

Primary interjections in Ugaritic

Alexander Andrason – University of Stellenbosch

[The present paper analyzes the lexical class of primary interjections in Ugaritic within a canonical prototype-driven approach to interjectionality. By examining the compliance of six lexemes –*y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, *ahl* and *an*– with the functional (semantics and pragmatics) and formal (phonology, morphology, and syntax) features associated with the prototype, the author concludes as follows: each of the analyzed lexemes is a more or less canonical instantiation of the prototype and a rightful member in the category of interjections. Despite a considerable functional-formal variation of the interjections and their dissimilar compliance with the prototype, the category itself is coherent, if depicted as a radial network with prototype effects.]

Keywords: Ugaritic, interjections, canonical typology, radial category.

1. Introduction

The present paper analyzes the word class of interjections –one of the least researched and least understood grammatical categories in the Ugaritic language. The vast majority of Ugaritic scholarship classifies words that, from the perspective of linguistic typology, seem to approximate interjections as members of another lexical class, i.e. that of particles (Aartun 1974; Caquot, Szyner & Herdner 1974; Sivan 2001; Bordreuil & Pardee 2004; 2009; Halayqa 2008, 456; Huehnergard 2012; Tropper 2012). Sometimes, Ugaritic scholars avoid any specific word-class categorization by using vague terms such as markers (Testen 1998), elements (Huehnergard 1983), functors (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 932), and vocatives (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 481, 932). Only sporadically, a few lexemes are classified as interjections (Caquot, Szyner & Herdner 1974, 302, 475, 591; Segert 1984, 81, 104; 2000, 14; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 3, 481), being alternatively labelled –by the same authors– as exclamations (Halayqa 2008, 456; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 932). Overall, the terminology used to refer to Ugaritic interjections is messy and linguistically problematic; even more questionably, interjections are generally denied categorial independence in the Ugaritic language.

This article aims to clarify the murky waters in studies of Ugaritic interjections. To be exact, I will design a unified model of the interjective word class in terms of a coherent, yet internally complex, category. As in my previous research on interjections in Semitic languages (Andrason & Hutchison 2020; Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020; Andrason & Vita forthcoming), the present study will be developed within a canonical approach to categorization (Corbett 2005; 2007; Evans & Green 2006; Janda 2015) drawing on an interjective prototype postulated in linguistic typology (Ameka 1992; 2006; Nübling 2001; 2004; Stange & Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). To achieve my

objective, I will examine the interjective canonicity of six lexemes which are the optimal candidates to be included in the category of interjections. That is, I will determine the extent to which these lexemes comply with –or violate– the prototype of interjections in uses attested in the selected Ugaritic corpus (KTU³).

The paper will be organized as follows: in Section 2, I will present the underlying theoretical framework of my study. In Section 3, I will introduce the evidence that demonstrates the degree of compliance of the studied lexemes with the prototype of interjections. In Section 4, I will evaluate the results of my empirical study within the adopted framework and will design a holistic model of the interjective category in Ugaritic. Section 5 will conclude the article.

2. Theoretical framework – A canonical approach to interjections

In this paper, I follow a canonical approach to linguistic categorization (Corbett 2005; 2007). According to this approach, a linguistic category –in the case of the present study, the category of interjections– is defined as a radial network organized around a prototype. Members that comply with the prototype maximally are canonical –they occupy a central position in the category. Members that comply with the prototype minimally are non-canonical –they are located in the category’s periphery. The intermediate zones of the category comprise members exhibiting a medium range of canonicity (Evans & Green 2006; Janda 2015). As a result, categorial belonging is not defined in terms of a neat alternative “either-or” but is rather conceived in terms of a gradient scale representing the extent of compliance with the category’s prototype (Janda 2015).

The fundamental element in a canonical approach to categorization, which internally structures the entire category constituting the epicenter of its radiation, is the prototype. The prototype itself is defined cumulatively as a set of features that represent the most common and the most salient types of behaviors associated with a given category across languages (Croft 2003; Corbett 2005; 2007; Janda 2015). Therefore, albeit a convention constructed by linguists, the prototype is plotted in light of empirical data. Crucially, no prototypical feature is viewed as an essential and/or sufficient condition for the inclusion of an item into the category. The lack of such decisive features stems from two facts. First, members of the same category, in particular those that are non-canonical, need not have any feature in common among them. Second, even for minimally non-canonical members, the radiation proceeds by failing to comply with any of the prototypical features. In other words, no feature is immune to being lost when radiating from the categorial nucleus.¹

I have used a canonical approach in my previous studies on interjections in Semitic languages, i.e. Aramaic (Andrason & Hutchison 2020), Biblical Hebrew (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020), and Canaano-Akkadian (Andrason & Vita forthcoming), as well as in research dedicated to interjections in other language families, e.g. Xhosa (Andrason & Matutu 2019; Andrason & Dlali 2020) and Tjwao (Andrason, Fehn, Phiri 2020).² Initially, when constructing the prototype of an interjection, I eclectically drew on earlier seminal publications devoted to the interjective category

1. This, in turn, implies that categories overlap by sharing certain features and transmuting –both conceptually and diachronically– one into another.

2. As a result, without being reproduced verbatim, the theoretical section of the present paper coincides, to an extent, with the theoretical sections of those articles.

in general linguistics, especially those authored by Ameka (1992; 2006), Ameka & Wilkins (2006), Nübling (2001; 2004), Stange & Nübling (2014), and Stange (2016). Gradually, by conducting my own typological research and testing the properties identified in previous scholarship on languages from diverse language phyla (Semitic, Bantu, Slavonic, Hellenic, Italic, Nilotic, and Khoe), I have compiled my own list of prototypical features. This list can be regarded as relatively reliable and comprehensive.³

The features characterizing the prototype of an interjection concern both function (i.e. semantics and pragmatics) and form (i.e. phonetics, morphology, and syntax). To begin with, from a semantic perspective, interjections tend to give insight into the mental state of the speaker (Ameka 1992; 2006). Depending on the specific type of mental state being expressed, four classes of interjections may be distinguished: emotive, cognitive, conative, and phatic. Emotive interjections express emotional or sensorial states and exhibit an “I feel” component (Wierzbicka 1991; 1992; Ameka 1992, 110, 113; 2006, 743-744; Nübling 2004, 20; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982-1983; Stange 2016, 8, 18-20). Cognitive interjections express the state of knowledge of the speaker, in terms of awareness, ignorance, understanding, remembering, or doubting (Wierzbicka 1991; Ameka 1992, 133; 2006, 744; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 13). Conative interjections express volitional states. They are used to draw the attention of addressees or, similar to orders and exhortations, prompt them to engage in determined actions (Wierzbicka 1991; Ameka 1992, 113). Phatic interjections express the mental state of the speaker with regard to ongoing communication. They are used to establish, maintain, or terminate communication. They determine what part of information may enter into communication and what part is rejected; offer meta-commentaries between conversational turns; and are widely exploited in rituals of welcoming, leave-taking, apologizing, or thanking (Ameka 1992, 113-114; 2006, 744; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 9-10; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016, 12). From a pragmatic perspective, interjections are non-referential. They thus preclude discourses about parties other than the interlocutors themselves (Nübling 2004, 19; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982-1983; Stange 2016, 10). Interjections are polysemous and their interpretation depends to a large extent on context and conversational inferences (Ameka 1992, 114; 2006, 743; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 2-3; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1985; Stange 2016, 12, 41). Emotive and cognitive interjections are semi-automatic reflexes, i.e. spontaneous, instinctive, unplanned reactions to linguistic or extra-linguistic stimuli (Ameka 1992, 108-109; Nübling 2004, 19-20; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 16; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982-1983; Stange 2016, 10, 18, 20). They are also monologic and reflexive –they lack addressees and are not intended to trigger responses from other participants (Ameka 1992, 109; Nübling 2004, 20; Stange 2016, 42; Stange 2016, 11, 13, 42).⁴

3. My research has maintained the validity of most features associated with the prototype of interjections that had been postulated in literature, expanding them with a few new properties and modifying the range of some that had been previously included. Therefore, my list should not be viewed as a radically new inventory. It should rather be understood as a creative and critical synthesis of earlier scholarship and my own empirical studies.

4. In contrast, conative and phatic interjections are often deliberate, dialogic, and generally require the presence of an interlocutor (Wierzbicka 1991; Ameka 1992, 113; 2006, 744; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 9; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1983; Stange 2016). There are other properties of interjections which are not relevant for this study: (a) interjections typically occur in oral language and in those types of written language that imitate oral language, e.g. comics and drama; and (b) interjections are related to gestures (Ameka 1992, 112; 2006, 743; Nübling 2004; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 3; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982-1983, 1986; Stange 2016, 45).

Formal features of a prototypical interjection are equally complex. Phonetically, interjections exhibit a monosyllabic structure, either [C] or [CV] (Nübling 2001, 23; 2004, 24-25). They contain sounds and sound combinations that are atypical of, or entirely absent in other lexical classes found in the hosting language system (Ameka 1992, 112; 2006, 745; Nübling 2001, 23-24; 2004, 25; Velupillai 2012, 149; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982, 1985; Stange 2016, 34-35). The vocalic component plays a more significant role in interjections than the consonantal component (Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 26; Andrason & Dlali 2020). Interjections bear a full stress –they are uttered with increased intensity and louder speech volume (Nübling 2004, 22; Stange 2016, 20). Pluri-syllabic interjections exhibit harmonious patterns, e.g. vocal and consonantal harmony and reduplication (Nübling 2004, 26-27). Being propitious to lengthening or shortening, interjections are phonetically unstable. This is in turn visible in their graphic mutability (Nübling 2001, 23-24; 2004, 24, 26).⁵ Morphologically, interjections are characterized by a simple structure, being generally monomorphemic and indivisible in smaller meaningful elements (Ameka 1992, 111; 2006, 743-744; Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 29; Velupillai 2012, 149; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1985). This means that interjections fail to contain inflections and derivations, and do not exploit compounding mechanisms (Nübling 2001, 24; 2004, 29; Ameka 2006, 743-744; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1985; Stange 2016, 36). Interjections are morphologically anomalous, i.e. opaque and with no identifiable lexical structure (Nübling 2001, 24-25; 2004, 29; Ameka 2006, 744; Stange 2016, 50). Syntactically, interjections may be used both as parts of utterances (i.e. as words) and holophrastically as fully fledged, non-elliptical, autonomous utterances (Ameka 1992, 107-108; 2006, 743-745; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 20, 30; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982-1983; Stange 2016, 20, 48). When used as parts of utterances, they are loosely integrated in the sentence/clause grammar or are not integrated at all. They lack a specific syntactic function and do not constitute core structural components. They are not governed by the predicate and its dependent elements, nor do they modify the predicate, its arguments, or other adjuncts (Ameka 1992, 108, 112; 2006, 745; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1985; Stange 2016, 20, 48). Although compatible with negative and interrogative clauses, interjections fail to participate in the syntactic operations of negation and interrogation (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 30). This is related to their ability to entertain illocutionary force that is independent from that of the rest of the utterance. Interjections do not enter into constructions with other word classes and/or the remaining elements of the sentence/clause, with the exception of other interjections and vocatives (Ameka 1992, 112; 2006, 743-744; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31). Interjections occupy an utterance peripheral position, at its left (and less frequently, right) edge (Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 31; Nordgren 2015, 44). They are phonologically separated from the rest of the utterance, e.g. by comma intonation, pause, and contouring, thus forming an autonomous intonational phrase (Ameka 1992, 108; 2006, 745; Nübling 2001, 25; 2004, 30; Nordgren 2015, 45).

Given the adopted approach, the method of my research will consist of examining the extent to which potential Ugaritic interjections comply with the interjective prototype postulated in linguistic typology. This compliance will enable me to demonstrate the presence of the lexical class of interjections in Ugaritic and determine its overall organization. A set of such potential candidates –

5. Another phonetic property of interjections is their close relationship with tone. That is, tone often plays a phonemic function in interjections even in non-tonal languages (Nübling 2001, 22-23; 2004, 22-23). This feature cannot be assessed in ancient languages such as Ugaritic.

namely, the lexemes *y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, *ahl*, and *an-* and the list of their occurrences have been identified in a preliminary study by means of the comprehensive Ugaritic concordance (Cunchillos, Vita & Zamora 2003) and by reviewing the principal works dedicated to these lexemes in Ugaritic scholarship, despite differences in the terminology used to refer to them (i.e. particle, element, marker, functor, vocative, exclamation, or interjection). These aforementioned works include grammars (Sivan 2001; Bordreuil & Pardee 2004, 2009; Huehnergard 2012; Tropper 2012), dictionaries (Tropper 2008; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 932), and articles as well as other monographs (Aartun 1974; Segert 1984; Huehnergard 1983; Testen 1998). This list has been composed by excluding lexemes that could be classified more accurately as particles, whether modal⁶ or pragmatic,⁷ as well as secondary interjections,⁸ including exclamations.⁹ In so doing, I followed the current linguistic theory where modal particles, pragmatic particles, and exclamations are viewed as lexical classes or grammatical categories essentially different from interjections (Ameka 1992) and where the membership of less grammaticalized secondary interjections in the interjective lexical class is also problematic (Meinard 2015, 154). As a result, the list includes only those lexemes that seem to approximate primary interjections, i.e. elements that are primarily used as interjections. This “primal quality” could be original and date to the beginning of the grammatical life of interjective lexemes. Alternatively, it could be acquired through a profound interjectionalization of initially non-interjective lexemes and constructions (Ameka 1992, 110-111; 2006; Nübling 2001; 2004; Stange & Nübling 2014, 1982, 1986-1988; Stange 2016, 48-49).¹⁰ This

6. Particles are not mental acts but rather indicate the speaker’s argumentative relationship to the proposition or communication (Ameka 1992, 107, 111; Fischer 2007, 47; Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 3). They also fail to entertain an independent illocutionary force. Instead, they are used to “modify the illocutionary force” of an utterance and have scope over the sentence (Ameka 1992, 107, 110; Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 7). Crucially, particles cannot be used holophrastically (Ameka 1992, 107; Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 7). To occur they require a clausal structure into which they are well integrated (Ameka 1992, 107, 109). They are typically unstressed (Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 7).

7. Pragmatic particles logically structure and manage the speech or conversation (Fischer 2006, 9) by indicating the relationship between the parts of a discourse and delimitating boundaries of discourse parts (Ameka 1992, 107, 114). Pragmatic particles include: “response signals, segmentation signals, hesitation markers, discourse connectives, evidential markers, conversational management markers” (Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 5), as well as “discourse coordinators, interaction markers, and punctors” (ibid; citing Sankoff et al. 1997). Formally, in contrast to interjections, pragmatic particles fail to be used holophrastically and tend to be bleached and phonologically reduced forms of their sources (Ameka 1992; Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 6). Moreover, pragmatic particles “are multifunctional linguistic expressions and (...) do not form a recognized (...) word class” (Degand, Cornillie & Pietrandrea 2013, 5) but rather a “functional category” (Ameka 1992, 107).

8. Secondary interjections are non-interjective word classes or larger constructions whose grammaticalization into interjections (or interjectionalization) is only partial. That is, their non-interjective origin is transparent and the link with nouns, verbs, adverbs, and other word classes and phrases is fully recoverable: both functionally and formally (Ameka 1992; 2006; Nübling 2001; Ameka & Wilkins 2006, 3-4; Meinard 2015, 154; Norrick 2009, 867-869; Stange 2016, 18-19). Often, they are formally nouns, verbs, and adverbs, or exhibit clausal/phrasal structures hosting morphemes, including derivations and inflections. Common types of secondary interjections are swearwords, nouns in the vocative case, imperatives, and *yes/no* words (Ameka 1992, 110-111; Stange 2016, 19).

9. Exclamations constitute a functional category which contains utterances composed of any lexical classes that are used in an exclamatory manner (Ameka 1992, 108, 111). They are the least grammaticalized secondary interjections.

10. Of course, given the gradualness of all grammaticalization processes (Hopper & Traugott 2003) the line dividing secondary interjections from (some) primary interjections is fuzzy (for details, consult Nübling 2001 and Stange & Nübling 2014). For a detailed account of the process of interjectionalization consult Nübling (2001).

was again in line with current linguistic scholarship and the common identification of primary interjections as the most canonical members of the interjective word class.¹¹ The occurrences of the potential interjections have been restricted to (mainly) literary and religious texts as edited in KTU³, i.e. sections 1.1-1.182, which constitute the corpus of my research.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that the focus of my inquiry is linguistic rather than philological. I am not concerned with proposing a new reading of a particular example or a new contextual interpretation of a lexeme. Instead, I am interested in examining the category of interjections in Ugaritic holistically in light of recent advances in general linguistic theory. Therefore, I approach my evidence globally, aiming at larger generalizations that would have theory-related implications.

3. Evidence – Primary interjections in Ugaritic

In the present section, I will test the six interjective candidates *-y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, *ahl*, and *an-* for their compliance with the prototype of interjections. For each lexeme, I will firstly introduce all potential instances of use. After that, I will examine the functional (semantic and pragmatic) and formal (phonetic, morphological and syntactic) properties emerging from these attestations. This presentation is deliberate and reflects my interest in the interjective category in Ugaritic as a holistic phenomenon as well as the linguistic orientation of my study, as I explained in the previous section.¹²

3.1. *Y*

There are twenty-three possible cases of the interjection *y* in Ugaritic (see (1.a-z) below).¹³ Of all those examples, two (namely, (1.c) and (1.h)) are highly problematic (Wyatt 2002, 95, 234; Tropper 2012, 804).

- (1) a. *ʕbdk . bʕl . y ymm . ʕbdk . bʕl* (1.2.I.36)
 ‘Your servant is Baal,¹⁴ **Y** Yam, your servant is Baal’ (Sivan 2001, 186; Wyatt 2002, 61; Pardee 2003a, 246; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).¹⁵
- b. [bn(t) .] bht \ k . **y** ilm . bnt [.] bh[t]k a[l . t]šm^h (1.3.V.19-20)
 (i) ‘[Let not the sons of] your house, **Y** Il, let not the daughters of your house rejoice, let not the children of your palace rejoice!’ (Wyatt 2002, 86).

11. Given the objective of my research (i.e. the analysis of the category of interjections) and the approach used (i.e. a canonical prototype-driven approach), I will not compare the potential members of the interjective category in Ugaritic for their compliance with other related categories, especially modal and pragmatic particles, as well as exclamations.

12. The same manner of the presentation of data has been used in some of my studies dedicated to other languages, e.g. Aramaic (Andrason & Hutchison 2020) and Canaanite-Akkadian (Andrason & Vita forthcoming).

13. The order of the examples reflects that of KTU³.

14. All proper names will be translated following Wyatt (2002).

15. In the Ugaritic text, interjections will be marked in bold. In translations, I will not use English equivalents but will instead gloss interjections by means of its Ugaritic form (i.e. *y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, *ahl*, and *an*). The English translations offered in this article generally draw on or combine the translations proposed in scholarship as indicated by references. The German translations are quoted literally with the exception of the interjective lexeme itself which is glossed. Proper nouns are adjusted to English in most translations.

- (ii) [(in the) [building/grandeur/construction of] your house, **Y** Il, in the building/grandeur/construction of your house do not rejoice (Pardee 2003a, 254; Smith & Pitard 2009, 74; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932); ‘In/m...deines Hauses, o Ilu, in/m deines Hauses [fr]eue dich nicht!’ (Tropper 2012, 804).
- c. [*ly . ilm . d mlk* (1.4.III.9)
‘**Y** Ilu (?), der...’ (Tropper 2012, 804).¹⁶
- d. *pl . ŕnt . ŕdm . y ŕpš \ pl . ŕnt . ŕdm [.] il* (1.6.IV.1 and par.)
(i) ‘Dried up / parched are the furrows of the fields, **Y** Shapsh, dried up are the furrows of the PN’s (Il) fields’ (Pardee 2003a, 271; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932); see similarly: ‘Rissig sind die Furchen der Felder ... geworden, **Y** Špš’ (Aartun 1974, 37); ‘Vertrocken sind die Furchen der Äcker, **Y** Šapšu, vertrocknet die Furchen der Äcker Ilus / (o) Ilu’ (Tropper 2012, 804);
(ii) ‘Search the wells of the steppe, **Y** Shapsh, search the wells of the vast steppe.’ (Wyatt 2002, 137-138).
- e. *pl . ŕnt . ŕdm . y ŕpš \ pl . ŕnt . ŕdm . il [.]* (1.6.IV.12)
ibid. (1.d) (Aartun 1974, 37; Wyatt 2002, 138-139; Pardee 2003a, 271; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- f. *an . l . an . y ŕpš . [[a]] \ an . l . an . il . ygr[k]* (1.6.IV.22)
(i) ‘Wheresoever, **Y** Shapsh, wheresoever (you are/go), may Il keep you’ (Wyatt 2002, 139; Pardee 2003a, 271; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
(ii) ‘wo? wohin? **Y** Špš’ (Aartun 1974, 37).
- g. *att [. tq/h . y krt . att \ tqh . btk* (1.15.II.21-22)
(i) ‘[Take] a wife, **Y** Keret, take a wife to your house’ (Wyatt 2002, 209).
(ii) ‘Die Frau, die du genommen hast, **Y** Keret; die Frau, die du in dein Haus genommen hast’ (Tropper 2012, 804); ‘die Frau, die du nimmst, **Y** Krt’ (Aartun 1974, 37); ‘The woman you have taken, **Y** Keret’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- h. *y atr[t]* (1.16.V.6)
‘**Y** Atirat[*tu...*]’ (Tropper 2012, 804).¹⁷
- i. *ytr \ hrn . y bn . ytr . hrn \ rišk* (1.16.VI.54-56)
‘May Horon, **Y** (my) son, may Horon break your head (Sivan 2001, 186; Wyatt 2002, 241; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- j. *prsm . ŕdk . y bn[. bln] \ prsm . ŕdk* (1.17.V.37)
‘The first-fruits of your hunt(ing), **Y** son, [...] the first-fruits of your hunt(ing) (Wyatt 2002, 270; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932; see also Tropper 2012, 804).

16. Absent in Aartun (1974), Sivan (2001), Wyatt (2002, 95), Smith & Pitard (2009, 78), and del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015, 932).

17. Absent in Aartun (1974), Sivan (2001), Wyatt (2002, 234), del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015, 932).

- k. *al . tšrgn . y btlm . dm . l ġzr \ šrgk hhm* (1.17.VI.34)
 ‘Do not deceive me, **Y** Virgin, for to a hero your deceit is rubbish!’ (Wyatt 2002, 274); see similarly: ‘do not deceive me, **Y** Virgin’ (Sivan 2001, 186); ‘Belüge mich nicht, **Y** Jungfrau; den für einen Helden sind deine Lügen wirkungslos!’ (Tropper 2002, 804); ‘Do not entangle me, **Y** Virgin!’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 505, 932).
- l. *y lkm . qr . mym . d š[lk] \ mħš . aqht ġzr* (1.19.III.46)
 ‘**Y** to you, Qar-Mayim because nea[r you] was smitten Aqhat the hero!’ (Wyatt 2002, 307; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 505, 932); ‘Wehe dir, (**Y**) Wasserquelle’ (Tropper 2012, 805).
- m. *y lk . mrrt \ tġll . b nr . d šlk . mħš . aqht \ ġzr* (1.19.III.51)
 ‘**Y** to you, Mararat-Tagulalu-Baniri, because near you was smitten Aqhat the hero!’ (Wyatt 2002, 307); ‘Weh dir, (**Y**) PN’ (Tropper 2012, 805).
- n. *y lk . qrt . ablm \ d šlk . mħš . aqht . ġzr* (1.19.IV.4)
 ‘**Y** to you, Abilim, because near you was smitten Aqhat the hero!’ (Wyatt 2002, 307); ‘Weh dir, Stadt Ablm’ (Aartun 1974, 76).
- o. *y . mt . mt . nħtm . htk* (1.23.40)
 ‘**Y** husband, husband, your staff is lowered’ (Aartun 1974, 37; Wyatt 2002, 331; Tropper 2012, 804; see also del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- p. *y . ad . ad . nħtm . htk* (1.23.43)
 ‘**Y** father, father, lowered is your staff’ (Aartun 1974, 37; Wyatt 2002, 331; Tropper 2012, 804; see also del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- r. *y . mt . mt \ nħtm . htk* (1.23.46-47)
ibid. (1.o) (Aartun 1974, 37; Wyatt 2002, 332; Tropper 2012, 804).
- s. *y . att . itrħ \ y bn . ašld . šu* (1.23.64–65)
 ‘**Y** women (wives) whom I have married, **y** son(s) whom I have begotten, arise’ (Wyatt 2002, 334; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- t. *y . nġr \ nġr . pth* (1.23.69)
 ‘**Y** guard, guard, open (up)! (Sivan 2001, 186; Wyatt 2002, 335; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).
- u. *pl . tbsn . y ymm* (1.83.11)
 ‘Toward the desert (or Dried up) shall you be scattered, **Y** Yam! (Pitard 1998; see Wyatt 2002, 369; ‘**Y** Yammu’ Tropper 2012, 804; cf. del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).¹⁸
- v. *hmlt ht . y nhr* (1.83.12) (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932)
 ‘To the multitudes of Ĥt, o Nahar! (You shall not see / Indeed you shall)’ (Pitard 1998; cf. Wyatt 2002, 369; see also ‘**Y** Naharu’ Tropper 2012, 804; cf. del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).

18. The verb *tbc* means ‘to go, leave, depart; to die’ (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 844).

- w. *tn . nḥšm . y ḥr . tn . km \ mhry* (1.100.73-74) (= *tn . {km} . nḥšm . y ḥr<n> . tn . <nḥšm> km mhry* KTU 118)
 (i) ‘Give me the snakes, Y DN, give me ... (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932) (cf. however Wyatt 2002, 387).
- z. *y bšlm . al . tdy šz l tgrn \ y . qrd [l] ḥmytny* (1.119.28-29)
 ‘Y Baal, if you will drive the strong one from our gates, the warrior from our walls’ (Wyatt 2002, 421; see also Caquot & de Tarragon 1989, 210: ‘Y Baal, puisse-tu...’); ‘Y Baal treibe den Starken weg von unseren Tore, den Kireger [weg von] unseren Mauern!’ (Tropper 2012, 804); ‘Y Baal, do repel, the strong one, ...’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 505, 932).¹⁹

The interjection *y* appears regularly in vocative contexts; hence, its common classification as a vocative particle/marker/functor (Aartun 1974, 37; Sivan 2001, 187, 265; Bordreuil & Pardee 2004, 164; 2009, 29, 58; Halayqa 2008, 456; Huehnergard 2012, 79; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015, 932). In all instances attested, *y* heads nominal elements referring to (divine) persons who are directly involved in the conversation and to whom the speech containing *y* is addressed. Grammatically, such elements are either vocative nouns (1.a-k, 1.o-z) or, inherently vocative 2nd person pronouns (1.l-n). Vocative nouns are often overtly marked for vocative by the suffix *-m* (1.a-c, 1.k-l, and 1.u) (see Aartun 1974, 38; Sivan 2001, 186; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 505).²⁰ In many instances, however, nouns used vocatively are unmarked (1.d-g, 1.i-k, 1.o-r, 1.t, 1.w, 1.z). In all such contexts, the lexeme *y* is employed to draw the attention of a person or a god. The clearest example is found in (1.t). After seven years of wandering, the gods arrive in a sown land. They make themselves noticed by calling the land’s guardian. They ask the guardian to open it up, which –responding to their call– he does, and they enter. This pervasive connection of *y* to vocatives entails an equally pervasive conative meaning of that lexeme. However, the conative function of *y* expands beyond its use as an attention getter. Even in the example (1.t) analyzed above, *y* may be employed not only to call the guardian but also in an exhortative function, i.e. to urge him to perform a desired action. Overall, in agreement with its pervasive conative value, *y* is translated in most occurrences as conative interjections in target languages:²¹ (1) ‘o’ (Aartun 1974, 37-38; Segert 1984, 81; Testen 1998, 205; Sivan 2001, 187; Wyatt 2002; Pardee 2003a; Bordreuil & Pardee 2009, 58; Smith & Pitard 2009, 74; Huehnergard 2012, 78; Tropper 2012, 318, 804), ‘ô’ (Caquot, Szyner & Herdner 1974, 302, 397, 475, 591; Bordreuil & Pardee 2004, 164), or ‘oh’ (Halayqa 2008, 356; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932).

19. Other potential cases of *y* mentioned in the Ugaritic concordance (Cunchillos, Vita & Zamora 2003.III, 1532-1534) are either analyzed as other word forms in KTU3 (e.g. 1.3.IV.40, see also Smith & Pitard 2009, 268, 280, 285-286; 1.5.II.21; 1.22.II.10; 1.114.3), are highly uncertain (e.g. 1.5.III.4; 1.103.40; 1.114.8), or their context is unclear (1.129.5). They are not translated as interjections by Wyatt (2002). There are also absent in other grammatical or lexicographic works (e.g. Aartun 1974; Sivan 2001; Tropper 2012; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015).

20. In Ugaritic, a noun may be vocative without hosting the vocative marker *-m* (Bordreuil & Pardee 2009, 29). Regarding the enclitic *-m* as an optional vocative marker consult Singer (1948, 102-103), Aartun (1974, 38), Segert (1984), Watson (1992, 234-236), Sivan (2001, 192), Bordreuil & Pardee (2004, 78-79), Tropper (2012, 318), and del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín (2015, 505).

21. The target languages discussed here are English, German and French.

Although the conative use of *y* is prevalent, often constituting the main reason for the presence of this lexeme in a text, in various such cases *y* expresses secondary nuances that provide insight into the emotional state experienced by the speaker – apart from his/her desire to address someone. To be exact, *y* can convey a range of predominantly negative feelings such as: sadness, regret, dissatisfaction, and disappointment (1.d-e), anger, fury, and contempt (1.b, i, 1.k, 1.u), and fear (1.z). For instance, in (1.d-e), the god Il orders Anat to complain about the fields which Baal has neglected (Wyatt 2002, 137-138; Pardee 2003a, 271). The element *y* appearing in Il's speech profiles his dissatisfaction with Baal being absent. In (1.b), Anat threatens Il to seize his palace, his sons and daughters, and to strike his head and injure him (Wyatt 2002, 86; Pardee 2003a, 254). The use of *y* renders the fury experienced by Anat more explicitly. In (1.i), Yasib requests his father Keret to abdicate. To this, visibly infuriated, Keret answers by cursing his son (Wyatt 2003, 241). The lexeme *y* channels that anger directly. In (1.k), the goddess Anat promises to bestow the hero Aqhat with gold and silver, and, above all, grant his immortality, if he gives her his bow (Wyatt 2003, 272-274). With anger and impetuosity, perhaps even with a shade of contempt and derision, Aqhat declines and provides a tactless (Wyatt 2003, 274) response to Anat. Example (1.u) concerns a threat or a curse. The speaker, full of contempt, predicts misfortunes to happen: an expulsion to the desert and a likely death of thirst (see Pitard 1998; Wyatt 2002, 369). In (1.z), *y* expresses fear experienced by the inhabitants of a city when facing an attack from a powerful enemy (Wyatt 2003, 421). They promise offerings to the god Baal, should he repel the attackers.

Probably, the emotive function is the most patent in instances where *y* is followed by prepositional phrases formed by the preposition *l* and the 2nd person pronoun *k* (see 1.1-n). In the three cases where this construction is attested, the father expresses his utmost despair, anger, and wrath towards those who are, in his eyes, responsible for the death of his son Aqhat. He curses, for generations, the inhabitants of the towns of Qar-Mayim, Mararat-Tagulalu-Baniri, and Abilim, near which Aqhat was killed (Wyatt 2003, 307). Instead of a vocative, the element *y* found in those examples, is traditionally classified as an exclamation of curse (Aartun 1974, 76; Tropper 2002, 805; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932) and is translated in target languages by prototypical emotive interjections such as 'woe' (Halayqa 2008, 356; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 505, 932) or 'weh(e)' (Aartun 1974, 76; Tropper 2012, 804).²²

As far as the remaining semantic-pragmatic characteristics of *y* are concerned, the above discussion demonstrates the extensive polysemy of this lexeme. As explained in the previous paragraphs, *y* allows for both conative (attention getter or expression of urge) and emotive uses (various types of feelings, although all of them negative). This extensive polysemy or multifunctionality implies, in turn, the high context dependency of *y*. Indeed, to determine the particular function of *y*, the contextual cues accompanying this lexeme must always be taken into consideration. The use of *y* as a conative interjection, i.e. in vocative contexts, addressing other participants, indicates that although *y* is non-referential and cannot be used to talk about the properties of the third parties, it is not monologic. On the contrary, *y* typically appears in dialogic contexts involving concrete addressees. No example indicates clearly the semi-automaticity of *y* and its instinctive production as an unplanned response to experienced stimuli. It seems that *y* is

22. Aartun (1974, 76) views this type of *y* as etymologically distinct, deriving it from < *wVy. Tropper (2012, 805) posits the same etymology for both types.

rather produced deliberately to achieve certain dialogic objectives, which is congruent with its prevalent conative function.

As explained in section 2, a formal analysis of interjections concerns phonetics, morphology and syntax. With regard to its phonetics, *y* was probably realized as /yā/ (Sivan 2001, 187; Huehnergard 2012, 79; Tropper 2012, 804). Sometimes, the type of *y* used in curses (see examples 1.1-n) is viewed as allowing for an additional variant /yê/ (Tropper 2012, 805) or *wy*²³ (Aartun 1974, 76; see footnote 22). The lexeme *y* is phonologically simple. It is monosyllabic. The syllable is open with a semi-vowel as its onset, exhibiting the following structure: $\check{V}V$. Accordingly, all the phonetic components of *y* –whether its onset or nucleus– are vocalic in nature. Crucially, the lexeme *y* does not contain any sounds or sound combinations that would have been aberrant in the Ugaritic language. Conversely, its phonetics and phonotactics are fully regular.²⁴ The intonational and accentual pattern of *y* cannot be assessed with certainty as one deals with an ancient language preserved in texts that do not provide graphemes indicating intonation and stress. However, the use of the only interpunctuation marker found in Ugaritic, i.e. the word divider, may shed some light on the prosodic features of *y*. In six instances, *y* is separated from the following vocative by a word divider (see 1.c, 1.o-t). Four of them involve contexts in which *y* is followed by a reduplicated noun: *mt mt* (1.o, 1.r), *ad ad* (1.p), and *n̄gr n̄gr* (1.t). Indeed, all cases where a vocative is reduplicated, *y* is separated by a word divider. This suggests that at least in some instances, *y* was not a phonologically weak proclitic, but functioned as a fully stressed word.²⁵ Lastly, the phonological mutability of *y*, and its possible lengthening or shortening, cannot be tested given the graphic conventions adopted by Ugaritic scribes. That is, long vowels and long consonants, as well as any types of exaggerated, extra-long pronunciation, were not indicated in the script. Therefore, although *y* is graphically stable, consistently exhibiting a single grapheme, no generalization about the phonological stability of this lexeme may be formulated. The same observation applies to the remaining interjections discussed in sections 3.2-3.5.

With regard to morphology, *y* exhibits the simplest structure possible. It is monomorphemic and thus does not contain inflectional and derivational affixes. It also fails to attest to any type of compounding. The lexeme *y* is morphologically anomalous and opaque from the perspective of the Ugaritic language system. First, it does not exploit the word-formation mechanism where words are built around roots, usually triradical, and inflections, as is typical of most lexical items in Ugaritic and the Semitic family in general. Second, and even more importantly, it does not exhibit a recognizable, word-class specific pattern whatsoever (see Fox 2003; Edzard 2011, 491-500). This anomaly and opacity of *y* probably stem from its origin as a diachronically primary interjection.²⁶ Indeed, the cognates of *y* exhibiting a variety of interjective functions are widely attested in the

23. Aartun (1974) does not propose the actual phonological realization of *wy*.

24. Given that *y* is monosyllabic, it cannot exhibit harmonious patterns.

25. A word divider is a vertical wedge that usually separates words or word units in Ugaritic texts (Sivan 2001, 11). A word unit separated by a word divider usually consists of a content word (e.g. noun, adjective, and verb) or a monosyllabic particle heading a content word (Tropper 2012, 68). The use of a word divider between monosyllabic particles (e.g. prepositions) and content words is rare in Ugaritic literary texts (*ibid*). However, there are cases of word dividers being used after particles, before pronominal suffixes, and even within a single word (Sivan 2001, 11; Tropper 2012, 68-70).

26. That is, interjections that have been primary since their origin instead of becoming primary due to the process of interjectionalization.

Semitic family: *ia-a-ia-ia* in Canaanite-Akkadian (Andrason & Vita forthcoming), *yē* in Akkadian (Aartun 1974, 37), *yā* and *yē-yē* in Mehri (Johnstone 1987, 460), *y* [*yā*] in Imperial Aramaic (Sivan 2001, 187; Cohen et al. 2012, 1140), *yāʔ* (Brockelmann & Sokoloff 2009, 559; Del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 932) *yā*, *yāy* (Cohen et al. 2012, 1140) in Syriac, and *yā* in Classical Arabic (Wright 1996, 294; Segert 2000, 14).

With regard to syntax, there are no examples in which *y* would exhibit unquestionable holophrastic behavior, thus functioning as a fully-fledged utterance. First, in no instance does *y* constitute the sole word in a turn of dialogue or monologue. It always belongs to a larger portion of text forming a given turn of speech. Second, the limits of utterances are not overtly indicated in Ugaritic –i.e. in a manner similar to a full stop or an exclamation mark, which are used in many modern languages to determine utterance boundaries. It is therefore generally impossible to determine categorically whether *y* is a separate utterance in a sequence of utterances, or whether it rather belongs to an utterance where it functions as one of its many elements. Nevertheless, the regular co-occurrence of *y* with vocative nouns –with which, according to linguistic typology, interjections tend to form constructions– and the common absence of the word divider separating *y* from that vocative element suggest jointly that the inclusion of *y* into a larger utterance structure and thus its word-like status are highly plausible. When functioning as a word, *y* regularly fails to be integrated syntactically into the sentence structure. This is especially visible at the clause-level grammar. That is, *y* is not governed by the verb as one of its arguments or adjuncts; nor does it modify the verb, the arguments, and the adjuncts. Such a loose syntactic integration surfaces in the incompatibility of *y* with the operations of negation and interrogation. Certainly, *y* is not limited to affirmative contexts, cooccurring with affirmative sentences or clauses (1.a, 1.d-e, 1.g, 1.i-j, 1.l-z). Albeit sporadically, sentences or clauses accompanied by *y* may also be negative (1.b, 1.k) as well as interrogative (1.f). Similarly, *y* can be found with imperative expressions, either direct or indirect (1.b, 1.g, 1.i, 1.k, 1.t-u, 1.w). However, the lexeme *y* itself cannot be negated, questioned, or turned into an imperative form. Crucially, when used with negative, interrogative, imperative, and any other types of sentences, *y* seems to entertain its own illocutionary force, independent from the illocutionary force of the sentence which it accompanies. Failing to govern dependent elements and to be governed by structural heads, *y* does not form constructions with other words. A noticeable and highly persistent exception is its use with vocative nouns. As explained above, in nearly all cases, *y* immediately precedes a vocative noun, often marked overtly by the affix *-m* (1.a-c, 1.k-l, and 1.u) (Aartun 1974, 37; Segert 1984, 81; Bordreuil & Pardee 2009, 29; Tropper 2012, 318). This results in a pervasive structural type: *y* + NP (noun phrase). In a few instances, the noun –invariably in an unmarked vocative form– may be repeated, thus yielding the structure *y* + NP + NP. In a few exceptional cases, *y* heads a prepositional phrase (PP) composed of *l* and the 2nd person ms.sg. pronoun, e.g. *y lk* (1.l-n). The pronoun itself may also be overtly marked for vocative (1.l).

In the sequences with NPs and PPs, *y* always occupies a construction-initial position. It appears at the construction's left periphery. In relation to the sentence, which it accompanies, *y* together with the adjacent NP/PP tends to appear in an intermediate position. Two types of such sentence-internal positions are attested. First, in nine cases, *y* + NP appears between two identical or highly similar clauses (1.a-b, 1.d-g, 1.j, 1.w) or parts of clauses (1.i) (cf. Tropper 2012, 318). In another type, which comprises four cases, *y* and the adjacent NP appear between two different clauses (1.k, 1.s,² 1.u-v). In contrast, a sentence peripheral position is less common. It is clearly attested in nine cases, in which *y* occurs initially (1.l-t, 1.z). Three of them involve constructions

with PPs (1.1-n) and four involve reduplicated NPs (1.o-r, 1.t) (see Aartun 1974, 37; Tropper 2012, 318).²⁷ Cases in which *y* would occupy a sentence-final position are unattested. In all instances, whether sentence-initial or sentence-internal, *y* appears at the clause boundaries. The only less exemplary case is (1.i), where *y* appears semi-internally, i.e. between two identical predicates (inflected in the same person, gender, and number) with the object only being found in the second clause even though it belongs to the first clause too: *yṭbr ḥrn y bn yṭbr ḥrn rišk* ‘may Hrn break, oh (my) son, may Hrn break your head’.

The phonological relationship of *y* to the remaining parts of the sentence can only be determined indirectly. That is, given the nature of the text which does not provide information regarding prosody or intonation (see above in this section), phonological separation or integration can only be deduced from the presence of a word divider. As explained above, in most instances, *y* is not separated graphically from its accompanying vocative NP or PP by a word divider. The word divider is used in only six cases, (see 1.c, 1.o-t). This may suggest the common (although perhaps not universal) absence of phonological separation –*y* and the adjacent NP/PP likely constituted an unbroken phonological phrase. This concurs with the classification of *y* as a proclitic proposed by Huehnergard (2012, 79). However, the fact that *y* can be separated by a word divider indicates that it maintained its independent word status contrary to some other elements (e.g. *u-* or *-m*) that are genuine affixes (Sivan 2001; Tropper 2012).²⁸

3.2. *L*

There are thirty-four potential cases of the interjection *l* (see 2.a-ab below).²⁹ Three of them are (highly) uncertain (2.o and 2.aa-ab).

- (2) a. *l rgmt \ lk l zbl. bṣl . ṭnt . l rkb . ṣrpt* (1.2.IV.8-9) (= *l rgmt lk l aliyn bṣl ṭnt l rkb ṣrpt*; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482)
 (i) ‘Indeed / hereby, I say to you, **L** Prince Baal, I repeat, **L** Cloud-Rider (Wyatt 2003, 65; Pardee 2003a, 248; Tropper 2012, 319, 811);
 (ii) ‘Did I not tell you, **L** Baal, The Most Powerful, did I not repeat to you, **L** Charioteer of the clouds!?’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- b. *bṭ . l aliyn . b[ṣl] \ bṭ . l rkb . ṣrpt* (1.2.IV.28-29)
 (i) ‘Dry (him) up / scatter (him), **L** Valiant / Mighty Baal, dry (him) up / scatter (him), **L** Cloud-Rider!’ (Wyatt 2003, 68-69; Pardee 2003a, 249; Tropper 2012, 318);
 (ii) ‘Be ashamed, **L** Baal, The Most Powerful, be ashamed, **L** Charioteer of the clouds! (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).

27. The position of *y* in (1.c) cannot be determined as the text is damaged.

28. It should be noted that in all cases where it is possible (1.a-b, 1.d-g, 1.i-k, 1.u-w), *y* is separated from the preceding element by a word divider. Similarly, in all possible cases, the sequence composed by *y* and the NP/PP is separated from a subsequent right element by a word divider (1.a-c, 1.f-g, 1.i, 1.k-s, 1.w-z). These two facts suggest that the *y* + NP/PP sequence may have been marked by phonological separation on its left and right edge.

29. Ugaritic contains two other *l* homographs: the (affirmative/assertive/emphatic) particle *l* (Huehnergard 1983, 2012; Sivan 2001, 191-192; Tropper 2012, 810-813), and the preposition *l* (Sivan 2001, 195-197; Tropper 2012, 758-760). These two lexemes are excluded from my discussion.

- c. *šmšr \ l dgy . aṭrt mǧ l qdš amrr* (1.3.VI.20-21)
 ‘Set off / drive (the chariot) / drag (nets), **L** fisherman /-men of Athirat’ (Wyatt 2003, 89; Pardee 2003a, 255; Tropper 2012, 318), go / come, **L** Qudšu-’Amrur!’ (Pardee 2003a, 255; Tropper 2012, 318; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- d. *šmš . l aliyn . bfl \ bn . l rkb šrpt* (1.4.V.59-60)
 ‘Listen, **L** Valiant / Mighty Baal, understand / pay attention, **L** Cloud-Rider!’ (Sivan 2001, 187; Wyatt 2003, 104; Huehnergard 2009, 78; Smith & Pitard 2009, 82, 541, 548; Tropper 2012, 318; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- e. *šmš . mš . l al[i]yn bfl* (1.4.VI.4-5)
 ‘Listen, please, **L** Valiant / Mighty Baal!’ (Wyatt 2003, 105; Pardee 2003a, 261; Smith & Pitard 2009, 82, 592, 596; Tropper 2012, 318; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- f. *l rgmt . lk l ali \ yn . bfl* (1.4.VII.23)
 (i) ‘I truly told you, **L** Mightiest Baal’ (Smith & Pitard 2009, 84, 649, 653; Tropper 2012, 318)
 (ii) ‘Did I not say to you, **L** Valiant / Mighty Baal’ (Wyatt 2003, 109; Pardee 2003a, 262; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- g. *bḥt . l bn . ilm mt* (1.5.II.11)
 ‘Greetings, **L** son of Ilu, Mot!’ (Wyatt 2003, 121; Pardee 2003a, 266; Tropper 2012, 318; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- h. *šmš \ l rbt . aṭr[t] ym* (1.6.I.44-45)
 ‘Listen, **L** Great Lady-who-tramples-Yam’ (Wyatt 2003, 131).
- i. *mh \ taršn . l btl . šnt* (1.6.II.13-14)
 ‘What do you wish / ask of me, **L** Virgin Anat?’ (Aartun 1974, 39; Testen 1998, 205; Sivan 2001, 186; Wyatt 2003, 134; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- j. *šmš . l btl . šnt* (1.6.III.23)
 ‘Listen, **L** Virgin Anat!’ (Wyatt 2003, 137; Tropper 2012, 319).
- k. *šmš . mš \ l bn . ilm . mt* (1.6.VI.24)
 ‘Listen, please, **L** son of Ilu, Mot!’ (Testen 1998, 205; Sivan 2001, 187; Wyatt 2003, 143; Tropper 2012, 318; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- l. *zi . at . l tlš \ amt . yrḥ \ l dmgy amt \ aṭrt* (1.12.I.14-16)
 ‘Go out, you, **L** Talish handmaid of Yarih, **L** Dimgay handmaid of Athirat’ (Wyatt 2003, 163; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- m. *šmšk . l arḥ . w bn . l [t]d [.]* (1.13.22)
 ‘May he hear you, **L** Cow, and understand (you)’ (Aartun 1974, 38; Wyatt 2003, 172; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).

- n. *t]bš . l ltpn \ [il .]d pid .* (1.15.II.13)
 (i) ‘Come, **L** Wise One, perceptive (god)’ (Wyatt 2003, 207).
 (ii) ‘Are you really going, oh “Benevolent One”!?’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482); ‘Solltest du dich nicht erheben, o gütiger Ilu, Barmherziger?’ (Tropper 2002, 815; cf. **L** Scharfsinniger, (o) verständiger Gott’ Tropper 2012, 319).
- o. *ltpn . il d pi[d]* (1.16.IV.9) (= *l ltpn il d pid*; Tropper 2012, 319)
 ‘**L** Scharfsinniger, (o) verständiger Gott’ (Tropper 2012, 319).³⁰
- p. *šmš . l ngr . il il[š]* (1.16.IV.10)
 ‘Listen, **L** herald of the god(s) / of Ilu, Iiśh’ (Wyatt 2003, 233; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- r. *šmš . l mtt \ hry* (1.16.VI.16)
 ‘Listen, **L** maiden Hurriy’ (Wyatt 2003, 238; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- s. *šmš . mš . l krt \ tš* (1.16.VI.41-42)
 ‘Listen, please, **L** Keret the votary’ (Sivan 2001, 186; Wyatt 2003, 240; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- t. *l tbrknn . l tr . il aby \ tmrnn . l bny* (1.17.I.23-24)
 ‘Do surely bless him, **L** Bull Ilu, my father, do strengthen him, **L** Creator-of-creatures’ (Wyatt 2003, 254-255; Tropper 2012, 319, 812; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- u. *[[y]]irš . hym . l aqht ġzr* (1.17.VI.26)
 ‘Ask for life, **L** hero Aqhat’ (Wyatt 2003, 273; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- v. *tb . ly . l aqht* (1.17.VI.42)
 (i) ‘Leave me, **L** Aqhat!’ (Wyatt 2003, 277)
 (ii) ‘Attend to me / reconsider, **L** Aqhat!’ (Pardee 1997, 347; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- w. *šmš . l btl . šnt* (1.18.IV.13)
 ‘Listen, **L** Virgin Anat’ (Wyatt 2003, 283; Tropper 2012, 319).
- x. *šmš . l dnil . mt . [rpi]* (1.19.II.41)
 ‘Listen, **L** Danel, Rapi’u-man / man of [healing]’ (Wyatt 2003, 302; Tropper 2012, 319; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).

30. Absent in Wyatt (2003; see instead: ‘Thus says the Wise One, the perceptive god’) and del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015).

- y. ḥr[xxx]\ *trt l bnt . hl* (1.24.5-6)
 ‘Hear, goddesses, Kotharat, **L** daughters of Ellil’ (Wyatt 2003, 337; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- z. [xxx .]tb \ ḡ . *l ktrt* (1.24.14-15)
 ‘[Hear,] **L** Kotharat’ (Wyatt 2003, 338; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
- aa. **I** \ *nšmn . ilm* (1.24.24-25)
 ‘**L** most gracious / handsome of the god(s) become son-in-law to Baal’ (Aartun 1974, 38; Wyatt 2003, 338; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482)³¹
- ab. [xxxx] *l aliyn bfl* \ [xxxx‘]l . *rkb šrpt* (1.92.39) (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482).
 ‘**L** Valiant / Mighty Baal, **L** Cloud-Rider!’ (ibid.)³²
- ac. [[x]] *atr* . [b] *šlk . l . k[[i]]sih . atr \ bšlk . arš . rd* (1.161.20)
 ‘Nach deine Eigentümer, **L** Thron; nach deinem Eigentümer steig (hinab) in die Erde...!’ (Tropper 2012, 319; see also de Moor 1983; Bordreuil & Pardee 1982; Taylor 1988, 153)³³

Similar to *y*, the interjection *l* appears in vocative contexts, regularly preceding a vocative noun (Aartun 1974, 38-39; Segert 1984, 81; Huehnergard 1983, 592; Bordreuil & Pardee 2009, 29). In three instances which involve the divine noun *il*, the noun is marked overtly as vocative through the affix *-m*: *l bn ilm* (2.g, 2.k) and *l nšmn ilm* (2.aa) (see Tropper 2012, 319). In most cases, however, the vocative noun does not bear any morphological marking. This may suggest that the use of *l* alone was viewed as sufficient to indicate the vocative function of a noun –the overt marker *-m* being inversely unnecessary. Crucially, in nearly all cases, the referent of the noun following the lexeme *l* is the person or the god to whom the entire speech –not only the vocative noun itself– is directed. The direct address to that human or divine interlocutor is typically achieved by means of an imperative of the verb *šmš* ‘listen!’ (2.d-e, 2.h, 2.j-k, 2.m, 2, p-s, 2.w-x) (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482) or the imperatives of other verbs (2.b-c, 2.l, 2.n, 2.t-v, 2.aa) (see Aartun 1974, 39; Huehnergard 1983, 584; Tropper 2012, 319). Occasionally, the addressee is identified by means of 2nd person pronouns: *at* ‘you’ (2.l) or *lk* ‘to you’ (2a, 2.f). Once, a direct welcoming formula *bḥt* ‘greetings; hail’ (2.g) is employed. The only possible exception, although itself a problematic case, is (2.ac). In this example, *l* heads the vocative noun *ksi* ‘throne’ which is not the actual addressee of the speech, but is rather used in an optative sense.³⁴ The pervasive use

31. Tropper (2012, 319) also identifies a vocative *l* in this example, although he reads the verses differently, namely: *l ḥtn \-m b‘l / tnt l rkb ‘rpt* ‘o Schwiegersohn Ba‘lus’ / ich wiederhole (dir), o Wolkenfahrer’.

32. Contrast with ‘for Valiant Baal...for the Charioteer of the Clouds’ (Wyatt 2003, 374; see also Caquot & de Tarragon 1989, 36).

33. In this example, the sequence *l* + NP is usually translated as ‘from the throne’ (Wyatt 2003, 438) or ‘depuis (ton) trône (Caquot & de Tarragon 1989, 108-109; see also Dietrich & Lorentz 1983). Tropper (2012, 318-319) suggests four further cases: *l qdš amrr* ‘o Qdš-Amrr’ (1.3.VI.11; 1.4.IV.2-3) *l dgy rbt atrt ym* ‘o Fischer der Herrin Aṭiratu des Meeres’ (1.4.IV.3); *l aqht ḡzr* ‘o Held Aqhatu’ (1.17.VI.17). However, all of them are reconstructed.

34. Examples (2.o), (2.y), (2.z), and (2.ab) are ambiguous.

of *l* with vocatives –where it apparently suffices to mark nouns as vocatives– and the regular identification of those nouns’ referents with the addressees of the whole speech suggest that the conative function constitutes the semantic nucleus of *l*. Within the conative domain, the role of an attention getter is the most pervasive. This explains the common classification of *l* as a vocative particle, marker, or element (Aartun 1974, 38-39; Caquot, Sznycer & Herdner 1974, 337, 350, 592; Huehnergard 1983, 584; Segert 1984, 81; Testen 1998, 205; Sivan 2001, 186, 254, 261; Bordreuil & Pardee 2004, 177; 2009, 29, 58; Tropper 2012, 804) and its view as the most typical exponent of a vocative function in Ugaritic in general (Aartun 1974, 38-39; Huehnergard 1983, 584; Testen 1998, 205). Accordingly, *l* is translated as conative interjections in target languages: ‘o’ (Aartun 1974, 38-39; Segert 1984, 81, 105; Testen 1998, 205; Sivan 2001, 186-187; Wyatt 2003; Huehnergard 2009, 78; Tropper 2012, 318-319, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015), ‘oh’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482), or ‘ô’ (Caquot, Sznycer & Herdner 1974, 337, 350; Caquot & de Tarragon 1989, 25). The clearest examples of a conative attention-getter function occur when the *l* + vocative complex is introduced by the imperative *šmš* ‘listen!’ (2.d-e, 2.h, 2.j-k, 2.m, 2, p-s, 2.w-x). For instance, in (1.j), the god Il addresses Anat. He overtly draws her attention by means of the imperative *šmš* ‘listen!’ and by addressing her by her name: *šmš l btlš šnt* ‘Listen, **L** Virgin Anat!’ (Wyatt 2003, 137; Tropper 2012, 319). Only after getting her attention, he gives her a specific instruction, i.e. to talk to the god Shapsh (Wyatt 2003, 137-138). In most examples in which *l* functions as an attention getter, it may also exhibit another conative nuance, that of urging or encouraging the interlocutor to perform a given action. In (2.a), Kothar urges Baal to destroy Yam, addressing the hero twice: *rgmt lk l zbl bšl* ‘I talk to you, **L** Prince Baal’ and immediately adding *tnt l rkb šrpt* ‘I repeat, **L** Cloud-Rider!’. This repetition likely profiles the urge of the order or the strong encouragement to execute it.

Nevertheless, in various instances, especially those that do not involve speaking-hearing verbs, *l* may secondarily express emotive nuances, revealing the emotional state of the speaker independent from getting attention of the interlocutor or urging him/her to perform an action. In (2.b), Athtart rebukes Baal “to exhort him to complete the task” of drying up Yam, who had collapsed and fallen to the ground (Wyatt 2003, 68-69). By giving Baal the same order twice, Athtart reveals her impatience. Similarly, in (2.t), Baal intercedes before Il for Danel and asks, on his behalf, for his blessing. The use of near synonyms, ‘bless him’ and ‘bless/strengthen him’ (see Wyatt 2003, 254-255) suggests the insistence, determination, and probably impatience of the speaker. In (2.i), Anat seizes Mot and asks him about the whereabouts of her brother Baal. Mot answers her, seemingly annoyed: *mh taršn l btlš šnt* ‘What do you want/ask **L** Virgin Anat?!’. It is likely that in this instance *l* profiles the annoyance experienced by the speaker. In (2.u), after the goddess Anat offers to provide gold, silver, and immortality to the hero Aqhat in exchange for his bow, he rejects it, suggesting that Kothar-and-Hasis make a bow for her instead (Wyatt 2003, 272-273). Anat renews her offer, again offering immortality (Wyatt 2003, 273). She is persistent, impatient, and perhaps irritated. Example (2.v) refers to the same scene. Aqhat declines and considers the whole offer to be deceptive since he will certainly die (Wyatt 2003, 274-275). Subsequently, he claims that bows are not for women but only for warriors. To this, Anat laughs, saying *tb ly l aqht* ‘Leave me, **L** Aqhat!’ or ‘Reconsider, **L** Aqhat! (for your own sake)’ (Pardee 2003b, 347). This first interpretation suggests contempt and mockery, the other suggests warning and impatience.

The above discussion demonstrates that *l* entertains a considerable range of polysemy, even though it is more constrained than was the case of *y*. As has been mentioned, *l* principally assumes

the conative function of an attention getter. However, it also allows for other conative functions (urge/encouragement) as well as for several, invariably negative, emotive uses. To determine those secondary nuances accompanying the primary function of an attention getter, the broad context in which the lexeme *l* appears need always be considered. In congruence with its pervasive conative component, *l* is dialogic. As explained in the previous paragraphs, *l* is regularly used in discourses directed to the referents of the vocative nouns, which it introduces. Inversely, *l* is never used in monologues. The interjection *l* is invariably non-referential, thus failing to refer to the properties of the third parties. Furthermore, serving conative purposes, *l* is not produced in a semi-automatic and instinctive manner, i.e. as an unplanned response to experienced stimuli. Rather, its presence seems to be deliberate –the lexeme is employed to achieve determined dialogic goals: draw the attention of the interlocutor and, sometimes, urge him/her to perform a specific action.

From a phonetic perspective, *l* was likely pronounced as /la/ (Sivan 2001, 186; Tropper 2012, 804).³⁵ It thus exhibits a simple structure –an open mono-syllable CV.³⁶ The lexeme does not contain any sounds or sound combinations that would be asystematic in the Ugaritic language. Since the syllable starts with a mono-consonantal onset /l-/, the lexeme *l* is not exclusively vocalic. Given the properties of the Ugaritic writing, the features related to intonation and accent cannot be fully determined. However, it is noticeable that, contrary to *y* discussed in the previous section, *l* is never separated from the following vocative by a word divider. This suggests a close phonological relationship with the vocative and a lesser phonological independency and weaker accentuation. Most likely, therefore, *l* does not bear its own full stress. This complies with the definition of *l* as a proclitic (Huehnergard 1983, 584)³⁷ or a (vocative) prefix (ibid. 592; see Testen 1998, 205).

From a morphological perspective, *l* exhibits a simple structure. It is mono-morphemic with no inflections, derivations, and compounding. The lexeme *l* is morphologically anomalous. Contrary to nouns, adjectives, verbs, and some adverbs, it fails to exploit the word-formation mechanism typical of Ugaritic in terms of roots and introflexions. This also means that *l* is morphologically opaque: it has no identifiable structure in terms of specific patterns. This aberrancy and opacity likely stem from a high extent of grammaticalization and interjectionalization of an originally non-interjective lexeme that yielded both the particle *l* and the interjection *l*. That is, the interjection *l* analyzed in this section is etymologically related to the (affirmative/assertive/emphatic) particle *l* (Huehnergard 1983, 579, 584, 592; 2012, 78; Tropper 2012, 804) –both lexemes deriving from a common ancestor.³⁸ However, the transparent link between the interjection *l* and the particle *l* is no longer transparent. The two lexemes specialize in different contexts and functions, being viewed as homophones/homographs rather than as a single lexeme with semantic potential encompassing both types of uses (i.e. interjection and particle). Accordingly, the structural simplicity of *l* would have resulted from phonological and morphological reduction, similar to that which affected prepositions, conjunctions, discourse markers, and particles. Overall, the use of *l* in conative functions (vocative) is common in Semitic languages (Huehnergard 1983; Testen 1998). It is, for instance, attested in Biblical Hebrew (Waltke

35. Sivan (2001, 186) admits another possibility, i.e. [lū].

36. Being monosyllabic, *l* cannot exhibit harmonious patterns.

37. A proclitic is an element that is pronounced with minimal accent, the main stress falling on the following noun with which the proclitic element is pronounced jointly.

38. Contrary to the prevailing opinion, Bordreuil & Pardee (2009, 58) relate the interjection *l* to the preposition *l*. This etymology is however unlikely.

& O'Connor 1990), Phoenician and Punic (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 481), as well as Arabic (Wright 1996).

From a syntactic perspective, in none of the examples does *l* function holophrastically as an independent complete utterance. The element *l* never constitutes the sole word in a turn but, instead, regularly forms part of a larger portion of direct speech –a turn in dialogue. As explained above, *l* always occurs together with a vocative noun from which it is never separated by a word divider. This makes its word-like interpretation highly plausible and any type of holophrasticity unlikely. Being an element of a sentence, *l* resists syntactic integration in that sentence structure, especially at a clause-level. That is, *l* is not governed by the predicate and thus does not introduce the verb's arguments or adjuncts. It fails to modify the predicate and any of the arguments or adjuncts. It never participates in the syntactic operations of negation. The element *l* –alone or together with the accompanying vocative– cannot be negated. The sequence *l* + vocative may however accompany negative sentences apart from affirmative ones, which are by far the most common. The two possible cases are (2.a) and (2.f), where *l rgmt* may be interpreted as a negative expression 'didn't I say?' (Wyatt 2003, 109; Pardee 2003a, 262; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 482). The interjection *l* may also head questions (2.i and perhaps 2.n and 2.a, 2.f) and commonly co-occurs with imperatives (the uncontested examples are 2.b-e, 2.h, 2.j-m, 2.p-s, 2.u-x; see above in this section). Nevertheless, *l* itself cannot be questioned or turned into an imperative form. The cases where *l* is accompanied by negative or interrogative sentences illustrate its illocutionary independence, or the fact that *l* regularly has its own illocutionary force independent from the rest of the sentence. However, given that *l* is typically used in a conative function, and that the conative function expresses the wishes of the speaker and prompts the other participants to perform determined acts (being thus closely related to imperatives), the illocutionary force of *l* and that of the most common type of adjacent sentences (i.e. imperatives) coincide. Since *l* is neither governed by structural heads nor does it govern dependent elements, it fails to yield constructions comparable to other constructions in the Ugaritic language. However, as already mentioned, *l* regularly appears in sequences with vocatives, yielding vocative constructions of a pervasive type: *l* + NP. Only under this analysis, namely as part of the vocative chain, does *l* exhibit some type of syntactic integration as postulated by Tropper (2012, 318).

As far as its position is concerned, *l* invariably occurs in the left periphery of the vocative construction, introducing a single vocative noun (2.m, 2.v, 2.ac, 2.t, 2.z) or a more elaborated vocative phrase (e.g. 2.a-l, 2.n, 2.p-t, 2.u, 2.w-y, 2.ab). With one exception, *l* never appears sentence-initially, but prefers a sentence-internal position (see Tropper 2012, 318 for a similar observation). As a sentence-internal element, *l* nearly always follows a verb (2.a-f, 2.h-n, 2.p, 2.t, 2.v-x). Sometimes, the elements preceding *l* are more complex, e.g. a verb and an object (2.u-v) or a verb and a particle (2.e, 2.k, 2.s). The unique case where *l* appears in a sentence-initial position is (2aa) (Aartun 1974, 38). In its sentence-internal uses, *l* tends to be intercalated between a verb and a vocative. In (2.1), however, the second *l* + vocative sequence is introduced directly after the first sequence, without being headed by its own verb.³⁹

39. The vocative phrase itself –that is, *l* and the vocative NP– tends to appear after the verb, its complements, and modifiers (Aartun 1974, 38-39; Tropper 2012, 318-319). The exception is (2.aa) where the vocative phrase precedes the clause and its verb and arguments. The only case where the vocative phrase occupies a clause-internal position is the problematic example (2.ac), where *l ksi* 'L throne' is interjected between two reduplicated adjuncts ('after/to the place of your lords'), i.e. 'after your lords, L throne, after your lords, go (down) to the earth' (Tropper 2012, 319; see also Wyatt

The possible phonological separation of *l* or its integration can only be deduced from the presence of word dividers. As explained above, *l* generally fails to be separated from the vocative noun phrase by a word divider.⁴⁰ It is also typically viewed as a proclitic (Huehnergard 1983, 584) or prefixable element (Aartun 1974, 38; Testen 1998, 205; Huehnergard 1983, 592). Therefore, instead of being phonologically separated, *l* probably formed a single intonational phrase with the accompanying vocative. Nevertheless, there is evidence that rather than constituting a genuine bound morpheme (and thus a fully-fledged affix), *l* was a clitic that still entertained a word status (see Sivan 2001 and Tropper 2012).

3.3. *I*

There are five possible cases of the lexeme *i* in the Ugaritic corpus (3.a-c). All of them are, to an extent, problematic. The most uncertain is (3.d).⁴¹

- (3) a. *i* [[t]]*iitt* . *atrt* . *šrm* \ *w ilt* . *šdynm* \ *hm* . *hry* . *bty* \ *iqh* ... *atn* (1.14.IV.38)⁴²
 ‘**I** (as) Athirat (Ashera) of the Two Tyres exists/is-present, the Goddess of the Sidonians’ (Sivan 2001, 190; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3), if I take Hurri to my house...I shall give... (Wyatt 2003, 201); ‘So wahr die (Göttin) Aṭiratu (Aṭrt von) Tyrus existiert (da ist), (und) die Göttin von Sidon’ (Aartun 1974, 76; Tropper 2012, 808).⁴³
- b. *i* . *ap* . *bʕl* \ *i* . *hd* . *d* \ (Cunchillos, Vita & Zamora 2003.I.306)
 ‘**I**, where is Baal [...]?’ **I** (where is) Hadd, who [...] (Wyatt 2002, 122).
- c. *ap* . *ab* . *ik mtm* \ *tmtn* (1.16.I.3) (= *ap ab i k mtm tmtn*; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3, 83)⁴⁴
 ‘Father, **I**, like (mortal) men even you will die’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3); and similarly: ‘Shall you then, father, **I**, die like (mortal)men?’ (Sivan 2001, 190).⁴⁵
- d. *ab* . *šrry* \ *ikm* . *yrgm* (1.16.I.19-20) (= *i km yrgm*; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3)
 ‘Father, the heights, **I**, how can it be said ...?’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3, 780).⁴⁶

2003, 438). It should also be noted that *l* often appears in sequences of two *l* lexemes –each one introducing an independent vocative noun (phrase) (2.a-d, 2.1, 2.t) (Tropper 2012, 318).

40. The only exception to the absence of word-division marking is (2.ac), which as explained above is a problematic example overall. In contrast, *l* is almost always separated by a word divider from the preceding element, a verb, its complement, or modifier. The few exceptions involve: the indirect object *lk* (2.a, 2.f), the verb *mġ* (2.c), and the noun (2.y).

41. This instance of *i* is only recorded by del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015, 3).

42. This example is viewed by Tropper (2012, 804) as the only case of *i*.

43. See however del Olmo Lete (1981, 185) ‘¿dónde?’. Similarly, Wyatt (2003, 201) interprets <*iitt*> as a dittograph and translates as ‘gift’, thus arguing against its division into two elements, i.e. *i* and the existence marker. Alternatively, the form *šrm* could be interpreted as *šr* ‘Tyre’ with the enclitic *-m*. It could also mean ‘Tyrians’.

44. See *ap* . *ab* . *k mtm* \ *tmtn* (1.16.I.17) and *ap* . *ab* . *k mtm* . *tmtn* (1.16.II.40).

45. See similarly Wyatt (2003, 220): ‘Yet father, how can you possibly die’.

The lexeme *i* occurs in the context of either vow or lamentation. In (3.a), *i* is used by Keret as part of an oath: If he is allowed to take the sacred bride Hurriy to his house, he will provide in exchange “twice her weight in silver” and “three times her weight in gold” (Wyatt 2002, 201). This oath is rendered solemn by invoking the goddess Athirat and the goddess of Sidon. Since according to the interpretation proposed in (3.a), *i* heads the existential predicator *it* ‘there is, exist’ instead of a vocative noun, the conative use in terms of an attention getter directed to the goddesses is unlikely. Rather, *i* expresses another conative type of meaning, that of exhortation, imploration, and urging the interlocutor (in this case, divine creatures) to perform an action (namely, giving Hurriy to the speaker). In this example, *i* may also convey a secondary emotive sense, revealing the excitement experienced by Keret. Examples (3.b), (3.c) and (3.d) are uttered in the context of lamentation. In (3.b), the speaker laments Baal’s death asking rhetorical questions regarding his current location (Wyatt 2002, 122). The interjection *i* introducing the question seems to profile sadness, sorrow, and grief. In (3.c), Keret’s son Elhu laments his father –the son of god Il. He complains that a man who was supposed to be immortal will die like other mortals (Wyatt 2002, 219-221). The lexeme *i* likely expresses emotive nuances of despair and grievance experienced by the speaker, possibly mixed with a cognitive nuance of disbelief. In (3.d), which concerns the same scene, Elhu questions the validity of the assumption that Il is the father of Keret, since Keret is mortal. Again, *i* exhibits an emotive value expressing sadness, despair, and complaint, possibly intermingled with astonishment and disbelief. Significantly, the speaker, i.e. Elhu, is weeping (cf. Wyatt 2002, 222).

The above discussion shows the difficulty of providing a propositional definition of the lexeme *i* as well as its polyvalence and compatibility with different emotions (positive and negative) and different functions (conative, emotive, and cognitive). This demonstrates in turn the polysemy of the lexeme and its context dependency –despite being found in three cases only. This variability has its expression in the disparity of definitions that *i* has received in scholarship and the variation of its translations. To be exact, *i* is interpreted as an interjection (Wyatt 2003, 201; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3), an exclamatory particle (Tropper 2012, 808), an emphatic type of discourse marker parallel to *ken* in Biblical Hebrew (Sivan 2001, 190; see also Aartun 1974, 76), or an oath particle (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015, 3). Depending on the definition adopted, *i* is translated in target languages as canonical interjections, e.g. ‘o’, ‘oh’, ‘woe’ (Wyatt 2003, 201; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3) or as lexemes entertaining functions of discourse markers, e.g. ‘surely’, ‘verily’, ‘true/truly’ (Sivan 2001, 190; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3) and ‘so wahr’, ‘gewiß’ (Aartun 1974, 76; Tropper 2012, 808).

With regard to the remaining pragmatic properties, *i* is non-referential and dialogic. Given the relevance of the emotive nuances apart of the conative function, the semi-automaticity of *i* or its unplanned character may be somewhat higher than it was the case with *y* and *l*.

Phonologically, *i* exhibits a simple form, having likely been realized as an open mono-syllable /ʔi/ (Sivan 2001, 190; Tropper 2012, 808; see also ‘y’ in Aartun 1974, 75). The vocalic component is prominent. The glottal onset [ʔ] most probably results from the rule operating in most Semitic languages whereby initial vowels cannot appear onsetless but require at least a glottal stop as their onset (see Procházka 2006, 425). From an articulatory perspective, the glottal stop is indeed “a minimally obstructive consonant” (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020), merely used as a “vowel

46. See similarly Wyatt (2003, 222): ‘O my wretched father? How can it be said...?’.

releaser” (ibid.). In any case, neither the sounds used (whether consonantal or vocalic) nor their combination transgress the rules of Ugaritic phonology and phonotactics. As usual, little can be said about the stress. On its right edge, *i* may be separated from the following elements by a word divider. This occurs twice in (3.b). However, in (3.a), (3.c) and (3.d), a word divider is not used. On the left edge, in (3.b), the only case where it is possible, the word divider is used.⁴⁷ Consequently, although the scarcity of the examples does not enable me to formulate a firm generalization, the lexeme most likely bore stress.

Morphologically, *i* is simple. It is monomorphemic, with no inflections, derivations, or traces of compounding. It is also anomalous and opaque: it fails to exploit the root and pattern system typical of the other lexical classes and has no identifiable morphological structure. This aberrancy and opacity are most likely related to its reflex-like origin as a primary interjection (see the etymology **ʾVy* ‘so wahr’ proposed by Aartun (1974, 76)). Indeed, cognates of the Ugaritic *y* are widely attested in the Semitic family, invariably functioning as primary interjections, e.g. in Akkadian –*ai*, *ayi*, and *aya* ‘alas’, ‘wehe’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3); in Biblical Hebrew– *ʾî* *ʾā* ‘alas’ (BDB 1906, 33; Clines 1993, 204) or ‘woe’ (Gesenius 1910, 307; Klein 1987, 20; Jenni 1997a, 483-484; HALOT 1994-2000); in Aramaic –*ī* ‘yes’ (Tropper 2012, 808); and in Arabic– *ʾī* and *ʾay* ‘oh’ and ‘ho’ (Wright 1996, 294-295; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3).

Syntactically, *i* always appears as part of a larger sentence rather than being used holophrastically in terms of an independent utterance. In such word-like uses, *i* is never governed by the verb. It also fails to modify the verb, the verbal arguments, and the other adjuncts. Thus, its syntactic integration is loose. The interjection *i* does not enter into constructions with vocative nouns. In (3.a-b), *i* does not appear together with a vocative, but rather heads an oath formula or a rhetorical question. In (3.c-d), *i* does co-occur with a vocative. However, in both cases, it follows the vocative noun instead of introducing it. One should also note that in (3.c-d), the left edge of *i* is marked by a word divider, separating it from the vocative noun. Consequently, rather than forming a vocative phrase with vocative nouns, *i* heads clauses: ‘Athirat of the Two Tyres exists/is-present, if I take Hurriy to my house...I shall give’ (3.a); ‘where is Baal?’ and (where is) Hadd? (3.b), ‘like (mortal) men even you will die’ (3.c); and ‘how can it be said?’ (3.d). The lexeme *i* does not participate in the syntactic operations of negation or interrogation. It entertains its own illocutionary force, independent from the rest of the sentence. This is visible clearly in (3b) and (3.d). Although in those examples *i* heads questions, it is not employed in an interrogative function itself. As far as its position is concerned, *i* may appear sentence-initially (3.a-b) or sentence-internally (3.b-d). In the sentence-internal cases, *i* is intercalated between the vocative noun phrase and the rest of the sentence –the core clause. As explained above, contrary to *y* and *l*, *i* follows the vocative and never precedes it (3.c-d). With regard to the phonological separation from the rest of the sentence, or its absence, little can be concluded with certainty, given the scarcity of the examples. However, *i* was probably separated by pause or contouring on its left edge given the presence of a word divider in the only case where such use is possible. On its right edge, the presence of phonological separation and its lack seem to be equally possible given the similar frequency of the use and absence of the word divider (see above in this section).

47. In (3.a), (3.b), and (3.d), *i* cannot exhibit a word divider on its left margin.

3.4. *U*

The interjection *u* is found eight times in the corpus. It is only Dietrich, Loretz & Sanmartín (1975, 152) and Tropper (2012, 805) who interpret *u* found in those examples as an interjection. The other scholars (e.g. Wyatt 2003) read these cases of *u* in terms of disjunction, thus identifying them with a homophonous lexeme –the canonical marker of disjunction *u* (Sivan 2001, 188; Tropper 2012, 792-793; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 3).

- (4) a. *ph mʕ . ap . k[rt . tʕ] \ u tn . ndr[h ?]* (1.15.III.29) (= *u tn ndr[h?]*; Tropper 2012, 805)
 ‘Look here, please, Keret, nobleman, U, vows you have broken (de Moor 1987, 208; see similarly Tropper (2012, 805): ‘U, hat er [sein(?)] Gelübde verändert?’.
- b. *ap . ab . ik mtm \ tmtn . u hštk . l ntn \ ʕtq* (1.16.I.3-5)
 ‘Will you then, father, o!, die like (mortal)men?’ (see 3.b above), U, wird den dein ... (?) (zum Ort) des Ausstoßens der Wehklage...?’ (Tropper 2012, 805).
- c. *ap . ab . k mtm \ tmtn . u hštk . l ntn \ t[]q* (1.16.I.17-18)
 ibid. (Tropper 2012, 805).
- d. *ap . ab . k mtm . tmtn \ u hštk . l bky . ʕtq* (1.16.II.40-41)
 ibid. (Tropper 2012, 805).
- e. *\ w qdš . u ilm tmtn* (1.16.I.22)
 ‘(...and holy one.) U, sollen gar die Götter sterben?’ (Tropper 2012, 805).
- f. *\ u ilm . tmtn* (1.16.II.43)
 ‘U, sollen gar die Götter sterben?’ (Tropper 2012, 805).
- g. *qra . u . nqmd . mlk* (1.161.12)
 ‘Gerufen ist – U! – der König Niqmadu’ (Tropper 2012, 805; see also Spronk 1986, 191 and de Moor 1987, 167; *contra* Wyatt 2003, 435).
- h. *tḫt . ʕmtḫmr . mlk \ tḫm (or tḫt) . u . nq[md] . mlk* (1.161.25-26)
 ‘(Steig hinunter in die Unterwelt) – U! – unter den König Niq[maddu]!’ (Tropper 2012, 805).⁴⁸

Semantically, the lexeme *u* presented in (4.a-h) appears in contexts of threat, mourning, and rituals (e.g. funeral or coronation). It expresses a variety of emotional states of the speaker, entertaining a patent emotive function. In (4.a), despite being blessed by the gods and enjoying prosperity, Keret breaks his vows (Wyatt 2003, 212-213). Athirat is cognizant of this and, as a result, threatens him that she too will break her vow (ibid.). The interjection *u* that introduces

48. The element *u* in examples (4.a-f) are interpreted as disjunction by Wyatt (2003), namely: (4.a) ‘or (has) [the king] altered his vow?’ (ibid. 213); (4.b) ‘or will your burial chamber be given over to howling...?’ (ibid. 220); (4.c-d) Or will your burial chamber (be given over to) weeping...?’ (ibid. 222, 230); (4.e) ‘How can it be said that... Or do the gods die...?’ (ibid. 222); (4.f) ‘How can you possibly die? ... Or do the gods die...?’ (ibid. 230). The element *u* in examples (4.g-h) is interpreted as coordination: (4.g) ‘(and) invoked as well is Niqmad the king’ (Wyatt 2003, 435); (4.h) ‘and also down to Niqmad the king’ (ibid. 439).

Athirat's speech most likely expresses astonishment (an emotive function) and disbelief (a cognitive function). In (4.b-d), after uttering a rhetorical question concerning the (im)mortality of their father, Keret's children ask another question regarding the destruction of his burial chamber (Wyatt 2003, 220, 222, 230). The lexeme *u* that heads this question profiles the feelings of sadness, desolation, and the cognitive state of disbelief. However, in (4.e-f), Keret's children despair and again question the immortality of their father by raising a rhetorical question about the mortality of divine creatures (Wyatt 2003, 222). If Keret is Il's son, how can he, a god, be mortal? They are weeping and gnashing their teeth. They are terrified, distressed, and deeply saddened by the mortality of their father (ibid. 230; see Tropper's 2012, 805). The examples (4.g-h) describe a ritual (funeral, coronation, or *kispum*-rite) that consists of invoking the king Niqmad and his ancestors (Wyatt 2003, 430-431). In (5.g), *u* heads a non-vocative noun and expresses a cry of mourning (if the rite in question is a funeral) or excitement (if it is a coronation) (see also Spronk 1986, 191; de Moor 1987, 167; Tropper 2012, 805). In (4.h), the speaker invokes Shapsh and provides a list of his predecessors who went down into the underworld. Last on the list, the king Niqmad, is introduced by *u* (Wyatt 2003, 438-438). In this funerary context, *u* likely expresses some type of grief, sorrow, or despair. Given the above-mentioned contexts of use and the ranges of meaning, it is not surprising that *u* tends to be defined as a (particle of) exclamation (Dietrich, Loretz & Sanmartín 1975, 152; Tropper 2012, 804) and translated as interjections of lament in the target languages: 'woe', 'wehe', or 'ach' (Dietrich, Loretz & Sanmartín 1975, 152; de Moor 1987, 208; Tropper 2012, 805).

As far as the other pragmatic properties are concerned, *u* is non-referential, dialogic, and – given the prominence of the emotive component– less deliberate and thus more spontaneous than the interjections *y* and *l* discussed previously. It is also polysemous (entertaining mostly negative emotive and cognitive functions) and thus considerably dependent on its context of use.

From a phonetic perspective, the interjection *u*, apparently pronounced /ʔ̄/ (Sivan 2001, 188; Tropper 2012, 805), does not present any anomaly. The consonant [ʔ] and the vowel [o:], as well as their combination are fully systematic in the Ugaritic language. The lexeme is monosyllabic.⁴⁹ It exhibits the simplest monosyllabic structure possible, namely a vowel preceded by a glottal stop, given that zero-onsets are disallowed in a word-initial position in Ugaritic. The prominence of the vocalic element –a long vowel– is evident. In contrast, the contribution of the consonant component is minimal. In two cases (4.g-h), *u* is separated by a word divider from the following element. In the remaining six cases (4.a-f), the word divider is not employed. On the left edge, the use of a word divider is more consistent, occurring in all cases where it is possible (4.b-c, 4.e, 4.g-h). Therefore, the interjection *u* likely bore full stress, being pronounced as a phonological word rather than as a clitic.

Morphologically, *u* exhibits a simple form. It is monomorphemic with no inflections, derivations, or traces of compounding. It is anomalous and opaque as it fails to exploit the root and pattern mechanism pervasive in the Ugaritic language. It has no identifiable morphological structure. This aberrancy and opacity are most likely related to its reflex-like origin as a primary interjection (see the etymology of *u* as *'aw 'ach', 'wehe!' postulated by Tropper (2012, 805)). The Ugaritic interjection *u* is probably related to 'ôy יִא in Biblical Hebrew, 'ô(y) in Syriac, 'aww in Aramaic, and ū'a, ūya in Akkadian (Tropper 2012, 805). In Biblical Hebrew, 'ôy יִא is a primary

49. Being monosyllabic, *u* cannot exhibit harmonious patterns.

interjection of grief and despair, anxiety, complaint, anguish, intimidation, pain, dismay, and threat, being generally translated as ‘woe’, ‘alas’, ‘ah’ and ‘ho’ (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020).

Syntactically, no clear holophrastic cases of *u* can be identified. Rather, the lexeme forms part of a larger sentence or a sequence of sentences in a turn. In all cases, *u* fails to entertain a core syntactic role in the sentence grammar. It is not governed by the verb and its dependents (whether arguments or adjuncts). Additionally, it does not function as a modifier of the verb, arguments, or adjuncts. The lexeme *u* does not enter into construction with any other words in the sentence, including the vocative. In the only case where *u* appears adjacent to a vocative chain (see *ph mš ap krt tš* ‘Look here, please, Keret, nobleman’ in (4.a) above), it does not belong to that chain but rather introduces the subsequent clause indicating the act of broken vows. As far as word order is concerned, the element *u* occupies a sentence-internal position. In a sentence, it is usually located outside the frame of the core clause. In (4.b-f) *u* appears between two core clauses that belong to a longer turn. In (4.a), it appears between the vocative chain and the core clause. However, in (4.g-h), *u* occupies a clause-internal position, being intercalated between the predicate (*gra*) and the subject (*nqmd mlk*) (4.g), and the preposition (*tht*) and its nominal complement (*nqmd mlk*) (4.h). As explained above, on its right edge, *u* is most often not separated from the remaining part of sentence by a word divider. As a result, the phonological separation and its lack are both plausible. In contrast, on its left edge, *u* is separated by a word divider in all instances where this is possible. This suggests the phonological separation of *u*.

3.5. AḤL AN

There are two cases of the interjections *aḥl* and *an* each in the corpus. In both instances, *aḥl* and *an* occur concurrently in a sequence (Aartun 1974, 77; Tropper 2012, 804; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 33):

- (5) a. **aḥl . an** . bšq[1] \ ynpš . b palt . bšql ypš b yglm (1.19.II.15)
 ‘AḤL AN may this shoot rise up in the heat-cracked field, may the shoot rise up among the wilted plants!’ (Wyatt 2003, 299; Tropper 2012, 804, 813); similarly, del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín (2015, 33, 73): ‘AḤL AN everywhere shoot that sprouts (...), may the hand of PN gather you!’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 33, 73).
- b. **aḥl . an** . š[blt] \ tpš . b aklt . šblt . tpš [b ḥ]mdrt (1.19.II.22)
 ‘AḤL AN may this ear of corn rise from the parched land, may the ear of corn rise up among the withered stalks’ (Wyatt 2003, 299; see also Aartun 1974, 77; Tropper 2012, 804, 813).

In scholarly literature, the lexemes *aḥl* and *an* are discussed separately. However, given their cooccurrence, I will treat them as a single construction, i.e. a form-meaning pairing of a determined degree of complexity and abstraction (Goldberg 1995, 2006, 2013; Fried & Östman 2004). That is, although originally the meaning of the sequence *aḥl an* must have been compositional, it is likely that due to entrenchment, the sequence acquired constructional properties. Nevertheless, the grammaticalization of this sequence into a holistic construction is not completed as evidenced by the presence of a word divider between *aḥl* and *an* (see further below).

In the two examples presented above, the *ahl an* sequence occurs in the context of a blessing. In (5.a), riding on a donkey across a field, Danel observes consequences of the curse he uttered earlier. The field is full of dried and wilted plants. Among them, he sees a shoot. He stops, embraces it, and kisses it. Subsequently, he utters a counter-blessing “may this shoot rise up”, which he hopes “will revive the shrivelling plant” (Wyatt 2003, 298-299). In (5.b), within the same scene, Danel sees an ear of corn among dried and wilted stalks. Again, after embracing it and kissing it, he pronounces a blessing: “may the corn rise”. By introducing a wish, the sequence *ahl an* likely exhibits a conative function of exhortation or encouragement. However, it also gives insight into the emotional state of the speaker, which is typical of emotive interjections. Specifically, *ahl an* demonstrates the pity, worry and concern experienced by Danel when seeing the parched, withered, and dying land. The semantics of *ahl an* discussed above are fully reflected in the respective definitions of the two components and their translations in scholarship. The element *ahl* is usually classified as a desiderative interjection (Segert 1984, 105) or (emphatic) particle of wish (Aartun 1974, 77; Tropper 2012, 813; see also Halayqa 2008, 41 who defines it as an interjective particle). It is translated accordingly as: ‘ach, daß’ (Aartun 1974, 77), ‘o that’ (Segert 1984, 105), ‘I pray’ (Margalit 1984, 140), ‘o daß doch / wenn doch’ (Tropper 2012, 814), and ‘if only’ (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 33; see also Halayqa 2008, 41). Alternatively, the emotive component is made more prominent by means of translations such as ‘wehe’ (Sanmartín 1977, 266). The element *an* is classified as a particle of exclamation (Tropper 2012, 804) and imploration (Caquot, Sznycer & Herdner 1974, 446) or, alternatively, as an adverb (del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 73), being translated respectively as ‘ach bitte’ (Tropper 2012, 804), ‘ah puisse’ (Caquot, Sznycer & Herdner 1974, 446), or ‘where, wherever, anywhere’ (Halayqa 2008, 53; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 73). Again, some scholars opt for more emotive renderings such as ‘for pity’s sake’ (Cassuto 1973/1975, 196), and ‘wehe mir!’ (Sanmartín 1977, 266; see also the lexeme ‘ah’ in Caquot, Sznycer & Herdner 1974, 446).

The above paragraph demonstrates that the meaning of *ahl an* depends heavily upon its context of use. However, given the limited number of examples, the range of its polysemy cannot be estimated precisely. With regard to the remaining pragmatic features, *ahl an* is non-referential. Contrary to the other interjections it is monologic. Given the prominence of the emotive component and monologic character, *ahl an* is the least deliberate and, simultaneously, the most automatic and spontaneous of all the primary interjections in Ugaritic.

Phonologically, neither *ahl* nor *an* contains aberrant sounds or aberrant sound combinations. Being likely realized as /ʔah(V)IV/ (Tropper 2012, 814) and /ʔannā/ (Tropper 2012, 804), the sequence and its components comply with the phonology and phonotactics of Ugaritic. Contrary to the other primary interjections, neither *ahl* nor *an* exhibit a simple form. Both lexemes consist of at least two syllables. The element *an* likely exhibits a harmonious pattern, i.e. vocalic harmony /CaCCa/. The vocalization of *ahl* is uncertain. Containing several consonants, such as *h*, *l* and *n* (apart from the word-initial glottal stops), the vocalic nature of the two elements is less patent. Since in the attested examples, *ahl* and *an* are separated from the following words by a word divider (as well as between themselves), it is possible that they were fully stressed rather than cliticized or affixed to the preceding or following hosting entities. This full stress is even more plausible given the constructional nature of *ahl an*, i.e. their presence in a sequence, and that construction’s length (four or five syllables in total).

Morphologically, the two components of the *ahl an* sequence do not exhibit simple forms, at least not from a diachronic perspective. The lexeme *ahl* most likely consists of two morphemes: the

primary interjection *ah* and the emphatic/affirmative particle *l* (Tropper 2012, 814). It is related to the BH lexeme *'ah^ala/ey* אִלְיָא/לִיָּא 'if only, oh, o that' (Aartun 1974, 77; del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2015, 33), which is generally defined as a positive desiderative interjection (Klein 1987; van der Merwe & Naudé 2017, 484). Similar to *ahl*, the lexeme *'ah^ala/ey* אִלְיָא/לִיָּא is a composite of the primary interjection *'āh* אָה and the emphatic marker *lû/lay* לִי/לִי (Klein 1987). The BH lexeme *'ah* אָה –the plausible cognate of the element *ah* in *ahl* in Ugaritic– expressed “joyous excitement” (Jenni 1997a, 483), sorrow (Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 321), pain, and grief (Waltke & O'Connor 1990, 683; see Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020). The Ugaritic element *an* exhibits a similar complexity. It is arguably related to *'ānnâ* אָנָא/אָנָא in Biblical Hebrew (Cassuto 1973/1975, 196; Tropper 2012, 804). In Biblical Hebrew, the interjection אָנָא/אָנָא expresses pain and complaint (Jenni 1997b, 117) also implying request and entreaty (BDB 1906, 58; Jenni 1997b, 117; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 323). It is translated by ‘ah’ (Gesenius 1910, 307), ‘ah now (I/we pray!)’ (BDB 1906, 58; Klein 1987, 37), or ‘oh! (please!)’ (Clines 1993, 333) (for detail see Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020). The lexeme אָנָא/אָנָא is itself a composition of the primary interjection *ah* and the emphatic/polite/logical particle *nâ* (BDB 1906, 58, Gesenius 1910, 307; Jenni 1997b, 117; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 323; see also Klein 1987, 37 who instead of *ah* proposes a lengthened variant *ahâ*).⁵⁰ Thus, even though no inflections and derivation are present, *ahl* and *an* originally made use of compounding –both being built around a primary interjection (*ah*) and a particle (*l* or *na*). Nevertheless, in Ugaritic, these two compounds were most likely no longer transparent –*ahl* and *an* were synchronically indivisible into more fragmentary and meaningful units. Overall, the two lexemes are anomalous and opaque. They have no identifiable morphological structure as they do not make use of the root and pattern system that characterizes other lexical classes. This opacity stems from their origin as primary interjections strengthened by the presence of modal clitic particles.

Syntactically, neither the sequence *ahl an* holistically nor its two components individually attest to clear holophrastic uses. They rather form parts of larger sentences. In such non-holophrastic uses, the sequence and its two components are not integrated into the sentence grammar. They are not governed by the verb and its dependents, nor do they modify the verb or any of the sentence’s structural elements whether arguments or adjuncts. The sequence *ahl an* does not enter into construction with the other words in the sentence. However, as explained at the beginning of this section, it is itself a construction composed of two interjective elements: *ahl* and *an* –themselves historical constructions built around a primary interjection and a particle. Inversely, both *ahl* and *an* appear in a construction with another primary interjection. This interjective construction *ahl an* occupies a peripheral sentence-initial position.⁵¹ As explained above, the sequence *ahl an* regularly exhibits a word divider on its right edge. This suggests its phonological separation from the remaining part of the sentence. The presence or lack of phonological separation on the left edge cannot be demonstrated as no example allows for potential use of a word divider.

50. In Biblical Hebrew, the particle אָנָא expresses polite entreaties and requests, being equivalent to ‘please’ (Waltke & O'Connor 1990; Joüon-Muraoka 2006, 322; van der Merwe & Naudé 2017, 485). Alternatively, it is classified in terms of a logical particle (Lambdin 1971, 119).

51. Of course, the second component of *ahl an* occupies a sentence internal position. However, structurally, it is still sentence-initial together with *ahl*.

4. Results and discussion – The interjective category in Ugaritic

The evidence demonstrates that each of the Ugaritic interjections analyzed in this study complies to a large extent with the interjective prototype postulated in linguistic typology. Therefore, each of them may be viewed as a representative of the category of interjections. However, this compliance is not identical for all six lexemes. As far as their meaning is concerned, it is the highest for *i*, *u* and especially *ahl an*. As far as formal aspects are concerned, the three domains need to be examined separately. With regard to phonetics, the largest number of prototypical features are exhibited by *y*, *i*, and *u*; with regard to morphology, by *y*, *l*, *i*, and *u*; and with regard to syntax, all the interjections comply with a comparable number of features. The results of the empirical study are summarized in Table 1 below.⁵²

Parameters		Lexemes					
		<i>Y</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>AHL AN</i>	
Function	meaning	conative (emotive)	conative (emotive)	emotive, conative	emotive (cognitive)	emotive, conative	
	polysemy / context dep.	+	+	+	+	+	
	non-referentiality	+	-	+	+	+	
	monologicity	-	-	-	-	+	
	semi-automaticity	-	-	+/-	+/-	+	
	own illocutionary force	+	+	+	+	+	
Form	Phonetics	aberrant sounds	-	-	-	-	-
		aberrant combinations	-	-	-	-	-
		monosyllabicity	+	+	+	+	-
		vocalic nature	+	-	+	+	-
		full stress	+/-	-	+	+	+
		harmonious patterns	0	0	0	0	+
	Morph.	monomorphemicity	+	+	+	+	+/- ⁵³
		no inflections	+	+	+	+	+
		no derivations	+	+	+	+	+
		no compounding	+	+	+	+	+/- ⁵⁴
		anomaly / opacity	+	+	+	+	+
	Syntax	holophrasticity	-	-	-	-	-
		loose integration	+	+	+	+	+
		no syntactic operation	+	+	+	+	+
		no constructions	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/- ⁵⁵

52. The symbol + implies an instantiation of a feature; - implies violation; +/- implies both instantiation and violation; (+) and (-) imply the scarcity of instantiations or violations; 0 implies impossibility of attestations; ? implies the absence of possible examples. Although the illocutionary independence of the interjection has been discussed in the paragraphs dedicated to syntax, I place it in the meaning domain in this table, as it concerns pragmatic properties.

53. The feature is met from a synchronic perspective but violated from a diachronic perspective.

54. Ibid.

55. The exceptions involve: for *y* and *l* –vocative NPs/PPs; and for *ahl* and *an* – another interjection.

	sentence-peripheral	+/-	(+)/-	+/-	-	+ ⁵⁶
	clause-external	+	+	+	+ (-)	+
	phon. reparation (right)	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	+
	phon. reparation (left)	+	+	+	+	?

Table 1: The compliance of Ugaritic interjections with the interjective prototype

In light of the results presented above, I propose that the category of primary interjections in Ugaritic is characterized by a significant extent of internal variation, patent as far as both its function and form are concerned.

Semantically, interjections exploit three main domains: conative, emotive, and cognitive. The conative domain is the most pervasive. It constitutes the predominant semantic component of *y* and *l*; it plays a significant role in the meaning of *i*; it is also visible in *aḥl an*. Within the conative domain, two functions are typical: the use of interjections as attention getters and as expressions of urge and exhortation. The emotive domain often accompanies the conative function (in case of *y* and *l*) or contributes to the semantics of a lexeme, at least, to an equal degree as the conative domain (*i* and *aḥl an*). In some instances, it may indeed constitute the most relevant value expressed by an interjection (*u*). The emotional states expressed tend to be negative. Overall, the combination of conative and emotive nuances is pervasive. From a cross-linguistic perspective, such amalgamations of the conative and emotive domains are common (Ameka 1992; Stange 2016). Additionally, in rare cases, interjections (*i* and *u*) may secondarily draw on a cognitive domain. The contribution of this semantic type is however minimal.

Pragmatically, interjections in Ugaritic are regularly non-referential, thus precluding discourses about third parties. They are polysemous and their interpretation depends heavily on the context of use and conversational inferences drawn. The majority of interjections (*y*, *l*, *i*, and *u*) are dialogic. They are addressed to interlocutors with the aim of triggering responses from other participants. In contrast, a monologic character is less common. It is relatively evident only with one interjection (*aḥl an*). Most interjections (especially *y* and *l*, as well as *i*) are deliberate and planned. Their semi-automatic and instinctive production is only visible with *aḥl an*, in some cases of *i*, and especially *u*. Such a common dialogic and deliberate production of interjections in Ugaritic is congruent with the conative essence of their majority (*y*, *l*, *i*). As explained in section 2, conative interjections tend to be dialogic and intentional. It is emotive interjections that are monologic and spontaneous.

Phonologically, most interjections are mono-syllabic (*y*, *l*, *i*, *u*). The syllables used in these interjections are open. In contrast, *an* and *aḥl* exhibit at least two syllables each, while their constructional combination contains four or five syllables. The sounds (whether consonants or vowels) and sounds combinations found in primary interjections are fully systematic. The vocalic component is prominent in three interjections (*y*, *i*, *u*). In *l*, *aḥl* and *an*, the consonantal component also plays a significant role. Several interjections likely bore full stress. This is the most evident in case of *aḥl an*, as well as, although perhaps to a lesser extent, in case of *u* and *i*. Full stress might also have been present with *y* (at least, in some instances). In contrast, *l* did not, most likely, bear

56. *Y* mainly occupies an internal or, less often, an initial position; *l* almost exclusively occupies an internal position; *i* occupies both internal and initial positions; *u* occupies an internal position; and *aḥl an* occupies an initial position.

full stress. Only one interjection (*an*) exhibits a harmonious pattern, i.e. a vocalic harmony. The phonetic instability of the interjections, and their potential lengthening or shortening, cannot be estimated. The presence of guttural consonants ([ʔ] or [ħ]) is noticeable, as is the use of [ʔ] in word-initial onsets (*y, i, u, ahl, an*).

Morphologically, all interjections exhibit a simple monomorphemic structure from a synchronic perspective, thus being indivisible into smaller meaningful elements. Diachronically however, *ahl* and *an* both derive from bi-morphemic structures built around a primary interjection and a particle. In any case, interjections do not contain inflections and derivations, and with the exception of *ahl* and *an*, they do not exploit compounding. Overall, interjections are morphologically anomalous and opaque, i.e. they have no identifiable word-structure. This anomaly and opacity stems either from the origin of interjections as primary interjections (*y, i, u*, as well as *ahl* and *an*, which draw on the primary interjection *ah*) or from the highly advanced interjectionalization of an originally non-interjective lexeme (*l*).

Syntactically, no unquestionable holophrastic uses are attested. Rather, in all cases, interjections function as words, i.e. parts of larger sentences or utterances. In such non-holophrastic uses, interjections are only integrated into the sentence/clause grammar loosely or not at all. They do not constitute core structural components. They are not governed by the verb or its dependent elements, nor do they modify the predicate, arguments, and adjuncts. Interjections do not participate in the syntactic operations of negation and interrogation, regularly entertaining their own illocutionary force independent from the illocutionary force of the rest of the sentence. Interjections do not enter into constructions with the core elements of the sentence (predicate, arguments, adjuncts). They also do not usually form constructions with content-type lexical classes (verbs, nouns, adjectives, pronouns, adverbs). The noticeable exceptions are vocatives, i.e. vocative nouns and 2nd person pronouns (especially in the case of *y* and *l*). Rarely, interjections yield constructional patterns with prepositional phrases, built around the preposition *l* and the 2nd person pronoun (*y*). Ugaritic interjections form constructions with particles (see *ahl* and *an* that are successors of constructions composed of an interjection and a particle) as well as with other interjections (see again the synchronic sequence *ahl* and *an*). As far as word order is concerned, interjections exhibit a number of positional tendencies. Respective of the broader sentence, a sentence-internal position predominates (*y, l, i, u*), although a sentence-initial position is commonly attested too (*y, i, ahl an*, and exceptionally *l*). In contrast, a sentence-final position is virtually absent. Respective of the core clause, a clause-external position is typical (*y, l, i, u, ahl an*). Exceptionally, an interjection occupies a clause-internal position (*u*). With regard to the adjacent vocative, the interjections *y* and *l* typically occupy a phrase-initial position. When appearing with adjacent vocatives, the interjections *i* and *u* do not form vocative phrases and follow the vocative element.⁵⁷ Lastly, interjections attest to both phonological separation and its absence.⁵⁸ On the right periphery, the lack of phonological separation seems to be typical of *y* and *l*, while its presence is characteristic of *ahl an*. For *i* and *u*, both the presence of phonological separation and its absence

57. Consequently, Segert's statement (1984, 104) that Ugaritic interjections are located "outside of, or on the periphery of clause and sentence structure" is only partially corroborated by this study. This is true as far as the position relative to a clause is concerned; not necessarily true, however, if one considers the position of interjections in a sentence.

58. This statement is tentative as it only draws on the presence or absence of a word divider.

seem to be equally possible. On the left periphery, the presence of phonological separation is typical of *y*, *l*, *i*, and *u* (for *aḥl an*, the data are inconclusive).

As explained above, as far as the function of interjections is concerned, the emotive component –the most prototypical for the interjective category from a typological perspective– is less common than the conative domain. This means that several prototypical features in the realm of pragmatics are often not instantiated, e.g. monolocality and semi-automaticity. As far as the formal aspects of interjections are concerned, morphological properties are instantiated most regularly –the only exceptions appearing from a diachronic perspective. Phonological properties are instantiated less regularly, although in several aspects they are respected. The general absence of aberrant sounds and sound combinations, as well as a weak accentuation of some interjections constitute noticeable violations. Syntactic properties are even less regular from the perspective of the interjective prototype. The lack of holophrastic uses is pervasive; phonological separation is often absent; sentence-internal and even clause-internal positions are attested; and combinations with other elements –although all of them of the expected types– occur.

Although internally variable, the category of interjections can be structured coherently if depicted as a radial network organized around the topologically driven interjective prototype that was presented in section 2. The canonical instantiations –i.e. those that comply with all (or the most) semantic, pragmatic, phonetic, morphological, and syntactic features associated with the prototype– are located in the center of the category. The non-canonical instantiations that violate the prototype in several aspects, are located in the category's periphery. The zone comprised between these two extremes is occupied by instantiations characterized by an intermediate canonicity. Crucially, in Ugaritic, it is not only distinct interjective lexemes that attest to different canonicity levels and occupy distinct places in the categorial radial network. The canonicity of different examples of the same interjective lexeme, and their positions in the network, may also be distinct. This means that the category of primary interjections constitutes a messy phenomenon in which both the entire category and each lexeme that belongs to it span (more or less extensive) sections of the categorial network available in light of typological research.

The results of my study also demonstrate the distinctiveness of the analyzed lexemes from the category of particles. To be exact, contrary to particles, *y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, and *aḥl an* do not modify the illocutionary force of the sentence but rather entertain their own illocutionary force; they do not operate over the entire sentence, but rather restrict their scope to a peripheral extra-clausal slot; they are not integrated into a clausal structure; they can be stressed; and in most cases, are not bleached or phonologically reduced forms of their respective sources. This means that, as argued in this article, *y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, and *aḥl an* should be classified as members of the lexical class of interjections instead of being defined as particles, which is the common practice in Ugaritic and Semitic studies.

Lastly, the present study contributes to the broader theory of interjections. First, my research corroborates the utility of the radial prototype-driven model in analyzing the category of interjections, and the cumulative definition of the interjective prototype (Ameka 1992, 2006; Nübling 2001, 2004; Stange & Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). Second, I provide evidence for phenomena observed in recent scholarship which, although not included in the definition of the interjective prototype, seem to constitute (more or less) pervasive tendencies. This evidence concerns the commonness of guttural consonants (see Andrason & Dlali 2020); the use of ?-onsets in languages that disallow onsetless syllables (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020); and the compositionality of interjections with particles and the morphologization of the latter as indivisible parts of interjections due to grammaticalization (Andrason & Dlali 2020).

5. Conclusion

The present paper analyzed the word class of primary interjections in Ugaritic within a canonical approach to categorization, drawing on an interjective prototype postulated in linguistic typology. After examining the compliance of six interjective lexemes –i.e. *y*, *l*, *i*, *u*, *ahl* and *an*– with functional (semantics and pragmatics) and formal (phonology, morphology, and syntax) prototypical features, I conclude that each of these lexemes is a more or less canonical instantiation of the prototype and thus a rightful member in the category of interjections in Ugaritic. Overall, despite a considerable functional-formal variation of the interjections attested in Ugaritic and their dissimilar compliance with the typological prototype, the category itself can be structured coherently. This is possible if the interjective category is depicted as a radial network with prototype effects, thus including canonical, semi-canonical, and non-canonical members that are located in the central, intermediate, and peripheral zones of the network, respectively. Such a model preserves the internal variation of the members and their attestations on the one hand, and the coherence of the category envisaged holistically on the other hand.

6. References

- Aartun, K. 1974, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen. 1. Teil*, Kevelaer / Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Ameka, F. and Wilkins, D. 2006, “Interjection”, in J-O. Östman and J. Verschueren (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam, 1-19.
- Ameka, F. 1992, “Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech”, *Journal of Pragmatics* 18/2-3, 101-118.
- Ameka, F. 2006, “Interjections”, in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Amsterdam, 743-746.
- Andrason, A. and Dlali, M. 2020, “The (crucial yet neglected) category of interjections in Xhosa”, *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 73/2, 159-217.
- Andrason, A., Fehn, A.M. and Phiri, A. 2020, “Interjections in Tjwao”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 83/2, 293-319.
- Andrason, A., Hornea, I. and Joubert, M. 2020, “The structure of interjections in Biblical Hebrew: Phonetics, morphology, and syntax”, *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 20/1, 1-43
- Andrason, A. and Hutchison, D.A. 2020, “Interjections in Biblical Aramaic: A radial model”, *Aramaic Studies* 38/1, 1-45.
- Andrason, A. and Matutu, H. 2019, “The syntax of interjections in isiXhosa – a corpus-driven study”, *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 58, 1-16.
- Andrason, A. and Vita, J-P. forthcoming, “A contribution to the study of interjections in Canaan-Akkadian”, *Die Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.
- BDB = Brown, F., Driver, S.R. and Briggs, C.A. 1906, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford.
- Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 1982, “Le rituel funéraire ougaritique RS 34.126”, *Syria* 59, 121-128.
- Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 2004, *Manuel d’ougaritique. Vol I. Grammaire*, Paris.
- Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 2009, *A Manual of Ugaritic*, Winona Lake.
- Brockelmann, C. and Sokoloff, M. 2009, *A Syriac Lexicon*, Winona Lake /Piscataway.
- Caquot, A., Sznycer, M. and Herdner, A. 1974, *Textes ougaritiques. Tome I. Mythes et legends*, Paris.

- Caquot, A. and de Tarragon, J-M. 1989, *Textes ougaritiques. Tome II. Textes religieux, rituels, correspondance*, Paris.
- Cassuto, U. 1973/1975, *Biblical and Oriental Studies I-II*, Jerusalem.
- Clines, D.J.A. et al. 1993, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew Vol. 1*, Sheffield.
- Cohen, D., Lentin, J., Bron, F., Lonnet, A. and Cantineau, J. 2012, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques : Fascicule 10, H, T/T', T, Y, K*, Leuven.
- Corbett, G. 2005, "The canonical approach in typology", in Z. Frajzyngier, A. Hodges and D. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*, Amsterdam, 25-49.
- Corbett, G. 2007, "Canonical typology, suppletion and possible words", *Language* 83, 8-42.
- Croft, W. 2003, *Typology and Universals*, Cambridge.
- Cunchillos, J-L., Vita, J-P. and Zamora, J-Á. 2003, *A Concordance of Ugaritic Words*, Piscataway.
- De Moor, J.C. 1983, "Enkele liturgische teksten uit Ugarit", in K.R. Veenhof (ed.), *Schrijvend verleden*, Leyde, 247-252.
- De Moor, J.C. 1987, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*, Leiden.
- Degand, L., Cornillie, B. and Pietrandrea, P. 2013, "Modal particles and discourse markers: Two sides of the same coin? Introduction", in L. Degand, B. Cornillie and P. Pietrandrea (eds.), *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and Description*, Amsterdam.
- Del Olmo Lete, G. and Sanmartín, J. 2015, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Vol 1 and 2*, Leiden (3rd edition).
- Dietrich, M. and Loretz, O. 1983, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit II", *Ugarit Forschungen* 15, 17-22.
- Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 1975, "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (XIII)", *Ugarit Forschungen* 7, 69-157.
- Edzard, L. 2011, "Biblical Hebrew", in S. Weninger (ed.), *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*, Berlin, 480-514.
- Evans, V. and Green, M. 2006, *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*, Edinburgh.
- Fischer, K. 2007, "Towards an understanding of the spectrum of approaches to discourse particles: introduction to the volume", K. Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, 1-20.
- Fox, J.T. 2003, *Semitic Noun Patterns*, Winona Lake.
- Fried, M. and Östman, J.-O. 2004, "Construction grammar: A thumbnail sketch", in M. Fried and J.-O. Östman (eds.), *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective*, Amsterdam, 11-86.
- Gesenius 1910 = Gesenius, W., Kautzsch, E. and Cowley, A.E. 1910, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford.
- Goldberg, A. 1995, *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, Chicago.
- Goldberg, A. 2006, *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford.
- Goldberg, A. 2013, "Constructionist approaches", in T. Hoffmann and G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford, 15-31.
- Halayqa, I.K.H. 2008, *A Comparative Lexicon of Ugaritic and Canaanite*, Münster.
- HALOT = Koehler, L. et al. 1994–2000, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament CD-ROM Edition* (Subsequently revised by Baumgartner, W. and J.J. Stamm), Leiden.
- Hopper, P. J. and Traugott, E. C. 2003, *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge.

- Huehnergard, J. 1983, "Asseverative *la and hypothetical *lu/law in Semitic", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103, 569-593.
- Huehnergard, J. 2012, *An Introduction to Ugaritic*, Peabody.
- Janda, L. 2015, "Cognitive linguistics in the year 2015", *Cognitive Semantics* 1, 131-154.
- Jenni, E. 1997a, "הוֹי hōy", in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament. Vol I*, Peabody, 483-485.
- Jenni, E. 1997b, "הָהָה hāh", in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament. Vol I*, Peabody, 117-118.
- Johnstone, T.M. 1987, *Mehri Lexicon and English-Mehri Word List*, London.
- Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T. 2006, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Roma.
- Klein, E. 1987, *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English*, Jerusalem.
- KTU³ 2013 = Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 2013, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten*, Münster (3rd edition).
- Lambdin, T. O. 1971, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*, New York.
- Margalit, B. 1984, "Lexicographical notes on the Allhat epic (Part II: KTU 1.19)", *Ugarit Forschungen* 16, 119-179.
- Meinard, M. 2015, "Distinguishing onomatopoeias from interjections", *Journal of Pragmatics* 76, 150-168.
- Nordgren, L. 2015, *Greek Interjections*, Berlin.
- Norricks, N. 2009, "Interjections as pragmatic markers", *Journal of Pragmatics* 41/5, 866-889.
- Nübling, D. 2001, "Von oh mein Jesus! zu oje! – Der Interjektionalisierungspfad von der sekundären zur primären Interjektion", *Deutsche Sprache* 29/1, 20-45.
- Nübling, D. 2004, "Die prototypische Interjektion: Ein Definitionsvorschlag", *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 26/1-2, 11-46.
- Pardee, D. 2003a, "Ugaritic myths: The Ba'lu myth", in W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (eds.), *The Context of Scripture. Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*, Leiden, 241-274.
- Pardee, D. 2003b, "The 'Aqhatu legend", in W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger (eds.), *The Context of Scripture. Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions, and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*, Leiden, 343-356.
- Pitard, W. 1998, "KTU 1.83, The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Text", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57, 261-283.
- Sankoff, G., Thibault, P., Nagy, N., Blondeau, H., Fonollosa, M-O. and Gagnon, L. 1997, "Variation in the use of discourse markers in a language contact situation", *Language Variation and Change* 9/2, 191-217.
- Sanmartín, J. 1977, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (I)", *Ugarit Forschungen* 9, 263-266.
- Segert, S. 1984, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language with Selected Texts and Glossary*, Berkeley.
- Segert, S. 2000, "Ugaritic and Classical Arabic", *Asian and African Studies* 9, 4-15.
- Singer, A.D. 1948, "The vocative in Ugaritic", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2, 1-10.
- Sivan, D. 2001, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language. Second impression with corrections*, Leuven.
- Smith, M. S. and Pitard, W. T. 2009, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume II*, Leiden.
- Spronk, K. 1986, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Neukirchen-Vluyn / Kevelaer.

- Stange, U. 2016, *Emotive Interjections in British English. A Corpus-Based Study on Variation in Acquisition, Function and Usage*, Amsterdam.
- Stange, U. and Nübling, D. 2014, "Interjections", in C. Müller et al. (eds.), *Body – Language – Communication*, Berlin, 1982-1989.
- Taylor, J.G. 1988, "A first and last thing to do in mourning: *KTU* 1.161 and some Parallels", in L. Eslinger and J.G. Taylor (eds.), *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*, Sheffield, 151-177.
- Testen, D. 1998, *Parallels in Semitic linguistics: the development of Arabic la- and related Semitic particles*, Leiden.
- Tropper, J. 2008, *Kleines Wörterbuch des Ugaritischen*, Wiesbaden.
- Tropper, J. 2012, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, Münster (2nd edition).
- Van der Merwe, C.H.J. and Naudé, J.A. 2017, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, London.
- Velupillai, V. 2012, *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*, Amsterdam.
- Waltke, K. and O'Connor, M. 1990, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake.
- Watson, W.G.E. 1992, "Final *-m* in Ugaritic", *Aula Orientalis* 10, 223-252.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1991 [2003], *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*, Berlin.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1992, "The semantics of interjections", *Journal of Pragmatics* 18/2-3, 159-192.
- Wright, W. 1996, *Grammar of the Arabic Language. Vol 1*, Beirut.
- Wyatt, N. 2002, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, Sheffield.