 1906, 17; HALOT 1994-2000). It has been suggested that the extension הָ present in הָוּיָה is the so-called paragogic ה (Klein 1987, 11). Two types of the paragogic ה are found in Biblical Hebrew. One type is attested in nominal forms, where it usually expresses direction or motion towards a place (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 256). However, it may sometimes be employed due to rhythmic and metrical necessity (ibid. 259) or broadly understood analogy (ibid. 257), with no directive nuances being involved. This “nominal” paragogic ה does not— with a few exceptions—bear the stress (ibid. 256). The other type of the paragogic ה appears with verbs, especially volitive forms such as the imperative and the cohortative (Lambdin 1971, 112, 118; Waltke and O’Connor 1990; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 127, 131–32; Robar 2014, 163), as well as some other types of the prefix conjugation (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 129–30). Irrespective of its debatable origin, this “verbal” paragogic ה encodes a number of functions: (a) it expresses an emphatic, honorific, or polite sense (ibid, 132); (b) it expresses the nuance of volitive or agent-oriented modality (Robar 2014, 168); (c) it functions as ventive and andative, expressing motion towards and the involvement of the speaker or “a named recipient/destination” (ibid. 165–67); and (d) it is used as a discourse (ibid. 165) and thematic (ibid. 170–71) marker. It has also been suggested that the verbal morpheme ה may sometimes fail to add any “discernible” nuance to the verb (ibid. 132), being instead used due to euphony (ibid. 132) or analogy (ibid. 129–30). In contrast, to the “nominal” type, the “verbal” paragogic ה tends to be stressed (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 127). Klein (1987, 11) proposes that ה present in הָוּיָה is related to the “nominal” paragogic ה that is found in הָוִי (cf. the basic form הָוִ). This is, in principle, possible since ה (i.e. ה) in הָוּיָה is unstressed and ה in הָוִ is merely analogical being devoid of a directional sense (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 57). However, the absence of the accent on the extension ה in הָוּיָה may be due to the presence of the prepositional phrase to which the interjection is linked by the maqqeph, i.e. הָוּיָה. Indeed, this often occurs with the “verbal” paragogic ה—which as explained tends otherwise to bear stress—when it is followed by lamed and a pronominal suffix, e.g. לְכָה †לְכָה ‘let us build ourselves’ (Robar 2014, 169). It is also found in two cases involving BH interjections, which were introduced in section 3.1 above. That is, in Num 21:29 and Jer 48:46, הָוּי loses its accent which is transferred onto the subsequent prepositional phrase composed of lamed and a pronominal suffix לְכָה. It should be noted that verbal forms accompanied by the paragogic ה may themselves be grammaticalized into discourse markers or secondary interjections such as הָוּיָהז ‘come (on)!’ or הָוּיָהז ‘come, go!’ (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 574; Robar 2014, 169). In such
cases, the accent is often not on the paragogic מ itself but rather elsewhere in the word, as illustrated by מֶּרֶךְ in Gen 11:3-4 (Robar 2014, 169). Given the above, and due to semantic-pragmatic resemblance linking imperatives and cohortatives to interjections, the analysis of the extension מ found in יהוה יְָּהָ as the “verbal” paragogic מ is, in our view, more plausible.

The pluri-morphemic origin is even more evident—and diachronically less challenging—in case of יהוה יְָּהָ. This interjunctonal lexeme most likely derives from the primary interjection יהוה יְָּו and the postpositive preceptive particle יְָּא (BDB 1906, 58; Gesenius 1910, 307; Jenni 1997b, 117; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 323).23 The particle יְָּא is highly common in Biblical Hebrew. It is used to convey entreaties (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 322) and polite requests translatable by ‘please’ (Waltke and O’Connor 1990; van der Merwe and Naudé 2017, 485). 24 Additionally, it encodes broadly understood emphasis, accompanying verbs inflected in volitional forms, such as the imperative, cohortative, and jussive, as well as certain particles, discourse markers, and negators (Gesenius 1910; Lambdin 1971, 114, 116, 170; Waltke and O’Connor 1990). In Biblical Hebrew, the original construction composed of יהוה יְָּו and יְָּא is highly grammaticalized. First, the sequence is invariably written as a single word, i.e. never with יהוה and יְָּא being fully separated or connected by the maqaphe. Second, the coda consonant of the first syllable is always assimilated to the onset consonant of the syllable that follows, i.e. b [h] + n [n] > [n]. Inversely, the final consonant of the interjection יהוה never surfaces as й b. Third, the interjection יהוה is never attested on its own in Biblical Hebrew, being only found in the compound יהוה יְָּא מ. Fourth, even though in five instances, יהוה יְָּא מ hosts two accents, one for each component separately, in most cases (specifically eight times), only one accent is present. As a result, it is unlikely that the two original components of יהוה יְָּא מ, i.e. יהוה יְָּו and יְָּא, “were still felt as distinct” (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 323). Rather, יהוה יְָּא מ has been fully grammaticalized as an interjunctonal lexeme, and the few cases of a two-segment accentuation are mere remnants of its diachronic origin, unavailable or, at least, very remotely available to BH speakers (contra Joüon-Muraoka ibid.).25 From a functional perspective, the origin of יהוה יְָּא מ would be similar to that of יהוה יְָּו. In both cases, an emphatic postpositive particle, otherwise typical of volitive verbal forms, has been incorporated into a primary interjection.

23 Klein (1987, 37) proposes that the interjection underlying יהוה יְָּא מ is יהוה rather than יהוה יְָּו.

24 Alternatively, it is viewed as a logical particle (Lambdin 1971, 119).

25 An initial stage of this process may be observed in certain uses of the interjection יָּא. In three examples (i.e. Jer 4:31; 45:3; Lam 5:16), יָּא is connected to the particle יְָּא by the maqaphe, yielding the sequence יְָּא יָּא. In all such cases, the two lexemes maintain their respective accent (see section 3.3).
BH interjections are morphologically anomalous (see feature M-2). Contrary to many other word classes—e.g. nouns, adjectives, participles, and verbs (see Fox 2003; Edzard 2011, 491–94, 497–500) which have recognizable, class-specific patterns and/or affixes—interjections have no transparent morphological and lexical structure in Biblical Hebrew. Indeed, neither a particular morphological pattern nor affixes mark lexemes as interjections, profiling their emotive meaning and distinguishing them from the other lexical classes. Crucially, interjections do not exploit the word-formation built around roots and inflections, which is the dominant morphological mechanism in Semitic (Rubba 2001, 681–82; Watson 2006, 431). Overall, interjections are lexically opaque, which concords with their most likely origin as automatic reflexes or onomatopoeic imitations.

3.3 SYNTAX

BH interjections may function holophrastically (see feature S-1). In such instances, a sole interjectional lexeme constitutes an autonomous utterance equivalent to fully-fledged sentences. Biblical Hebrew does not use punctuation that would overtly distinguish between separate sentences and, thus, utterances. Verbal and/or verb-less clauses accompanied by peripheral components can often be interpreted as parts of larger sentences. Therefore, the only unambiguous examples of holophrasticity emerge in cases where the interjection is the unique constituent of a turn in a dialogue or a narrative comment. Such isolated uses of interjections are found five times in the Hebrew Bible (slightly more than 4%). Four of those cases involve the lexeme הֶאָח (1.a-c); one involves the lexeme וה (1.d). In three of the five instances, the interjection is reduplicated, yielding the sequences הֶאָח הֶאָָֽח (1.a-b) and והוֹ־הו (1.d). In all such holophrastic uses, the utterances formed by interjections are non-elliptical. They do not constitute abbreviated versions of longer phrasal, clausal, or sentential structures. In other words, no elements are absent or understood implicitly. The interjectional utterance is complete.

(1)

a. Ps 40:16 (see also a similar use in Psalm 70:4)

יַשָּׁמְו עַל־עֵּקֶב בָּשְתָם הָאֹּמְרִּים לִּי הֶאָח הֶאָָֽח׃

May they turn back because of their shame, those saying to me: “Aha, aha!”

b. Job 39:25

26 This ambiguity is reflected in translations as a BH verse may often be rendered either as a complex sentence with a number of coordinated and subordinated clauses, or as two or more independent sentences. For instances, two consecutive wayyiqtol clauses may be understood as two clauses-sentences or two clauses forming a single coordinated sentence.

27 These will be analyzed as one of the constructional types (see feature S-4 further below). From a syntactic perspective, reduplicated holophrastic interjections may constitute cases of coordination (see Corver 2015).
Among the trumpets he says “Ha, ha!” and from a distance he smells [the] battle, [the] thunder of captains, and [the] shouting.

c. Ezek 25:3

Say to the Ammonites: “Hear the word of the Lord God; Thus says the Lord God: ‘Because you said “Aha!” over my sanctuary when it was profaned…’” (adapted from NRSV)

d. Amos 5:16

Therefore, thus says the Lord, the God of hosts, the Lord: In all the squares there shall be wailing; and in all the streets they shall say, “Alas, alas!” They shall call the farmers to mourning, and those skilled in lamentation, to wailing. (NRSV)

Even though the holophrasticity of interjections is attested, their non-holophrasticity—i.e. functioning as parts of utterances—is significantly more common. In 115 cases, interjections occur non-holophrastically. This amounts to nearly 96% of all the instances. Two types of non-holophrastic uses are possible: non-sentential and sentential.

The non-sentential type refers to utterances which are entirely projected by the interjection. These utterances either fail to contain clauses or the clauses that they contain are relative clauses structurally subordinate to the dependent of the interjection and its phrase. In other words, interjections do not fall under the scope of larger sentences. The non-sentential type is found in 20 instances, which amounts to nearly 17% of all the cases. The dependent of an interjection may be a bare nominal, e.g. noun, adjective, pronoun, pronominal suffix, participle (2.a). This nominal may further be qualified by pronominal affixes (2.b), adjectives, and appositions (2.c). It may be even more complex, being elaborated on by prepositional phrases, arguments projected by the valency pattern inherent to the verbal stem in the case of active participles (2.d), or relative clauses. The dependents—shorter or longer—may also be coordinated, overtly and/or by juxtaposition (2.e).
THE STRUCTURE OF INTERJECTIONS 23

(2)

a. Ezek 30:2

Son(s) of man, prophesy and say: “Thus says the Lord God: ‘Wail ‘Alas’ for the day!’ ” (adapted from NRSV)

b. 1 Kgs 13:30

He laid the body in his own grave, and they mourned over him, saying: “Alas, my brother!” (NRSV)

c. Dan 9:4

I prayed to the Lord my God and made confession: “Ah, Lord – the great and fearsome God keeping covenant and love with those who love you (lit. him) and who keep your (lit. his) commandments.” (adapted from NRSV)

d. Isa 5:21

Ah wise ones in their [own] eyes and cunning ones before their [own] sight!

e. Isa 5:20

Ah, you who refer to (lit. calling) evil as good, and to good as evil, to light as darkness, and to darkness as light, to sweet as bitter, and to bitter as sweet!

The other non-holophrastic type—the sentential type—emerges in cases where interjections form part of larger sentences. They co-occur with clauses that do not fall under the scope of the phrases which they (i.e. these interjections) govern.31 This is by

dealing with constructional properties of BH interjections, further below in this section.

31 The distinction between sentential and non-sentential interjections is important. The sentential type has a structural representation in sentence grammar and may, at least potentially, enter into relation with the core clause. These cases of non-holophrasticity can be viewed as canonical. In the non-sentential type, an interjection acts as a structural head that together with its dependents and/or modifiers forms the entire utterance. It cannot therefore have a structural representation in the grammar of a sentence under the scope of which it would fall. Nor can it enter into relation with a core clause (as this is simply absent). These cases of non-holophrasticity could be viewed as semi-canonical since everything in the utterance is structurally subordinate to or dependent on the interjection. Similar to genuine holophrastic uses,
far the most common use of interjections in Biblical Hebrew. It is found in 95 cases, which equate to nearly 79%. In their sentential uses, interjections may occur on their own, simply appearing together with the adjacent clause (3.a). They may also project dependent elements (e.g. ‘Lord God’ in 3.b or ‘to us’ in 3.c) as was the case with the non-sentential type described in the previous paragraph—the interjection and its dependent(s) co-occurring with an adjacent clause (3.b). The adjacent clause may be verbal (3.a-c) or nominal (see 3.d).

(3)
a. Zech 2:10

hoho, flee from the land of the north, says the Lord; for I have spread you abroad like the four winds of heaven, says the Lord. (adapted from NRSV)

b. Judg 6:22

Gideon saw that it was the angel of the Lord; and Gideon said: “Oh Lord God, for [because] I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face.” (adapted from RSV)

c. 1 Sam 4:7

The Philistines were afraid for they said: “God has come into the camp”. They said: “Woe to us for nothing like this has happened before.” (adapted from RSV)

d. 2 Kgs 6:5

And [as] one [was] felling a beam, his ax head fell into the water and he cried: “Alas master, it [was] borrowed.”

When falling under the scope of a larger sentence, interjections generally do not constitute an integral part of any of its clauses. On the contrary, the relationship between interjections and the utterance only consists of an interjectional phrase (IP). The distinction between non-sentential non-holophrastic uses and holophrastic uses would thus consist of the overt presence (semi-holophrastic) or the absence (holophrastic) of dependents and modifiers in the IP.

[32] See for instance Gen 50:17; Exod 32:31; Num 24:23; Josh 7:7; Judg 6:22; 1 Sam 4:8; 2 Kgs 20:3; Isa 1:4; 24:16; Jer 6:4; 15:10; 30:7; Ezek 21:20; 34:2; Hos 7:13; Amos 5:18; Micah 2:1; Ps 35:21; 120:5; Nch 1:11.
The structure of interjections is loose (see feature S-2). First, interjections are not projected by the clause’s verb and its valency. Second, they do not complement the verb as its adjunct in terms of manner, means, instrument, or modality. Third, they neither modify nor determine the verb’s arguments or adjuncts in the manner in which for instance, adjectives and adverbs do. This loose integration in the clausal structure is visible in that fact that interjections are often placed outside the structural boundaries of the clause. Accordingly, they appear before elements that mark the beginning of a clause. Such elements are: the connector ו (and; even); but’ (4.a; see also examples 3.a and 3.d above); the presentative particle היה ‘look; truly’ (4.b.; see also 5.b below); the connector and assertive particle כי ‘for, because; certainly’ (see example 4.c); the elements introducing interrogative clauses such as the particleبق_volume ‘whether’ (4.d), the adverbs איך ‘how’ (4.e), لماذا ‘why’ (see 6.a below), עד-אני ‘until when’ (see example 7.b below), and the pronoun מי ‘who’ (4.f); as well as and the negator לא ‘not’ (4.g; see also 5.a below).

(4)

a. Ezek 36:2

כָֹּ֤ה אָמַרָּ֙ אֲדֹּנָָ֣י יְהוִּּ֔ה יַָ֣עַן אָמַ֧ר הָאוֹיֵַ֛ב עֲלֵיכֶ֖ם

הֶאָ֑ח

וּבָמָ֣וֹת עוֹלָ֔ם

לְמָֽוֹרָשָ֖ה הָָ֥יְתָה לָָֽנוּ

TN.: Thus says the Lord God: “Because the enemy said of you ‘Aha, even the ancient heights have become our possession’.” (adapted from NRSV)

b. Jer 14:13

וָאֹּמַַ֞֞ר אֲהָָ֖֞ה אֲדֹּנָָ֣י יְהוִָּ֗ה הִֵ֨נֵֵּ֨ה הַנְבִּאִָּ֤ים אָֹּ֤מְרִָּ֤ים לָהִֶּםָּ֙

And I said: “Ah Lord God, here are the prophets [who are] saying to them: . . .”

c. Jer 30:7

הָ֗וֹי

כִָּ֥י גָדַ֛וֹל הַיָ֥וֹם הַה֖וּא מֵּאַָ֣יִּן כָמֹֹּ֑הוּ וְעֵָּֽת־צָרָָ֥ה הִּֽיאָּ֙ לְיַָֽעֲקֹּּ֔ב וּמִ֖מֶנָה

TN.: Alas, for that day is so great, there is none like it; it is a time of distress for Jacob; yet he shall be rescued from it. (adapted from NRSV)

d. Jonah 4:2

וַיִּתְפַלֵּ֨ל אֶל־יְהוָָ֜ה וַיֹּאמַָ֗ר אָנָ֤ה יְהוָ֤ה הֲלוֹא־זֶָּ֣ה דְבָרֵָּ֗י עַד־הֱיוָּ֙תִי עַל־אַּדְמָתִּּ֔י עַל־כֵָּ֥ן קִּדַ֖מְתִּי לִּבְרָֹּ֣חַ תַרְשִֹּ֑ישָה כִָּ֣י יָדַָ֗עְתִּי כִָּ֤י אַתָהָ֙ אֵָּֽל־חַנָ֣וּן וְרַחּ֔וּם אֶָ֤רֶךְ אַפַָּ֙יִּםָּ֙ וְרַב־חֶ֔סֶד וְנִּחָ֖ם עַל־הָרָעָָֽה׃

TN.: He prayed to the Lord and said: “O Lord! Is not this what I said while I was still in my own country? That is why I fled to Tarshish at the beginning; for I knew that you are a gracious God and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love, and ready to relent from punishing.”

(4.g; see also 5.a below).
e. Num 24:23

וַיִּשָָ֥א מְשָל֖וֹ וַיֹּאמַֹ֑ר

And he took up his oracle, saying: “Alas, who shall live when God does this?” (adapted from NRSV)

f. 2 Kgs 6:15

וַָ֠יַשְכֵּם מְשָרֵֵּ֨ת אִָּ֥יש הָָֽאֱלֹהִּים֮ לָקוּם֒ וַיֵּצֵ֕א וְהִּנֵּה־חַַ֛יל סוֹבֵָּ֥ב אֶת־

And when the servant of the man of God was risen early and gone forth, behold, an host compassed the city both with horses and chariots. And his servant said unto him: “Alas, my master! how shall we do?” (adapted from NRSV)

g. Jer 1:6

וָאֹּמַָ֗מר

Then I said: “Ah Lord God, truly I cannot speak, for I am a boy.”

BH interjections do not participate in the syntactic operation of negation (see feature S-3). Certainly, non-holophrastic interjections may accompany negative clauses and are thus compatible with negative contexts, even though this occurs infrequently (5.a-b; see also examples 4.f and 7.b). However, in such cases, the interjection itself is not negated. Instead, it carries its own affirmative value, merely expressing a given feeling. Due to the likely ungrammaticality of negative interjections, non-holophrastic interjections never appear in negative environments.

(5)

a. Isa 33:1

וָאֹּמַָ֗מר

Ah destroyer, you have not been destroyed . . .

b. Ezek 4:14

וָאֹּמַָ֗מר

And I said: “Ah Lord God, I have not defiled myself (lit. my soul [is] not polluted) . . .”

Interjections are slightly more compatible with interrogation. Although not particularly common, interjections may form parts of interrogative sentences. In such cases, they typically head the actual question and preserve their own non-interrogative illocutionary force (6.a) (see also 4.d-f above). More significantly however, phrases projected by interjections—and hence interjections containing dependents—may be reformulated into questions. This occurs in two instances found in the same verse (see example 6.b). Complying with the rules of BH syntax, the question word in (6.a) appears first—together with the preposition governing it—while the interjection occupies the second position: לא שומע איזה ונעשים לא ממקם. This contrast with affirmative constructions.
where the word order of the constituents is inverse: the interjection occupies the first position while its complementary PP occupies the second position (see 2.b and 3.c above). Cases in which holophrastic interjections would be questioned are untested.

(6) 

a. Josh 7:7

Josha7:7

וַּיֵּאמֶר יְהוֹשָּעַ אֲהָָ֣ה אֲדֹּנָָ֣י יְהוִָּ֗ה לָָ֠ם הֵּעֲבֵַ֨רְתָ הַעֲבִָּ֜יר אֶת־הָעָ֤ם הַזֶּ֙ה אֶת־הַיַרְדֵּ֔ן לָתֵּ֥ת אֹּתַָ֛נוּ בְיַָ֥ד הָאֱמֹּרִ֖י לְהַאֲבִּידֵֹּ֑נוּ וְלוָּ֙ הוֹאַ֣לְנוּ וַנֵּּ֔שֶב בְעֵ֖בֶר הַיַרְדֵָּֽן׃

Joshua said: “Ah Lord God, why have you brought this people across the Jordan at all, to hand us over to the Amorites so as to destroy us? Would that we had been content to settle beyond the Jordan!” (adapted from NRSV)

b. Prov 23:29

לְמִֵ֨י אָ֥וֹי לְמִִּ֪י אֲבָ֡וֹי לְמִָּ֤י מְדוֹנִּים לְמִָּ֥י שִָּ֗יחַ לְִ֭מִּי פְצָעִָּ֣ים חִּנָֹ֑ם לְְ֝מִָּ֗י חַכְלִּלָ֥וּת עֵינֶָָֽ֥יִּים׃

To whom woe? To whom alas (sorrow)? To whom strife?
To whom complains? To whom wounds without cause?
To whom redness of eyes? (adapted from NRSV and LEB)

BH interjections can form constructions (see feature S-4). Three constructional types can be identified: (a) interjections governing phrases; (b) interjections falling under the scope of a particle; (c) interjections forming chains with interjections. The three types are not mutually exclusive. All interjections restricted by particles govern a phrase, which is also the case of an interjectional chain on one occasion. Constructional uses of interjections are overall far more common (107x) than non-constructional ones (13x).

As has been mentioned several times in this section, BH interjections are able to govern dependent elements. This occurs in 102 cases, thus being the most prevalent among all constructional syntactic types in which BH interjections may participate. Interjections project two types of dependent phrases: noun phrases (NP) and prepositional phrases (PP). NPs are projected by interjections in 69 instances. The head of the NP is typically a noun (43x) (see example 7.a-b) or a participle (25x) (7.c). In one case, it is an adjective (albeit coordinated with a subsequent participle) (7.d).

33 Examples of non-constructional uses are found in Gen 50:17; Exod 32:31; Num 24:23; 2 Kgs 3:10; Isa 1:24; 44:16; Ezek 21:20; 26:2; 36:2, Jer 30:7; Zech 2:10; 2:11; Ps 35:21.


a. Jdg 11:35

When he saw her, he tore his clothes, and said: “Alas my daughter! You have brought me very low . . .” (adapted from NRSV)

b. Jer 47:6

Ah sword of the Lord! How long until you are quiet? Put yourself into your scabbard, rest and be still! (adapted from NRSV)

c. Jer 22:13

Woe to the one building his house by unrighteousness and his upper rooms by injustice; he makes his neighbors work for nothing, and does not give them their wages. (adapted from NRSV)

d. Amos 6:1

Alas for those who are at ease in Zion and feeling secure on Mount Samaria, those named chiefs of the nations; the house of Israel comes to them!

The nominal dependent may be addressed directly thus functioning as a canonical vocative (8.a; see also 7.a-b), or it may be referred to indirectly (8b; see also 7.c-d):

(8)

a. Isa 29:1

Ah Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped! Add year to year, let the festivals run their round. (NRSV)

b. Isa 10:1

Ah those who make iniquitous decrees, who write oppressive statutes. (adapted from NRSV)

Prepositional phrases are projected by interjections in 32 instances. The most typical preposition used is ל (28x) (9.a). The

36 See Num 21:29; 1 Sam 4:8; Isa 3:11; 4:31; Jer 6:4; 13:27; 45:3;
occurrence of the two other prepositions, i.e. על (9.b) and אֶל (9.c), is significantly lower, each occurring twice.

(9) a. 1 Sam 4:8

Woe to us! Who can deliver us from the power of these mighty gods? These are the gods who struck the Egyptians with every sort of plague in the wilderness. (NRSV)

b. Jer 50:27

Kill all her bulls, let them go down to the slaughter. Alas for them, their day has come, the time of their punishment! (NRSV)

c. Ezek 6:11

Thus says the Lord God: Clap your hands and stamp your foot, and say: "Alas for all the vile abominations of the house of Israel! For they shall fall by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence." (NRSV)

The dependent of the preposition is typically a pronominal suffix (23x) (10.a). Other types of constituents are less common: a noun (6x) (10.b), an interrogative pronoun (2x; see example 6.b above), and a participle (1x) (10.c).

(10) a. Ps 120:5

Woe to me for I am an alien in Meshech, for I must live among the tents of Kedar. (adapted from NRSV)

b. Joel 1:15

Alas for the day! For the day of the Lord is near, and as destruction from the Almighty it comes. (NRSV)

c. Ezek 13:18

50:27; Ezek 6:11; 13:3; 30:2; Hos 7:13; 9:12; Mic 7:1; Joel 1:15; Ps 120:5; Prov 23:29 (x2); Eccl 4:10; 10:16; Lam 5:16.
And you will say: “Thus says the Lord God: Woe to the women who sew bands on all wrists and make veils for the heads of persons of every height, in the hunt for human lives! Will you hunt down lives among my people, and maintain your own lives?” (adapted from NRSV)

Additionally, there is one instance in which the interjection governing a PP (לִּי 'to me' see in 11) also governs an additional non-appositional NP (אִּמִּי 'my mother'):

(11) Jer 15:10

אָֽוֹי לִָּ֣י אִּמִּּ֔י כִָּ֣י יְלִּדְתִָּ֗נִּי אִָּ֥ש רִַּ֛יב וְאִָּ֥יש מָד֖וֹן לְכָ֥ל־הָאָֹ֑רֶץ לָֹּֽא־נָשִָּ֥יתִּי וְלֹּא־נָָֽשוּ־בִּ֖י כֻ֥לָה מְקַלְלַָֽונִּי׃ ס

Woe to me, my mother, that you ever bore me, a man of strife and contention to the whole land! I have not lent, nor have I borrowed, yet all of them curse me. (adapted from NRSV)

BH interjections enter in constructions with particles. The particles that operate over interjections are וב, וב, and נא. The first two, i.e. וב and וב, occur in the same instance with the interjection אוֹי (12.a). The use with the particle נא is more common, being attested three times. In all three instances, נא intervenes between the interjection (to which it is linked by a maqappph) and a dependent prepositional phrase (12.b).37

(12)

a. Hos 9:12

כִָּ֤י אִם־יְגַדְלוָּּ֙ אֶת־בְנֵּיהֶ֔ם וְשִּכַלְתִּ֖ים מֵָּֽאָדָֹ֑ם כִָּֽי־גַם־אָ֥וֹי לָ֖הֶ֑ם בְשוּרִָּ֥י מֵּהֶָֽם׃

Even if they bring up children, I will bereave them until no one is left. Woe to them indeed when I depart from them! (NRSV)

b. Jer 4:31

כִּי לֹֽא־כִּ֣י־עָיְפָָ֥ה נַפְשִ֖י לְהֹּרְגִָּֽים׃ פ

For I heard a cry as of a woman in labor, anguish as of one bringing forth her first child, the cry of daughter Zion gasping for breath, stretching out her hands, “Woe to me! I am fainting before killers!” (adapted from NRSV)

Lastly, Biblical Hebrew allows for interjection chains, i.e. the combination of interjections into sequences. This phenomenon is attested six times. In all such cases, however, the combination involves the reduplication of an interjectional lexeme rather than

37 See also Jer 45:3 and Lam 5:16.
grouping of different interjections. The reduplicated interjections are: אֹי (13.a), הֶאָח (13.b; see also 1.a), רֹאֶה (see example 3.a), and הָוֹי (see example 1.d). In other words, constructional sequences composed of different interjections are unattested.

(13)
a. Ezek 16:23

וַיְהִּי אַחֲרֵּ֖י כָּל־רָעָתֵֹּ֑ךְ אָ֣וֹי אָ֣וֹי לָֽ֔ךְ נְאֻ֖ם אֲדֹּ֛נָי יְהוִָּֽה׃

After all your wickedness (woe, woe to you! says the Lord God). (NRSV)

b. Ps 35:21

רְחִָּ֥יבוּ עָלַָ֗י פִִּּ֫יהֶָ֥ם אִָ֭מְר הֶאָָ֣ח׀ הֶאֹ֑ח רָאֲתָָ֥ה עֵּינֵָּֽ׃

They open wide their mouths against me; they say: “Aha, aha, our eyes have seen it.” (NRSV)

Non-holophrastic interjections, which function as words and parts of utterances, are typically found at the margins of an utterance (see feature S-5). Most commonly, they occupy an initial position, being thus located in the utterance’s left periphery. Overall, an utterance-initial position is attested in 100 cases, while a non-initial position, invariably an utterance-internal one, is found in 15 cases. To be exact, interjections that form sentences with other clauses occur utterance-initially in 81 instances out of 95 possible (14.a).38 In only 14 instances of this structural type, interjections occupy an utterance-internal position (14.b).39 For interjections that do not form sentences with other clauses but project their own phrase (either simple or elaborated on by relative clauses), the preference for an utterance-initial position is even more evident. In 19 instances out of 20 possible, such interjections occur at the beginning of an utterance (14.c).40 Only in one case, an utterance-internal position is attested (see example 12.a above).

(14)
a. Nah 3:1

ה֖וֹי עִָּ֣יר דָמִֹּ֑ים כֻלָָ֗הּ כַָ֤חַש פֶָּ֙רֶקָּ֙ מְלֵּ֔אָה לָֹּ֥א יָמִ֜יש טָָֽרֶף

Ah, city of bloodshed, utterly deceitful, full of booty—no end to the plunder! (NRSV)

b. Job 10:15

אֲפַרְסִיתֶהָ֖יָּ֣רֶצֶף לֵ֑י זַעְמֵּ֣ת שֶּׁאָם שֵׁ֥מֵעַ הָ֑ארְאַה

뿐יו:

38 For instance, Num 21:29; 24:23; 1 Sam 4:7, 8; 2 Kgs 3:10; Isa 5:8; 5:18; Jer 30:7; Ezek 26:2; 36:2; Amos 5:18; Mic 7:1; Zeph 2:5; Zech 2:10; 11:17; Ps 35:21; 116:16; 120:5; Ecel 10:16; Neh 1:5.
40 1 Kgs 13:30; Isa 5:20, 21, 22; 10:1; 18:1; Jer 22:18 (4x); 23:1; 34:5; Ezek 6:11; 30:2; Hab 2:9; 2:15; Zeph 3:1; Ps 35:25; Dan 9:4.
If I am wicked, woe to me! If I am righteous, I cannot lift up my head, for I am filled with disgrace and look upon my affliction. (NRSV)

c. Hab 2:15

 Assyria, people of the Assyrians, you who make your neighbors drink, pouring out your wrath until they are drunk, in order to gaze on their nakedness! (NRSV)

Non-holophrastic interjections also tend to occupy a peripheral position in their own phrase—that is, in relation the interjection’s dependents. This position is, again, typically initial. In 112 cases out of 115 possible, interjections feature at the beginning of the phrase (15). In two cases—found in the same verse—the interjections appear phrase-finally (see example 6.b). As has been explained above, this phrase-final position is due to their use in an interrogative context. In one example, the interjection occupies a phrase-internal position, occurring between an affirmative particle and a prepositional phrase (see 14.d above).

(15)

Jonah 1:14

Then they cried out to the Lord: “Please O Lord, we pray, do not let us perish on account of this man’s life. Do not make us guilty of innocent blood; for you, O Lord, have done as it pleased you.” (NRSV)

Peripherality and an utterance-initial placement are equally patent if one considers the mutual position of the interjection accompanied by its nominal dependent—either headed directly or via a preposition, and thus, the structure [I + NP/PP]—and the rest of the utterance. Indeed, such structures appear utterance-initially in 101 instances out of 115 possible (16.a). Only in 14 instances, they occupy an utterance-internal position (16.b).

(16)

a. Ps 35:25

Do not let them say to themselves: “Aha, we have our heart’s desire.” Do not let them say: “We have swallowed you up.” (NRSV)


42 For other examples, see footnote 38 above.

b. Lam 5:16

The crown has fallen from our head, woe to us, for we have sinned! (NRSV)

Extrametrum—or a phonological separation—is not a pervasive feature of BH interjections (see future S-6). Overall, interjections bear a conjunctive accent in 66 cases (out of 115 possible), while a disjunctive accent is used in 49 cases. Thus, the absence of extrametrum is, at least moderately, more common (57%) than its presence (43%). More specifically, out of 82 instances in which interjections occur in a sentence and have an NP, a PP, or a combination of both as their dependent, they exhibit a conjunctive accent 50 times (17.a). Inversely, in 32 of these instances, the interjection bears a disjunctive accent (17.b). Extrametrum is more evident in cases in which the interjection forms part of a sentence, but lacks a dependent. Only 1 instance out of a total of 13 attests to a conjunctive accent (3.a), while the remaining cases bear a disjunctive accent (17.c). Interjections that do not form part of sentences (i.e. non-holophrastic non-sentential interjections) also tend to bear a conjunctive accent (15x) (17.d) rather than a disjunctive accent (5x) (17.e).

(17)

a. Jer 6:4

“Prepare war against her; up, and let us attack at noon!”
“Woe to us, for the day declines, the shadows of evening lengthen!” (NRSV)

b. Ezek 13:3

Thus says the Lord God: “Alas for the senseless prophets who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing!” (NRSV)

c. Gen 50:17

Say to Joseph: “O please, forgive the crime of your brothers and the wrong they did in harming you.” (adapted from NRSV)

d. Jer 23:1

“Woe to the shepherds who destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture!” – says the Lord. (adapted from NRSV)
The extrametrum of interjections can be assessed differently. Again, one may consider the phonological link that exists between the interjection projecting its NP or PP, on the one hand, and the remaining parts of the utterance, on the other hand. When analysed from that perspective, extrametrum is more evident. That is, the structure \([I + NP/PP]\) tends to be phonologically separated from the rest of the utterance: out of 102 cases, 97 bear a disjunctive accent,\(^{44}\) while only 5 bear a conjunctive accent.\(^{45}\) This type of extrametrum is equally patent for the sentential and non-sentential types. In sentential uses, the analysed structures are marked by a disjunctive accent 77 times (18.a), while a conjunctive accent is only used 5 times (18.b). In non-sentential uses, all 20 cases are separated from the rest of the utterance by a disjunctive accent (see example 17.f above).

(18)

a. Ezek 9:8

While they were killing, and I was left alone, I fell prostrate on my face and cried out: “Ah Lord God! will you destroy all who remain of Israel as you pour out your wrath upon Jerusalem?” (NRSV)

b. Isa 6:5

And I said: “Woe to me! I am lost, for I am a man of unclean lips, and I live among a people of unclean lips; yet my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts!” (adapted from NRSV)

4. DISCUSSION

The study of the formal profile of interjections shows that the canonicity and extra-systematicity of BH interjections is distinct in the different modules of language—or when analyzed locally.

In phonology, three features postulated for the interj ectional prototype are met (nearly) entirely (P-3, P-4, P-5); two features are met to a certain extent only (P-6 largely and P-7 only


\(^{45}\) See Num 21:29; Isa 6:5; Jer 48:46; Prov 23:29; Eccl 10:16.
residually); lastly, two features are not met (P-1 and P-2). The combination of those different “scores” into a single value is not an easy task—perhaps unachievable. Nevertheless, approximatively, BH interjections seem to exhibit a semi-canonical phonological profile, which means that their asystematicity is moderate.

P-1 [-]  asystematic sounds are unattested;
P-2 [-]  asystematic clusters are unattested;
P-3 [+]  BH interjections have a marked vocalic character;
P-4 [+]  with marginal exceptions, BH interjections bear the stress;
P-5 [+]  with marginal exceptions, BH interjections exhibit a simple phonetic structure;
P-6 [+/−]  some BH interjections exhibit harmonious patterns;
P-7 [(+)/−]  a few BH interjections exhibit alternative variants.

As far as morphology is concerned, BH interjections comply fully with one feature (M-2). The feature M-1 (composite of three sub-features) is met to a large extent. As a result, the morphological canonicity of BH interjections and their asystematicity are relatively high.

M-1 [+/(−)]  BH interjections tend to exhibit a simple mono-morphemic structure. With the exception of two lexemes, interjections lack inflections (M-1.a), derivations (M-1.b), and compounding (M-1.c);
M-2 [+]  BH interjections are morphologically anomalous and lexically opaque.

In syntax, two features are met fully (S-1 and S-2);46 three features are met partially (S-5 to a large extent, while S-3 and S-6 to a limited degree); and one feature is violated (S-4). Overall, the canonicity of BH interjections in syntax and their syntactic extra-systematicity are moderate:47

S-1 [+]  BH interjections may be used holophrastically as autonomous, complete, non-elliptical utterances;
S-2 [+]  when used in sentences, BH interjections are associated with the adjacent clause(s) in a loose manner;

---

46 Concerning S-1 see, however, further below.
47 The approximate values of the canonicity/extra-systematicity of interjections in the three language modules that are presented above in an approximate and narrative fashion, coincide with more numeral calculations. The allocation of a number reflecting high or low compliance (1 for +; 0.75 for +/(−); 0.5 for +/−; 0.25 for (+)/−; and 0 for −) to each feature-related score yields the following averaged values: phonology – 0,53; morphology – 0,85; syntax – 0,54.
BH interjections generally do not participate in syntactic operations of negation and interrogation. However, interjectional phrases exhibiting the structure [I+PP] may be questioned;

BH interjections can form constructions with other elements by governing phrases (NPs and PPs), falling under the scope of particles, and yielding interjectional sequences;

BH interjections often (albeit not always) occupy a peripheral, typically left, position in the utterance. The same holds true for the placement of interjections in their own phrases, as well as for the placement of the structures [I+NP/PP];

BH interjections are often linked to adjacent elements by conjunctive accent, thus failing to function as separate prosodic or intonational entities—even though disjunction is also widely attested. The extrametrum of [I+NP/PP] is significantly more evident.

The different values that BH interjections exhibit locally in phonology, morphology, and syntax, can in turn be combined into a global canonicity/extra-systematicity range. Although similar to the local summations, this total value should be viewed as approximate, we conclude that globally, BH interjections are semi-canonical and thus semi-extra-systematic.

Apart from determining the extent of canonicity and extra-systematicity of BH interjections—and thus apart from positioning them in the typological categorial network—our research reveals certain significant properties of BH interjectional lexemes; even though most of these properties are not directly associated with the prototype. First, BH interjections make a common use of gutturals consonants (ח [χ], ה [h]). Second, all BH interjections exhibit mono-consonantal, [ʔ] or [h] onsets in a word-initial position. Third, onomatopoeic interjections are uncommon. Four, reduplication occurring within a single lexeme is a phonological process rather than a morphological one. Five, the only morphemes incorporated into or combinable with interjections are “emphatic” particles typical of imperative and volitive forms. Six, holophrastic uses of interjections are far less common than non-holophrastic uses. The first five properties, related to phonology and morphology, coincide with observations made in research on interjections in other language families, e.g. in Xhosa (Andrason and Dlali forthcoming), which suggests their wider cross-linguistic status. The sixth property demonstrates that the compliance with a feature does not imply that that particular feature—and not its opposite—is the prevalent situation in a given language. This perhaps lowers even further the extent of canonicity and extra-systematicity of interjections in Biblical Hebrew.

The pervasiveness of interjectional non-holophrasticity in Biblical Hebrew suggests that interjections may have both an internal representation and syntagmatic role(s). First, we propose
that an interjection may govern constituents within its own phrase—the Interjectional Phrase (IP) (see a similar proposal in Nordgren 2015, 48, 51–52). In Biblical Hebrew, the dependent constituents may be an NP or a PP. However, the dependent position may also be non-filled with the interjection being the only constituent of the IP. Accordingly, interjections are the head of their IP (Nordgren 2015, 52), projecting other dependent constituents (see Figure 1 below). Arguably, the interjection would also project the case to its dependent phrases—either vocative (with a NP) or prepositional (with a PP). This is consistent with certain violations of the interjectional prototype observed in typological studies, in particular: a close link to vocatives through parataxis and the ability to project determined valency patterns (Ameka and Wilkins 2006, 67; Nordgren 2015).

Figure 1: Structural representation of non-holophrastic interjections

Second, we propose that in their sentential uses, interjections entertain a syntagmatic role in the sentence structure, fully comparable to that attributed to various extra-clausal constituents such as vocatives, left-dislocands, and pragmatic/discourse markers (see Kaltenböck, Keizer and Lohmann 2016, 1). Although unable to “to enter into syntactic relations with other structures” (ibid.), vocatives, left-dislocands, and pragmatic/discourse markers form syntagmatic parts of a sentence (see for instance the syntagmatic role of left-dislocands in Westbury 2014; Andraison, Westbury and van der Merwe 2016). They are also structurally represented in the sentence model, as nodes placed beyond the core clause or complementizer phrase (CP). Accordingly, interjections could occupy a syntagmatic beyond-clause/CP position parallel to a left-dislocand (LD), a vocative phrase (VP), or a topic phrase (TP). At this time, where research on the formal syntax of interjections is in its preliminary stage, we are unable to provide a more precise structural interpretation.

The results of our research enable us to correct or nuance several statements and assumptions formulated previously in BH scholarship (see section 2.2). The claim of the phonetic extra-systematicity of BH interjections (Waltke and O’Connor 1990,

48 The term ‘left-dislocand’ refers to a phrase that is dislocated to the left in left-dislocation constructions. It is the element that is located outside the core clause (Westbury 2014; Andraison, Westbury and van der Merwe 2016).
683) is unsupported. Our study suggests the opposite. Crucially, no “odd” sounds (ibid.) are attested—all sounds are fully systematic. Similarly, the alleged syntactic extra-systematicity of BH interjections (ibid.) is much less patent. Contrary to Gesenius (1910, 470–71), interjections do not form “incomplete” sentences. In their holophrastic uses, such sentences are complete and non-elliptical. Our data also invalidate the claim whereby BH interjections are unable to enter into constructions with other grammatical elements (Richter 1980, 158). The opposite is true. Interjections form tied constructions with prepositional phrases and noun phrases, with particles, and with interjections themselves. Furthermore, although loosely related to core clauses, BH interjections do entertain a syntagmatic role in sentences, comparable to that of vocatives, left-dislocands, and discourse markers (contra Richter 1980, 158). Lastly, while failing to be discussed in scholarship, the highest extent of extra-systematicity of BH interjections pertains to morphology. Our study also provides validity to certain statements that have thus far been merely assumed and never supported by empirical evidence. First, as hypothesized by van der Merwe and Naudé (2017, 483), BH interjections “do not form part of […] a clause.” Our data demonstrate that they are indeed extra-clausal. Second, further corroborating van der Merwe and Naudé (ibid.), interjections do not modify and complement constituents. However, interjections may govern constituents—an observation that has been unnoticed by those two authors.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper demonstrates that when envisaged globally, the lexical class of interjections in Biblical Hebrew exhibits a semi-canonical and thus semi-extra-systematic profile as far as its form is concerned. Locally, the levels of canonicity and extra-systematicity of BH interjections are uneven. The highest level is attested in morphology, while the levels found in phonology and syntax are only moderate.

We propose furthermore that BH interjections have a structural representation and syntagmatic role. They govern dependents within their own interjectional phrases, either a PP or an NP, and form part of a sentence structure to a comparable extent as other extra-clausal phrases such as vocative, left-dislocand, and topic phrases.
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