

*Interjections and interjectional phrases  
as a characterisation tool  
in  
Hamlet, Twelfth Night and Othello*



*"'Swounds, you're robbed; for shame, put on your gown!"  
(Othello. Act 1, scene 1)*



The Faculty of Arts and Education

## MASTERS THESIS

Study programme: Master in Literacy studies	Spring term, 2020  Open
Author: Mari Rolfsnes	..... (signatur author)
Supervisor: Merja Riitta Stenroos	
Title of thesis:  Interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool in <i>Hamlet</i> , <i>Twelfth Night</i> and <i>Othello</i>	
Keywords: Interjections, characterisation, Shakespeare, Early Modern English	Pages: 125 + attachment/other: 3  Stavanger, 11.05.2020 date/year

## Abstract

Having mostly escaped scholarly scrutiny, interjections have in recent years received more attention and are currently being fronted and championed in linguistic research. However, there does not seem to be much research on how interjections and interjectional phrases are used in characterisation in historical play-texts. Interjections play a major role in the communication of feelings and of identity, choices of interjection often being closely linked to specific social groups. They are therefore ideal in signalling character and in the negotiation of meaning-making between stage and audience.

The present study enquires into the use of interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* and investigates how interjections and interjectional phrases may have assisted role inhabitation and character interpretation in late Elizabethan playhouses. Three main questions are addressed: what kind of interjections and phrases are used in the plays, how interjections and phrases convey character information, and whether interjections are used intentionally in the plays.

The collected data in the present study comprises primary and secondary interjections and interjectional phrases. These have been collected from the First Folio (1623) edition of the *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* as it is generally agreed that the Folio is the most authoritative source for Shakespeare's plays. In addition to the First Folio, the present study has used the Oxford edition of the plays as a control text. It provides modernised spelling and supplies expurgated readings from early quarto versions of the plays. The expurgated material is highly relevant for the present study as it consists of profane and offensive or potentially offensive interjections and interjectional phrases.

The data have been collected manually together with a range of different linguistic and extra-linguistic variables such as formal and functional category, pragmatic function, play, speaker and addressee gender and social status. Due to the context-boundedness of interjections, these and other linguistic and extra-linguistic variables are of vital importance in identifying interjection use and how interjections may assist character description in dramatic texts. Through an investigation of interjections and interjectional phrases on both the authorial and speaker discourse level, the present study finds that these words and phrases had their place in the toolbox that comprises linguistic characterisation devices available to playwrights of earlier times.

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical background.....	4
2.1. The orality of play-texts.....	4
2.2. Interjections.....	6
2.2.1. The problematic interjections.....	6
2.2.2. Ameka's definition of interjections.....	8
2.2.3. Pragmatic noise .....	10
2.2.4. Challenging Ameka.....	13
2.2.5. The approach of this study.....	15
2.3. The world of Elizabethan drama.....	16
2.3.1. Public and private theatres.....	16
2.3.2. Attitudes towards plays, players and playhouses.....	18
2.3.3. Expectations and challenges in the playhouse .....	21
2.3.4. Boy players in professional companies.....	22
2.3.5. Theatrical productions as written text.....	23
2.4. Character and characterisation.....	27
2.4.1. Stanislavski's heritage.....	27
2.4.2. An Elizabethan view of character.....	28
2.4.3. Characterisation through language.....	30
3. Material and methodology.....	31
3.1. Data.....	31
3.2. The material.....	32
3.3. Data collection.....	34
4. Presentation of findings.....	38
4.1. Overview of the findings.....	38
4.2. Discrepancies between the First Folio and the Oxford edition.....	40
4.3. The primary interjections.....	46
4.4. The secondary interjections.....	60
4.5. Interjectional phrases.....	74
4.5.1. Religious phrases.....	76
4.5.2. Secular phrases.....	93

5. Interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool.....	103
5.1. Towards the mapping of relatively uncharted territory.....	103
5.2. Gender.....	104
5.3. Social rank and status.....	107
5.4. Foul and pious language as a marker of individual character.....	110
5.5. The players' passionating.....	113
5.6. Characterisation and the intentionality of interjections.....	114
6. Conclusion.....	116
Bibliography.....	120
Appendix.....	126

## 1. Introduction

The present study enquires into the use of interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool in Shakespeare's plays and investigates how these words and phrases may have assisted role inhabitation and character interpretation in late Elizabethan playhouses. The studied plays are the two tragedies *Hamlet* and *Othello* and the comedy *Twelfth Night*. The present study addresses three main questions: what kind of interjections and phrases are used in the plays, how interjections and phrases convey character information, and whether interjections are used intentionally in the plays.

Interjections play a major role in the communication of feelings and of identity, choices of interjection often being closely linked to specific social groups. They are therefore ideal in signalling character and in the negotiation of meaning-making between stage and audience. This meaning negotiation involves two discourse levels: the authorial discourse level, which negotiates meaning between playwright, actors and audience, and the speaker discourse level, which is found within the play in character interaction (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 146).

The present study is based on the assumption that interjections and interjectional phrases play a part in conveying character to actors and audience. By investigating Shakespeare's use of these elements and ascertaining how they assist characterisation in *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*, it may be suggested that Early Modern dramatists considered interjections and interjectional phrases as valuable assets in linguistic characterisation of dramatic personae. This is connected to the possibility that interjections and interjectional phrases were central in Elizabethan players' dramatic preparation of inhabiting a part prior to first performance. Jucker and Taavitsainen's (2013: 63) claim that "characterisation of fictional people using interjections is a fairly late phenomenon" without giving a specific timeframe. Assuming that late Elizabethan drama is not included in Jucker and Taavitsainen's (2013: 63) "fairly late phenomenon", the present study suggests that the use of interjections and interjectional phrases as a means of character description may be traced back to a much earlier date than previously assumed. Lastly, there is disagreement among researchers as to the intentional or unintentional use of interjections. Ameka (1992) claims that interjections are marked by their spontaneous, unintentional use. The present study suggests that if interjections are used intentionally in historical play-texts, the usage reflects devised interjection practice in actual discourse.

Play-texts are speech-purposed and oral by design – constructed to be performed in front of a theatre audience. For this reason, they are considered a good source for the study of historical colloquial speech (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 17, 208). Interjections are strongly associated with oral discourse and it is believed that they are presented in the written mode as an imitation of spoken language (Taavitsainen 1995: 440). A close study of Shakespeare's use of interjections and interjectional phrases in relation to characterisation may therefore also allow for inferences about actual socio-linguistic patterns prevalent at his time and familiar to his audience.

Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 208) note that comedies in particular may help reconstruct spoken language. However, as the primary focus of the present study is on characterisation and not on Elizabethan colloquial speech presentation, both the tragic and comic genres are useful in the identification of the roles of interjections and interjectional phrases in Early Modern dramatic characterisation. The studied plays are also close in production; *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* were written approximately at the same time, around 1600/1601 and *Othello* about 1602/1603. They are therefore good candidates in establishing the use of interjections and interjectional phrases as a means of characterisation in Late Elizabethan England and in the middle of Shakespeare's career.

Interjections have largely been neglected in linguistic research (Ameka 1992: 101), and there seems to be few studies that investigate how interjections may assist dramatic characterisation. Taavitsainen (1998, 1999) looks into the role of primary interjections in character description in Gothic romances and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Støle (2012) finds that primary interjections play a part in the characterisation of good and bad characters in Late Middle English cycle plays. In addition, Culpeper and Kytö (2010) connect pragmatic noise, that is, morphologically simple, non-homonymic, sometimes phonologically anomalous elements that overlap with certain interjections (Culpeper and Kytö: 199-200), and characterisation. However, this is not their primary focus. Interjections as a means of characterisation, then, seems to be relatively uncharted territory. There are of course studies that note that elements identified as interjections and interjectional phrases in the present study may reveal information about gender and social status, such as Salmon (1967 [1987]) and Hughes (2006). However, these studies do not clearly specify interjection use for characterisation purposes even though examples are from Middle English and Early Modern play-texts.

Interjections are highly problematic and notoriously difficult to define. Researchers cannot seem to agree on an adequate and satisfactory definition and refer to them variously as

discourse markers, particles and routines (Gewheiler 2010: 315). The present study defines interjections as belonging to a heterogeneous word class. Following Ameka (1992), the word class comprises both morphologically simple, sometimes phonologically anomalous words not otherwise used (primary interjections) and those that have homonyms in other word classes (secondary interjections). The latter words are interjections in their capacity as referents to mental acts.

The collected data in the present study comprises primary and secondary interjections and interjectional phrases, which have been collected manually together with a range of different linguistic and extra-linguistic variables such as formal category, pragmatic function, play, speaker and addressee gender and social status. The different variables are discussed in section 3.3.

The interjections and phrases are collected from the First Folio (1623) version of *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* as the Folio is generally agreed to be the most authoritative source for Shakespeare's plays (Neill and Wells 2008: 409). In addition to the First Folio, the present study uses the Oxford edition of the plays as a control text. It provides modernised spelling and supplies expurgated readings from early quarto versions of the plays; see discussion in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2.

The structure of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 discusses the problems involved in defining and studying interjections and explains the stance of the present study towards these marginalised words. Part of the basis laid out in Ameka's (1992) influential paper about the formal and functional categorisation and classification of interjections is followed, however, as section 2.3.4 discusses, there are problems as well that need to be addressed. Chapter 2 also provides an overview of Elizabethan attitudes towards plays, play-texts, playhouses and players, the conditions of the playhouses and rehearsal and the relationship between Elizabethan and 21<sup>st</sup> century dramatic preparation. As the latter are more closely related than one might think, modern and Early Modern ideas of character and characterisation may not be altogether that different. The chapter also discusses early Modern theatrical productions and written text.

Chapter 3 discusses the choice of the materials studied, both with regard to the plays chosen and the versions in which they have been studied. The chapter also describes the categorisation of the interjections and interjectional phrases, the linguistic and extralinguistic variables collected and the method of data collection.

Chapter 4 presents the findings in the three different formal categories, dealing with each interjection or phrase in turn and accounts for substantial differences between the First



Folio and the Oxford edition of the plays. Chapter 5 discusses interjections and interjectional phrases in relation to characterisation and intentionality.

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1 The Orality of play-texts

As the sole access to Shakespeare's plays is through the printed medium, it is easy to overlook the fact that the people he originally wrote for conceived his produce as being part of spoken discourse (Hulme 1958 [1987:145]). Willcock (1954: 12, as cited in Hulme [1987:145]), points out that Shakespeare's texts were "originally conceived in the mind for an actor's voice, and published to the world on an actor's lips". This is the case for all play-texts: they are speech-purposed and oral by design – constructed to be performed in front of a theatre audience (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 17). For this reason, play-texts contain characteristics typically associated with spoken language.

Salmon (1967 [1987: 39-41]) notes three major ways in which spoken language is distinct from the written mode, all of which may be found in conversational exchange in play-texts: Speech is spontaneous, addressee-oriented and situation-based, conversation participants use appropriated language that reflects reactions and attitudes towards other participants, the conveyed message and the situation as a whole, and lastly, speech may depend on the memory of the speaker. Since spoken interaction within a specific context depends on gestures and previous utterances, structures needed in written discourse may be omitted in dialogue. As a result, spoken discourse is not as explicit as written language. This may be realised through incomplete sentences (Salmon 1967 [1987: 40, 48]). In example (1), both the noun phrase and the verb phrase, needed to make a complete written sentence, have been omitted:

- (1) Olivia:           How does he loue me?  
      Viola:           With adorations, fertill teares,  
                          With groanes that thunder loue, with sighes of fire.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

Further, as speech is realised as an exchange between speaker and addressee, the spoken mode includes addressee-oriented features such as commands and exclamations (Salmon

1967 [1987: 40]). Salmon (1967 [1987: 49]) gives the following example of an exclamatory sentence from *Merry Wives of Windsor*, act, 2, scene 1:

(2) Mistress Ford: O, that my husband saw this letter!

The appropriated language used in the communication between speaker and addressee may denote permanent states such as master and servant, parent and child and immediate reactions and attitudes such as dislike, politeness and formality. The manner in which a person is summoned or addressed may denote both states (Salmon 1967 [1987: 40, 55-56]) and exclamations are particularly apt for conveying attitudes towards message and situation. There are two types of exclamations: Non-referential utterances that are mostly monosyllabic, such as *alas* and *fie*, and referential utterances in the shape of words and phrases such as *'sblood*, functioning as exclamations due to their solely emotive meaning in the context in which they occur (Salmon 1967 [1987: 60-61]).

Speakers often venture into linguistic constructions that are too complex for a limited memory. As a result of this lack of premeditation, spoken language contains false starts, repetition of message, linguistic structures and even whole sentences (Salmon 1967 [1987: 41, 64]). Material may also be rephrased. Salmon 1967 [1987: 64]) gives the following example from *Henry IV* part 2, act 5, scene 1:

(3) Mistress Quickly: I will not excuse you; you shall not be excused; excuses shall not be admitted; there is no excuse shall serve; you shall not be excused.

Pause-fillers such as *well*, *come*, *look you*, *indeed*, *you know* and *why* are also part of the elements comprising lack of premeditation (Salmon 1967 [1987: 65]).

The features Salmon (1967 [1987: 60-61, 64]) describes as exclamations and pause-fillers are of particular interest for the present study. Speaker attitude towards a person, a situation or the conveyed message is an important part of dramatic characterisation. The dramatist's choice of exclamations and features of lack of predetermination may assist actors in inhabiting a role and the audience in interpreting the characters presented on stage. The present study includes the elements Salmon (1967 [1987: 60-61, 64]) refers to as exclamations as interjections and interjectional phrases and some of the pause-fillers as interjections.

As a speech-related genre, plays are recognised as valuable sources of information about colloquial speech prevalent in earlier times. Their spoken affiliation allows for inferences about actual socio-linguistic patterns (Jucker and Taavitsainen 2013: 13, 24). However, there are challenges in using plays as a source for historical language use due to conventions within the dramatic genre. Constructed play-texts contain language that serves specific purposes, such as furthering plot and characterisation. The interjection *A* may be used to signal that a character has just fallen in love, but the use cannot be interpreted as actual language behaviour (Jucker and Taavitsainen 2013: 25-26). People do not exclaim ‘*A!*’ when they fall in love. There is also the poetic form rhyme verse and blank verse, commonly found in combination with prose in historical play-texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. While prose is considered to be ‘natural’ speech representation, verse, with its structural metre requirements, is artificial (Ballard 2016)<sup>1</sup>. Actual people do not speak in lines comprised of five rhythmic, two syllable units where the first syllable is unstressed and the second is stressed (Ballard 2016)<sup>2</sup> as shown in (4).

(4)     ˘   /   ˘   /   ˘   /   ˘   /   ˘   /

But soft, what light through yonder window breaks?

(*Romeo and Juliet*: Act 2, scene 2, as cited in Ballard 2016<sup>3</sup>)

It is important to recognise, then, that dramatic texts contain features that allow for inferences about historical language use, but that the information is represented in a typified manner (Jucker and Taavitsainen 2013: 25, 29).

## 2.2 Interjections

### 2.2.1 The problematic interjections

Culpeper (2009: 8) refers to interjections as “the Cinderellas of language”. They have been ignored in linguistic studies, discarded as “peripheral to the ‘real’ concerns

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>

of linguistics” (Wilkins 1992: 119). When dealt with, researchers find that that interjections are highly problematic and notoriously difficult to define and cannot seem to agree on an adequate and satisfactory definition. It is perhaps not particularly strange, then, that Gewheiler (2010: 315) notes that it might be “impossible to define the part of speech ‘interjections’ in absolute terms”.

Several definition proposals have been presented. Ameka (1992) argues that interjections are proper linguistic features best categorised as a separate word class. This contrasts with the much earlier view of Jespersen (1924) who suggests that they should be viewed as adverbs, pronouns and particles that are used as interjections as “the only thing that these elements have in common is their ability to stand alone as a complete utterance” (Jespersen 1924: 90). Further, Cuenca (2000) argues that it is better to view interjections as sentence substitutes and Goffman (1978) regards interjections as natural response cries that are not part of the linguistic system at all.

The disagreement among linguists is a testament to the difficult nature of interjections. They belong to a far from homogeneous group of words, if indeed they are words at all. Some interjections, such as HEAVENS, WELL, BOTHER and WHY, are identical in form with words from other word classes and some scholars consequently analyse them within these classes (Gewheiler 2010: 315). Yet other interjections are unconventional words or ‘non-words’ that are not otherwise used, such as AH, OH, PHEW and HA (Ameka 1992: 102, 105). There are also other interjections that form atypical words which may lack vowels such as SH, PSST and UGH. Since these interjections are comprised of sounds not found elsewhere in the main language system, they are viewed by some as paralinguistic and an addition to proper linguistic communication. They seem to lie somewhere between verbal and non-verbal communication and are considered peripheral to language as a whole (Ameka 1992: 106, 111-112). Consequently, interjections have been regarded as “something on the fringes of the main business of grammar” (Culpeper & Kytö 2010: 201).

Another way in which interjections are problematic is their ability to form independent utterances. This may not appear as an obstacle in itself, but difficulties arise when one for instance is to determine whether there is a difference between *Oh!* and *Oh*, in examples (5) and (6):

(5): **Oh!** [i.e. I am surprised by this something that I’ve just now become aware of and I say ‘Oh’ because I want to show how I feel right now]

(Wilkins 1992: 126)

(6): **Oh**, don't go on like an old fool.

(Wilkins 1992: 126)

*Oh!* in example (5) is straightforward as it clearly constitutes an utterance on its own, but example (6) is more problematic. Wilkins (1992: 126) notes that *Oh*, may be regarded both as an interjection and as a sentential particle. The interpretation depends on whether the comma justifies two independent utterances in parataxis or if *Oh*, is an integrated part of a single utterance.

### 2.2.2 Ameka's definition of interjections

According to Ameka's (1992) influential paper, interjections are best viewed as proper lexical elements that belong in a separate word class. This word class contains both conventional and unconventional words, that is, the members have homonyms in other word classes and may or may not conform with the main sound system. Interjections "express a speaker's mental state, action or attitude or reaction to a situation" (Ameka 1992: 106). In other words, they are produced as a response to a linguistic or extralinguistic context and are dependent on that context in their interpretation. They are context-bound (Ameka 1992: 108). It follows that interjections are unintentional, immediate reactions that do not have addressees. They "may be directed at people, but they are not addressed to people" (Ameka 1992: 109).

For Ameka (1992: 106, 110), interjections refer to the speaker's emotional and cognitive reactions. He thus contests the traditional view that interjections are purely emotive words. The scholarly focus on interjections' ability to convey emotional reaction seems to overshadow and neglect their more diverse usage. Ameka (1992: 108) also notes that interjections can constitute utterances by themselves. This involves that interjections "are always separated by a pause from the other utterances with which they may co-occur. They always constitute an intonation unit by themselves" (Ameka 1992: 108). For Ameka, then, *Oh*, in example (6) would be an interjection if considered as a co-utterance with another unit.

Remarking upon the heterogeneity of interjections, Ameka (1992: 105, 107) proposes that the word class members should be organised into primary and secondary interjections. The primary interjections are those members that are not otherwise used, such as *wow*, *ah*, *oops*, *oh*, *lo*, *fie*, *alas*, *ho*, *ha*, *tut*, *psst* and *ouch*. The secondary interjections have homonyms in other word classes and are included in the interjection word class solely due to their non-elliptical capacity as referents to mental acts. They may be used to attract attention

as HELP, FIRE, HEY and CAREFUL. They may also be used as profane oaths such as HEAVENS, GOD, CHRIST and MARRY. Other secondary interjections are WELL, WHY, WHAT, SHAME and BOTHER (Ameka 1992: 105, 111). Bloomfield (1933 [1996: 176]) includes phrases such as OH DEAR, BY GOLLY and GOODNESS SAKES ALIVE as secondary interjections. In contrast, Ameka (1992: 104) proposes that these are best viewed as interjectional phrases.

In addition to the division between primary and secondary interjections, Ameka (1992: 113-114) suggests that these words be classified into three functional categories: Expressive, conative and phatic. Expressive interjections reflect the speaker's mental state and are further divided into two subcategories; the emotive – which expresses immediate sensations and emotions - and the cognitive – which expresses the speaker's knowledge and thoughts. In examples (7) and (8), the primary interjection *o* has an emotive-expressive function signalling surprise and the interjectional phrase *BY THE MASS* has a cognitive-expressive function signalling reflection.

(7): Hamlet: My father, me thinks I see my father.

Horatio: **O** where my lord?

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 2)

(8): Polonius: And then, sir, does he this – he does – what was

I about to say? **By the mass**, I was about to say something.

Where did I leave?

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 1)

Conative interjections demand attention, action or a response from an auditor. A *Sh!* directed at someone is a signal for silence and *Eh?* in the right context conveys a request for repetition of information. Lastly, phatic interjections establish and maintain communication through the use of vocalisation items. During a conversation, *MHM*, *UH-HUH*, *RIGHT* and *YEAH*, for instance, are channelled back to the speaker as signals of attention and response (Ameka: 113-114).

Due to their context-boundedness, interjections may serve multiple pragmatic functions. Even though the perceived predominant function determines their classification, they may be associated with other classification categories (Ameka 1992: 114). It is possible, then, that *MHM* could signal both a phatic and a cognitive expressive function during a conversation. Given the conversational topic, the speaker may wish to signal 'Yes, I'm still listening to you and I'm processing your information to make up my own mind. Please go on'. Similarly, interjections may be both emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive or have

an integrated conative element. In example (9), the secondary interjection PEACE serves both a cognitive-expressive and a conative function, as it signals disagreement with the previous statement and a request:

- (9): Feste: Apt, in good faith, vert apt. Well, go thy way. If Sir Toby would leave  
Drinking thou wert a as witty a piece of Eve's flesh an any in Illyria.  
Maria: **Peace**, you rogue, no more o'that. Here comes my lady: make your  
excuse wisely, you were best.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

### 2.2.3 Pragmatic noise

Finding the term interjection too problematic, Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 199-200) have introduced the notion of pragmatic noise. The elements that comprise pragmatic noise are morphologically simple, do not have homonyms in other word classes and have pragmatic or discursal meanings. Moreover, the majority are sentence-initial elements and may have an atypical phonological structure, they are sound symbolic to a degree. In other words, they overlap with Ameka's (1992) primary interjections. A vital difference, however, lies in Culpeper and Kytö's (2010: 200) description of pragmatic noise as "relatively natural noises". The elements have a varying degree of lexicality but none can be regarded as fully lexical. Pragmatic noise may also be viewed as a subclass of pragmatic markers or discourse markers (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 200).

There are several reasons for why Culpeper and Kytö (2010) have coined a new term when the elements they are concerned with clearly overlap with Ameka's primary interjections. One reason is that the category of pragmatic noise allows for the inclusion of elements not typically dealt with in analyses involving interjections. According to Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 199), these analyses fail to account for non-fluency element such as UM, HUM and EM. In addition, the written presentations of laughter - HA, HA and HA, HA, HA and HE, HE and HO, HO - are not typically viewed as interjections either. By designating these elements as part of the pragmatic noise category, Culpeper and Kytö fronts them as worthy of scholarly study.

Further, they find the dominating view that interjections mainly signal emotion too limited. Even though Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 201, 205) agree that Ameka's (1992)

functional classification of interjections reaches beyond the emotive usage, they observe that most researchers view display of emotion as one of interjections' main characteristics. Quirk *et al* (1985: 853), for instance, claim that "interjections are purely emotive words". For this reason, Culpeper and Kytö favour pragmatic noise and reject interjection as an adequate term as it "obscures the range of pragmatic and discursal functions that interjections have" (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 201).

Culpeper and Kytö (2010) also disagree with the view that interjections, along with other features of spoken language, do not really belong in written grammar. The interjection is traditionally viewed as a peripheral element that is not well-integrated into the grammatical clause due to its syntactic independence. Accordingly, interjections have been considered unworthy of study (Ameka 1992: 112). In traditional grammar, the sentence, as the maximal grammatical unit, is divided into smaller units according to form and grammatical function. The main and subordinate clauses that make a simple, compound or complex sentence contain the functional elements subject, predicator, object, compliment and adverbial. These are further divided into five phrase categories: noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, adverb phrase and prepositional phrase (Hewings and Hewings 2005: 5-6) Interjections and other features of spoken discourse do not fit nicely into this structure. Biber *et al* (1999: 224) refer to such features as non-clausal units; analysable only outside the clause structure. Example (10) contains both clausal and non-clausal units. The clause boundaries are marked with || and non-clausal units are in bold.

- (10) B: || So this was your mother's? ||  
A: || **No**, || **my father's**. ||  
B: || **Your father's mother?** ||  
A: || **Yeah**. || Her name was Martha <name> ||  
B: || **Uh huh**. ||

(Biber *et al* 1999: 1070)

Non-clausal material frequently occurs in spoken discourse due to spontaneous production, shared context and interaction with other conversation participants. The result is a discourse structure that is not as neatly organised as a planned, written sentence or even compatible with written syntax (Biber *et al* 1999: 224-225). This has led to the assumption that spoken and written grammar are radically different (Leech 2000: 704). Culpeper and Kytö (2010) follow Leech (2000: 675-676) who argues that spoken and written grammar are united in a basic



grammatical system where the differences between the two discourses are realised in the different implementations of that system. Accordingly, the concept of the sentence, with its traditional written affiliation, is not a component of written grammar but “an orthographic unit (distinguishable by initial capitalization and final punctuation)” (Leech 2000: 712).

If spoken and written discourse are united in the same grammatical system, then perhaps the sentence needs to be abandoned as the primary focus in grammatical analysis (Leech 2000: 712). Biber *et al* (1999: 1039, 1069-1072) have introduced the notion of the C-unit as a suitable replacement. Although they have primarily spoken discourse in mind, Leech (2000:712) argues that the C-unit also “provides a suitable working framework [...] for written grammar”. The C-unit may comprise independent clausal and non-clausal units. A clause unit “is a structure consisting of an independent clause together with any dependent clauses embedded within it” (Biber *et al* 1999: 1069). In contrast, an independent non-clausal unit “cannot be analysed in terms of clause structure and [...] is not analysable as part of any neighbouring clause” (Biber *et al* 1999: 224). In traditional sentence analysis, example (11) would be analysed as a complex sentence comprised of two units, a main clause and a subordinate clause. Biber *et al* (1999), on the other hand, would consider the sentence as one C-unit.

(11) || Jack played in the garden while I was working. ||

(Hewings and Hewings 2005: 5)

Example (12) consists of two C-units, one non-clausal unit, marked in bold, and one independent clausal unit. || marks the boundary of a C-unit.

(12) || **Yeah.** || Her name was Martha <name> ||

(Biber *et al* 1999: 1070)

When analysed as C-units, clausal and non-clausal material are granted equal status (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 201). This has an important consequence for interjections, due to their oral and non-clausal nature and their status within grammatical analysis. The view taken in the present study is that there is no reason why interjections should not be regarded as a part of the grammatical structure.

#### 2.2.4 Challenging Ameka

The present study follows the main foundation in Ameka's (1992) definition of interjections. In other words, interjections are viewed as lexical words that belong in a word class of their own where they are divided into primary and secondary ones. On the functional level, these primary and secondary interjections are context-bound and convey speaker emotions, attitudes and wants; they also assist in establishing and maintaining communication between speaker and addressee. Consequently, interjections are functionally diverse and should not be restricted to an emotive usage.

However, there are issues with Ameka's (1992) full description of interjections that need to be addressed. His claims that interjections are immediate and unintentional responses that always constitute an intonation unit of their own and do not have addressees (Ameka 1992: 108-109) are not entirely unproblematic. In fact, these claims are part of the reasons why the entire concept of the interjection is too problematic for Culpeper and Kytö (2010) to adopt in their studies. They are not alone in questioning Ameka's (1992) claims. Taavitsainen (1995), Wilkins (1992), Libert (2012) and O'Connell and Kowal (2009) all present refutational arguments that suggest a revision of the above claims is in order.

As to the spontaneous, unintentional nature of interjections, Wilkins (1992: 149-151) notes the relativity of spontaneity. He argues that even though a response is perceived as impulsive, it is likely to have encoded within it elements of assessment, selection and censorship. A person who experiences sudden pain may moderate the cry of pain from *Shit!* to *Ouch!* if swearing is inappropriate in the situational context. This also implies that interjections are sometimes used intentionally with a communicative intent. As Wilkins (1992: 149) puts it:

English informants with children have observed that when their children say "Ow!", it is not usually the case that the children are experiencing any real or significant pain. Instead, children tend to use this interjection knowing that it will get their parents' attention, and knowing that it can be used to start a chain of events that will lead to their sibling getting into trouble.

The intentional use of interjections for communicative purposes is also noted by Taavitsainen (1995) in her study of Early Modern English interjections. In addition, Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 231, 291) note that pragmatic noise is occasionally used intentionally in their Early

Modern English material. For instance, ALAS is used to feign emotional distress to in a comical scene. The view that interjections are intentional is shared by the present study, which also suggests that intentional use in play-texts at least partly reflects intentional use in real spoken discourse.

If interjections may be used deliberately to achieve specific means, it must mean that there is an addressee involved. Paralleling Libert's (2012: 291) concern, the present study finds Ameka's (1992: 109) claim that interjections do not have addressees at odds with his statement that conative and phatic interjections "may be directed at people, but they are not addressed to people". Libert (2012: 291) does not elaborate his concern, but states that he finds it difficult to see the difference between directing interjections at people and addressing them to people. It seems strange that interjections should be without addressees yet serve functions that clearly involve an addressee. Although Libert (2012: 286-287) identifies interjections as having conversation valence 1, that is, they may be uttered in the presence of the speaker only and still be pragmatically meaningful utterances, he recognises that low conversation valence does not exclude communication with an addressee. Moreover, Taavitsainen (1995) and Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 225) observe that high frequency interjections such as O, OH and AH frequently collocate with vocatives. Vocatives are, according to Salmon (1967 [1987: 40]), addressee-oriented and characteristic of spoken language.

However, the noted collocation of interjections with vocatives poses a challenge as Ameka (1992: 108) defines separation from the co-occurring utterance through a pause as one of the main characteristics of interjections. Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 209) point out that "it is most unlikely if a vocative follows that the pragmatic noise element will be an independent intonation unit" and suggest that O and OH represent "something less interjection-like" (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 277) when they collocate with a vocative. O'Connell and Kowal (2009: 297, 302) disagree that interjections are always separated by a pause. Studying primary and secondary interjection in a film production of Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, they conclude that "as in all our previous research on interjections, their temporal separation by both preceding and following pauses, as hypothesized by Ameka (1992), was not confirmed" (O'Connell and Kowal 2009: 297). They state that Mrs. Bennet's OH in example (13) "is embedded in her discourse rather than isolated by both preceding and following pauses" (O'Connell and Kowal 2009: 302) but do not present further evidence to support their refutation of Ameka's (1992) claim.

(13) Mrs. Bennet: “Oh, Mr. Bennet, God has been very good to us.”

(O’Connell and Kowal 2009: 302)

### 2.2.5 The approach of this study

The present study agrees with Ameka (1992) that interjections should be treated as members of a separate word class. The members are heterogenous and context-bound and comprise primary and secondary interjections. In the present study, primary interjections are words not otherwise used. They may be monosyllabic such as OH, LA, PUH and TUSH and polysyllabic such as ALAS, PARDIE, HA HA and DIABLO. Secondary interjections have homonyms in other word classes. Words belonging to both groups are identified as interjections when they signal speaker attitudes, that is, emotions such as fear, joy, jealousy and approval and cognitive reactions such as evaluation, rejection, acceptance and doubt and serve communicative purposes. The latter point that interjections may be used intentionally. Interjections may have, but do not require, an addressee and are pragmatically meaningful even when uttered in the presence of the speaker only. The view in the present study is that interjections may or may not constitute an intonation unit by themselves as neither case excludes mental reactions and communicative intent.

It is understandable that Culpeper and Kytö (2010) are reluctant towards the term interjection. As section 2.2.1 and 2.2.4 discuss, there are clearly problems that influence how they are defined by various researchers, such as lexicality, emotive affiliation and whether they form independent or embedded intonation units. Culpeper and Kytö (2010) tackle these problems by presenting pragmatic noise as an alternative to the term interjection. The term pragmatic noise allows them to account for findings that do not comply with some of the traditional views on interjections, such as intentional, addressee-oriented use that reflect a wide selection of functions, not just the emotive function. At the same time, researchers such as Taavitsainen (1995), Wilkins (1992), Libert (2012) and O’Connell and Kowal (2009) address the same problems while retaining the term interjection. This implies that Culpeper and Kytö’s (2010) research on pragmatic noise also applies to interjections, as the material, overlapping with primary interjections, is more or less the same.

Retaining both terms in the present study would be problematic: How should pragmatic noise and primary interjections be separated? A possible solution would be to accept Ameka’s (1992) full definition of interjections and refer to those elements that do not

fully comply with that definition as pragmatic noise. For instance, elements followed by a vocative would be pragmatic noise and not interjections. Laughter and hesitations would also be identified as pragmatic noise, although these could just as easily be considered as primary interjections. In fact, Levisen (2019) champions laughter interjections in a recent study. Nevertheless, the two categories pragmatic noise and primary interjections appear to be at odds with each other, as the acceptance of the notion of pragmatic noise involves the rejection of full lexicality and primary interjections' status as full-fledged words. Consequently, the present study views Culpeper and Kytö's (2010) work on pragmatic noise as part of the continuous revision of interjections, rather than a testament for the need of a new term.

## **2.3 The world of Elizabethan drama**

### 2.3.1 Public and private playhouses

In the 1570s, two similar yet different kinds of buildings emerged in England and Italy: the Elizabethan playhouse and the Italianate theatre. Both had three spaces within the building itself, a physical space for the audience and performers and an imaginary space, created through the collective pretence of players and spectators. However, the two buildings had a contrasting approach towards the creation of dramatic illusion. Whereas the Italianate theatre magically made worlds appear and disappear through elaborate scenic design, the Elizabethan playhouse relied on the power of the human mind to create the place of action (Longman 2016: 29-31). This is eloquently illustrated in the prologue of *Henry V*:

And let vs, Cyphers to this great Accompt,  
On your imaginarie Forces worke.  
Suppose within the Girdle of these Walls  
Are now confin'd two mightie Monarchies,  
Whose high, vp-reared, and abutting Fronts,  
The perillous narrow Ocean part asunder.  
Peece out our imperfections with your thoughts:  
Into a thousand parts diuide one Man,  
And make imaginarie Puissance.  
Thinke when we talke of Horses, that you see them.

Printing their proud Hooves i'th receiuing Earth:  
For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our Kings,  
Carry them here and there:

*(Henry V: Enter Prologue)*

The Elizabethan commercial playhouses were cheap, open-spaced arenas where a penny at the door bought a standing place in the sun-lit yard and a penny more gave access to the galleries where one could stand more comfortably or even have a seat. A third penny provided a comfortable cushion (Hattaway 2005: 18, 46-47). The galleries were located in the shade at the sides, behind and above the stage. This was very practical for the more privileged part of the audience, as the shade protected the valuable vegetable-dyed clothes from the bleaching sun. The stage itself was in the south-west part of the yard, where the actors too were sheltered from the afternoon sun (Moseley 2007: 27-28). It is unarguably more comfortable to perform in a cool space; however, the position of the stage had been chosen with more than comfort in mind. The costumes, also vegetable-dyed, were expensive (Moseley 2007: 27).

Most public playhouses were located on the South Bank of the Thames, outside London jurisdiction. The City magistrates' hostile attitude towards plays, players and playhouses (Moseley 2007: 20) placed restraints on theatrical companies. Across the Thames on Surrey side, they were less restricted in their topical performance choices. The area fell under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Winchester and was known for its dubious entertainment such as the bloody sport of bear-baiting and brothels. The bishop approved and even collected rent from the many prostitutes located there (Stern 2004: 14, 18-19).

Words enjoyed a prime position in Elizabethan playhouses. Just as modern concert halls are designed to accommodate different soundscapes, the Renaissance public playhouses were constructed to enhance aural input. Gurr (2012: 3-4) notes that all pre-Restoration playhouses had the stage in centre, resulting in the audience having proximity to the performing voices. In addition, the scale and diameter of most playhouses were well-suited to accommodate the range of the human voice. The wooden building material, the polygonal shape and the stage all projected sound waves effectively. Nevertheless, the players relied on the entire acting space for the distribution of sound to their listener, as the volume of their voices was at the mercy of seasonal and atmospheric conditions. It seems too that some players were noted for a particular sound, such as Edward Alleyn's bellowing and the bass sounds at the Fortune (Cerasano 2002: 199-200). In contrast, a softer style could be adopted in the private playhouses. While the more esteemed part of the audience was seated in the

galleries in the commercial playhouses, the dearest seats were closest to the stage in the private ones (Foakes 1994: 31).

Private indoor playhouses were more expensive and exclusive. The admission fee would have cost a worker more than a week's wage. Seating was guaranteed, although the most comfortable seats came at a cost. In contrast to the public theatres, the private playhouses had simple stage lighting that added to the visual experience of a play (Moseley 2007: 25). The footlights and chandeliers that made the stage light needed regular trimming and replacing, which resulted in intervals roughly every half hour. Also, untended candles posed a huge risk not only to the playhouse itself but to the entire timbered city. The audience needed entertainment as the candles were tended to keep boredom at bay. For this reason, private theatre-goers enjoyed music in the form of lutes, flutes and boy singer between acts. The artificial lighting also required a smaller stage to keep the candle expenses at a manageable level (Stern 2004: 30, 32).

The exclusiveness and comforts of the private playhouses did not prevent members of high society with heavy purses to attend a play in a public playhouse. In fact, the commercial theatres became a place where the strict social boundaries were seemingly put aside. Rank and gender were immaterial when it came to the judgement of play and performance. Inside the playhouse, every voice had an equal say (Moseley 2007: 28). Moreover, the dramatic form was equally accessible to all members of society, regardless of their literacy skills (Foakes 1994: 35). The plays furnished audiences with jests, one-liners, flirtatious language and anecdotes for later use. Plays also enabled them to enrich their vocabulary with new terms and phrases borrowed from merchants or coined by the dramatist, who knew that vibrant language drew crowds (Stern 2004: 20-21).

### 2.3.2. Attitudes towards plays, players and playhouses

In Late Elizabethan England, where the pulpit and the stage were the only available mass media (Moseley 2007: 22), the views on plays, players and playhouses were divided: while some argued fiercely against the corruptive and subversive power of the stage, others recognised that attending a play offered a pleasant opportunity for recreation and public display of wealth. Given that the governing authorities viewed the playhouses as the Devil's playground and a space that challenged and subverted the natural order of things, it is understandable why most public theatres were located beyond the lawful and critical reach of

the London magistrates. They frequently lamented plays, players and playhouses' popularity among the masses (Moseley 2007: 20-21).

The hostility among Puritans and the magistrates of the city of London had its basis in several, often interrelated issues. Not only were the players themselves viewed as no better than vagrants, forced to tour in the provinces when the plague closed the playhouses, but they also bypassed the law through aristocratic patrons. In addition, they offended religious doctrine and commercial well-being by performing during Lent and on the Sabbath, profiting on recreation and keeping citizens from their work and churchly duties in the afternoon (Hattaway 2005: 42-44). Labour was rapidly becoming a commodity and idle hands were bad news for the economy. Moreover, idleness kept the Devil busy (Moseley 2007: 22). He presumably found plenty of work in the playhouses, if one is to trust a letter the Archbishop of Canterbury received in February 1592:

To which places also do usually resort great numbers of light and lewd disposed persons, as harlots, cutpurses, cozeners, pilferers, and such like, and there, under the colour of resort of those places to hear the plays, devise divers evil and ungodly matches, confederacies, and conspiracies, which by means of the opportunity of the place cannot be prevented nor discovered, as otherwise they might be.

(Lord Mayor 1592, as cited in Hattaway 2005: 45)

The moral condemnation of plays, players and playhouses also included attire. Companies had a rich supply of costumes and it was common that they purchased clothes from the aristocracy. This posed a problem for the keepers of the natural order of things. Clothes made the man in Early Modern England. By law, gold, silver and certain fabrics were reserved for the higher ranks, and even the height of one's hat indicated social position. Consequently, it was highly problematic for some that a mere player became indistinguishable both in speech and dress from a gentleman, a lord or even royalty (Moseley 2007: 22-23). Worse still, players who appeared in costume outside the playhouse to collect professional praise risked being so convincingly gentlemanly in attire and manner that he be mistaken for one, by others and by himself. The players at the Rose were threatened with a forty pound fine for such an offence (Palfrey and Stern 2007: 46, 501). In addition, the lavish costumes subverted the Puritan doctrine of simplicity (Hattaway 2005: 43). It is perhaps no wonder, then, that people attending a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1578 could hear the following damning words from the pulpit:



Look but upon the common plays in London, and see, the multitude that flocketh to them and followeth them. Behold the sumptuous theatre houses, a continual monument of London's prodigality and folly. But I understand they are now forbidden because of the plague. I like the policy well if it hold still, for a disease is but lodged or patched up that is not cured in the cause, and the cause of plagues is sin, if you look to it well: and the cause of sin are plays: therefore the cause of plague are plays.

(White 1578, as cited in Moseley 2007: 23)

Perhaps more unsettling still was the daily display of boys cross-dressing as women. Teenage boys had to play the female roles as there was a strong resistance towards female players. Acting and acting companies had for the most part been the man's domain since ancient times. Cross-dressing was considered a sign of immorality and wickedness and the boys were thus corrupted through their adoption of a female dress on stage (Cerasano 2002: 209). Cross-dressing also offended the established notions of sexuality and gender. Just as a noble's discarded clothes worn by a player devilishly disrupted the social order, boys in female dresses questioned the naturalness of sex by suggesting it be "a construct of clothes and language" (Moseley 2007: 23).

Despite massive critique, commoners and nobles alike flocked to the public and private playhouses in the afternoon and early evening, having seen the hoisted flags in the morning signalling the plays of the day. The colour indicated what kind of play to expect, black for tragedy, white for comedy and purple for history (Moseley 2007: 26). The general public was positive towards plays and playhouses. Attending the playhouse was an appreciated recreational activity and some attended plays to be seen. Drama was also taught in schools and universities. The swaying rhetoric used during performance, accompanied by signifying gestures, trained young men in the skill of speech and persuasion. These were important tools in gaining and retaining authority and power (Moseley 2007: 27, 49).

The mixed attitude towards plays, players and playhouses may also be connected to the appreciation of the hidden political nature of drama. In the histories, for instance, present problems could easily be redressed in the shape of past narratives. The pretence of the stage created an arena for questions otherwise too dangerous in the public sphere. Plays also frequently reflected current political and economic ideals. Consequently, issues presented in the plays appealed to anyone who craved for wealth, status and securing a profitable marriage (Moseley 2007: 17, 29).

### 2.3.3 Expectations and challenges in the playhouse

For a modern audience, going to the theatre involves, among other things, sitting quietly in a dark space while watching the performance. The general agreement is that audience response is restricted to laughter and ovation and that refreshments are enjoyed during the interval. An Elizabethan audience, on the other hand, had completely different expectations to the public playhouse experience. The bright and intimate conditions made it easy for playhouse visitors to interact with both the players and each other. They were very loud and responsive. They chatted, cheered, hissed, clapped and even threw apples and nuts onto the stage if they disliked the play (Charry: 2017: 134). In addition, the audience returned jokes to the stage, cracked nuts and enjoyed other refreshments (Cerasano 2002: 198). Moseley (2007: 29-30) comments that it must have been a rather smelly atmosphere. The playhouse odour would have been a mixture of beer, wine, fruit, onions, garlic, leeks and urine - the business of the day being done against a wall or in a bucket where one stood or sat.

In addition to the demanding conditions in the playhouse during performances, Elizabethan players also faced challenges off stage. The dramatic world was highly competitive, with a continuous demand for fresh plays (Moseley 2007: 48) to keep and satisfy a seasoned and, in some cases, a very selective audience (Ceresano 2002: 202). Hattaway (2005: 47-48) explains that each company made sure it had enough plays in its repertoire to keep up in the competition for audiences. Henslowe kept record of the Admiral's Men's performances in his diary and the entries for June 1596 reveal that the company presented "fifteen different plays over twenty-five playing days" (Hattaway 2005: 50). Moseley (2007: 48) estimates that the companies performed between 50 and 60 different plays each year. Obviously, companies needed skilled and versatile players who could cope with an extensive repertoire and convincing improvisation. The latter skill would presumably have been of extra importance on 7<sup>th</sup> February 1601, when the Lord Chamberlain's Men revived *Richard II* at a special request - having only one day to prepare (Hattaway 2005: 51).

Evidently, the pressure of an extensive repertoire and the limited time to learn lines affected the way the players rehearsed. A plot summary of each scene was hung up backstage for consultation and the players received a scroll with their speaking part (Moseley 2007: 48). A surviving sample of a professional player's part, that of Edward Alleyn's part as Orlando from 1591 reveals information about the scrolls the players received. It contains Alleyn's lines only, short cues and simple stage directions. If the format represents the prevailing

player manuscript practice in the playhouses, it suggests, along with the plot summaries in the tiring house, that brutal memorising demanded simplicity (Hattaway 2005: 53-54). It also seems to suggest that for the players, the opening performance would be their first experience of the play as a whole (Moseley 2007: 48). Only shareholders attended the reading of a play prior to rehearsal (Stern 2004: 76).

#### 2.3.4 Boy players in professional companies

The Renaissance boy players were part of a relatively long tradition; boys had taken part in processions and pageants since the thirteenth century (Charry 2017: 133). The boys joined adult companies between the age of ten and thirteen (Hattaway 2005: 83) and were apprentices to master players who trained them in music, rhetoric and grammar. Payment came in the form of food and lodging (Charry 2017: 133). The training also included the meaning of gestures and body language and general ideas about blocking, that is, the player's movements on stage. Knowing where to position oneself when acting a given role in a given scene was crucial on the Elizabethan stage, due to the limited rehearsal time. For example, court scenes would have a similar, recognisable appearance with pre-set, specific blocking (Moseley 2007: 48-49). If anything went wrong during performance, experienced and inexperienced players alike had a set of movements and gestures as a rescue.

Given the challenging conditions in the playhouse during performance, it would be a great risk to leave a boy player alone on stage (Moseley 2007: 45). It took practice and skill to handle a loud and responsive audience. Stern (2004: 79) notes that there is evidence in Shakespeare's plays that master and apprentice often strictly had dialogue with the other, allowing them to rehearse together. This kind of dialogue structure also prevented inexperienced boy players from being left alone on stage. However, as the boys gained more experience and developed their talent, they could be trusted to play all-female scenes without the presence of an adult player. Further, Charry (2017: 133) suggests that "plays with prominent female roles were probably written keeping specific outstanding boy actors in mind". Moseley (2007: 45) illustrates this by noting that the boy who played Juliet must have been gifted as he was left alone on stage and was also trusted the tragedy's climax. Customised female roles also included singing. Stern notes that between 1601 and 1604, there

was an accomplished boy singer in the Lord Chamberlain's Men, who played both Ophelia in *Hamlet* and Desdemona in *Othello*.

It was common that female roles had to be adapted as the company boys grew and their voices started to break. Suddenly there was no need for the chopine, a shoe with "a monstrously high cork heel" (Stern 2004: 70). Stern (2004: 70) suggests that a sudden growth might explain why Rosalind in *As you like it* refers to her uncommon height even though Celia has been described as the taller one earlier in the play. A breaking voice sometimes resulted in songs being redistributed from one character to another. In the beginning of *Twelfth Night*, Viola plans to entertain count Orsino with her good voice and musical skills. However, when Orsino requests her to sing the song they heard the night before, one of his attendants replies that Feste the clown should sing it. It is possible that the redirection of the song from Viola to Feste is a result of a broken voice, although it might as well have been a company wish that it be given to their new Fool (Stern 2004: 70) Robert Armin, who replaced Will Kempe (Moseley 2007: 45).

Cerasano (2002: 210) notes that some historians speculate whether all female roles were played by apprentice boy players. They suggest that strong heroines such as Cleopatra and Lady Macbeth may just as well have been played by older boys with broken voices or even by adult players. A distinct male resonance would affirm a female ruler's credibility and power and enhance the comic effect of mature, comical characters. Moseley (2007: 45) states that it would be unproblematic to give the company Fool a comical female role such as the Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*. At the same time, he notices that strong heroines come in bulks in Shakespeare's work, suggesting the presence of one or more talented boys. Further, White (1998: 84) explains that Shakespeare would not have written demanding female roles if there had not been capable boys to play them.

### 2.3.5 Theatrical production as written text

In 1557, the Stationers' Company was granted a royal charter that exclusively gave the company members or holders with a royal licence printing- and book-dealing rights. Titles intended for publishing were required to be entered in the Stationers' Register and be approved by the authorities. This not only restricted the printing industry to London and protected the Stationers from unwanted competition and secured copyright, but also gave the Crown a means to suppress profane and blasphemous writing (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008:

27-28). Unlike 21<sup>st</sup> century playwrights who enjoy full textual ownership by law, Early Modern dramatists had no legal claim to their plays. Ownership belonged to whoever entered a manuscript at the Stationer's Register and payed a certain sum to the stationer's guild (Stern 2004:141). Still, many printing houses obtained some of their material in a dubious manner and failed to register it pre-print. Illegal titles found their way to the market as first publishing also gave copyright to printing houses (Finkelstein and McCleery 2013: 63).

Both acting companies and printing houses could hope to profit from the printed versions of successful plays. It has been suggested that although many playwrights and companies shared the opinion that lines written to be spoken should not be forced onto the printed page, they recognised that playbooks advertised and thus benefited current productions. Fresh titles were prized and if an old play was revived, newly printed copies might stimulate playhouse attendance. Printing also served as a second chance when plays failed in the playhouse (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 33-34, 163). Printing- and publishing houses had little to gain from single prints due to various legal fees, but would gamble on a play's success and profited well from reprints of popular plays (Stern 2005: 47). The title pages promised newly corrected, enlarged and augmented playbooks, ensuring readers of the textual proximity to the ongoing adaptations and editing of the playhouse manuscripts (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 33, 150).

Despite the profit, playbooks were viewed as short-lived popular literature by the printing houses. Generally, not much care was put into the setting and printing of play-texts. The printers' efforts and expensive materials were better spent on more highly esteemed works (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 33). Hotchkiss and Robinson (2008: 26, 138, 141) suggests that the absence of general patents that restricted the number of printing houses that were allowed to print and publish plays reflects the disregard for the genre as literature. To print a play, one only needed a granted licence from the Master of the Revels. In contrast, exclusive, time-framed patents were given for the printing of Bibles and works in the classical languages. Such patents disadvantaged the smaller printing houses. What is more, the preface in playbooks sometimes stressed that the printed version served only as a poor recreation of the performance (Hotchkiss and Robinson 163).

One also has to keep in mind that the printing format reflected textual status in Early Modern England. For roughly a sixpence, London residents could purchase a quarto version of current popular plays (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 33). The quarto was the most common printing format in Early Modern England as it was inexpensive to produce. Four pages were printed on both sides of a sheet which was then folded twice and cut into eight

pages (van Gelderen 2014: 161). The large folio was the least complicated yet most expensive format. The sheets, containing two pages on each side, was folded once (Hotchkiss and Robinson 2008: 36) and the format was commonly reserved for bibles and the ancient classics. In other words, serious written works (Stern 2004: 47). Plays could hardly be regarded as serious writing and were thus well suited as inexpensive quartos one could keep in a pocket (Moseley 2007: 6, 49).

Implying that plays were worthy of being published as folios, then, would be very offensive. For this reason, Ben Johnson's publication of his plays and poems in folio format in 1616 caused a public outcry. Not only had something as common as plays been printed in a high-status format, but Johnson had also presumptuously titled the book as a work. Critical voices also spoke against the First Folio version of Shakespeare's plays in 1623, finding it outrageous that plays be printed on excellent paper (Stern 2004: 47-48). Nevertheless, the First Folio's collators, Heminges and Condell, affirmed the Folio's authority by claiming that readers of published quarto versions of Shakespeare's plays had been "abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors".<sup>4</sup> Through the folio, they asserted Shakespeare's reputation as a playwright and the status of plays in general (Stern 2004: 47).

Before any play could be printed – or staged, for that matter - the companies had to get a fair copy of the play in question censored and approved by the Master of the Revels. His responsibility was to make sure that the language to be performed in public was not too profane, blasphemous or politically subversive. The playhouse prompter risked a reprimand if he had not purged the manuscript sufficiently in advance (Stern 2004: 144-145). In 1633, the King's Men's prompter received an angry note from the Master of the Revels: "Mr. Knight, In many things you have saved mee labour; yet wher your judgment or penn fayld you, I have made boulde to use mine. Purge ther parts, as I have the booke" (Herbert 1633, as quoted in Stern 2004: 145). Still, as Moseley (2007: 47) notes, the strictness of the Master of Revels' censorship varied. Plays were ready to be written into parts and be rehearsed only when they had the Master's signature. As a consequence, the 'Allowed Book' was a company's most prized possession (Moseley 2007: 47).

In 1606, profane and blasphemous stage language became a major concern in the censorship of the Master of the Revels, through the Act to Restrain Abuses of Players. Even though plays were subjected to such policing prior to the Act, the 1606 legislation made stage

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/Second+page+of+the+preliminaries/mode/2up>

profanity a legal offence (Hughes 2006: 415, 417) and resulted in revision of playhouse manuscripts. The Act to Restrain Abuses of Players stated that

if at any time or times after the end of this present Session of Parliament, any person or persons, doe or shall in any Stage-play, Interlude, Shew, Maygame, or pageant iestingly, and profanely speake, or vse the holy Name of God, or of Christ Iesus, or of the holy Ghost, or of the Trinitie, which are not to be spoken but with feare and reuerence, [? he or they] Shall forfeit for euery such offence by him or them committed tenne Pounds;

(as cited in Gazzard 2010: 459)

The fine was severe. According to Gazzard (2010: 509), a hired player might initially expect £10 as an annual income and the whole company would be rewarded the same sum for a Court performance. Strict legislative enforcement would result in financial ruin. Interestingly, Shirley (1979: 10, as cited in Hughes 2006: 391) suggests a deliberate delay of the Act until the accession of James I, as it would not have gained the Queen's favour. Some speculate that the bill 'against usual and common swearing' failed to reach the second reading in 1601 because the Members of Parliament knew that their Sovereign, known for her foul language, would have refused to give Royal Assent (Hughes 2006: 166). King James I, in contrast, ascending the English throne as Scotland's censor, encouraged stricter legislation (McEnry 2006: 56).

Elizabethan plays were very much a work in progress where frequent revision was not only common but expected. A play's survival depended on adaptations to satisfy the competitive market where continuous alteration was a mark of quality (Stern 2005: 45). The result was that plays existed in multiple versions both on and off stage. Many of these alternative versions have been lost and are only alluded to through reference. For instance, the Lord Chamberlain's Men's Fool, Robert Armin, writes: "Ther are, as Hamlet saies, things called whips in store" (Armin 1608, as quoted in Stern 2005: 57). Hamlet never speaks these words in print and some scholars, noting the similarity to a quote in *Henry VI*, regard Armin's reference as a misremembrance. Others find it plausible that Armin's reference suggests a lost version of *Hamlet*, as he had acted in the play since its first performance. There is also the case of *Winter's tale*, where a character in first appearance asks the audience to remember a line that has never been spoken (Stern 2005: 52, 57).

## 2.4 Character and characterisation

### 2.4.1 Stanislavski's heritage

The construction of people and what they are like – their characteristics – is intrinsic to the dramatic genre. Although Aristotle argued that action is primary and the characters secondary agents (Culpeper 2001: 8), the characters and ultimately their characteristics are nonetheless important on stage and in film- and tv productions. Modern viewers are almost instinctively on the lookout for characters with whom they may connect. The reason for this is that 20<sup>th</sup> century and 21<sup>st</sup> century actors are trained in a system of dramatic preparation where character development involves a psychological investigation and combination of mind, body and spirit (O'Brian 2013: viii). As a result, character emerges in such naturalistic forms that reality and fiction become almost indistinguishable. This is the heritage of the Russian actor and director Konstantin Stanislavski's immensely influential and ground-breaking work on an actor's basic training. His method is known as 'The System' and continues to impact training and production organisation. Methods based on his work still dominate the Western dramatic world (Whyman 2013: 1, 138).

The dramatic illusion that modern theatre-goers expect is created through a combination of internal and external processes of characterisation. Stanislavski emphasises the creative process where the actors invest in the character they are to play and interact with it emotionally. That is, a role becomes alive only when actors have invested their own emotions in the character and felt the character's emotions in themselves. During the inner preparation to play Hamlet, for example, the actor needs to know what he himself would do if he returned to find his loving father dead and his mother married to his father's brother. Further, he needs to adopt Hamlet's feelings and experience what it is like to inhabit them (Benedetti 2010: 80- 81).

In the process of inner characterisation, there also needs to be in place an awareness of motivation and justification of actions. The actor must appreciate that there is a reason why the character just entered the scenic room. He or she came from somewhere else and knows where to go when it is time to leave. In addition, individual goals emerge as the scene progresses, for instance to prevent someone from leaving or to exit as quickly as possible. The identification of internal motivation, justification of actions and individual goals is crucial for the actor's understanding of a scene. The information may not be present in the play-text and must therefore be invented in the spirit of the play (Benedetti 2010: 88).



Once the inner character has been established, the physical characterisation emerges, either naturally or crafted from the outside. Stanislavski explains that it illustrates the internal life, which cannot be conveyed without a physical form. Embedded in bodily movement, manner of speech, clothing and mannerisms lie vital information about the characteristics of the dramatic persons presented on stage (Hapgood 2013: 1). For example, a firm step may be used to convey a confident, determined nature and high shoulders may indicate a nervous, insecure disposition. Likewise, mannerisms such as fiddling with a lock of hair or lighting a cigarette may, when they appear in certain contexts, reveal information about reaction patterns and the psychological state.

#### 2.4.2 An Elizabethan view of character

The Elizabethan audiences did not expect dramatic illusion on the same lines as 21<sup>st</sup> century theatre-goers. The conditions in the playhouse did not allow it. The modern theatre illusion is partly dependent on the hushed darkness that surrounds the audience. In such an environment, it is easy to forget the other members of the audience and be immersed in the action and characters presented on stage. The Elizabethans, on the other hand, never forgot where they were due to the bright and noisy atmosphere in the playhouse. The modern idea of illusion is unachievable in a space where talkative playhouse visitors are in full view of each other and refreshments are ordered and carried about. In addition, the interactive relationship between stage and audience was a constant reminder of the dual levels at play – the real and the constructed world, the imitator and the imitated (Hattaway 2005: 79). Players also stepped out of character to collect praise through acclamation before inhabiting it again (Moseley 2007: 49) and some maintained character only when speaking. Richard Burbage was among those players who were praised for staying in character after their lines had been spoken (Stern 2004: 27, 89).

The Early Modern preparation for a performance stands in sharp contrast to the long and complex process of inhabiting a character undertaken by present day actors. The limited time Elizabethan players had to their disposal to learn their lines from the rolls with their speaking part only naturally prevented any in-depth analysis of inner life. Moreover, the practise of doubling was common as a company's size did not match the number of characters and required extras. Only those playing leading characters were assigned single parts (Hattaway 2005: 71). The result must have been superficial and generic characterisation – at

least from a modern naturalistic perspective. Hattaway (2005: 73) points out that what counts as natural changes over time and that the Early Modern sense of natural acting cannot be compared with 21<sup>st</sup> century naturalism. In fact, contemporaries praised the naturalness presented on the Elizabethan stage:

How would it have joy'd brave Talbot (the terror of the French) to think that after he had lain two hundred years in his tomb, he should triumph again on the stage and have his bones new embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators at least (at several times), who, in the tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding?

(Nashe, early 1590s, as quoted in White 1998: 125)

What the audience expected to see was the exhibit of various passions. During preparation, players scanned their parts for strong emotions such as joy, grief, fear and anger and telling clues such as repetition and shifts from verse to prose. How to appropriately enact the identified passions was part of their training (Stern 2005: 79-82). Gestures and pronunciation conventionally accompanied the passions: "In a sorrowful parte, ye head must hang downe; in a proud, ye head must bee lofty; in an amorous, closed eies, hanging downe lookes, & crossed armes, in a hastie, fuming, & scratching ye head &c" (*The Cyprian Conqueror* ca. 1633, as quoted in Stern 2005: 82). The players skilfully pleased the audience with speedy transitions from one passion to the next as this was highly appreciated. In fact, acting was often referred to as 'passionating' (Stern 2005: 80).

It is easy to presume that in order to grasp Early Modern characterisation and character work; one must put aside 21<sup>st</sup> century ideas of character and Stanislavski's 'method'. However, the breaking down of parts into passions seems strangely similar to Stanislavski's basic actors training. Stern (2016: 104, 107-108) argues that the Russian actor and director's system of dramatic preparation is part of a long tradition that dates back to Classical theatrical practice which was mimicked in the Early Modern period. In fact, passion was seen as intrinsic to character and players in their preparation examined the character's emotions as well as their own. They knew, as written in *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* from 1604, that "the passion which is in our brest is the fountaine and origen of all externall actions" (Wright 1604: as cited in Stern 2016: 107). Elizabethan and Jacobean players emotionally inhabited the given parts, either by imagining or remembering genuine feelings. The latter came with the risk of being so absorbed in the part that the player lost his own self, a concern

later resonated by those who were sceptical towards Stanislavski's preparation and acting methods (Stern 2016: 108-109).

#### 2.4.3 Characterisation through language

Given that play-texts are oral in design, language is naturally an important tool in building a character and conveying character traits to other characters, actors and the audience. In accordance with Stanislavski, Lakoff (1990: 257 as cited in Culpeper 2001: 13) notes that "Language is an intrinsic component of personality. Linguistic style is an outgrowth of psychological style, and a diagnosis of it as well". This means that information about sociability, attitudes, intellect and social position and background is imbedded in linguistic choices and behaviours (Culpeper 2001: 13). For example, if a character continuously interrupts during a conversation, he or she may be characterised as rude, dominating, aggressive or as someone with a limited command of social and conversational conventions (Culpeper 2001: 163). Frequent use of taboo words may further support a negative impression. Intellect may be inferred through lexical richness and a standard accent. Studies have shown that these seem to be judged to mark success and high status. However, a standard accent could also be used to denote snobbery and villainy. In Hollywood, for instance, Received Pronunciation is often included as one of the villain's many trademarks (Culpeper 2001: 188, 206-207).

Early Modern audiences would have replied, if asked, that they went to hear a play and not to see one (Cerasano 2002: 199). Moseley (2007: 16) outlines an "audience of very skilled listeners alert to the slightest nuances of versification, of prose style, of rhetoric and of tone". They knew that imbedded in prose and verse were important character information. Verse and prose were used to mark the difference between high and low status characters. Royals and nobles spoke in verse while commoners and low status characters spoke in prose. However, that general convention was often disregarded as many Early Modern dramatists recognised the dramatic possibilities imbedded in shifts from verse to prose or from prose to verse within scenes and speeches. A change in form could mark a shift from the public to the private sphere, set the mood and denote subject matter (White 1998: 44-45) and Culpeper (2001: 215) explains that verse is the form of emotional and serious topics such as bereavement, guilt and passionate love.

Shakespeare used a mix of verse and prose to create dynamic characterisation and display character relations. In *Romeo and Juliet*, Mercutio, being a gentleman, speaks a fairly equal percentage of verse and prose. Culpeper (2001: 213, 215) explains that the prose is intrinsic to Mercutio's character, it reflects his flippant nature. The Nurse, on the other hand, speaks predominantly in verse. The high-status form represents her position as senior servant, her respected status and her conceit (Culpeper 2001: 213, 215). Ballard (2016)<sup>5</sup> notes that the occasional prose in Hamlet's first soliloquy marks the beginning disintegration of his composure. She further suggests that the blank verse soliloquies ascertain Hamlet's true royal character – despite him addressing everyone save his mother and Horatio in prose. Hamlet uses verse to denote trust, intimacy and his real regard for his mother, while prose serves the function of detachment and intellectual battle. Interestingly, both Hamlet and Henry V see prose as a useful tool in establishing light companionships. Hamlet creates a common ground with the travelling players and king Henry, disguised, gains the confidence of two soldiers (Ballard 2016).<sup>6</sup>

### 3. Material and methodology

#### 3.1. The data

Primary and secondary interjections and interjectional phrases were collected from *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*. As stated in section 2.2.5, the collection was based on the assumption that interjections can, but do not necessarily have to, constitute an intonation unit by themselves. They may be followed by a pause but that is not always the case. Therefore, elements that would be categorised as particles by Ameka are viewed as primary interjections in the present material. In addition, interjections have addressees, as illustrated in example (14):

(14) **Oh** good my Lord, I would speake a word with you.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene)

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>

Furthermore, elements not typically included in interjection studies such as laughter and hesitators are included in the present study. Importantly, the Early Modern grammarian Bullokar (1586, as cited in Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 212) includes laughing as one of the meanings that interjections convey. The term interjection is preferred to pragmatic noise, as discussed in section 2.2.5. The view here is that Culpeper and Kytö's (2010) work on pragmatic noise is as an important and influential contribution to the field of interjection studies, but that there is no need for a completely new term.

Interjectional phrases include both formal and informal swearing, that is, solemn oaths that bind the speaker in truth and action, and casual and directed profanity and blasphemy (Hughes 2006: xv-xvii). Elizabethan players and playgoers were well aware of the moral implications and weight of oaths and asseverations and would pay close attention to them (Kerrigan 2016: 2, 6), as honour, reputation and respectability relied on one's ability to have one's word trusted (Bromhead 2009: 11). Bromhead (2009: 6) notes that such phrases, typical for Early Modern English, have not survived into Modern English. They are therefore crucial in a study that seeks to ascertain the role of interjections and interjectional phrases in Late Elizabethan dramatic characterisation.

### **3.2 The material**

Surprisingly few samples of Shakespeare's hand have survived. Only six signatures and a section in the single surviving manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* have been authenticated (Edwards 2016).<sup>7</sup> For this reason, researchers turn to the earliest printed editions of Shakespeare's plays as the most authoritative sources: in particular, the First Folio and the early printed quarto versions. The first editions of Shakespeare's plays that were printed were quarto editions. As discussed in section 2.3.5, the quarto format was inexpensive and ideal for printed versions of popular plays. Modern critics and editors divide the existing Shakespeare quartos into good and bad versions. The good quartos are judged to have some kind of authority and may be traced back to Shakespeare's own foul papers, a scribal copy of a Shakespearean draft or a playhouse promptbook. The bad quartos on the other hand are so muddled and corrupted in language and content that they clearly lack any basis in an authorial text. They may have been produced from memory by an actor or a playhouse visitor, or based on shorthand notes taken during performance (Stern: 2004: 46).

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/early-shakespeare-sources-a-guide-for-academic-researchers-part-1>

Researchers also turn to the authoritative First Folio. It was collated in 1623 by the last two surviving members of the Lord Chamberlain's Men, Shakespeare's friends and fellow actors John Heminge and Henry Condell, who also partook in editing and printing supervision.<sup>8</sup> Neill and Wells and Wells (2008: 409) explain that they "were uniquely placed to obtain what they thought were the best copies of their colleague's work". Even though scholars acknowledge that some quarto versions may offer a text closer to the playhouse manuscript, they agree that the First Folio has a particular claim in being the more reliable version (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 409). In addition, Heminge and Condell's efforts resulted in the first published collection of Shakespeare's plays and the book is in fact the first edition of eighteen plays previously existing only in manuscript form, including *Twelfth Night*.<sup>9</sup>

Three substantive early versions of *Hamlet* have survived: the First and Second Quarto and the First Folio. Of these, the Folio, although flawed, is considered the most authoritative version. It is most probably based on a fair Shakespeare manuscript. The First Quarto, or the 'bad' quarto, was published in 1603 despite lack of publishing rights and careless printing (Hibbard 2008: 67-69, 124-125). In addition to muddled content, prose is capitalized to look like verse and passages that should have been in prose are set as verse. Moreover, the language in general is uneven, ranging from eloquence to shaky metre and grammar (Hibbard 2008: 67, 71-72). The Second Quarto on the other hand, published over 1604 and 1605, has more authority despite many shortcomings. Evidence strongly suggest that it was based upon the playwright's own foul manuscripts (Hibbard 2008: 89, 95-96).

Besides the First Folio version, *Othello* survives in a quarto edition, printed in 1622. The Quarto claims some authority, as it is widely agreed that it derives from either an authorial manuscript or a scribal copy of one. Still, the First Folio is also here given the higher authority (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 405, 431). Interestingly, is highly likely that the Quarto version of *Othello* was published without the King's Men's assent in 1622. Cordell and Heminge's work on the First Folio gave them reason to resist any publication of Shakespeare's plays (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 407).

For the present study, data was collected from the First Folio version of *Twelfth Night*, *Hamlet* and *Othello*, more specifically from Folger 68, digital images of which are available online.<sup>10</sup> There are 235 known copies of the First Folio, of which the Folger Shakespeare

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/shakespeares-first-folio>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/shakespeares-first-folio>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/To+the+Reader/mode/2up>

Library holds 82 copies, making this the world's largest collection.<sup>11</sup> Being regarded as the most authoritative version of the available early printed editions, the First Folio is the best choice as a data source. In addition to the First Folio, the Oxford Shakespeare edition of the three plays, with modernised spelling and revised punctuation, has been used as a control text in the collection of interjections and interjectional phrases.

The Oxford edition is particularly useful in the reading of *Hamlet* and *Othello*. As discussed in section 4.2, the First Folio copy texts were subjected to an expurgation of profane and blasphemous language. The Oxford edition supplies purged readings such as 'SWOUNDS and 'SBLOOD from the quarto versions of the plays. In addition, there are differences due to First Folio compositor error and Oxford editorial choice, making the two editions difficult to compare directly (see discussion in section 4.2). These additional interjectional phrases have been included in the presentation of interjections in Chapter 4; however, all the figures given in Chapters 4 and 5 represent the First Folio unless otherwise indicated. Important differences between the First Folio and the Oxford edition (usually representing the usage of the quarto editions of *Hamlet* and *Othello*) are commented upon in the discussion, and tables providing the figures based on the Oxford edition are given in an Appendix.

### 3.3 Data collection

Rather than using a digital corpus, the present study is based on manually collected data recorded in an Excel document together with a range of linguistic and non-linguistic variables. As Table 1 shows, the variables are as follows: Normalised base form, Oxford and First Folio spelling, interjection and phrase type, quote, play, act, scene and page number, the speaker, speaker character, gender and rank, the addressee, addressee character, gender and rank, context, function, emotion, cognitive attitude and collocation.

O Base form	Type	F Base form	Type	Ox spelling	F1 spelling	Quote	Play
Tush	pi	Tush	pi	Tush,	Tush,	Tush, tush, 't	H
Tush	pi	Tush	pi	tush,	tush,	Tush, tush, 't	H
Well	si	Well	si	Well,	Well,	Well, sit we	H
Peace	si	Peace	si	Peace,	Peace,	Peace, break	H
By heaven	ip	By heaven	ip	By heaven,	By Heaven	By heaven, I	H

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.folger.edu/shakespeare/first-folio/about-folger-folios>

Act	Scene	F1 page	Ox page	Speaker	Character	S Gender	S Class
1	1	152	145	Horatio	side	m	gent
1	1	152	145	Horatio	side	m	gent
1	1	152	145	Horatio	side	m	gent
1	1	152	146	Marcellus	side	m	sol
1	1	152	146	Horatio	side	m	gent

  

Addressee	Character	A Gender	A Class	Context	Function	Emotion	Cogn Att	Collocation
Barnardo	side	m	sol	comments on	co ex		rejection	sam int
Barnardo	side	m	sol	comments on	co ex		rejection	sam int
Barnardo	side	m	sol	Barnardo wa	co ex		agreement	
Barnardo	side	m	sol	Ghost sudde	con		dem ac	
Ghost	side	m	roy	Demands tha	con		dem rep	

Table 1. The categories included in the data collection

While a normalised base form is required for processing the data, recording Oxford and First Folio spelling is crucial for any reconsideration in identifying form and spelling variation, in addition to historical significance. Recording the formal type, that is, primary, secondary and phrase, is needed for both a general statistical analysis and in specific characterisation analysis. Noting quote, play, act, scene and page number make play-text consultation easy, as illustrated in Table 1.

Due to the context-boundedness of interjections, the discursal context, that is, who speaks to whom in what context, is of vital importance in the analysis of how interjections and phrases assist characterisation. The discursal context in the present material comprises speaker, addressee and their respective gender and rank, as shown in Table 1, and the conversational context. Example (15) illustrates the conversational context for one of the registered tokens of the secondary interjection WHY. It was collected from *Twelfth Night*, act 3, scene 4 and is spoken by Olivia:

- (15) Quote: Why, how dost thou, man? What is the matter with thee?  
Context: Malvolio is cross-grated and in yellow stockings and smiles vividly.  
Olivia does not understand strange his strange behaviour.

Determining speaker and addressee gender and may pose a challenge due to masquerading. In the present material, Viola assumes the identity of the gentleman Cesario and the boy player in *Hamlet* plays a queen in the Court performance. This was dealt with in the following way: When speaking as herself, Viola was registered as female and when speaking as Cesario, she was registered as female masked as male. The boy player speaks only on stage during the



Court performance and was registered as male masked as female. Consequently, the gender categories are male, female, male as female and female as male.

In the data collection, each character is registered according to rank and social position as described in the ‘The persons of the play’ overview which precedes the play in the Oxford edition and information given in the play-text itself. In *Hamlet* for example, Horatio is registered as a gentleman, Hamlet as royal, Ophelia as noble and Reynoldo as a servant. In *Twelfth Night*, Orsino is registered as noble, Malvolio as a steward and Maria as a waiting-gentlewoman. In *Othello*, Iago is registered as a soldier, Cassio as a lieutenant, Desdemona as noble and Othello as a general.

Such a detailed classification, while providing important information, is not very useful from the point of view of quantitative analysis. Following Lutzky (2016)<sup>12</sup>, the characters are therefore also divided into two overreaching groups in the analysis of interjections and interjectional phrases and social rank: The higher rank, comprising royalty, the nobility and the gentry, and the lower rank, comprising the rest. Lutzky (2016)<sup>13</sup> points out that such a division allows for comparison between the social strata without being too detailed. The more fine-grained social division is therefore referred to in Chapter 5 where relevant.

Just as with the gender category, determining speaker and addressee social rank and position may be challenging due to masquerading. Viola as Cesario was registered as noble masked as gentleman and the boy player during Court performance was registered as player masked as royal. In *Twelfth Night*, Feste the Fool pretends at a point to be a member of the clergy. When speaking as Master Topaz, Feste was registered as Fool masked as priest.

The collected interjections and interjectional phrases are categorised in accordance with Ameka’s (1992) functional classification of interjections, that is, into the emotive-expressive, cognitive-expressive or conative mode – see discussion in section 2.2.2 – as these have important implications for use and characterisation. A collected token may belong in several categories. Ameka (1992: 114) states that the categorisation of an interjection is based on the perceived dominating function. However, in a study that deals with interjections as a characterisation tool, it is important that tokens that may belong in several categories are registered accordingly. For instance, Horatio’s duplicated *ho* in “Hillo, ho, ho, my Lord!” may be interpreted as being exclusively conative. However, Horatio and Marcellus are looking for Hamlet, whom they last saw following the Ghost. Horatio has also expressed

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/17/lutzky/>

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/17/lutzky/>

concern for Hamlet in his previous line and this concern may be reflected in next line through the duplicated *но*. Accordingly, this token was registered as being both emotive-expressive and conative.

Phatic interjections are not found in the play-texts and are therefore not included in the present study. It may be noted, however, that Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 231-232) interpret the phatic category broadly and classify pragmatic noise used as a politeness strategy and empathy as phatic. This study includes such use in the emotive-expressive category. It may also be noted that the present study follows Ameka (1992: 113) in classifying surprise as an emotive-expressive sensation whereas Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 230) includes it in the cognitive-expressive function.

Lastly, for statistical and characterisation analysis purposes, it is useful to note collocations. An interjection or phrase may collocate with the same element, another element, a prepositional phrase or a vocative. In example (16), *ҒИЕ* collocates with a prepositional phrase, another primary interjection as well as the same primary interjection.

(16) *Fie on't! O Fie, fie!*

As noted in section 3.2, there are numerous minor discrepancies between the First Folio and the Oxford edition due to expurgation. In addition, there are differences due to compositor error and Oxford editorial choice, making the two editions difficult to compare directly (see discussion in section 4.2). All the figures are therefore based on the First Folio, unless otherwise stated; an alternative set of Tables, based on the Oxford edition, is given as an Appendix. The only significant difference between the two versions has to do with profanity, which was to some extent purged from the First Folio edition; here the Oxford edition includes what appear to be ‘uncensored’ forms taken from the quarto version, as explained in section 3.2.

## 4. Presentation of findings

### 4.1 Overview of the findings

Tables 2 and 3 provide an overview of the distribution of interjections and interjectional phrases in each play, given as tokens (Table 2) and types (Table 3). The primary interjections are by far the most commonly used, with 474 tokens in all, amounting to 46% of the overall data, while the interjectional phrases are the least frequent, with 197 tokens (19%).

Altogether, 141 different interjectional elements (or types) have been collected from the First Folio. Of these, 24 are classified as primary interjections, while 31 are secondary interjections and 86 are interjectional phrases.<sup>14</sup> The phrase types, accordingly, dominate by far, with 61% of the total count of types. The primary and secondary interjections are closer together, with 17% and 21% respectively.

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>	<b>Total</b>
Primary int	166 (50%)	85 (34%)	223 (51%)	474 (46%)
Secondary int	115 (35%)	98 (39%)	140 (32%)	353 (34%)
Int phrases	52 (16%)	67 (27%)	78 (18%)	197 (19%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>1024</b>

Table 2. The distribution of interjection and phrase tokens in the three plays

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>	<b>Total</b>
Primary int	18 (25%)	15 (24%)	16 (22%)	24 (17%)
Secondary int	22 (31%)	14 (22%)	17 (23%)	31 (22%)
Int phrases	32 (44%)	34 (54%)	41 (55%)	86 (61%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>141</b>

Table 3. The distribution of interjection and phrase types in the three plays

Of the three plays studied here, *Othello* contains the highest number of tokens (441). The primary interjections are the most commonly used with 223 tokens (51%) and the interjectional phrases are used the least with 78 tokens (18%). The remaining 32% are attested to the secondary interjections, amounting to 140 tokens. *Hamlet* contains a lower number of

---

<sup>14</sup> In addition to these types, 11 others appear in the Oxford edition, where they have been supplied from the Second quarto version of *Hamlet* and the First quarto version of *Othello*; these types have been included in the qualitative presentation of the data in Chapters 4 and 5.

tokens (333). Still, the percentage distribution of the formal categories is very similar to that of *Othello*. 50% of the registered tokens are primary interjections in *Hamlet*, 35% are secondary interjections while 16% are interjectional phrases. Interestingly, the secondary interjections are the most commonly used in *Twelfth Night*, with 98 tokens (39%) and the numbers in general are closer together than in the two other plays. 34% (85) of the recorded tokens are primary interjections and 27% (67) are interjectional phrases.

Although the phrases are the least frequent tokens in the plays, they have the higher number of types. 55% of the 74 registered types in *Othello* are phrases while the primary and secondary interjection types are closer together, with 22% and 23% respectively. Similarly, the phrases amount to 54% of the 63 recorded types in *Twelfth Night* while the primary and secondary interjection types make up 24% and 22% respectively. 72 types are recorded in *Hamlet*. Of these, 44% are phrases, 25% are primary interjections and 31% are secondary interjection types.

The recorded interjections and interjectional phrases have been categorised into the three functional categories emotive-expressive, cognitive-expressive and conative. Elements may appear in a combination of these, as discussed in section 3.3. Table 4 shows the distribution of functions of the three predominant categories. The emotive-expressive function is by far the most commonly used; over half of the registered tokens in each play are used in this mode. *Othello* contains the highest number of emotive-expressive tokens, 271 (61%). *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* are very close together in percentage even though there is a large difference in tokens. They contain 172 (52%) and 124 (50%) emotive-expressive tokens respectively. In *Othello*, the cognitive-expressive and conative function are used in equal measure (16%). In contrast, the cognitive-expressive mode makes up 24% in both *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* while 14% and 10% respectively of the registered tokens are used conatively.

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>
Em ex	172 (52%)	124 (50%)	271 (61%)
Co ex	79 (24%)	61 (24%)	72 (16%)
Con	46 (14%)	26 (10%)	69 (16%)
	<b>333</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>441</b>

Table 4. Distribution of the main functions in the three plays

#### 4.2. Discrepancies between the First Folio and the Oxford edition

The Act to Restrain Abuses of Players discussed in section 2.3.5 may help explain the many expurgations of profane language in the First Folio and thus the interjection and interjectional phrase discrepancies between that and the Oxford edition of the plays in the present study. The Oxford editors have supplied purged material from the Second Quarto version of *Hamlet* and the First Quarto version of *Othello*. The *Hamlet* Second Quarto, most probably set from a foul Shakespeare manuscript, was published prior to the 1606 Act. The First Quarto version of *Othello*, on the other hand, was published in 1622, but the lack of censorship suggests a playhouse copy manuscript that predates the profanity legislation (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 427). The Folio provides the only printed version of *Twelfth Night* and the single interjection difference in that play is a result of Oxford editorial choice.

It is important to note that the Act to Restrain Abuses of Players did not extend to printed material (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 418). The explanation for the Folio purge must therefore partly lie in the manuscripts used as copy text in the setting. In the case of *Hamlet*, it is widely agreed that the First Folio version rests on a fair Shakespeare manuscript that predates the Act. The expurgation in the play is described as inconsistent and half-hearted and the last three quarters of the play contain strikingly little censorship. This suggests that the differences between the First Folio and the Second Quarto stem from authorial revision (Hibbard 2008: 128-129). Some omissions are, on the other hand, evidently editorial. Taylor (1993: 76, as cited in Hibbard 2008: 129) points out that *God*, having been inconsistently substituted up to the beginning of act 2, is completely tolerated in the remaining acts while oaths such as ‘*Sblood* and ‘*Swounds* are purged. He concludes that this gives “little reason whatever to suspect theatrical expurgation” (Taylor 1993: 76, as cited in Hibbard 2008: 129). Hibbard (2008: 129) adds that ‘*Sblood* and ‘*Swounds* were among the oaths that the First Folio meticulously censored. The revision in *Hamlet*, then, seems to derive from multiple sources and it is likely that it contains self-censoring as well as editorial legislative awareness.

The general assumption has been that the expurgation in the Folio version of *Othello* stems from a prompt-book, censored as a response to the 1606 Act (Neill 2008: 418). In fact, Taylor (1993, as cited in Neill 2008: 418) insist that one should assume that all heavily censored Folio texts may be traced back to post 1606 prompt-books, as scribes would not undertake the daunting task of purging a text and risk interference with the original intent. However, that does not explain the Folio’s omission of mild expletives and its inconsistent treatment of *God* and *heaven*, where the latter replaces the former yet is itself substituted with

even weaker forms. Clearly, there must be some editorial interference (Neill and Wells and Wells 2008: 419, 429). Moreover, the meagre First Folio stage directions further challenge the prompt-book origin of the Folio copy text (Neill and Wells 2008: 419). Neill and Wells (2008: 130-132) supports the suggestion that *Othello* derives from a scribal copy commissioned for the First Folio, transcribed from what Gurr (1999: 70, as cited in Neill and Wells 2008: 423) refers to as a maximal script, that is, the full textual version approved by the Revels Office. While the textual history is intensely debated and highly uncertain, the fact remains that someone purged *Othello* of oaths and profanities. Some were very likely removed by the scribe during preparation for the setting of the Folio, others may just as well have been removed in the playhouse and by Shakespeare himself (Neill and Wells 2008: 428, 432).

Given that the Folio is the only Early Modern printed copy of *Twelfth Night*, it is hardly surprising that there are no expurgation discrepancies between that and the Oxford edition of the play. It is very likely that the copy text for the setting was a scribal manuscript, transcribed from Shakespeare's papers (Warren and Wells 2008: 74). There exist no less than three explanations for the scribal copy. It may have been prepared at special request for the Folio, due to delay in obtaining the text (Warren and Wells 2008: 74). It has also been suggested that the printer insisted on the received foul papers being made more legible or, alternatively, that a scribal manuscript was produced as part of the preparations for production (Turner 1975:137, as cited in Warren and Wells 2008: 74-75). Considering the 1606 Act, the last point may help explain the relatively mild language in the play. Wilson (1930/1949 as cited in Warren and Wells 2008: 75) also claims that the play has been revised in connection with a possible stage production and suggests that the play's use of *Jove* may indicate expurgation of *God*. The claim is refuted by Turner (1975:136, as cited in Warren and Wells 2008: 74-75) who points to a higher frequency of *God* than *Jove*. Regardless, one can only speculate on the fluidity of *Twelfth Night*'s language and whether the play once had a more offensive linguistic form.

Tables 5, 6 and 7 provide a full list of the substantial interjection and interjectional phrase differences between the First Folio and the Oxford edition of *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*. The triple dash indicates omission. Table 5 shows the general interjection and interjectional phrase differences between the two editions. There is only one interjection difference between the Folio version and the Oxford edition of *Twelfth Night*. In contrast, there are five divergences in *Hamlet*. One originates from compositor error and four from Oxford editorial choice. There are two general differences in *Othello*.

Play	Oxford	First Folio	Comment
Twelfth Night	---	O	Oxford editorial choice
Hamlet	<b>Why</b>	How	From Second Quarto. Oxford editorial choice
Hamlet	<b>Alas, alas</b>	---	Compositor error
Hamlet	---	Oh	Oxford editorial choice
Hamlet	<b>Ho</b>	How	From First and Third Quarto
Hamlet	---	O, o, o, o	Stage direction in Oxford
Hamlet	---	In good faith	Oxford editorial choice
Othello	Go to	---	First Quarto sentence missing
Othello	O	---	From First Quarto

Table 5. General interjection and interjectional phrase differences between the two editions

Perhaps the two most interesting general differences in Hamlet are IN GOOD FAITH and the duplicated o that are omitted from the Oxford edition. In act 5, scene 2, IN GOOD FAITH, repeated within the same turn in the Folio, is replaced with a vocative from the Second Quarto in the Oxford edition, as example (17) shows. Osric doffed his hat when he entered to inform Hamlet of the wager fight with Laertes, but fails to put it back on again. When Hamlet requests him to finish the respectful gesture, he protests that it is too hot for a bonnet. Some turns later, Hamlet reminds him of the common courtesy, as courtiers continue to be bare-headed only in the king's presence. Osric keeping his hat off in Hamlet's presence is a display of excessive respect (Gurr 1992 1-2):

- (17) Hamlet: I beseech you remember.  
Osric: Nay, **in good faith**, for mine ease **in good faith**.  
(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 2. First Folio 1623)
Hamlet: I beseech you remember –  
*[He motions Osric to put on his hat]*
Osric: Nay, **good my lord**; for my ease, **in good faith**.  
(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 2. Oxford 2008)

The Oxford preference for the Second Quarto reading has an interesting effect. While the Folio's repeated IN GOOD FAITH emphasises the truth-value of Osric's previous statement and perhaps conceals the knowledge of exaggerated deference, the Quarto's polite *good my lord* fronts it. This adds to the tension of the scene.

Hamlet's dying "O, o, o, o" in the First Folio has often been the subject of ridicule, discarded as an actor's interpolation that was included in a prompt-book (Charney 1978: 110). Most modern Hamlets, both on page and on stage, seem to die in silence, as the prince's last words indicate (Dessen 2017: 121). In contrast, Hibbard (2008: 352) has converted the multiple Os into the stage direction *He gives a long sigh* in the Oxford edition. He bases his choice on Honigmann's (1976: 123, as cited in Dessen 2017: 121) suggestion that they may be regarded as a crypto-direction, that is, the dramatist's short-hand signal to the player "to make whatever noise (...) locally appropriate. It could tell him to sigh, groan, gasp, roar, weep" (Honigmann 1976: 123, as cited in Dessen 2017: 121). Honigmann (1976: 123, as cited in Dessen 2017: 122) concludes that in most cases the Elizabethan playhouse audience did not hear "O, o, o, o" and that it would be misleading not to transform them into a stage direction. Charney (1978: 114) agrees that the Early Modern players viewed the multiple Os as anything but hollow interjections and knew well how to handle them. As Hawkes (2005: 73) puts it: "No doubt they represent several harrowing seconds of action on the stage, and Horatio's subsequent 'Now cracks a noble heart' (V. ii. 364) perhaps supplies an appropriate commentary". Although Hibbard (2008: 352) seems to represent the minority in his editorial choice, the transformation of the duplicated o into a stage direction seems to be an apt appropriation of an Elizabethan play-text and stage tool which has lost its gist to modern readers (Dessen 2017: 121, 127).

The two general discrepancies between the Folio version and the Oxford edition of *Othello* are o and go to. Both are additions from the First Quarto, one involves adding a whole sentence missing in the Folio, the other preferring the sentence in the Quarto. In example (18), Othello has begun to question Desdemona's faithfulness and is torn between believing Iago's slander and trusting his wife. The o in the Quarto nicely underlines Othello's emotional distress and helps transfer it to the short exchange between husband and wife that follows.

(18) Othello: If she be false, Heaven mock'd it selfe:  
Ill not belecue't.

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3. First Folio 1623)

Othello: If she be false, **O** then heaven mocks itself:  
I'll not believe't.

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3. Oxford 2008)



According to Neill and Wells (2008: 238), the sentence that contains *go to* may be missing from the Folio due to compositor error. The missing sentence and the succeeding one end with the same word, *purse*, as example (19) shows, and this may have caused the eye skip.

(19) Iago: **Go to**, farewell, put money enough in your **purse**.

*Exit Roderigo*

Thus do I ever make my fool my **purse**:

*(Othello: Act 1, scene 3. Oxford 2008)*

Table 6 and 7 contain the discrepancies in *Hamlet* and *Othello* that are related to expurgation. They are offensive and potentially offensive interjections and interjectional phrases. *Othello* contains the highest number of interjection and interjectional phrase expurgation, with 55 instances against 12 instances in *Hamlet*. This is hardly surprising, given the textual history of the two plays. It is also unsurprising that 'SBLOOD and 'SWOUNDS have been absolutely purged from both plays. The Folio is particularly sensitive about these two expletives (Hibbard 2008: 129). In addition, both plays seem to prefer the weaker form 'heaven' to 'God', but there are inconsistencies.

An interesting purge in *Hamlet* is Laertes' lamenting address to God after Ophelia has sung her last mad song and left the stage. The Second Quarto reads "Do you see this, O God?" (Hibbard 2008: 309) while the Folio vocative is *you Gods*. Perhaps it seemed safer to apply the plural form, thus giving the address a pagan connotation.

Interestingly, relatively mild expletives and phrases such as TUSH, FOH, BY THIS HAND and BY MY TROTH are purged in *Othello*, possibly by the scribe who prepared the copy text for the Folio. Two of four occurrences of BY THIS HAND have been expurgated, one being an oath that underlines the truth value of the following statement. BY MY TROTH is also a declaration of truth, despite its resemblance to a possible blasphemous utterance. Both occurrences have been replaced, one oddly enough with INTROTH. It seems that after the 1604 Act, swearing by one's belief was deemed too heavy language.

<b>Oxford</b>	<b>First Folio</b>	<b>Substitute occurrence</b>	<b>Total purge</b>
<b>For God's love</b>	For Heavens love	1	100 %
<b>By th' mass</b>	---	1	50 %
<b>I'th name of God</b>	I'th name of Heaven	1	100 %
<b>By heaven</b>	---	1	12.5 %
<b>'Sblood</b>	Why, ---	1	100 %
<b>'Swounds</b>	Why, Come	1	100 %
<b>O God</b>	you Gods, Oh good Horatio, O Heaven	1, 2	66.67 %
<b>Total purge</b>		12	

Table 6. Expurgations in *Hamlet*

<b>Oxford</b>	<b>First Folio</b>	<b>Sub occ</b>	<b>Total purge</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Tush	---	1	100 %	
'Sblood	---	1	100 %	
God bless the mark	(bless the marke)	1	100 %	
'Swounds	---, Ha, Away, Come	6, 1	100 %	
Fore God	Fore Heaven, Why	2, 1	100 %	
God's will	Alas, Fie, fie	1, 1	100 %	
God forbid	Heaven forbid	1	100 %	
By 'th mass	Introth	1	100 %	
Faith	Sooth, But, Indeed, Yes, Why, ---	1, 3, 2	75 %	
By'r Lady	Trust me	1	100 %	
By heaven	Alas, ---	1	20 %	
I' faith	Trust me, Insooth, Indeed	1, 3	55.56 %	
Heaven bless us	Blesse us	1	100 %	
By my faith	In good troth	1	100 %	
By this hand	---, Nay	1	50 %	
By my troth	Trust me, Introth	1	100 %	
O God	Alas, Oh Heaven, Oh	1	100 %	
Good faith	Good father	1	50 %	
God's troth	Introth	1	100 %	Added to Oxford from First Quarto 'good'.
'Ud's pity	Why	1	100 %	
O heaven	Yes 'tis	1	16.67 %	
Foh	---	1	50 %	
Then Lord have	O Heaven have	1	100 %	
'Ud's death	---	1	100 %	
O Lord	---, Alas	1	100 %	
O heavenly God	O heavenly Powers	1	100 %	
<b>Total purge</b>		<b>55</b>		

Table 7. Expurgations in *Othello*

### 4.3. The primary interjections

As Table 2 shows, the primary interjections make up 46% of the recorded interjections and phrases in the First Folio, amounting to 474 tokens. It is interesting to note that while the primary interjections are the most commonly used in *Hamlet* (50%) and *Othello* (46%), they are the second most used in *Twelfth Night* (34%). Table (8) provides a full overview of the recorded types broken down by play and Table (9) shows the four most commonly used primary interjections. On the whole, *oh* and *o* are the most commonly used primary interjections. *oh* dominates by far with 43% of the individual primary interjection occurrences. *o* has a smaller number, amounting to 24%. It is still the second most used primary interjection in the present material. Unsurprisingly, then, *oh* makes up almost half of all recorded primary interjections in *Hamlet* (47%) and just above half in *Othello* (52%). Interestingly, *o* makes up 49% of the recorded primary interjections in *Twelfth Night*. In addition to *oh* and *o*, *alas* and *ho* are the most commonly used primary interjections in all plays. *alas* makes up 7% in *Hamlet*, 14% in *Twelfth Night* and 12% in *Othello*. *ho* makes up 7%, 6% and 8% respectively.

	Hamlet	Twelfth Night	Othello		Hamlet	Twelfth Night	Othello
<b>Ah</b>	2	1	1	<b>Hum</b>	1		2
<b>Ah ha</b>	2	2		<b>La</b>	1		
<b>Alas</b>	12	12	26	<b>Lo</b>	3	1	2
<b>Ay</b>	1	1	2	<b>O</b>	37	42	34
<b>Diablo</b>			1	<b>Oh</b>	78	9	116
<b>Fie</b>	7	4	8	<b>Pardie</b>	1	1	
<b>Foh</b>	1		1	<b>Pish</b>			2
<b>Ha</b>	3	3	5	<b>Puh</b>	2		
<b>Ha, ha</b>	1	1	1	<b>Tilly-vally</b>		1	
<b>Ha, ha, ha</b>			3	<b>Tush</b>	2		
<b>Ho</b>	11	5	17	<b>Tut</b>		1	
<b>Holla</b>	1		1	<b>Well-a-day</b>		1	

Table 8. Distribution of primary interjections in the three plays

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>	<b>Total</b>
Oh	78 (47%)	9 (11 %)	116 (52%)	203 (43%)
O	37 (22%)	42 (49%)	34 (15)	114 (24%)
Alas	12 (7%)	12 (14%)	26 (12%)	50 (11%)
Ho	11 (7%)	5 (14%)	17 (8%)	33 (/%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>474</b>

Table 9. The four most commonly used primary interjections

In the following, all the primary interjections are listed and commented on in alphabetical order.

#### **AH/A**

This interjection occurs twice in *Hamlet*, once in *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* respectively. In all cases, it is used in the emotive-expressive function and communicates sadness, shock and contempt. In (20) Hamlet has just left his mother's chamber, dragging Polonius' body, when Claudius enters and tells Gertrude to explain her distressed state. AH collocates with a vocative in (20), something that Taavitsainen (1995: 445) notes is typical for this interjection.

(20) Claudius: There's matters in these sighs.  
 These profound heaves  
 You must translate; Tis fit we vnderstand them.  
 Where is your Sonne?

Gertrude: **Ah** my good Lord, what haue I seene to night?

(*Hamlet*: Act 4. Scene 1)

The second instance in *Hamlet* is a challenge. With the spelling variation A, it occurs in the middle of the first Gravedigger's song, together with an occurrence of o on the same line. Considering that the Gravedigger sings a corrupted version of a poem (Hibbard 2008: 323), A and o may be regarded as part of that corruption and Hibbard (2008: 323) suggests that they represent breathless grunts as the Gravedigger digs and sings. If that is the case, then A in (9) is emotive-expressive and signals tiredness.

(21) First Clown: *Sings.*  
 In youth when I did loue, did loue,  
 me thought it was very sweete:

To contract O the time for a my behoue,  
O me thought there was nothing meete.

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

**AH HA/AHA/OH HA**

Taavitsainen (1995: 451) and Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 232-233) discuss AH HA under HA and agree that when the two primary interjections collocate, they are cognitive-expressive and signal insight and recognition. Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 232) also find that AH HA may signal satisfaction and triumph, an emotive-expressive function, and note that AHA may represent a sneeze in a text from 1400. However, the present study treats AH HA as an interjection in its own right, with AHA as a spelling variation, rather than AH HA as two collocating interjections.

The interjection is found twice in *Hamlet* in the cognitive-expressive function signalling disagreement and suspicion, and twice in *Twelfth Night*, both in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function, signalling contempt and defiance. In example (21), AH HA signals disagreement. Horatio and Marcellus have just sworn to keep their encounter with the Ghost a secret, but Hamlet further demands that they swear again upon his sword.

- (21) Marcellus: We haue sworne my Lord, already.  
Hamlet: Indeed, vpon my sword Indeed.  
Ghost: Swear. *Ghost cries vnder the Stage.*  
Hamlet: **Ah ha** boy, sayest thou so. Art thou there, true-penny? Come one you here this fellow in the celleredge  
Consent to sweare.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5)

AH HA in example (22) on the other hand, would seem to express contempt:

- (22) Maria: Lo, how hollow the fiend speakes within him;  
did not I tell you? Sir Toby, my lady prayes you to haue  
a care for him.  
Malvolio: **Ah ha**, does she so?

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

Malvolio is full of conceit and acts in accordance with the instructions in the mock letter, written by Maria in a good imitation of Olivia's hand. Even though Olivia is referred to, the contempt is directed at Sir Toby, as the mock letter instructs Malvolio to be rude with him. It is also important to note that Malvolio has already heard Olivia ask for Sir Toby's whereabouts so that he can be directed to him.

#### **ALAS/ALACK/'LAS**

This interjection occurs in all three play-texts and is uttered by both men and women, but seems to be a largely female interjection in the present material. It is used predominantly in the emotive-expressive function to express sadness, regret, pity, despair and fear. Taavitsainen (1995: 447) notes that ALAS is a stereotypical way of expressing lament and regret. This is attested in the present study, as lament (23) and regret (24) are by far the dominating emotions in connection with the use of ALAS:

(23) Gertrude: **Alas** he's mad.

*(Hamlet: Act 3, scene 4)*

(24) Olivia: Come to what is important in't: I forgiue you  
the praise.

Viola: **Alas**, I tooke great paines to studie it, and 'tis  
Poeticall.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

In *Othello*, the interjection also serves the cognitive-expressive function once to signal disagreement. In (25), Cassio has just given an explanation to why he kissed Emilia as a greeting and Iago responds with a sarcastic comment. Desdemona intervenes to deflate the growing hostility between the two men.

(25) Iago: Sir, would she giue you somuch of her lippes,  
As of her tongue she oft bestowes on me,  
You would haue enough.

Desdemona: **Alas**: she ha's no speech!

*(Othello: Act 2, scene 1)*

Neill and Wells (2008: 247) gloss Desdemona's ALAS as follows: "She means either that Emilia has been struck dumb with embarrassment, or that she is far from being the garrulous

nagger that Iago describes; or perhaps that the first proves the second”. This coincides with Culpeper and Kytö’s (2010: 232) find that ALAS may be used as a polite preface to a refusal.

#### **AY/AYE/I**

This emotive-expressive interjection signalling sorrow is recorded once in *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* and twice in *Othello*. It is an exclusively female interjection in the present material. Two of the four instances collocate with ‘me’ and the other two is repeated for emphasis. In (13), Emilia laments that she is mortally wounded and asks to die besides the already dead Desdemona.

(26) Emilia:           **I, I.** oh, lay me by my Mistris side.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

#### **DIABLO**

This expletive is uttered once by Iago in *Othello*, in connection with Cassio and Montano’s fight. Iago is pretending to be angry that someone is ringing the bell to alert the town. The emotive expressive use is ironic for the audience, as they know that Iago is responsible for both the fight and the bell ringing.

(27) Iago:   Who’s that which rings the Bell. **Diablo** hoa:

          The Towne will rise.

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

Interestingly, this expletive is a very practical characterisation of Iago as a Spaniard, as his name also suggests (Neill and Wells 2008: 267).

#### **FIE/FYE**

This mild expletive occurs seven times in *Hamlet*, four times in *Twelfth Night* and eight times in *Othello*. In the present study, FIE seems to be a very male dominated interjection. All instances save one are attested to men in *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night*. In contrast, there is an even distribution of FIE between men and women in *Othello*, with four occurrences each. It must be noted, however, that two of the men’s FIE are confined to the First Folio as a substitution for heavier swearing, see Table 7 in section 4.2.

It is also interesting to note that in all three play-texts, the women consistently collocate FIE with a prepositional phrase; either *fie for shame* or *fie upon/on*. Culpeper and

Kytö (2010: 251) explain that **ƒIE** is commonly used to shame or scorn someone or something. This suggests that shaming or scorning with a collocational prepositional phrase is not restricted to women.

The emotive-expressive function seems to be typical for this interjection. Taavitsainen (1995: 449) notes that it is often used as an expletive “to express strong repulsion, disgust, contempt or accusation” In (28), Gratiano is horrified that Iago draws his sword upon Emilia:

(28) Gratiano: Fye, your Sword vpon a Woman.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

**ƒIE** may also be found in the cognitive-expressive function as rejection, contradiction and correction (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 250, 252). In (29), both the emotive-expressive and cognitive expressive function are present. Iago seemingly rejects Emilia’s suggestion that someone has tainted Othello’s mind against Desdemona with slander. He also feigns disgust at the idea, possibly to save his own neck.

(29) Iago: **ƒie**, there is no such man: it is impossible.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

### **ƒOH**

This interjection may occur alone or in collocation with **ƒIE**. **ƒOH** signals contempt and disgust and may be used to reject the previous statement or part of the previous statement (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 252-253). It is recorded once in *Hamlet* and twice in *Othello*. In (30), Iago speaks of Desdemona’s infidelity and **ƒOH** signals disgust towards an imagined smell.

(30) Iago: **ƒoh**, one may smell in such, a will most ranke,  
Foule disproportions, Thoughts vnnaturall,

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3)

### **HO/HOA/HOE/HOO**

This interjection is the fourth most frequently used interjection, with eleven occurrences in *Hamlet*, five occurrences in *Twelfth Night* and seventeen occurrences in *Othello*. **ho** typically serves a conative function as an attention getter and as a part of an order or a question.

Depending on the context, **ho** also demands action or response. In (31), Orsino demands an immediate response to his question:



- (31) Orsino: Who saw Cesario, **hoa**?  
 Viola: On your attendance my Lord heere.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 4)*

When duplicated, **ho** may add concern to the attention call, thus serving both the conative and the emotive-expressive function, as is the case in (32). Having last seen Hamlet follow the Ghost, Marcellus and Horatio are looking for the prince on the dark stage.

- (32) *Enter Horatio and Marcellus.*  
 Marcellus: Lord Hamlet.  
 Horatio: Heauen secure him.  
 Hamlet: So be it.  
 Horatio: Illo, **ho, ho**, my Lord.

*(Hamlet: Act 1, scene 5)*

A double **ho** may also signal merriness. Warren and Wells (2008: 170) suggest that Malvolio's *ho, ho!* in (33) indicates that he "laughs as well as smiles". However, the duplicated **ho** may also just be part of Malvolio's bold and cheerful greeting, encouraged by the false letter. He appears before Olivia cross-grated and in yellow stockings.

- (33) Malvolio: Sweet Lady, **ho, ho**.

*(Twelfth Night, Act 3, scene 4)*

Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 243) note that "what **ho** collocates with turns out to be crucial in signalling its function". They explain that when collocating with **o** or **oh**, **ho** expresses triumph, a collocating **hey** signals resignation and the collocation **what ho** serves as an attention call (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 243-244). Concerned with pragmatic noise only, it is natural that they view **hey ho** and **what ho** as collocations. In contrast, the present study views **hey ho** and **what ho** as interjectional phrases rather than a primary interjection collocating with a secondary interjection.

#### **HA/HAH**

**HA** occurs three times in *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* and six times in *Othello*. This interjection is registered in the emotive-expressive and conative function. It is used to signal surprise, triumph, satisfaction and to elicit response. In (34), Othello is surprised by Desdemona's response to him assuring her that the handkerchief he gave her is magical.

(34) Desdemona: Then would to Heauen that I had neuer scene't?

Othello: **Ha**? wherefore?

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

HA is also recorded in double and triple form as a representation of laughter. Taavitsainen (1995: 450-451) and Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 236-238) treat these forms together with the single form of HA. In contrast, the present study analyses HA, HA and HA, HA, HA as separate interjections.

#### **HA, HA and HA, HA, HA**

Both double and triple HA are used to represent laughter in the play-texts. Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 236) note that use of double HA as a representation of laughter in English dates back Ælfric in the beginning of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, and that the triple form clearly involves laughter. In the present study, HA, HA is recorded once in each play-text and HA, HA, HA is recorded three times in *Othello*. Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 236-238) suggest that there is a difference between HA, HA and HA, HA, HA in usage and occurrence. While triple HA is often repeated by the speaker within or across turns to signal uncontrolled laughter and merriment, double HA tends to occur once within a turn with a clear cognitive-expressive function. Still, both may occur in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. Interestingly, HA, HA is purely emotive-expressive in the present study and reflects bitter and tormented laughter as well as merriness. In (35), double HA and single HA occur within the same turn. Sir Toby enjoys seeing Sir Andrew caper:

(35) Sir Toby: Ha, higher: **ha, ha**, excellent.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 3)

The three recorded HA, HA, HA are all uttered by Cassio. The first two (36) occur within a single turn if one ignores the hidden Othello's aside and across turns if one includes it. They serve as an expression of Cassio's state of mind; he finds the rumour that he and Bianca are to be married hilarious and utterly ridiculous.

(36) Iago: She giues it out, that you shall marry her.

Do you intend it?

Cassio: **Ha, ha, ha.**

Othello (aside) Do ye triumph, Romaine? do you triumph?

Cassio: I marry. What? A customer prythee beare  
Some Charite to my wit, do not think it  
So vnwholesome. **Ha, ha, ha.**

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

#### **HUM/HUMH/HEM**

HUM is recorded once in *Hamlet* and twice in *Othello* in the emotive-expressive, cognitive-expressive and conative function, each with different spelling. As an emotive-expressive interjection, HUM signals an evasive and dismissive grunt as shown in (37). The example contains the spelling variation HUMH.

(37) Desdemona: If you say, I hope you will not kill me.  
Othello: **Humh.**

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

Othello also uses HUM as an example of how Emilia can attract his attention. (38) contains the spelling variation HEM.

(38) Othello: Cough, or cry **hem**; if any bodycome:

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

Hamlet uses the interjection cognitive-expressively. In (39) he is at the graveyard together with Horatio and reflects on whose scull the gravedigger just threw out of the fresh grave he is digging.

(39) Hamlet: **hum.** This fellow might be in's  
time a great buyer of Land,

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

#### **HOLLA**

Derived from French, this early 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>15</sup> conative interjection is used once in *Hamlet* as an attention call and greeting, and once in *Othello* as a warning attention signal. In (40), Marcellus has just learnt from Francisco that that Barnardo has relieved him for watch duty.

(40) Francisco: Barnardo ha's my place: giue you goodnight.

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.uis.no/view/Entry/87735?rskey=PnuQFF&result=1#eid>

Marcellus: **Holla** Barnardo!

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 1)

#### **LA**

This interjection occurs only once in the present material. It is spoken by the mad Ophelia in *Hamlet* as a cognitive-expressive interjection between one of her mad songs. Salmon (1967 [1987:63]) connects this interjection with slow-witted people and explains that LA is used to emphasise the conveyed message. Even though it is impossible to follow Ophelia's trail of thoughts, it is clear that she wishes to put emphasis on her unspoken message:

(41) Claudius: Pretty Ophelia.

Ophelia: Indeed, **la?** without an oath, Ill make an end ont.

(*Hamlet*: Act 4, scene 5)

#### **LO/LOE**

This interjection occurs three times in *Hamlet*, once in *Twelfth Night* and twice in *Othello*. In five out of six instances, LO may be interpreted as an abbreviation for 'look'. Taavitsainen (1995: 452) explains this usage by pointing out that LO, commonly found in biblical texts, is the English translation of the Latin *ecce*, used to attract attention to something or someone. She gives the following examples of this usage:

(42) ...and causedest me to take hyr to wife? But now, *loo*, there is the wife, take hir and be walkynge.

(Tyndale Bible, Ph 12:19, as cited in Taavitsainen 1995: 452)

In this sense, LO has a conative element imbedded within it, as it directs focus. In the present material, LO as a focal element overlaps with the emotive-expressive function, resulting in the interjection expressing surprise, lament and joy while directing focus to the thing, person or situation that causes the emotive reaction:

(43) Iago: There is no other way: 'tis she must doo't:

And **loe**, the happinesse: go, and importune her.

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

Desdemona and Emilia are already on stage when Iago and Cassio enter in deep conversation. Iago is persuading Cassio that only Desdemona can restore Cassio's lost position as Othello's trusted lieutenant and directs his focus to her while feigning surprise at seeing her.

## **o and oh**

oh is by far the most commonly used primary interjection in the present material and makes up 43% of the primary interjection tokens. In comparison, o makes up 24% of the primary interjection tokens. Still, o is the second most commonly used primary interjection in the present material. Interestingly, o clearly dominates in *Twelfth Night* with 42 recorded tokens to 9 recorded tokens of oh. In contrast, oh clearly governs in *Hamlet* and *Othello*.

Taavitsainen (1995: 453) and Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 276) recorded o as the most frequent interjection in their Early Modern corpus. Given that they look to the comedy within the dramatic genre, the contrasting result may suggest that Elizabethans associated oh with tragedies and o with comedies. However, if this be the case, it is highly problematic that o and oh serve more or less the same functions in the present material.

oh and o are very similar and versatile interjections. They are used in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function and signal a wide variety of emotions and cognitive states. The emotive-expressive function is clearly dominant. As emotive interjections, o and oh express both positive and negative emotions. Positive feelings recorded in the three play-texts are love, affection, happiness, hope, confidence, approval and eagerness. In (44), Polonius believes he has found the cause of Hamlet's madness and Claudius is eager to hear about it.

(44) Claudius: **Oh** speake of that, that I do long to heare.

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

In (45), Orsino expresses his love for Olivia and Othello is confident in (46) that he justly smothered Desdemona. Even though the latter subject matter is negative, the expressed confidence is positive to the speaker.

(45) Orsino: **O**, when mine eyes did see Oliuia first  
Methought she purg'd the ayre of pestilence;

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 1)

(46) Othello: Cassio did tup her: ask thy husband else.  
**O**, I were damned beneath all depth in hell  
But that I did proceed upon just grounds  
To this extremity.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

The negative feelings expressed by *o* and *oh* are anger, despair, grief, sadness, contempt, regret, desperation, irritation, helplessness, concern, dislike, horror, disappointment and betrayal. In (47), Hamlet's late father expresses horror and lament that he was sent to his grave and judgement not just by a brother's hand but with all his imperfections on his head.

(47) Ghost:           **Oh** horrible, **Oh** horrible, most horrible!

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5)

Iago feigns anger towards Cassio's assailant in (48), and Claudius shows remorse in (49)

(48) Iago:   **O** murd'rous slave!

**O** villain!

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 1)

(49) Claudius:   **Oh**, my offence is rank, it smells to heaven.

                  It hath the primal eldest curse upon't –

                  A brother's murder.

(*Hamlet*: Act 3, scene 3)

As cognitive interjections, *o* and *oh* signal agreement and disagreement, rejection, reflection, confirmation, realisation, irony, recollection and reassurance. In (50) Laertes reassures his sister that he will live by the same advice he gave her and in (51), Orsino rejects Feste's request for more money for his fooling.

(50) Laertes:       **O** fear me not.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 3)

(51) Orsino:       **O**, you give me ill counsel.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 5, scene 1)

The interjections also have a conative element imbedded within them in the sense that they enhance response and action eliciting with an emotive emphasis. (52) is an illustration of this. Hamlet's double *oh* is exclusive to the First Folio, as the Oxford edition adopts the Second Quarto's single *oh*.

(52) Hamlet:       Thou com'st in such questionable shape

                  That I will speake to thee. Ill call thee Hamlet,

King, Father, Royall Dane: **Oh, oh**, answer me,

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 4)

#### **PUH/POOH/PAH**

This interjection is found twice in *Hamlet* in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function, signalling contempt and a reaction to a disgusting smell. In (53), Polonius uses PUH to contemptuously dismiss Ophelia's belief in Hamlet's affection for her. The example contains the spelling variation POOH.

(53) Ophelia: He hath, my lord, of late made many tenders  
Of his affection to me.

Polonius: Affection, **pooh!** You speak like a green girl  
Unsifted in such perilous circumstance.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 3)

#### **PARDIE**

This expletive is a corrupted version of the French *par dieu*, meaning 'by God' (Warren and Wells 2008: 196). It occurs twice in the present corpus, once in *Hamlet* and once in *Twelfth Night*, in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. In (54), Hamlet suddenly needs to feign madness as Guildenstern and Rosencrantz enter and uses PARDIE to emphasise an obvious conclusion. Perhaps he uses it deliberately as it rhymes with 'comedy'. Hibbard (2008: 265) glosses PARDIE in the example as equivalent to 'indeed' and 'assuredly'.

(54) Hamlet: Ah ha! Come, some music. Come, the recorders. For if the King like  
Not the comedy,

Why then, belike, he likes it not, **pardie**.

(*Hamlet*: Act 3, scene 2)

#### **PISH**

This emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive interjection may be used to signal disgust, contempt and rejection (Culpeper and Kytö 2010: 254-255). It is recorded twice in *Othello*, expressing disgust. In (55), Iago is trying to convince Roderigo that Desdemona and Cassio have a love affair.

(55) Iago: Villainous thoughts, Roderigo! When these

mutualities so marshal the way, hard at hand comes the master and the main exercise, th'incorporate conclusion.

**Pish!**

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 1)

#### **TUSH**

This mild expletive occurs twice in *Hamlet* and once in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. It was purged from the First Folio version of *Othello* as a result of the scribe's heedful suppression of profane language (Neill and Wells 2008: 195), as discussed in section 4.2. The Oxford edition supplies it from the First Quarto, thus making **TUSH** the first word uttered in the play. It is used emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively to signal irritation, confidence and rejection. In (56), Horatio confidently rejects the idea that ghosts exist.

(56) Horatio: **Tush, tush**, 'twill not appear.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 1)

#### **TUT**

Taavitsainen (1995: 459) and Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 256) note that this interjection expresses impatience and rejection of a previous statement. The cognitive-expressive function is attested in the single occurrence in *Twelfth Night*. Sir Andrew wants to leave, as he feels wooing Olivia is a hopeless task. Sir Toby disagrees and encourages him to stay longer:

(57) Sir Toby: She'll none o'th' Count. She'll not match above her degree, neither in estate, years, nor wit, I have heard her swear't. **Tut**, there's life in't, man.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 3)

#### **TILLY-VALLY**

This interjection is uttered once by Sir Toby. He uses it cognitive-expressively to signal that he disagrees with Maria that his niece will put him out of doors for his drunkenness and nightly disturbances:

(58) Sir Toby: Am I not of her blood? **Tilly-vally**, lady.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 3)



#### **WELL-A-DAY**

Salmon (1967 [1987: 61]) notes that this interjection, expressing regret and anxiety, is “first recorded in 1570 as a variant of well-a-way”. Warren and Wells (2008: 197) gloss it as an equivalent to ALAS. WELL-A-DAY occurs only once in the data-material, and is spoken by Feste to Malvolio, who has been shut up in a dark room so that others may believe he is mad. In *Twelfth Night*, WELL-A-DAY serves both an emotive-expressive and a cognitive-expressive function, signalling regret and disagreement.

- (59) Malvolio: Good fool, help me to some light and some paper. I tell thee I am as well in my wits as any man in Illyria.
- Feste: **Well-a-day** that you were, sir.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 4, scene 2)*

Of the three functions, the emotive-expressive function seems to be typical for the primary interjections. There also seems to be primary interjections that are connected with gender and character types. This must surely be important for the role they may play in characterisation.

#### **4.4 The secondary interjections**

In total, the secondary interjections make up 35% of the data in in the First Folio with 353 tokens. The present material contains altogether 31 secondary interjections types, as Table 10 shows. Of these, WHY is the most commonly used type. *Othello* contains the highest number of this interjection, with 46 tokens. *Hamlet* contains 34 tokens and *Twelfth Night* contains 28 recorded tokens of WHY. WHAT is the second most used secondary interjection with a total of 38 recorded tokens; ten in *Hamlet*, nine in *Twelfth Night* and nineteen in *Othello*. WELL and MARRY share the third place with 34 tokens in total. *Othello* contains the highest number of WELL, with 15 tokens and *Twelfth Night* has the highest frequency of MARRY with 13 tokens.

	Hamlet	Twelfth Night	Othello		Hamlet	Twelfth Night	Othello
<b>Buzz</b>	2			<b>Plague</b>		1	
<b>Bloody</b>	1			<b>Pox</b>		1	
<b>Come</b>	12	6	5	<b>Say</b>	1		
<b>Come, come</b>	3	2	5	<b>So</b>			1
<b>Faith</b>	6	4	3	<b>Soft</b>	6	3	4
<b>Go, go</b>	1			<b>Sooth</b>		2	1
<b>Help</b>	6		10	<b>Stand</b>	1		
<b>How</b>			4	<b>Thieves</b>			5
<b>Lord</b>	1			<b>Treachery</b>	1		
<b>Marry</b>	12	13	9	<b>Treason</b>	2		
<b>Mass</b>	1			<b>Troth</b>		1	
<b>Murder</b>			8	<b>Well</b>	8	11	15
<b>No</b>	1			<b>What</b>	10	9	19
<b>Now, now</b>		1		<b>Who</b>	1		1
<b>Out</b>	2		2	<b>Why</b>	34	28	46
<b>Peace</b>	3	16	2				

Table 10. Distribution of secondary interjections in the three plays

In the following, all the secondary interjections are listed and commented on in alphabetical order. However, some interjections with different initial letter are treated together where relevant.

#### **BUZZ/BUZZE**

This is a typical Elizabethan interjection expressing “contempt for stale news” (Hibbard 2008: 224). It is recorded twice in *Hamlet* only, and is duplicated for emphasis:

- (60) Polonius: My lord, I have news to tell you.  
Hamlet: My lord, I have news to tell you. When Roscius was an actor in Rome –  
Polonius: The actors are come hither, my lord.  
Hamlet: **Buzz, buzz.**

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

#### **BLOODY/BLOODY**

This interjection is spoken once by Hamlet. It appears in one of his soliloquies in the emotive-expressive function and signals his anger and hatred towards Claudius:

(61) Hamlet: **bloody**: a bawdy villaine,

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

### **COME and COME, COME**

COME is recorded twelve times in *Hamlet*, six times in *Twelfth Night* five times in *Othello*.

COME, COME OCCURS three times in *Hamlet*, twice in *Twelfth Night* and five times in *Othello*.

COME is a predominantly conative interjection, as it also often occurs as a preface to a request or an order. In example (62), Orsino asks Viola as Cesario to sing:

(62) Orsino: **Come**, but one verse.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 4)

COME may be used emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively as well and is very similar in use to COME, COME. As emotive-expressive interjections, COME and COME, COME express impatience and irritation. In (63), there is also an embedded conative element.

(63) Hamlet: Were you not sent for? Is it your own incling?  
Is it a free visitation? **Come**, deal justly with me.  
**Come, come**; nay, speak.

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

In the cognitive-expressive function, the two interjections signal disagreement and rejection and may be used as an element of reassurance and persuasion. In (64), Iago disagrees with Cassio that Cassio has grounds to despise himself because of the drunken brawling.

(64) Iago: **Come**, you are too severe a moraller.

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

In (65), Sir Toby reassures Sir Andrew that he will have Olivia in the end.

(65) Sir Toby: **Come, come**, I'll go burn some sack,

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 3)

## FAITH

This religious oath is recorded in all three play-texts: *Hamlet* has six occurrences and *Twelfth Night* has four. Interestingly, there is a huge difference between the First Folio version of *Othello* and the Oxford edition, with three to twelve recorded occurrences. The reason for this is the expurgation of the First Folio of profane language, as discussed in section 4.2. FAITH is a very male dominated interjection in the present data material and is used in both the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. As an emotive-expressive interjection, FAITH signals lament, irritation, surprise and disapproval. In (66), Roderigo is irritated that Iago's promise that Desdemona will be his soon seems to be empty words.

(66) Roderigo: **Faith**, I have heard too much, for your words and performances are no kin together.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

Cognitive-expressively, the interjection expresses agreement and disagreement, determination, evaluation and affirmation. In (67), Sir Andrew is determined to leave.

(67) Sir Andrew: **Faith**, I'll home tomorrow, Sir Toby. Your niece will not be seen, or if she be, it's four to none she'll none of me.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 3)

FAITH is also used to emphasise the truth value of a statement and as a preface to an answer. In (68), Desdemona tries to persuade Othello that she is telling the truth when she says that she has not the handkerchief he gave her about her.

(68) Desdemona: No, **faith**, my lord.

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

## FORSOOTH

FORSOOTH is an archaic and form of 'in truth' and is treated both as an adverb and as an exclamation (Bromhead 2009: 98-99). According to Salmon (1967 [1987: 63]) FORSOOTH is typically used by members of the lower ranks, particularly servants, but also children. It occurs once in *Othello* and expresses Iago's contempt for Cassio as Othello's new lieutenant:

(69) Iago: And what was he?  
**Forsooth**, a great arithmetician,

One Michael Cassio, a Florentine –

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1)

**GO, GO**

Hamlet utters the single occurrence of this interjection and uses it emotive-expressively. His irritation is apparent in (70):

- (70) Gertrude: Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended.  
Hamlet: Mother, you have my father much offended.  
Gertrude: Come, come, you answer with an idle tongue.  
Hamlet: **Go, go**, you question with a wicked tongue.

(*Hamlet*: Act 3, scene 4)

**HELP, MURDER, THIEVES, TREACHERY, TREASON**

These interjections are exclusively conative, used to attract attention and act as warning calls. **HELP** is recorded six times in *Hamlet* and ten times in *Othello*. It may collocate with **o**, **HO** and **WHAT HO** for greater emphasis and to signal desperation and urgency. In (71), a wounded Cassio cries desperately for help:

- (71) Cassio: **O help**, ho! Light! A surgeon!

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 1)

**MURDER**, recorded eight times in *Othello*, may also collocate with **HO**. In addition, it is often repeated for emphasis.

- (72) Iago: **Ho, murder, murder!**

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 1)

There are five instances of **THIEVES** in *Othello*. Just as **MURDER**, this interjection is repeated for emphasis. In (73), **THIEVES** serves as an explanation of why Iago calls for Brabantio as well as attracting his attention.

- (73) Iago: What ho, Brabantio! **Thieves, thieves, thieves!**

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1)

TREACHERY and TREASON are found in Hamlet only, TREACHERY once and TREASON twice. In (74), Hamlet responds to his mother having been poisoned and the courtiers respond to Hamlet stabbing Claudius in (75).

(74) Hamlet: O, villainy! Ho! Let the door be locked!  
**Treachery!** Seek it out.

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 2)

(75) All the Courtiers: **Treason! Treason!**

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 2)

### HOW

In the present material, this interjection is equivalent to WHAT. It occurs four times in *Othello* and is used to signal surprise and incomprehension. how possibly serves a comic effect in (76), as it is uttered by a naïve boy musician who does not understand the Clown's crude joke:

(76) Clown: Why, masters, have your instruments been in  
Naples that they speak i'th' nose thus?

Boy Musician: **How**, sir? **How**?

Clown: Are these, I pray you, wind instruments?

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 1)

### LORD

According to Salmon (1967 [1987: 62]) this expletive is typical for the lower ranks. Quite fittingly, the mad Ophelia utters the only instance of LORD in the present corpus. It occurs in the cognitive-expressive function as reflection:

(77) Claudius: How do you, pretty lady?

Ophelia: Well, God 'ild you! They say the owl was a baker's  
daughter. **Lord**, we know what we are, but know not  
what we may be. God be at your table!

(*Hamlet*: Act 4, scene 5)

### MASS

This Catholic expletive is recorded once in the present material. It is uttered by the Second Clown in *Hamlet* to signal his disappointment that he cannot answer the First Clown's riddle after all:

(78) Second Clown: **Mass**, I cannot tell.

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

### MARRY/MARRIE

This is a very male dominated interjection in the present material and is recorded in all play-texts, twelve times in *Hamlet*, thirteen times in *Twelfth Night* and nine times in *Othello*. It is mainly used emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively, but may be conative as well. As an emotive-expressive interjection, MARRY signals irritation, horror, impatience, dislike, despair, contempt and approval. In (79), Polonius approves of what his daughter tells him about Laertes.

(79) Polonius: What is't, Ophelia, he hath said to you?

Ophelia: So please you, something touching the Lord Hamlet.

Polonius: **Marry**, well bethought.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 3)

In (80), Olivia impatiently awaits an answer from the half-drunk Sir Toby. Interestingly, MARRY in this example may be glossed as 'yes, I remember'. In (81), Iago is horrified that Cassio might be mortally wounded.

(80) Sir Toby. Lechery? I defy lechery. There's one at the gate.

Olivia: Ay, **marry**, what is he?

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 5)

(81) Iago: What, are you hurt, lieutenant?

Cassio: Ay, past all surgery.

Iago: **Marry**, God forbid!

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

As a cognitive-expressive interjection, MARRY signals agreement, caution, reflection, correction and recollection. In (82), Maria agrees that Malvolio's urine should be taken to a wise woman for analysis and in (83), Iago adjusts his statement that his wife talks too much.

(82) Maria: Marry, and it shall be done tomorrow morning, if I live.  
(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

(83) Iago: In faith, too much!  
I find it still when I have leave to sleep.  
**Marry**, before your ladyship, I grant,  
She puts her tongue a little in her heart,  
And chides with thinking.  
(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 1)

MARRY is used conatively in (84), and signals focus on the following statement. Polonius is about to explain to his servant why he wants him to enquire about Laertes while in France.

(84) Polonius: **Marry**, sir, here's my drift,  
And I believe it is a fetch of warrant.  
(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 1)

MARRY is a corrupted version of the name of Virgin Mary and is first attested in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Gewheiler 2010: 321, 324). Its tendency to preface an explanation leads Salmon (1967 [1987: 62]) to question MARRY's status as an expletive. She notes that is "so frequently used in answering a question that it is hardly an expletive at all". This view is supported by Hughes (1991: 95, as cited in Gewheiler 2010: 325) who points out that the Reformation, which fundamentally redefined religious power, very much deflated the power of invoking sacred Catholic names. By the time Shakespeare started his career as a playwright, MARRY had been reduced to a harmless interjection (The Oxford English Dictionary, as cited in Gewheiler 2010: 325).

## NO

Hamlet uses the single recorded instance of this interjection as a tag question in the cognitive-expressive function. Through a series of questions, he seeks proof and confirmation that the ghost Horatio and Marcellus saw is his father's:



(85) Hamlet: His beard was grizzly, **no**?

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 2)

#### **NOW, NOW**

This interjection is recorded once in *Twelfth Night* with a conative function. Fabian tries to end Sir Toby's constant outbursts during the gulling of Malvolio by telling him to calm down:

(86) Fabian: O peace, peace, peace, **now, now**.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 5)

#### **OUT**

This interjection is recorded twice in both *Hamlet* and *Othello* in the emotive-expressive function. Neill and Wells (2008: 381) gloss that **OUT** typically expresses lament and often collocates with **ALAS** as an intensifier. Although lament is the dominating emotion of **OUT** in the present material, it only collocates with **ALAS** once. **OUT** may also be duplicated for emphasis. In (87), **OUT** signals anger. Moments before he kills her, Othello is outraged that Desdemona openly shows her grief when she learns that Cassio is dead:

(87) Othello: **Out**, strumpet! – Weep'st thou for him to my face?

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

#### **PEACE**

At first glance, this interjection seems to be strictly conative, as seen in (86) above. However, there may also be irritation, anger and friendly rejection imbedded in this archaic order for silence. In (88), Maria uses **PEACE** to tell Feste to chance the subject as well as rejects Feste's suggestion that Sir Toby would be a good match if he would only stop drinking.

(88) Maria: **Peace**, you rogue, no more o' that. Here comes my lady: make your excuse wisely, you were best.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 5)

#### **PLAGUE and POX**

These two interjections, uttered once by Sir Andrew, collocate with the prepositional phrase 'on't' in the present material. They are used to curse the current situation and signal fear,

regret and a change of mind. In (89) and (90), Sir Andrew reacts to the news that his duelling opponent is fiercer than expected and will not yield:

(89) Sir Andrew: **Plague** on't, an I thought he had been valiant and so cunning in fence  
I'd have seen him damned ere I'd have challenged him.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

(90) Sir Andrew: **Pox** on't, I'll not meddle with him.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

### **SAY**

SAY expresses surprise in the present material. It collocates with WHAT and is uttered once by Barnardo in *Hamlet*:

(91) Barnardo: **Say** –  
What is Horatio there?

(*Hamlet*: act 1, scene 1)

### **SO**

This interjection is used cognitive-expressively by Othello, who repeats it for emphasis as he, out of earshot, watches Cassio and Iago talk merrily together. Othello believes that Cassio is bragging about his affair with Desdemona to Iago and interprets his laughing as confirmation of the affair.

(92) Othello (*aside*): **So, so, so, so**: they laugh that wins.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

### **SOFT**

SOFT is the equivalent to 'wait' in the present material. It is attested in all three play-texts, six times in *Hamlet*, three times in *Twelfth Night* and once in *Othello*. As a cognitive-expressive interjection, SOFT signals evaluation, reflection and recollection and rejection of a previous thought. It may also be duplicated for emphasis. In (93), Olivia is surprised to find herself in love with Viola as Cesario after their first meeting and evaluates her thoughts and feelings.

(93) Olivia: 'What is your parentage?'

‘Above my fortunes, yet my state is well.  
I am a gentleman.’ I’ll be sworn thou art.  
Thy tongue, thy face, thy limbs, actions, and spirit  
Do give thee five-fold blazon. Not too fast. **Soft, soft** –  
Unless the master were the man. How now?  
Even so quickly may one catch the plague?

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 5)

### **SOOTH**

This cognitive-expressive interjection, meaning ‘truly’, ‘in truth’<sup>16</sup>, is recorded twice in *Twelfth Night* and once in *Othello*, signalling disagreement, affirmation and refusal. In (94), Viola as Cesario disagrees that Orsino cannot accept a negative answer to the question if Olivia loves him.

(94) Viola: **Sooth**, but you must.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 4)

### **STAND**

This conative interjection occurs once in *Hamlet*. Too dark to see anything, Francisco calls out to Horatio and Marcellus to identify themselves:

(95) Francisco: I think I hear them. – **Stand!** Who’s there?

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 1)

### **TROTH**

This interjection is used once by Feste in *Twelfth Night* in the cognitive-expressive function, as an expression of reasoning:

(96) Feste: But indeed, words  
are very rascals since bonds disgraced them.

Viola: Thy reason, man?

Feste: **Troth** sir, I can yield you none without words and

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.uis.no/view/Entry/184704?rskey=Cvt5zA&result=4#eid>

words are grown so false I am loath to prove reason  
with them.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 1)

#### **WELL**

This interjection is recorded eight times in *Hamlet*, twelve times in *Twelfth Night* and fifteen times in *Othello*. It is mainly used cognitive-expressively to signal evaluation, acceptance, confirmation and rejection of a previous statement. In (97), Olivia refuses to accept Viola as Cesario's offer to acquit her of her declared love and in (98), Laertes accepts that Hamlet managed to get the first hit during their wager fight.

(97) Olivia: **Well**, come again tomorrow. Fare thee well,  
A fiend like thee might bear my soul to hell.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

(98) Laertes: **Well**, again.

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 2)

WELL is also used in the emotive-expressive function, signalling impatience, approval and indifference. In (99), Roderigo impatiently asks Iago to tell him how it may be that Desdemona is his within two nights.

(99) Roderigo: **Well**, is it within reason and compass?

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

In addition, WELL may be used conatively to demand action or response. In (100), it serves both the conative and the emotive-expressive function. Othello impatiently tells Desdemona to pray before he kills her.

(100) Othello: **Well**, do it, and be brief; I will walk by:  
I would not kill thy unprepared spirit,

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

#### **WHY**

This interjection is recorded 34 times in *Hamlet*, 28 times in *Twelfth Night* and 46 times in *Othello*. It occurs mainly in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. As an emotive-expressive interjection, WHY signals mostly negative feelings such as disapproval, irritation, impatience, contempt, anger, lament and horror. In (101), Desdemona impatiently

and irritated wants to know when he will speak to Cassio to clear the air and in (102), a mortally wounded Laertes laments his folly.

(101) Desdemona: **Why**, the, tomorrow night, or Tuesday morn,  
On Tuesday noon, or night, on Wednesday morn –  
I prithee name the time,  
*(Othello: Act 3, scene 3)*

(102) Osric: How is't, Laertes?  
Laertes: **Why**, as a woodcock to mine own springe, Osric.  
I am justly killed with mine own treachery.  
*(Hamlet: Act 5, scene 2)*

The interjection also expresses positive emotions such as approval, admiration, confidence, amusement and happiness. In (103), Sir Andrew approves of Feste's fooling.

(103) Sir Andrew: Excellent! **Why**, this is the best fooling, when all is done.  
*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 3)*

In (104), Iago is confident that no one else but Cassio will receive Desdemona's love when she tires of Othello:

(104) Iago: **Why** none, **why** none - a slipper and a subtle knave, a finder  
of occasion,  
*(Othello: Act 2, scene 1)*

WHY may also express surprise:

(105) Viola: If I did love you in my master's flame,  
With such a suff'ring, such a deadly life,  
In your denial I would find no sense,  
I would not understand it.  
  
Olivia: **Why**, what would you?  
*(Twelfth Night: act 1, scene 5)*

Cognitive-expressively, **WHY** is used to signal curiosity, disagreement, acceptance, recollection, disbelief, rejection, reassurance and reasoning. In (106), Hamlet has claimed that Denmark is a prison and Rosencrantz politely disagrees. They coolly tolerate each other in the exchange that follows:

(106) Hamlet:                   **Why**, then, 'tis none to you; for there is nothing  
  either good or bad, but thinking makes it so. To me it is a  
  prison.

Rosencrantz:               **Why**, then, your ambition makes it one; 'tis  
  too narrow for your mind.

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

**WHY** may be used conatively to seek agreement:

(107) Hamlet:               **Why**, might not that be the skull of a lawyer?

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

#### **WHAT**

This predominantly emotive-expressive interjection occurs 10 times in *Hamlet*, 9 times in *Twelfth Night* and 19 times in *Othello*. It is used to signal surprise, irritation, sadness, anger, concern, fear and dislike. In (108), the First Clown in *Hamlet* is surprised how the Second clown can claim that Adam in the Bible never bore arms:

(108) First Clown:       **What**, art a heathen? How dost thou understand  
  the Scripture?

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

Sir Toby is furious about Malvolio's daydreaming in (109):

(109) Malvolio:        Saying 'Cousin Toby, my fortunes, having cast  
  me on your niece, give me this prerogative speech' –

Sir Toby:               **What, what!**

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 5)

In (110), Cassio dislikes and rejects the idea of him and Bianca as a married couple. There is thus an embedded cognitive-expressive element in the example.

(110) Cassio: I marry - **what** - a customer?

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

In addition to rejection, WHAT signals disagreement, reproof and reassurance as a cognitive-expressive interjection. In (111), Iago tries to comfort a disgraced Cassio and tells him to pull himself together. The latter is an embedded conative element.

(111) Iago: **What**, man! there are more  
ways to recover the general again

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

#### 4.5 Interjectional phrases

As Table 2 in section 4.1 shows, the interjectional phrases are used the least in the present material. They make up only 19% of the registered tokens. However, the interjectional phrases rank the top when it comes to the number of types, with 86 types in the First Folio and altogether 97 recorded types in both editions taken together<sup>17</sup>. IN FAITH and GO TO are the most commonly used phrases with 22 and 18 tokens respectively.

The present study divides the registered interjectional phrases in two main categories: religious phrases and secular phrases. The religious phrases refer to or swear by God, Christ, heaven, hell, the Devil, saints and pagan gods. The secular phrases refer to or swear by disease, nature, animals and the speaker or addressee. The religious and secular phrases may also be separated into two further categories. The first contains those phrases that in some way act as binding oaths and asseverations, such as a pledge or swearing the truth-value of a statement. The second category includes phrases that are more generally used as emphasis, as a conative element or as profanity. This division has implications for how the phrases are used in characterisation and is further discussed in chapter 5.

Tables 11, 12 and 13 provide an overview of the registered phrases broken down by play. BY HEAVEN is the most commonly used phrase in *Hamlet* with nine tokens, IN FAITH is the most commonly used phrase in *Twelfth Night* with 9 tokens and GO TO is used most frequently in *Othello*, with 11 tokens.

---

<sup>17</sup> The remaining eleven types from the Oxford edition are included in the presentation of the interjectional phrases.

<b>Hamlet</b>			
As I do live	1	For love of grace	1
Before my God	1	For shame	2
By Cock	1	For the love of God	1
By Gis	1	Fore God	1
By heaven	7	Go to	4
By my fay	1	God's bodykins	1
By Saint Charity	1	Heaven and earth	1
By Saint Patrick	1	In faith	6
By the Lord	1	In good faith	3
By the mass	1	In the name of heaven	1
By the rood	1	O God	2
By this hand	1	O Heaven	1
By yonder sun	1	Soft you now	1
By'r lady	2	Upon my life	1
Come on	1	What ho	2
For Heavens love	1	Woe is me	1

Table 11. Interjectional phrases in *Hamlet*

<b>Twelfth Night</b>			
Alas the day	2	By your patience	1
Before me	1	By'r lady	1
Beshrew me	1	Fire and brimstone	1
Bolts and shackles	1	For the love of God	3
By heaven	2	For the love of mockery	1
By innocence	1	Go to	7
By maidhood, honour, truth, and everything	1	Hey ho	5
By mine honour	1	In faith	9
By my life	1	In good faith	1
By my troth	7	In sooth	1
By my youth	1	In the name of jesting	1
By Saint Anne	1	My profound heart	1
By the Lord	2	Od's lifelings	1
By the roses of the spring	1	Slid	1
By the very fangs of malice	1	Slight	2
By this hand	3	What a plague	1
By your leave	1	What ho	2

Table 12. Interjectional phrases in *Twelfth Night*

<b>Othello</b>			
Alas the day	2	For Christian shame	1
Alas the heavy day	1	For heaven sake	1



As I am a Christian	1	For shame	2
As I am a soldier	1	For this fair island	1
As I shall be saved	1	Fore Heaven	2
Before me	1	Forsooth	1
Beshrew me	1	Go to	11
Bless the mark	1	Goats and monkeys	1
Bless us	1	Good faith	1
By heaven	8	Good father	1
By Janus	1	Heaven forbid	2
By my life and soul	1	Heaven forgive us	1
By the world	1	Heavens forfend	2
By the worth of my eternal soul	1	In faith	3
By this hand	2	In good faith	1
By this heavenly light	2	In good troth	1
By yon marble heaven	1	In sooth	1
Come on	2	Introth	3
Death and damnation	1	Upon my soul	1
Divinity of hell	1	What ho	9
Fire and brimstone	1		

Table 13. Interjectional phrases in *Othello*

#### 4.5.1 Religious phrases

##### **AS I AM A CHRISTIAN + AS I SHALL BE SAVED**

Desdemona utters the single occurrence of these two phrases. **AS I AM A CHRISTIAN** serves both the emotive-expressive and the cognitive-expressive function in (112), where Desdemona despairingly tries to convince Othello that she is not a strumpet:

(112) Desdemona: No, **as I am a Christian**.

If to preserve this vessel for my lord  
From any other foul unlawful touch  
Be not to be a strumpet, I am none.

*(Othello: Act 4, scene 2)*

**AS I SHALL BE SAVED** is also both emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive, signalling despair and attempted persuasion. Othello is not convinced by his wife's reply and asks again if she is not a whore.

(113) Desdemona:           No, **as I shall be saved**.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

**BEFORE MY GOD**

This phrase occurs once in *Hamlet* in the emotive-expressive function and is uttered by Horatio. As a rational scholar, he is shaken by his first meeting with the ghost and invokes God as his witness to assert the truth of his statement:

(114) Horatio:           **Before my God**, I might not believe  
                                Without the sensible and true avouch  
                                Of mine own eyes.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 1)

**BLESS THE MARK and GOD BLESS THE MARK**

These two phrases are closely connected in the present material: The former appears in the First Folio and is an expurgation of the latter First Quarto version of *Othello*, which the Oxford edition has adopted, as Table 7 in section 4.2 shows. The phrases are uttered once by Iago as an expression of disgust that he is Othello's ensign and not his lieutenant.

(115) Iago: He, in good time, must his lieutenant be,  
                  And I – **God bless the mark!** – his Moorship's ensign.

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1. Oxford edition)

And I (**blesse the marke**) his Mooreships Auntient.

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1. First Folio edition)

**BLESS US and HEAVEN BLESS US**

Just as the two phrases above, these two are also couplings due to the First Folio's sensitivity for potential blasphemous oaths. HEAVEN BLESS US was deemed too heavy an oath by the scribe who prepared the First Folio copy text of *Othello*, see section 4.2 and Table 7. The phrases are uttered once by Desdemona in the emotive-expressive function, signalling lament. In (116), she laments that Othello takes the loss of the handkerchief so badly.

(116) Othello: Is't lost? Is't gone? Speak, is it out o'th' way?

Desdemona: **Heaven bless us!**

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4. Oxford edition)

Desdemona: **Blesse vs.**

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4. First Folio edition)

#### **BY THE LORD**

Recorded once in *Hamlet* and twice in *Twelfth Night*, this phrase may be used both emotive-expressively and cognitive expressively, signalling lament, anger and reflection. In (117), Fabian reads from the letter Malvolio wrote while locked up in the dark room. **BY THE LORD** in this example is equivalent to the oath 'With God as my witness' and emphasises how strongly Malvolio feels that he has been wronged. It could also be read as a pledge.

(117) Fabian (*reads*): **'By the Lord**, madam, you wrong me, and  
the world shall know of it.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 5, scene 1)

#### **BY MY TROTH and GOD'S TROTH**

**BY MY TROTH** occurs seven times in *Twelfth Night* and twice in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. In the emotive-expressive function, **BY MY TROTH** signals light irritation, thankfulness and relief. In (118), Feste is thankful for Sebastian's generosity.

(118) Sebastian: There's money for thee. If you tarry longer  
I shall give worse payment.

Feste: **By my troth**, thou hast an open hand. These wise  
men that give fools money get themselves a good report,  
after fourteen years' purchase.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 4, scene 1)

Used cognitive-expressively, the phrase signals agreement and disagreement, rejection and reflection. In (119), Sir Andrew agrees with Sir Toby that Feste should sing a song.

(119) Sir Andrew: **By my troth**, the fool has an excellent breast.

I had rather than forty shillings I had such a leg, and so  
Sweet a breath to sing, as the fool has.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 3)

GOD'S TROTH OCCURS once in *Othello* and is uttered by Desdemona in the cognitive-expressive function. In (120), she and Emilia discuss whether Emilia would be unfaithful to her husband if it gained him or her. BY MY TROTH is also included in the example. Both phrases signal disagreement.

(120) Desdemona:           Wouldst thou do such a thing for all the world?  
Emilia:                    The world's a huge thing: it is a great price  
                                  For a small vice.  
Desdemona:           **God's troth**, I think thou wouldst not.  
Emilia:                   **By my troth**, I think I should, and undo't when I  
                                  had done.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3)

#### **BY MY LIFE AND SOUL**

Desdemona speaks the single instance of this oath. She uses it both emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively as she despairingly tries to convince Othello that she did not give the handkerchief to Cassio:

(121) Desdemona:           No, **by my life and soul** –  
                                  Send for the man, and ask him.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

#### **BY MY FAITH and IN GOOD TROTH**

The single occurrence of these oaths is uttered once by Cassio in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. The former appears in the Oxford edition and the latter in the First Folio, as Table 7 in section 4.2 shows. In (122), he has just given Bianca a handkerchief and asked her to copy its embroidery, but she reacts with jealousy. Irritated, Cassio tries to convince her that her jealousy is ungrounded.

(122) Cassio:            You are jealous now  
                                  That this is from some mistress, some remembrance –

No, **by my faith**, Bianca.

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

**BY MY FAY**

Attested once in *Hamlet*, this phrase is used cognitive-expressively to signal evaluation. Hamlet is getting tired of the word battle with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and says:

(123) Hamlet: Shall we to th' court? For, **by my fay**, I cannot reason.

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

**BY HEAVEN**

Attested seven times in *Hamlet*, twice in *Twelfth Night* and eight times in *Othello*, this phrase is used both emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively. In the emotive function, the phrase signals anger, hurt, irritation, confidence and lament. In (124), Othello is irritated that Iago answers so evasively and in (125), Roderigo is angered to hear how Othello bypassed Iago in his choice of lieutenant.

(124) Othello: **By heaven**, I'll know your thoughts!

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3)

(125) Roderigo: **By heaven**, I rather would have been his hangman!

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1)

Used cognitive-expressively, the phrase expresses evaluation as shown in (126), determination, rejections and persuasion.

(126) Orsino: She is not worth thee then. What years, i' faith?

Viola: About your years, my lord.

Orsino: Too old, **by heaven**.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 4)

In (127), Hamlet is determined in his decision to follow the ghost and that he will be violent if his friends try to stop him:

(127) Hamlet: **By heaven**, I'll make a ghost of him that lets me.

I say, away!

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 4)

**BY THE MASS/BY 'TH MASS/BY TH' MISSE**

This Catholic oath is attested once in *Hamlet* and once in Oxford edition of *Othello*. Both Polonius and Iago use it to express surprise. Polonius also uses the phrase to express agreement and reflection. In (128), he feigns surprise and indulges Hamlet.

- (128) Hamlet: Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?  
Polonius: **By th' mass**, and it's like a camel indeed.  
Hamlet: Methinks it is like a weasel.

(*Hamlet*: Act 3, scene 2)

**BY THE WORTH OF MY ETERNAL SOUL**

Othello utters the single occurrence of this phrase in the emotive-expressive function. He angrily threatens Iago:

- (129): Othello: Villain, be sure thou prove my love a whore!  
Be sure of it; give me the ocular proof;  
(He seizes Iago by the throat)  
**Or, by the worth of my eternal soul,**  
Thou hadst been better have been born a dog  
Than answer my waked wrath!

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3)

**BY THE ROOD**

Spoken once by Hamlet, this phrase is used in the emotive-expressive function to signal irritation:

- (130) Gertrude: Have you forgot me?  
Hamlet: No, *by the rood*, not so.  
You are the Queen, your husband's brother's wife,  
But – would you were not so – you are my mother.

(*Hamlet*: Act 3, scene 4)

### **BY'R LADY/BYRLADY**

This phrase occurs twice in *Hamlet*, once in *Twelfth Night* and once in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. Used emotive-expressively, BY'R LADY/BYRLADY signals merriness and irritation. In (131), Hamlet is happy to see the travelling players.

- (131) Hamlet: Welcome, good friends. – O, my old friend!  
Thy face is valanced since I saw thee last. Com'st thou to  
Beard me in Denmark? – What, my young lady and  
Mistress? **By'r lady**, your ladyship is nearer heaven than  
when I saw you last by the altitude of a chopine.  
*(Hamlet: Act 2, scene 2)*

In the cognitive-expressive function, the phrase expresses reflection and acceptance. Feste accepts Sir Andrew statement that he is a dog at a catch:

- (132) Feste: **By'r Lady**, sir, and some dogs will catch well.  
*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 3)*

### **BY SAINT ANNE and BY SAINT PATRICK**

These two phrases are two of three oaths that swear by a saint. BY SAINT ANNE occurs once in *Twelfth Night*. Feste uses it emotive-expressively to show that he disagrees that there shall be no more cake and ale.

- (133) Sir Toby: *(To Malvolio)* Art any  
More than a steward? Dost thou think because thou art  
Virtuous there shall be no more cakes and ale?  
Feste: Yes, **by Saint Anne**, and ginger shall be hot i'th  
Mouth too.  
*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 3)*

Hamlet uses the single occurrence of BY SAINT PATRICK emotive-expressively to signal disagreement:

- (134) Horatio: There's no offence, my lord.  
Hamlet: Yes, **by Saint Patrick**, but there is, Horatio,

And much offence too.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5)

**BY GIS, BY COCK and BY SAINT CHARITY**

These three phrases appear once in one of Ophelia's mad songs and signal dislike as well as the truth of her statement about young men. However, the truth-value of her utterance would be problematic to the Elizabethans. Kerrigan (2016: 18) explains that "madmen were not bound by their words".

(135) Ophelia:       **By Gis, and by Saint Charity,**  
                          Alack and fie for shame!  
                          Young men will do't, if they come to't,  
                          **By Cock** they are to blame.

(*Hamlet*: Act 4, scene 5)

According to Hibbard (2008: 300), *gis* is a corrupted form of Jesus and the spelling form is not recorded elsewhere in Shakespeare. *BY SAINT CHARITY* does not refer to a real saint, but the phrase 'by holy charity' "came to be treated as though *Charity* was the name of a saint" (Hibbard 2008: 300). *cock* serves the double function of being a corrupted version God and a quibble on penis (Hibbard 2008: 300) and thus plays with the sometimes very fine line between asseveration and profanity.

**BY THIS HEAVENLY LIGHT**

This oath occurs twice in *Othello* in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function. Desdemona and Emilia use it to emphasise the truth-value of their statement and signal confidence and agreement. In (136), Emilia has affirmed that there are women who would break their marriage vows and betray their husband and asks if Desdemona would do the same.

(136) Desdemona: No, **by this heavenly light.**  
          Emilia:       Nor I, **by this heavenly light:**  
                          I might do't as well i'th' dark.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3)



#### **BY JANUS**

The single instance of this phrase is spoken by Iago in the emotive-expressive function, signalling that he is surprised that it is not Desdemona's father and his friends that come and seek Othello. Neill and Wells (2008: 211) gloss the invocation of the Roman god thus: "Traditionally represented as two-faced, he is an appropriate deity for the shifty Iago to invoke".

(137) Othello: Is it they?  
Iago: **By Janus**, I think not.

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 2)

#### **FIRE AND BRIMSTONE**

This phrase occurs twice in the present material, once in *Twelfth Night* and once in *Othello*, signalling anger. Neill and Wells (2008: 338) gloss that the oath reflects the torments of hell and the and the divine punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah. In (138), Sir Toby gives an angry outburst while secretly observing Malvolio during the gulling. Malvolio fantasises that he is married to Olivia.

(138) Sir Toby: **Fire and brimstone!**

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 5)

#### **FOR (THE) LOVE OF GOD, FOR GOD'S LOVE and FOR HEAVEN'S LOVE**

These phrases are emotive-expressive with an embedded conative element and signal lament, despair and haste. **FOR (THE) LOVE OF GOD** occurs once in *Hamlet* and twice in *Twelfth Night*. In (139), Sir Andrew begs for help.

(139) Sir Andrew: **For the love of God**, a surgeon – send one  
Presently for Sir Toby.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 5, scene 1)

The couplets **FOR GOD'S LOVE** and **FOR HEAVEN'S LOVE** are uttered once by Hamlet. The latter phrase, which occurs in the First Folio, is an expurgation of the version from the Second Quarto, adopted by the Oxford edition. The phrases emphasise how much Hamlet wishes to hear his friends' tale about the ghost and implores them to speak without more delay.

- (140) Hamlet: The King my father?  
 Horatio: Season your admiration for a while  
 With an attent ear till I may deliver,  
 Upon the witness of these gentlemen,  
 This marvel to you.  
 Hamlet: **For God's love** let me hear.

**For Heuens loue** let me heare.

*(Hamlet: Act 1, scene 2)*

#### **FOR LOVE OF GRACE**

This phrase is spoken once by Hamlet in the emotive-expressive and conative function. It is a prayer that Gertrude will not discard his accusations as madness.

- (141) Hamlet: Mother, **for love of grace**,  
 Let not a flattering unction to your soul,  
 That not your trespass but my madness speaks.

*(Hamlet: Act 3, scene 4)*

#### **FORE GOD and FORE HEAVEN**

Signalling approval and surprise, the emotive expressive **FORE GOD** occurs once in *Hamlet* and thrice in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. The phrase was purged from the First Folio version of *Othello* and replaced twice by **FORE HEAVEN** and once by **WHY**, as shown in Table 7. In (142), a drunk Cassio shows his approval of Iago's drinking songs.

- (142) Cassio: **Fore God**, this is a more exquisite song than the other!

**Fore heaven**, this is a more exquisite song than the other!

*(Othello: Act 2, scene 3)*

#### **FOR HEAVEN SAKE**

Cassio uses this phrase once, emotive-expressively and conatively. He is wounded after a fight with Roderigo and desperately cries for help:

(143) Cassio: Here, here! **For heaven sake** help me!

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 1)

#### **FORSOOTH**

(Salmon 1967 [1987: 63]) connects this phrase to low-rank members. It is spoken once by Iago in the emotive-expressive function, this phrase signals disgust:

(144) Iago: 'I have already chosen my officer.'

And what was he?

**Forsooth**, a great arithmetician,

One Michael Cassio.

(*Othello*: Act 1, scene 1)

#### **GOD'S BODYKINS**

This phrase is the equivalent of 'By God's dear body' (Hibbard 2008: 232) and is recorded once in the present material, in the cognitive-expressive function. Hamlet disagrees with Polonius' reply that the travelling players will be look after according to their deserve. Salmon (1967 [1987: 62]) suggests that the phrase may be used to display bold intimidation. This may well be the case as Hamlet's GOD'S BODYKINS is a response to Polonius' speaking against his orders.

(145) Hamlet: **God's bodykins**, man, much better. Use every man  
after his desert, and who should scape whipping?

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

#### **GOD'S WILL**

Iago speaks the two registered instances in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. The phrase gives an emotional emphasis to a conative statement expresses Iago's feigned despair that Cassio and Montano fight and his inability to stop them. Deemed too blasphemous by the compositors, the First Folio reads ALAS and duplicated FIE for GOD'S WILL.

(146) Iago: Nay, good lieutenant! **God's will**, gentlemen!  
Help, ho! Lieutenant! Sir Montano! Sir!

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

**GOD FORBID, HEAVEN FORBID and HEAVENS FORFEND**

These related phrases express horror in the present material and are recorded in *Othello*. GOD FORBID and HEAVENS FORFEND are recorded once while HEAVEN FORBID appear twice. That is, one of the two instances can be found in the Folio only, as HEAVEN replaces GOD due to purging. In (147), Iago is horrified that Cassio may be dangerously wounded and in (148), he, Montano and Gratiano are horrified by the news that Desdemona is murdered. The collocation with MARRY and o adds an extra emotional emphasis.

(147) Iago: Marry, **God forbid!**

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

(148) Montano, Gratiano and Iago: **O heavens forfend!**

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

**GOOD FAITH and GOOD FATHER**

These two phrases are uttered once by Desdemona in the cognitive-expressive function, signalling evaluation of a string of thoughts. GOOD FAITH was purged from the First Folio and replaced with GOOD FATHER, as Table 7 shows. In (149), she talks to Emilia and refers to the wedding sheets that Emilia has put on her bed. Desdemona hopes that they will help her regain Othello's lost regard for her.

(149) Desdemona: All's one, **good faith**, how foolish are our minds!

If I do die before thee, prithee, shroud me

In one of these same sheets.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3)

**HEAVEN FORGIVE US**

Desdemona utters the single occurrence of this phrase. She uses it emotive-expressively to express her despair when Othello keeps insisting that she is a strumpet. The phrase collocates with the primary interjection o in the example.

(150) Desdemona: **O heaven forgive us!**

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

#### HEAVEN AND EARTH

This phrase is spoken once by Hamlet in his first soliloquy. He is tormented by grief and his mother's remarriage in (151):

(151) Hamlet:       So excellent a king, that was to this  
                          Hyperion to a satyr, so loving to my mother  
                          That he might not beteem the winds of heaven  
                          Visit her face too roughly. **Heaven and earth,**  
                          Must I remember?

*(Hamlet: act 1, scene 2)*

#### I'TH/ IN THE NAME OF GOD and I'TH/IN THE NAME OF HEAVEN

In *Hamlet*, IN THE NAME OF GOD occurs in the Oxford edition only and IN THE NAME OF HEAVEN in the First Folio only as HEAVEN replaces GOD to avoid blasphemy, as shown in Table 7 in section 4.2. The two phrases are both emotive-expressive and conative, signalling surprise and an urge to speak.

(152) Ophelia:       Alas, my lord, I have been so affrighted.  
                          Polonius:       With what, **i'th name of God?**

*(Hamlet: Act 2, scene 1)*

#### IN FAITH/'I'FAITH/YFAITH/INFAITH

This predominantly emotive phrase occurs six times in *Hamlet*, nine times in *Twelfth Night* and three times in the First Folio version of *Othello* due to expurgation. In comparison, the Oxford edition contains eight tokens. Used emotive-expressively, the phrase signals surprise, irritation, approval, sadness and confidence. In (153), Sir Andrew approves of Feste's song and in (154), is surprised to hear how the handkerchief Othello gave her came into being, by magic.

(153) Sir Andrew:   Excellent good, **i'faith**.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 3)*

(154) Desdemona:   **I'faith**, is it true?

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

Used cognitive-expressively, the phrase expresses evaluation, reflection, agreement, a binding oath, irony and reassurance. In (155), Horatio and Marcellus swear they will be quiet about their encounter with the ghost.

(155) Horatio: **In faith**, my lord, not I.

Marcellus: Nor I, my lord, **in faith**.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5)

Cassio agrees that Bianca is in love with him in (156):

(156) Iago: I never knew a woman love man so.

Cassio: Alas, poor rogue! I think **i'faith** she loves me.

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

#### **IN GOOD FAITH**

(IN) GOOD FAITH OCCURS three times in *Hamlet* and once in *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*. The phrase signals approval and lament in the emotive-expressive function. In (157), the First Clown approves of the Second Clown's answer to his riddle.

(157) First Clown: I like thy wit well, **in good faith**.

(*Hamlet*: Act 5, scene 1)

In the cognitive-expressive function, the phrase signals disagreement and irony. Feste seemingly approves of Maria witty comment:

(158) Feste: Apt, **in good faith**, very apt.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 1, scene 5)

Warren and Wells (2008: 104) gloss that Feste is probably being ironical since Maria interrupted him before he could make his witty points.

#### **IN SOOTH/INSOOTH**

Attested once in *Twelfth Night* and in the First Folio version of *Othello*, this emotive-expressive phrase signals irritation and approval. Sir Andrew compliments Feste for good fooling the night before in (159):

(159) Sir Andrew: **In sooth**, thou  
wast in very gracious fooling last night, when thou  
spok'st of Picrogromitus,

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 3)

#### **INTROTH**

This phrase occurs three times in the First Folio version of *Othello* as a milder oath version of GOD'S TROTH, BY MY TROTH and BY THE MASS. It is used both in the emotive-expressive and cognitive-expressive function to signal surprise and disagreement. See example (120) for the cognitive-expressive use.

#### **O GOD**

This phrase occurs four (two) times in *Hamlet* and twice in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. It is predominantly emotive-expressive and signals lament, despair and disapproval. In (160), Cassio laments how drink can change a man.

(160) Cassio: **O God**, that men  
should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their  
brains;

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

The phrase may also be used cognitively-expressively to signal disagreement. Rosencrantz argues that Hamlet's ambition makes Denmark feel like a prison as it is too narrow for his mind, something which Hamlet refutes:

(161) Hamlet: **O God**, I could be bounded in a nutshell and count  
myself king of infinite space,

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

#### **O HEAVEN**

Attested once in the First Folio version of *Hamlet* and once in the Oxford edition of *Othello*, the phrase is exclusively emotive-expressive and signals sadness and disapproval. In (162), Iago laments that Roderigo has been killed.

(162) Iago: Alas, my friend and my dear countryman,

Roderigo! No? Yes, sure! – **O heaven**, Roderigo!

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 1)

**O LORD**

This phrase is found once in the Oxford edition of *Othello* in the emotive-expressive function signalling fear:

(163) Emilia: **O Lord**, what cry is that?

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

**'OD'S LIFELINGS**

This mild oath is a variation of 'By God's little lives' (Warren and Wells 2008: 209) and is uttered once by Sir Andrew as an expression of surprise and anger when he sees the very man who hurt him and Sir Toby.

(164) Olivia: Who has done this, Sir Andrew?

Sir Andrew: The Count's gentleman, one Cesario. We took him for a coward, but he's the very devil incarnate.

Orsino: My gentleman, Cesario?

Sir Andrew: '**Od's lifelings**, there he is. (*To Viola*) You broke my head for nothing, and that that I did was set on to do't by Sir Toby.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 5, scene 1)

**'SLIGHT and 'SLID**

Sir Andrew speaks both instances of 'SLIGHT and the single instance of 'SLID. These oaths are the contracted forms of 'By God's light' and 'By God's eyelid' (Warren and Wells 2008: 143, 187). They signal anger, contempt and strong irritation. In (165), Sir Andrew is irritated, perhaps mildly angered by Fabian's comment that Olivia really signalled her love for Sir Andrew when she displayed affection towards Cesario in his presence. In (80), he is angered by Viola's cowardness and decides to continue the fight.

(165) Sir Andrew: '**Slight**, will you make an ass o' me?



(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 2)

(166) Sir Andrew: **'Slid**, I'll after him again, and beat him.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 4)

#### **'SWOUNDS** and **'SBLLOOD**

These two oaths are contracted forms of 'For God's wounds' and 'For God's blood' (Gewheiler 2010: 322) and are only uttered by men, as Salmon (1967 [1987: 62]) attests. 'SWOUNDS is the most frequent of the contracted oaths with two instances in the Oxford edition of *Hamlet* and nine instances in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. The phrase is predominantly emotive-expressive and expresses anger, irritation, disgust and lament. In (167), Othello is angry that Cassio and Montano have fought with each other:

(167) Othello: **'Swounds**, if I stir,  
or do but lift this arm, the best of you  
shall sink in my rebuke.

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

'SBLLOOD is recorded twice in the Oxford edition of *Hamlet* and once in the Oxford edition of *Othello*. It is exclusively emotive-expressive and signals irritation, anger and contempt. Hamlet contemptuously notes that those who would ridicule his uncle while his father was alive now purchase miniature pictures of him:

(168) Hamlet: **'Sblood**, there is something in this  
more than natural, if philosophy could find it out.

(*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2)

#### **'UD'S DEATH** and **'UD'S PITY**

These two phrases are found once in *Othello* in the emotive-expressive function. In (169), Desdemona has asked to what Cassio has confessed and Othello angrily replies:

(169) Othello: That he hath - **'ud's death!** - used thee.

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

In (170), Emilia is surprised that Desdemona could doubt that a woman would not be unfaithful.

(170) Emilia:           **'Ud's pity**, who would not make her husband a cockhold to make him monarch?

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3)

#### **UPON MY SOUL**

Emilia speaks the single occurrence of this phrase. She uses it emotive-expressively to signal how angry she is about Iago telling lies about Desdemona.

(171) Emilia:           You told a lie, an odious damnéd lie,  
                                  **Upon my soul**, a lie, a wicked lie:  
                                  She false with Cassio?

(*Othello*: Act 5, scene 2)

#### 4.5.2 Secular phrases

##### **ALAS THE DAY and ALAS THE HEAVY DAY**

These two phrases are emotive-expressive and signal lament and recollection. **ALAS THE DAY** occurs twice both in *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* while **ALAS THE HEAVY DAY** is uttered once by Desdemona. In (172), Antonio recalls the day he saved Sebastian from drowning and expresses his sadness that Viola drowned.

(172) Sebastian:       My father was that Sebastian of Messaline  
                                  whom I know you have heard of. He left behind him  
                                  myself and a sister, both born within an hour. If the heavens  
                                  had been pleased, would we have ended so. But you, sir,  
                                  altered that, for some hour before you took me from the  
                                  breach of the sea was my sister drowned.

Antonio:           **Alas the day!**

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 1)

In (173), Desdemona do not understand why Othello accuses her of being false and why he is so upset.

(173) Desdemona:       **Alas the heavy day**, why do you weep?

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 2)

### **AS I DO LIVE**

Horatio uses the single occurrence of this phrase cognitive-expressively to confirm that the story of the ghost is true and that it appeared in the shape of Hamlet's late father.

- (174) Hamlet: 'Tis very strange.  
Horatio: **As I do live**, my honoured lord, 'tis true;  
And we did think it writ down in our duty  
To let you know of it.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 2)

### **AS I AM A SOLDIER**

This phrase occurs once in *Othello* in the cognitive-expressive function. Montano swears it is true that they have only given the drunk Cassio a pint of liquor, not more.

- (175) Montano: Good faith, a little one - not past a pint, **as I am a soldier!**

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

### **BEFORE ME**

This mild oath is attested once in both *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* and was "perhaps formed on the analogy of 'before God'" (Honigmann 1996, as cited in Neill and Wells 2008: 334).

BEFORE ME is used emotive-expressively in *Othello* and cognitive-expressively in *Twelfth Night*. In (176), Iago is surprised to see Bianca, as he and Cassio has just talked about her.

- (176) Iago: **Before me**, look where she comes!

*Enter Bianca*

(*Othello*: Act, 4, scene 1)

Sir Andrew uses the phrase as an evaluative comment about Maria, who has just left after devising the gulling of Malvolio:

- (177) Sir Andrew: **Before me**, she is a good wench.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 3)

### **BESHREW ME**

Recorded once in both *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*, this phrase is used emotive-expressively to signal lament and cognitive expressively as evaluation. In (178), Feste evaluates Sir Toby's drunken behaviour.

(178) Feste: **Beshrew me**, the knight's in admirable fooling.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 3)*

### **BY MINE HONOUR**

Olivia utters the only instance of this phrase and uses it emotive-expressively. As Sir Toby makes his first appearance in the play, she laments that he cannot stay sober.

(179) Olivia: **By mine honour**, half-drunk. What is he at the gate, cousin?

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

### **BY MY LIFE and BY YOUR LEAVE**

These two phrases are spoken once by Malvolio and occur in the emotive-expressive function. In (180), Malvolio has just found the fake letter and is surprised when he recognises whose hand it is written in.

(180) Malvolio: *(Taking up the letter)* **By my life**, this is my lady's hand. These be her very c's, her u's and her t's, and thus makes she her great P's. It is in contempt of question her hand.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 5)*

Having read the inscription on the envelope, Malvolio is excited when he finds further proof that the letter is from Olivia:

(181) Malvolio: **By your leave**, wax – soft, and the impressure of her Lucrece, with which she uses to seal – 'tis my lady. To whom should this be?

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 5)*

**BY THE ROSES OF SPRING and BY MAIDHOOD, HONOUR, TRUTH AND EVERYTHING and BY INNOCENCE and BY MY YOUTH**

These four phrases occur once in *Twelfth Night* and are part of an exchange between Olivia and Viola as Cesario. The oaths are used cognitive-expressively to persuade the addressee and emphasise the truth of the following statement.

(182) Olivia:           Cesario, **by the roses of spring,**  
                              **By maidhood, honour, truth and everything,**  
                              I love thee so that maugre all thy pride,  
                              Nor wit, nor reason can my passion hide.  
                              Do not extort thy reasons form this clause:  
                              For that I woo, thou therefore hast no cause.  
                              But rather reason thus reason fetter:  
                              Love sought is good, but given unsought is better.

                  Viola:           **By innocence I swear, and by my youth,**  
                              I have one heart, one bosom, and one truth,  
                              And that no woman has, nor never none  
                              Shall mistress be if it save I alone.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 3, scene 1)*

**BY THIS HAND**

This phrase occurs in all three play-texts, once in *Hamlet*, three times in *Twelfth Night* and twice in the First Folio version of *Othello* and four times in the Oxford edition. It is used in both the emotive-expressive and the cognitive-expressive function. Used emotive-expressively, **BY THIS HAND** signals irritation, lament and confidence. In (183), Iago is confident that it was Desdemona's handkerchief that Cassio showed him. The example also has an embedded cognitive-expressive element in the form of persuasion.

(183) Othello:           Was that mine?  
                  Iago:                Your, **by this hand!**

*(Othello: Act 4, scene 1)*

Used cognitive-expressively, this phrase signals agreement, disagreement and persuasion. In (184), Hamlet disagrees with Laertes.

(184) Laertes: You mock me, sir.

Hamlet: No, **by this hand**.

*(Hamlet: Act 5, scene 2)*

#### **BY THE WORLD**

Othello speaks the single occurrence of this phrase. He despairs that he cannot make up his mind about Desdemona's faithfulness and whether Iago can be trusted.

(185) Othello: **By the world**, I think my wife be honest, and think she is not;  
I think that tough art just, and think thou art not:

*(Othello: Act 3, scene 3)*

#### **BY THE VERY FANGS OF MALICE and MY PROFOUND HEART**

Uttered once by Viola as Cesario in the cognitive-expressive function, these two phrases are used as a persuasive element:

(186) Olivia: Are you a comedian?

Viola: No, **my profound heart**; and yet - **by the very fangs of malice** I swear – I am not that I play. Are you the lady of the house?

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

#### **BY YONDER SUN**

The single occurrence of this phrase appears in one of Ophelia's mad songs. The male speaker in her song uses it cognitive-expressively to persuade the female speaker that he would have married her chaste, if she had not tempted him.

(187) Ophelia: Quoth she 'Before you tumbled me,  
You promised me to wed.'  
'So would I have done, **by yonder sun**,  
An thou hadst not come to my bed.'

*(Hamlet: Act 4, scene 5)*

#### **BY YON MARBLE HEAVEN**

Othello uses the single occurrence of this phrase both emotive-expressively and cognitive-expressively. Fully convinced of Desdemona's betrayal, he angrily vows revenge.

(188) Othello:        Now, **by yon marble heaven**,  
                              In the due revenge of a sacred vow,  
                              I here engage my words.

*(Othello: Act 3, scene 3)*

#### **BY YOUR PATIENCE**

Attested once in *Twelfth Night* in the cognitive-expressive function, Sebastian rejects the idea that he should stay longer or that Antonio should go with him.

(189) Sebastian:    **By your patience**, no. My stars shine darkly  
                              Over me.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 1)*

#### **BOLTS AND SHACKLES**

Sir Toby utters the single occurrence of this phrase. He uses it emotive-expressively to express his anger as he spies on Malvolio who is daydreaming:

(190) Malvolio:     after a demure travel of regard, telling them I know my  
                              place, as I would they should do theirs – to ask for my  
                              kinsman, Toby.

Sir Toby:        **Bolts and shackles!**

*(Twelfth Night: Act 2, scene 5)*

#### **COME ON**

This phrase is recorded once in *Hamlet* and twice in *Othello* in the emotive-expressive function, signalling irritation and impatience. There is also an embedded conative element in *Hamlet*:

(191) Hamlet:        Give us the foils. **Come on.**

*(Hamlet: Act 5, scene 2)*

#### DEATH AND DAMNATION

Othello speaks the single occurrence of this phrase. He uses it emotive-expressively to express anger. In (192), Othello's anger is directed at both Iago's suggestion that to be satisfied in his suspicion, Othello will have to catch Desdemona in the act with Cassio, and at the thought of his wife's infidelity. The phrase collocates with the primary interjection o in the example.

(192) Othello:       **Death and damnation! O!**

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 3)

#### DIVINITY OF HELL

Attested once in *Othello*, this phrase is used by Iago in the cognitive-expressive function. He rejects the thought that he is a villain to advise Cassio to seek Desdemona's help in recovering Othello's favour.

(193) Iago:   How am I a villain  
                  To counsel Cassio to this parallel course  
                  Directly to his good? **Divinity of hell!**

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

#### GOATS AND MONKEYS

Uttered once by Othello, this emotive-expressive phrase signals anger. Othello's anger is directed towards the letter he has received that calls him home from Cyprus and towards Desdemona, whom he thinks is glad that Cassio will take his place.

(194) Othello:       You are welcome, sir, to Cyprus. – **Goats and monkeys!**

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

#### FOR THE LOVE OF MOCKERY and IN THE NAME OF JESTING

These two phrases occur once within the same turn in *Twelfth Night*. Amused, Maria tells Sir Toby, Sir Andrew and Fabian to come and observe Malvolio as he finds the fake letter.



(195) Maria:           Observe him, **for the love of mockery**, for I know this  
letter will make a contemplative idiot of him. Close, in  
**the name of jesting!**

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 2, scene 5)

#### **FOR THIS FAIR ISLAND**

Attested once in *Othello*, this phrase is used cognitive-expressively. Iago pretends to reject Montano's suggestion that it be a good idea to inform Othello about Cassio's drunkenness.

(196) Iago:   Not I, **for this fair island!**  
I do love Cassio well, and would do much  
To cure him of this evil –

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

#### **FOR SHAME**

This phrase occurs twice in both *Hamlet* and *Othello*. It is exclusively emotive-expressive, signalling, dislike, irritation, anger and impatience. In (197), Polonius impatiently awaits Laertes' departure for France and in (198), Iago angrily tells Cassio and Roderigo to stop fighting.

(197) Polonius:    Yet her, Laertes? Aboard, aboard, **for shame!**

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 3)

(198) Iago:        The general speaks to you, hold, **for shame!**

(*Othello*: Act 2, scene 3)

#### **GO TO/GOE TOO**

This typical Elizabethan phrase occurs four times in *Hamlet*, seven times in *Twelfth Night* and twelve (eleven) times in *Othello*. It is mainly an emotive-expressive and conative phrase. In the emotive-expressive function, it signals irritation, impatience, disgust and approval. Irritation and impatience are the dominating emotions for the phrase in the present material. In (199), Sebastian is irritated that Feste will not let him be and keeps claiming he knows him and in (200), Desdemona impatiently awaits an answer.

(199) Sebastian:   **Go to, go to**, thou art a foolish fellow.

Let me be clear of thee.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 4, scene 1)

(200) Desdemona: **Go to!** Where loges he?

(*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4)

In (201), Othello is spying on Cassio and Iago, believing that Iago questions Cassio about his affair with Desdemona and approves of what he sees.

(201) Iago: Do you hear, Cassio?

Othello (*aside*) Now he importunes him

To tell it o'er. **Go to**, well said, well said!

(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

go to is used conatively in (202) and is equivalent to 'Calm yourself'. It is repeated for emphasis.

(202) Sir Toby: **Go to, go to.** Peace, peace, we must deal gently with him.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, scene 2)

The phrase may also be used cognitive-expressively to signal rejection and reassurance. (203) has an embedded emotive element. Polonius reject that his daughter's claim that Hamlet has shown her love in an honourable fashion.

(203) Polonius: Ay, 'fashion' you may call it. **Go to, go to.**

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 3)

#### **HEY HO**

Signalling resignation, this phrase occurs four times in one of Feste's songs:

(204) Feste (*sings*): When that I was and a little tiny boy,

With **hey, ho** the wind and the rain,

A foolish thing was but a toy,

For the rain, it raineth every day.

(*Twelfth Night*: Act 5, scene 1)

#### **SOFT YOU NOW**

Hamlet speaks the single occurrence of this phrase. At the end of a long soliloquy, he is surprised to see Ophelia:

(205) Hamlet:           And lose the name of action. – **Soft you now,**  
                                  The fair Ophelia.

*(Hamlet: Act 3, scene 1)*

#### **UPON MY LIFE**

Laertes utters the single occurrence of this phrase in the cognitive-expressive function. He recalls who Claudius is speaking of:

(206) Laertes:           **Upon my life,** Lamord.  
                  Claudius:           The very same.

*(Hamlet: Act 4, scene 7)*

#### **WHAT A PLAGUE**

Attested once in *Twelfth Night*, Sir Toby utters this phrase to signal irritation:

(207) Sir Toby:       **What a plague** means my niece to take the death of her brother thus?  
*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 3)*

#### **WHAT HO/WHAT HOA**

This exclusively conative phrase occurs twice in *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night* and nine times in *Othello*.

(208) Olivia:       **What ho,** Malvolio.

*(Twelfth Night: Act 1, scene 5)*

#### **WOE IS ME**

Ophelia utters the only instance of this phrase. She uses it emotive-expressively to signal sadness after a conversation with a mad Hamlet. In (209), **WOE IS ME** collocates with the primary interjection *o*.

(209) Ophelia:       **O woe is me**  
                                  T'have seen what I have seen, see what I see.

*(Hamlet: Act 3, scene 1)*

## 5. Interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool

### 5.1. Towards the mapping of relatively uncharted territory

There does not seem to be much research on how interjections and interjectional phrases are used in characterisation in historical play-texts. Studying Elizabethan colloquial English and the Falstaff plays, Salmon (1967 [1987]) notes that some exclamations and asseverations – terms in which interjections and interjectional phrases may be included – are clearly related to gender and social rank. However, she does not go into further detail about what this implies in terms of using such words and phrases as a characterisation tool. Hughes (2006) also states that profanities may be connected to gender and the different layers in society, but just as Salmon (1967 [1987]), he does not specify interjections and interjectional phrases explicitly. In contrast, Culpeper and Kytö (2010: 259) point out that their pragmatic noise does serve as part of characterisation in their Early Modern material:

They act as authorial pragmatic devices, and very often speaker pragmatic devices, conveying interpersonal meanings to the audience, and very often the other characters on stage. The playwright uses them as authorial pragmatic devices to convey information to the audience about thoughts and feelings of one character in relation to what another character has just said or to some event in the fictional world. In so doing, the playwright furthers characterisation and plot.

Still, pragmatic noise and characterisation is not their main concern and they do not elaborate any further.

Taavitsainen (1998, 1999) on the other hand, investigates the role interjections play in character description. Focusing on primary interjections, Taavitsainen (1998) finds that they signal a character's typical emotional reactions in Gothic romances. Primary interjections also play a part in characterisation in Jane Austen's Gothic parody, *Northanger Abbey*. Compared to Isabella, Catherine has the highest frequency of the interjection *oh* and Henry Tilney has a more playful use of *oh* than John Thorpe. Taavitsainen (1999) establishes a clear relationship between primary interjections as features of personal affect and personality types in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Støle (2012) is also concerned with primary interjections, specifically what functions they play in Late Middle English cycle plays. She finds that they are used in character description in the good versus bad dichotomy. It is important to keep in mind that

the plays in Støle’s (2012) Middle English corpus are altogether different from the Early Modern plays studied here, yet her findings are nonetheless relevant in determining the relationship between interjections and characterisation.

Given the evidence of studies as the above, Jucker and Taavitsainen’s (2013: 63) claim that “characterisation of fictional people using interjections is a fairly late phenomenon” seems somewhat strange. They are perhaps referring to the modern idea of character and characterisation, but as section 2.5.2 discusses, the modern view is part of a long tradition that may be traced back several centuries. The present study suggests that a subtle characterisation through interjections is present in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello* and that this allows for inferences about the use of interjections and interjectional phrases in character description in late Elizabethan plays.

## 5.2 Gender

There is an uneven distribution with regard to the gender of speakers between the three play-texts. In this respect, the two tragedies *Hamlet* and *Othello* are very masculine whereas the comedy *Twelfth Night* is a feminine play. As a result, the men dominate the conversational floor in the present study, as shown in Table 14. In fact, 77% of the recorded interjections and interjectional phrases are attested to men. Table 14 also gives an overview of the distribution of the three main categories, primary and secondary interjections and interjectional phrases, according to speaker gender. Generally, both genders use primary interjections the most and the interjectional phrases the least. Interestingly, the primary interjections make up over half of the spoken amount for the women, while the difference between the primary and secondary interjections is smaller for the men.

	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Primary int	348 / 474 (73%)	126 / 474 (27%)
Secondary int	292 / 353 (83%)	61 / 352 (17%)
Int phrases	151 / 197 (77%)	46 / 197 (23%)
Total	791 of 1024	233 of 1024
	<b>77% of all</b>	<b>23% of all</b>

Table 14. Distribution for the formal categories according to speaker gender.

The major difference between the genders when it comes to speaker distribution makes gender comparison of interjection and interjectional phrase usage challenging. In addition, the present study also has to take into consideration that there are types that occur less than three times within or across plays. Still, it is possible to extract certain patterns. For example, men seem to use a more profane language than women. Strong profane oaths such as 'SWOUNDS, 'SBLOOD, 'SLID, 'SLIGHT, 'UD'S DEATH and 'UD'S LIFELINGS are all exclusively attested to men. The men also claim the sole use of BY THE MASS, BY THE LORD, BY THIS HAND and FORE GOD. Phrases and interjections that are used by both sexes but are heavily male dominated in the present material are presented in Table 15. Naturally, the content reflects the fact that men control the conversational floor, but the data seems to suggest that BY HEAVEN, IN FAITH, O GOD, FAITH, FIE, MARRY, WELL, WHAT and WHY are typical phrases and interjections associated with male speech.

	Male	Female
By heaven	15	2
Come	20	3
Faith	12	1
Fie	13	6
Go to	19	3
Ha	9	3
Ho	28	5
In faith	16	2
Marry	29	5
O	88	25
Oh	156	47
Well	28	6
What	33	5
Why	87	21
What ho	10	3

Table 15. Male-dominated interjections and phrases

Kerrigan (2016: 21) speculates that Queen Elizabeth I, whose favourite oath, reportedly, was 'UD'S DEATH, discursively compensated for being a female sovereign in a patriarchal society. Similarly, it would be reasonable to assume that in *Twelfth Night*, Viola adopts typical male interjections and interjectional phrases while masquerading as Cesario. She would presumably need to be masculine in discourse as well as in dress. Interestingly, she does not. She does

have one IN FAITH, but otherwise, her utterances are free of anything resembling foul language. Kerrigan (2016: 27) explains that Elizabethan women who uttered heavy oaths were balancing on the line of acceptability. He further notes that “when gentle or noble women are disguised as boys in Shakespeare, they avoid or skirt profanity” (Kerrigan 2016: 27). For this reason, Viola swears upon her ‘profound heart’, ‘by the very fangs of malice’, ‘by innocence’ and ‘by my youth’. She also utters as Cesario her three instances of the very female dominated primary interjection ALAS. In addition, she has one BY MY TROTH, which Salmon (1967 [1987: 63]) notes is a typical phrase in female speech, but interestingly, it is fairly evenly distributed between the genders in the present material, with four tokens attested to women and five to men. Viola remains a woman in discourse notwithstanding her disguise, a constant reminder for player and audience of her true nature.

The primary interjections AY and ALAS are typical for female speech in the present material. The women account for all four occurrences of AY and 31 of 48 recorded instances of ALAS. According to Salmon (1967 [1987: 61]), ALAS THE DAY and WELL-A-DAY are female interjections. This is not attested in the present material. ALAS THE DAY is used in equal measure by men and women with two occurrences each and the single occurrence of WELL-A-DAY is spoken by Feste. Salmon (1967 [1987: 61]) further notes that the collocation OUT, ALAS is typically female. Although only one of four recorded instances of OUT is uttered by a woman in the present study, it is the only collocation with ALAS. Consequently, OUT may be generally regarded as a gender universal interjection, but with a feminine connotation when collocating with ALAS.

All the three formal types, primary and secondary interjection and interjectional phrase may be linked to gender-specific speech in the three plays, the phrases more than the interjections. Interestingly, a higher number of interjections and phrases are associated with men. This is hardly surprising as they dominate the conversational floor and are less hampered in their linguistic choices. An interesting result is that the women seem to be more inventive and diverse in their oaths. Although the token frequency is too low to draw the conclusion that the oaths the women use are typically female oaths, the overall pattern emerges that since they are restricted in the use of profane language, they are forced to be more creative. In addition to Viola as Cesario’s innocent oaths, Olivia swears by ‘the roses of the spring, by maidhood, honour, truth and everything’. Maria is more situational in her ‘for the love of mockery’ and ‘in the name of jesting’ and the innocent Desdemona swears by her ‘life and soul’ and ‘by this heavenly light’.

As cross-dressing and an unbroken or a higher pitched voice would make gender very apparent on the all-male Elizabethan stage, the linguistic marking of gender would be part of a general characterisation of men and women and not aimed specifically at player and audience identification of gender. Typical male and female interjections and phrases would however be more apparent and play a more distinct role when female characters masquerade as men. Interestingly, though, it seems that women may use the male-associated *WHY* to gain authority and equalize status relation. Bianca's single *WHY* occurs when she demands to know whose handkerchief Cassio has just handed her and Gertrude's only *WHY* is uttered as a mother's rebuke of her son. Desdemona too asserts authority through the interjection as she reproaches Othello. The majority of Emilia's *WHY* occurs in the scene where she and Desdemona discuss infidelity. It may be argued that the subject-matter influences her to boldly equalize the status between mistress and waiting-gentlewoman through an interjection associated with male speech.

### **5.3 Social rank and status**

Just as some interjections and interjectional phrases may be linked to gender, some may also be connected to social rank and status. Aijmer (2009: 11) notes that interjections "encode social-deictic information". This means that even though the interjections and interjectional phrases are found throughout the social hierarchy, the context in which they are uttered may reveal information about perceived status as well as real status. As described in section 3.3, the characters are divided for this study into two overarching groups; the higher rank and the lower rank. Royal, noble and gentle characters are identified as high rank members and everyone else are identified as low rank members. A more detailed division is referred to where relevant. 25<sup>18</sup> characters are registered as belonging to the higher rank and 22 characters are registered as belonging to the lower rank in the overarching rank division. 560 tokens are spoken by high rank member and 459 tokens are spoken by low rank members. In addition, three tokens are uttered by both ranks at the same time, as illustrated in example (210), and two tokens are uttered by lower rank characters as high rank people, namely the two players in *Hamlet* who play King and Queen during court performance.

---

<sup>18</sup> Included here are all the courtiers who cry "Treason!" in *Hamlet*. They are registered as one. Excluding these, 24 single characters are registered as high rank.



(210) Horatio and Marcellus:        Ay, by heaven, my lord.

(*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5)

IN FAITH is a predominantly high-rank oath in the present material, with 15 of 22 recorded tokens. Bromhead (2009: 175-176) confirms the connection between IN FAITH and high society speech and explains that high society members were believed to be more truthful and reliable than the lower ranks and could therefore swear by abstract concepts such as faith without having their word and honour questioned. The use of IN FAITH is thus closely linked with the speaker's identity and reliability. It is used by noble and gentle characters such as Hamlet, Desdemona, Viola, Horatio, Orsino and Sir Andrew, confirming their high rank. However, Kerrigan (2016: 7) notes that most Shakespearian oaths are "casual, incidental profanities, circulating in conversation, more interpersonal than individual". Perhaps IN FAITH may also be regarded as fashionable swearing among the higher rank members, mimicked by soldiers and officers who recognise the double function of light profanity and asserting their reliability. Four of Sir Andrew's five IN FAITH certainly juxtapose the two, the phrase being his favourite oath while drunk. Accordingly, the phrase is used by characters such as Cassio, Othello and Iago as profanity and as assertion of – or in Iago's case, feigning of – a truthful and trustworthy character.

According to Bromhead (2009: 175-176), BY MY TROTH is more evenly distributed between the social ranks than IN FAITH because it does not involve the speaker's identity. Indeed, BY MY TROTH is used more or less in equal measure by the different ranks in the present material, with five tokens attested to the higher rank and four tokens to the lower rank. Despite this, it seems possible that *Twelfth Night* BY MY TROTH may be associated with lower social status. Seven of the nine recorded instances of the phrase are found in the play; Viola and Maria speak one each, two are spoken by Feste and the remaining three are attested to Sir Andrew. The latter is important as Sir Andrew is a drunkard - two of his three BY MY TROTH are uttered while drunk - and a foolish character. It is possible to argue that he shares the phrase with the two lower rank characters to indicate a perceived low status to the audience. BY MY TROTH, then, would signal different meanings depending on the extralinguistic context.

JUST AS BY MY TROTH, MARRY is equally distributed among the high and low rank in the present material, with 17 tokens each. When it comes to rank use, Lutzky (2008, as cited in Jucker and Taavitsainen 2013: 290) notes the pattern that MARRY "is used most prevalently among the lower social ranks when addressing superiors or equals". The former is the main pattern in the present study. In addition, high rank characters predominantly utter this

interjection to other members of high social rank. Perhaps the general view was that addressing social inferiors with MARRY or uttering the mild expletive in their presence would be too familiar. If this is the case, MARRY may reveal important clues about character relations. Hamlet regards Marcellus as a friend and has no reservations about uttering MARRY to Horatio in the soldier's presence. In addition, he wishes to be familiar with the First Clown in order to extract information from him. Polonius addresses MARRY to his servant Reynaldo. This could be an attempt to be familiar with him or it could simply be that MARRY is Polonius' favourite expletive, at least when addressing his daughter and his servant.

Both Bromhead (2009: 106) and Salmon (1967 [1987: 63]) connect FORSOOTH with the speech of lower rank and low-status people in Early Modern English plays. Salmon (1967 [1987: 63]) highlights servants and children and Bromhead (2009: 106) adds that fools, clowns and soldiers use it in response to a superior's question or command. Iago utters the single instance of FORSOOTH in the present material. He is neither responding to a question nor a command, but he does use it while addressing his social superior, the noble Roderigo. In the present study, FORE GOD may also be linked to lower rank speech and low social status. Three of four occurrences in the present material are uttered by a drunk Cassio, whose language becomes noticeably profane when he is intoxicated.

Hughes (2006: 80) states that the sociolinguistic idea of oaths and profanity as lower-class behaviour is an oversimplification of a much more complex situation. Historically, foul language was widespread among both the higher and lower rank, although such use was always frowned upon by some. Certain linguistic forms did have a distinct lower rank association in Medieval England, as suggested by Chaucer's *cherles termes*, meaning foul peasant language, but the higher rank also knew how to speak profanely. The Parson in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* "criticises those who 'holden it a gentrie or a manly dede to swere grete oaths'" (Hughes 2006: 80). In 1531, Sir Thomas Elyot noted: "They will say that he that swereth depe, swereth like a lorde" (Elyot 1531: I, xxvi, as cited in Hughes 2006: 81). Hughes (2006: 80-81) explains that the freedoms enjoyed by the nobility and gentry in Early Modern England encompassed a crude, carefree linguistic mode as they were above the social norms of the middling sort.

The dual image of fashionable high-rank swearing and the notion of foul language use as being below a gentleman's or a lord's status is manifested in Shakespeare's plays. Hughes (2006: 81) uses Hamlet's soliloquy in act 2 as an example, where he chastises himself not only for his lack of action but that he "fall a-cursing, like a very drab, A scullion" (*Hamlet*: Act 2, scene 2). He is only too acutely aware that his fierce linguistic choices – comprising o

GOD, BLOODY, 'SWOUNDS and FIE at this point – do not match his deeds and are unworthy of the future king of Denmark. One can only speculate what other profanities the prince has in mind. Indeed, FIE is predominantly a high rank oath in the present material, with twelve of nineteen tokens attested to noble and royal characters.

Early Modern England was a highly stratified society and as section 2.3.3 explains, members of each rank were marked through linguistic choices as well as clothing. A late Elizabethan audience would therefore naturally be attuned to interjections and interjectional phrases that marked real and perceived social status. Playwrights would also know how to exploit them in subtle characterisation that was noticeable to contemporaries but which is now lost to a modern audience. It is also plausible that these words and phrases would be noticed by the player while rehearsing his part. However, given that he had access to his speaking part only and the limited time available to learn his lines, it is debatable how salient social status markers in the form of interjections and phrases would be prior to first performance. Perhaps such markers would be more noticed by the player during first performance and built upon during the second. On the other hand, a seasoned player, trained in isolating linguistic cues for quick inhabitation of character and character interpretation, would presumably notice a pattern from one part to the next. There is also the point that just as interjections are dependent on context for interpretation, interjections and interjectional phrases as character cues in a player's part would be identified along with other linguistic cues which together create the larger picture.

#### **5.4 Foul and pious language as a marker of individual character**

Hughes (1991: 63, as cited in Taavitsainen 1999: 220) states that pious and blasphemous oaths are good indicators of character piety or lack thereof and Taavitsainen (1997 as cited in Taavitsainen 1999: 220) notes about her Middle English material that “blasphemous abuses of religious language are revealing”. This is also true when it comes to pious and profane language and characterisation in the present material. The complex link between linguistic choices and rank and perceived social status established in the previous section intertwine with the question of how foul language or absence of such may indicate character. It is hardly surprising that Hamlet has the highest frequency of oaths and foul language in the present material, given his emotional crisis. However, he is a habitual swearer as well and the contrast to Claudius' sparing use of profanity and oaths cannot go unnoticed. Despite his villainous

deeds, Claudius linguistically exemplifies royal dignity. Sir Toby and Sir Andrew in *Twelfth Night* also swear by habit, their foul language mark them as drunkards. The puritan steward Malvolio avoids swearing and uses harmless, secular oaths when he is excited to find the fake letter and when he is locked up in the dark room: BY MY LIFE, BY THIS HAND and BY YOUR LEAVE. Only once, and under great distress, does he use the – for him – strong oath BY THE LORD.

In *Othello*, Desdemona as the tragic heroine is clearly marked by her Christian oaths. They testify to her true and faithful nature. She swears by BY THIS HEAVENLY LIGHT, BY MY LIFE AND SOUL and utters AS I SHALL BE SAVED, AS I AM A CHRISTIAN and HEAVEN FORGIVE US when faced with the idea of being unfaithful and accused of having cuckolded Othello. The pious oaths are powerful authorial signals to the audience, and the boy player too, who knows that Desdemona is as true and pure as she claims to be. However, there is an interesting duality in Desdemona's swearing that may have caught the Early Modern audience's attention. At first glance, her irritated "Ifaith, you are to blame!" (*Othello*: Act 3, scene 4) when Othello is angry that she has lost the handkerchief seems quite innocent, along with FAITH when she swears that she has it not about her. Also, there seems to be nothing but honest and true relief in her exclamation "By my troth, I am glad on't" (*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1) when Othello is commanded home from Cyprus. Even her "God's troth, I think thou wouldst not" (*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3) to Emilia about cuckolding her husband could easily be taken as an assertion of Desdemona's firm belief in a wife's duty.

However, the Early Modern idea of women and swearing may cast a more questionable light on these oaths and thus Desdemona's character. Kerrigan (2016: 29-30) explains that women were viewed as false and deceptive compared to men and could not be trusted on an oath. It was common in Shakespeare's time that they had their word questioned in court and "asked whether they knew what an oath meant in its solemn and legal force" (Kerrigan 2016: 29). Perhaps Desdemona's pious swearing did not carry as much weight in 17<sup>th</sup> century playhouses as it does in modern theatres. It may be suggested that they introduce an element of doubt that plays with the audience's perception of her. They, as Othello reminded by Iago, remember Brabantio's warning "Look to her Moor, if thou hast eyes to see, she has deceived her father, and may thee" (*Othello*: Act 1, scene 3).

Similarly, it may be argued that Emilia is established as a dual character with an emerging questionable status through her linguistic choices. Up to act 4, scene 3, her strongest interjections are FAITH and FIE. The scene, with its cuckold subject-matter, noticeably influences Emilia's choice of interjections and interjectional phrases. She boldly swears BY MY TROTH, MARRY and 'UD'S PITY that she, just as any other woman, would be unfaithful to her

husband if it advanced his position. She even manages to give Desdemona's BY THIS HEAVENLY LIGHT a twisted tone by echoing it and adding "I might do't as well i'th' dark" (*Othello*: Act 4, scene 3). An Early Modern audience may have contemplated on an observation resonated in a book published in 1616: "Oaths are monstrous in a woman, in whom imprudency ioyned with prophanation makes them the more odious and loathsome" (Rich Cabinet, 1616, as cited in Kerrigan 2016: 29).

Iago's villainy is marked by the kind of interjections and interjectional phrases he speaks. Quite fittingly, he makes use of oaths connected to the devil and pagan gods: DIVINITY OF HELL, DIABLO, BY JANUS. As noted in sections 4.3 and 4.5.1, DIABLO marks Iago as a Spaniard and BY JANUS has a very specific meaning in its reference to the two-faced Roman god. Iago also utters blasphemous Christian oaths: 'SWOUNDS, 'SBLOOD, BY THE MASS, O HEAVEN, IN FAITH, HEAVEN FORBID, GOD FORBID, GOD BLESS THE MARK, FAITH. He is of course not alone in using bad language, but compared to the other male characters, Iago's language is particularly foul. In addition, he does not moderate his language in the presence of or when addressing social superiors. FORSOOTH addressed to Roderigo seems to be the only case of moderated language use.

Interestingly, some of this linguistic villainy transfers to Othello as the play progresses. He starts to use phrases connected with evil and sex: DEATH AND DAMNATION, FIRE AND BRIMSTONE and GOATS AND MONKEYS. They bring him closer to Iago and distance him from the position as a tragic hero. There is also an interesting relationship between Othello's religious and secular swearing when connected to his Moorish parentage. They balance his status as the valiant Moor and the low-status heathen Moor. 'UD'S DEATH uttered in the scene where he kills Desdemona is particularly gruesome.

The oaths and profanities may also be said to serve as a soldier's marker in *Othello*. Hughes (2006: 439) explains that "sociolinguistic studies consistently show that swearing and foul language are manifestations of "'macho' behavior, which becomes intensified in all-male verbal contexts such as the armed forces". The connection between armies and swearing has a long historical tradition. An 11<sup>th</sup> century poem, 'The Battle of Maldon', speaks of strong language in a trade of insults between Vikings and Saxons before a battle, and the French referred to the English soldiers as the *goddems* due to their crude oaths during the Hundred Years' War (Hughes 2006: 439). The military men in *Othello*, Iago, Cassio, Othello and Montano, all have their share of formal and informal swearing, that is, oaths that swear to the truth-value of their statement and oaths as profanity. 'SWOUNDS is the only phrase they have in common and may be taken as a soldier's oath in the play.

Lastly, foul language is used to mark Ophelia's madness. Her use of interjections and interjectional phrases is clean and innocent up until the point where she loses her sanity. Ophelia's discourse moves from ALAS, O, OH and WOE IS ME TO BY COCK, BY GIS, BY SAINT CHARITY, BY YONDER SUN, FIE, FOR SHAME, LA and LORD. As section 4.3 points out, BY COCK is a play on both religion and profanity. Hughes (2006: 420) explains that the sexuality in Ophelia's mad songs is connected to the Early Modern stereotypical belief that the mentally ill were sexually fixated. Salmon (1967 [1987: 62]) connects LA with naïve and slow-witted people and notes that LORD is frequently used among low-rank members. They are therefore fitting interjections for the mad Ophelia, who has been tragically reduced from an innocent, noble young lady to a common, low-status woman with a foul mouth.

### **5.5 The players' passionating**

Chapter four clearly shows that the emotive mode is but one of three modes in which interjections may occur. Still, the emotive-expressive mode is of particular interest when it comes to the passions the Elizabethan players isolated in their parts and the emotional communication between stage and audience. The present study suggests that interjections were part of the passion cues and thus played an important part in the players' preparation, giving information about both the character's state of mind as well as appropriate blocking on stage. Play-texts are written to be spoken and Taavitsainen (1995: 440) stresses that "in spoken language, intonation plays an important role in the interpretation of interjections as pitch, lengthening, loudness and non-verbal sounds all add to the expressiveness and convey specific nuances of meaning". Players would presumably combine these paralinguistic features and the passion cues and exploit them during performance.

The primary interjections o and OH are particularly salient as passion cues, not only because they dominate the present material but also because they are very versatile, as section 4.3 shows. They express a wide range of different emotions. Strong feelings such as love, joy, anger and grief are excellently expressed through these two primary interjections and players could easily exploit pitch, length and loudness to convey more subtle meanings. The interjection o helps establish Orsino as a lover at the beginning of *Twelfth Night* and signifies for the preparing player the to-be-acted state of mind as well as accompanying gestures. In fact, o is the interjection Orsino uses the most and in five of his eight uses of it, it is uttered as an expression of love, importantly all within the first act. OH acts as a central emotional

signifier in Hamlet's soliloquies, while OH and o together proclaim Othello's torments and shifting emotions and attitudes.

The use of o and OH as markers of various passions is particularly interesting in *Hamlet*. They seem to be regarded as very personal and intimate. Generally, Claudius is in control of his emotions and uses the two interjections predominantly when he is alone and in Gertrude's presence. OH is a salient signifier of his guilty conscience in the soliloquy in act 3, scene 3. Only five of seventeen examples of o and OH are uttered to and in the presence of others and in such a topical context that Claudius cannot restrain himself. Gertrude uses o and OH only when she is alone with Hamlet except twice: in her dying moment and when a messenger enters to announce the entrance of Laertes and his followers, who want Laertes as their king. Hamlet's use of o and OH is somewhat more complex. As a passionate character, he cannot contain his emotions and uses the two interjections to vent his torments in soliloquies, in his antics and as a marker of both true and feigned familiarity and intimacy. Importantly however, most of his examples of o and OH are spoken in solitude or in contexts where he feels safe or has relaxed and lowered his guard.

Other interjections and indeed also interjectional phrases may have served as passion signposts for players and audiences alike. Lament and anger are expressed through ALAS, FIE and FOH and along with OH and o, they may be used to produce tragical and comical effects. The oaths 'SWOUNDS, 'SLIGHT and 'SBLOOD are typically used to signal negative feelings. It could be argued that oaths and profanities in general express the emotional involvement that is crucial for quickly inhabiting character and understanding character relations - especially when textual access is limited, as it was for late Elizabethan players.

It is interesting to speculate whether the isolated passions in combination with paralinguistic features may have acted as aural signposts for multitasking playhouse audiences. As they were for unknown periods of time preoccupied with chatting to nearby people and ordering and consuming refreshments, they would presumably from time to time need auditory flag posts from the stage.

## **5.6 Characterisation and the intentionality of interjections**

As discussed in section 2.2.4, there is disagreement among scholars as to the intentionality of interjections. The present study recognises that some interjections are indeed used spontaneously and unintentionally; interjections are part of spoken language and as section

2.1 discusses, lack of premeditation is typical for spoken discourse. Not all utterances are fully cognitively processed before being spoken. At the same time, the present study agrees with Wilkins (1992: 149-151) that immediacy is relative and that conscious moderation is present in interjection use in addition to a clear communicative purpose. Further, as play-texts are oral in design, intentional use of interjections in plays may suggest intentional use in real spoken discourse. There is of course the point that all interjections are intentional in play-texts as they are authorial and have been carefully chosen to signal pre-set meanings. Still, the present study suggests that they have been chosen not only to mimic spoken, unintentional use but also to serve deliberate speaker-addressee-oriented goals present in real-life situations.

Some interjections are clearly used intentionally in the present material. When Cassio gives Bianca Desdemona's handkerchief and asks her to have its embroidery copied, she exclaims "Oh Cassio, whence came this?" (*Othello*: Act 3 scene 4). Being in love, Bianca deliberately communicates her disappointment that Cassio has accepted a token from another woman. Similarly, Desdemona wishes to convey both dislike and disagreement to Iago through her "Oh most lame and impotent conclusion!" (*Othello*: Act 2, scene 1). Iago may be said to be the master of intentional interjection use through his manipulation and false statements. In fact, a large amount of his uttered interjections serves specific purposes that also mark Iago's villainy. ALAS, FOH, FIE, HA, O and OH are all devised cues that mask and manipulate. In act 4, scene 2 for instance, Iago uses FIE to seemingly reject and feign disgust at the idea that someone should have manufactured the accusations of infidelity against Desdemona, as illustrated in example (29) in section 4.3. FOH is deliberately used in devising Othello's suspicion towards Desdemona, see example (30) in section 4.3. Having witnessed Othello striking Desdemona, Iago implies through ALAS that it was not the first time:

(211) Lodovico: Is it his use?  
 Or did the letters work upon his blood  
 And new-create his fault?  
 Iago: **Alas, alas!**  
 It is not honesty in me to speak  
 What I have seen and known. You shall observe him,  
(*Othello*: Act 4, scene 1)

O and OH mark false feelings, such as sadness as hurt that Othello accuses him of slander and concern that jealousy should cloud Othello's judgement in act 3, scene 3.



Interjections are also used intentionally in *Twelfth Night* and *Hamlet*. While having fun with Malvolio, Maria uses LO deliberately, exclaiming “Lo, how hollow the fiend speaks within him” (*Twelfth Night*: Act 3, act 4) to Sir Toby about Malvolio. Feste responds WELL-A-DAY to Malvolio’s claim that he is not mad, as illustrated in example (59) in section 4.3. Sir Toby reassures Sir Andrew with TUT, as shown in example (57), also in section 4.3. In *Hamlet*, Polonius deliberately conveys contempt through PUH - see example (53) in section 4.3 – and the Ghost uses OH as a conative emphasis in “List, Hamlet, Oh list” (*Hamlet*: Act 1, scene 5). Hamlet’s duplicated BUZZ in act 2, scene 2 is also clearly intentional, see example (60) in section 4.3.

Based on the above findings, Ameka’s (1992) argument that interjections are only used unintentionally seems strange. It is granted that plays are constructed texts with authorial pragmatic devices that serve pre-set goals and convey pre-set meanings. However, since plays are also speech purposed and have a distinct oral style, as discussed in section 2.1, it is reasonable to assume that the use of interjections in play-texts portrays actual interjection use. Interjections are important in the interpersonal communication of feelings and of opinions, some having been consciously chosen in order to achieve specific goals or to elicit specific reactions from the listener. The mimicking of actual linguistic use is one of the elements that make constructed, dramatic characters seem familiar and real and contribute to their characterisation.

## 6. Conclusion

The present study set out to address what kind of interjections and phrases are used in the plays and the ways in which interjections and interjectional phrases assist characterisation in *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*. The overall findings with regards to the distribution of the three formal categories primary and interjection secondary and phrase are that that primary interjections are used the most and the phrases are used the least, but the phrases show the most diversity. The three categories are also used relatively evenly in all plays. Importantly, of the three functional categories emotive-expressive, cognitive-expressive and conative, the emotive-expressive function is the most frequent. The interjections and phrases are used to signal a wide variety of feelings and cognitive states. High frequency interjections and

phrases such as O, OH, ALAS, WHAT, WHY, IN FAITH and GO TO are used more or less in the same way in the three plays.

The premise was that interjections and interjectional phrases play a part in the linguistic conveyance of character. The present study confirms that this is the case. As both authorial and speaker pragmatic devices, interjections and interjectional phrases give information about character cues such as gender, social rank, and real and perceived social status. They make up a multi-layered characterisation tool, especially those words and phrases that reflect foul language. Interjections and interjectional phrases vent strong emotions, signal speaker attitudes towards people and situations and reveal information about character relations. Skilful playwrights such as Shakespeare may also use them to tease audience and characters alike and make them question a character's credibility.

In the present material, primary interjections are used to mark Orsino as a lover and Hamlet as a passionate character. They also signal Ophelia's tragic demise from a noble lady to a mad commoner. In addition, they are used to convey Claudius' loss of characteristic emotional composure, mark Iago's villainous nature and remind player and audience of Viola's true gender. Secondary interjections encode information about characteristic linguistic behaviour, such as Polonius' use of MARRY. They are also used to empower women and convey information about nationality. Interjectional phrases, just as secondary interjections, reveal characteristic linguistic choices and mark perceived social status, such as Sir Andrew and Cassio's drunk phrases. The phrases are particularly salient in marking villainy and a pious nature. They are also ideal in creating complex characters.

When dealing with interjections and interjectional phrases as a characterisation tool in historical play-texts, it is important to keep in mind that some of the significant meanings imbedded in the interjection and phrase use has been lost to a modern audience. Elements identified in *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*, such as gender and rank-specific use, may not be obvious devices in character description unless knowledge about Early Modern interjections and their meanings is present. Nevertheless, interjections and interjectional phrases, in their capacity of conveying character emotions and attitudes, are present in the linguistic toolbox available to playwrights.

Early Modern playwrights would presumably have been interested in the linguistic devising tools at hand and exploited them in their plays. Having established that Shakespeare used interjections and interjectional phrases in character description, it seems plausible that late Elizabethan playwrights in general considered interjections and interjectional phrases as valuable assets in linguistic characterisation of dramatic personae. By using markers prevalent

at their time and familiar to their audience, gender, social rank and the balance between formal swearing and casual profanity would be conveyed to and relished by demanding playhouse visitors. In addition, interjections and interjectional phrases seem to have been of some assistance to Elizabethan players in their preparation prior to a performance. Especially primary interjections are particularly apt in conveying the passions players isolated in their parts. Combined with paralinguistic features such as intonation, pitch and length, these words would assist both acting and stage-audience communication.

The present study assumed that late Elizabethan drama is not included in Jucker and Taavitsainen's (2013: 63) claim that "characterisation of fictional people using interjections is a fairly late phenomenon" and suggested that the use of interjections and interjectional phrases as a means of character description may be traced back to a much earlier date than previously assumed. Conveyance of character information through interjections and phrases is clearly present in *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night* and *Othello*. Consequently, the conclusion follows that English dramatists in the late 1500s and early 1600s used interjections in their linguistic characterisation of fictional people, as Shakespeare would not be alone in his character devising methods.

Taavitsainen's (1999) established relationship between primary interjections as features of personality types in Chaucer and Støle's (2012) note that they are used in character description in the good versus bad dichotomy in late Middle English cycle plays. This suggests that interjections as a characterisation tool may be traced back further than the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. Although Taavitsainen (1999) and Støle (2012) are dealing with different types of dialogue from those dealt with in the present study, their research is nonetheless an important indicator that this field within the study of interjections needs further exploration.

Finally, interjections are clearly used intentionally in the present material. They are an important asset in the achievement of goals and in the elicitation of responses and reactions that serve specific purposes. As play-texts are constructed texts, the linguistic elements are authorial pragmatic devices. Still, as plays contain oral features in order to mimic actual spoken discourse and convey the sense of real human interaction, deliberate interjection use in speech purposed texts indicates intentional use in the real world. Ameka's (1992) claim that interjections are marked by their spontaneous, unintentional usage seems therefore ungrounded.

Clearly, there is more to interjections than their strong emotive association and their questionable status within language research. They are multi-layered, multi-functional words that convey a range of different meanings and contribute to the dynamic meaning negotiation

that takes place between the dramatist, the actor and the audience. Granting their deserving place in the toolbox that comprises linguistic characterisation devices available to playwrights of earlier times, interjections and interjectional phrases as a means of character description in historical play-texts should not remain the undiscovered country.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources:

Shakespeare, William. 1623. "The tragedie of Hamlet, prince of Denmarke" in *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies*. Folger copy no 68. London: Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. Accessed 11 May 2020. <https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/To+the+Reader/mode/2up>

Shakespeare, William. 1623. "Twelfe Night, or what you will" in *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies*. Folger copy no 68. London: Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. Accessed 11 May 2020. <https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/To+the+Reader/mode/2up>

Shakespeare, William. 1623. "The tragedie of Othello, the Moore of Venice" in *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies*. Folger copy no 68. London: Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. Accessed 11 May 2020. <https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/To+the+Reader/mode/2up>

Hibbard, George R. and Stanley Wells (eds). 2008: *The Oxford Shakespeare: Hamlet*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warren, Roger and Stanley Wells (eds). 2008: *The Oxford Shakespeare: Twelfth Night*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neill, Michael and Stanley Wells (eds). 2008: *The Oxford Shakespeare: Othello*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### Secondary sources:

Aijmer, Karin. 2009. "Interjections in the COLT Corpus". In Stef Slembrouck, Stef, Miriam Tavernies and Mieke Van Herreweghe (eds), *-From will to well: Studies in linguistics, offered to Anne-Marie Simon Vandenberghe*. Gent: Academia Press: 11-20.

Ameka, Felix. 1992. "Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech". *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 101-118.

- Ballard, Kim. 2016. "Prose and verse in Shakespeare's plays". Accessed 11 May 2020. <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/prose-and-verse-in-shakespeares-plays>
- Benedetti, Jean. 2010. *An actor's work on a role. Konstantin Stanislavski*. London: Routledge.
- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad and Randi Reppen. 1998. *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1996 [1935]. *Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Bromhead, Helen. 2009. *The reign of truth and faith. Epistemic expressions in 16th and 17th century English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Busse, Ulrich and Beatrix Busse. 2010. "Shakespeare". In Jucker Andreas and Irma Taavitsainen (eds), *Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter: 247-284.
- Cerasano, Susan P. 2002. "Must the devil appear? Audiences, actors, stage business". In Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.), *A companion to Renaissance drama*. Oxford: Blackwell: 193-211.
- Charney, Maurice. 1978. "Hamlet's O-groans and textual criticism". *Renaissance drama* 9: 109-119
- Charry, Brinda. 2017. *The Arden guide to renaissance drama. An introduction with primary sources*. London/New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cuenca, Maria Josep. 2000. "Defining the indefinable? Interjections". *Syntaxis* 3: 29-44.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2001. *Language and characterisation: People in plays and other texts*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2009. "Keyness: Words, parts-of-speech and semantic categories in the character-talk of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 14(1): 29-59. Final draft version, downloaded from and accessed 11 May 2020. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233493422\\_Keyness\\_Words\\_parts-of-speech\\_and\\_semantic\\_categories\\_in\\_the\\_character-talk\\_of\\_Shakespeare's\\_Romeo\\_and\\_Juliet](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233493422_Keyness_Words_parts-of-speech_and_semantic_categories_in_the_character-talk_of_Shakespeare's_Romeo_and_Juliet)
- Culpeper, Jonathan and Merja Kytö. 2010. *Early Modern English dialogues: Spoken interaction as writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dessen, Alan C. 2017. "Much Virtue in O-Oh: A Case Study". *Early Theatre*-20(2): 121-130.

Edwards, Alan S. 2016. "Early Shakespeare sources: a guide for academic researchers. Part 1: manuscript and early print sources for Shakespeare's works". Accessed 10 May 2020. <https://www.bl.uk/shakespeare/articles/early-shakespeare-sources-a-guide-for-academic-researchers-part-1>

Finkelstein, David and Alistair McCleery. 2013. *An introduction to book history*. London/New York: Routledge.

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. and Irma Taavitsainen. 2007. *Methods in historical pragmatics*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Foakes, Reginald A. 1994. "Playhouses and players". In Albert R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway. *English renaissance drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-52.

Gazzard, Hugh. 2010. "An act to restrain abuse of player (1606)". *The Review of English Studies* 61(251): 495-528.

Gewheiler, Elke. 2010. "Interjections and expletives". In Andreas Jucker and Irma Taavitsainen (eds), *Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter: 315-350.

Goffman, Erving. 1978. "Response cries". *Language* 54(4): 787-815.

Gurr, Andrew. 2012. "Why was the Globe round?" In Laury, Magnus and Walter W. Cannon (eds), *Who hears in Shakespeare? Shakespeare's auditory world, stage and screen*. Lanham/Plymouth: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press: 3-16.

Gurr, Andrew. 1992. *The Shakespearean stage, 1574-1642*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Hawkes, Terence. 2005. *That Shakespearian rag: Essays on a critical process*. London/New York: Routledge.

Hattaway, Michael. 2005. *Elizabethan popular theatre: Plays in performance*. London: Routledge.

Hapgood, Elizabeth Reynolds. 2013. *Building a character. Constantin Stanislavski*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hewings, Ann and Martin Hewings. 2005. *Grammar and context. An advanced resource book*. London/New York: Routledge.

Hotchkiss, Valerie and Fred C. Robinson. 2008. *English in print from Caxton to Shakespeare to Milton*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Hughes, Geoffrey. 2006. *An encyclopaedia of swearing: The social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the English-speaking world*. New York/London: M.E. Sharpe.

Hulme, Hilda M. 1958. "The spoken language and the dramatic text: Some notes on the interpretation of Shakespeare's language". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 9: 379-86. Reprinted in: Salmon, Vivian and Edwina Burness (eds), 1987. *A reader in the language of Shakespearean drama*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 145-152.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Jucker, Andreas and Irma Taavitsainen. 2013. *English historical pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Kerrigan, John. 2016. *Shakespeare's binding language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lech, Geoffrey. 2000. "Grammars of spoken English: New outcomes of corpus-oriented research". In *Language Learning* 50 (4): 675-724.

Levisen, Carsten. 2019. "Laughter interjections. Contributions to a lexical anthropology of humour (with special reference to Danish)". In *Scandinavian studies in language* 10 (1): 110-130.

Libert, Alan Reed. 2012. "On conversational valence and the definition of interjections" in Ponsonnet Maïa, Loan Dao and Margit Bowler. *Proceedings of the 42nd Australian linguistic society conference – 2011. (Canberra, 1-4 Dec 2011)* Canberra: ANU Research Repository: 282-295.

Longman, Stanley Vincent. 2016. "Playhouse vs theatre". In *Torch Magazine, spring 2016*: 29-32.

Lutzky, Ursula. 2016. "Exploring the characterisation of social ranks in Early Modern English comedies". In Minna Nevala, Ursula Lutzky, Gabriella Mazzon and Carla Suhr (eds), *The Pragmatics and stylistics of identity construction and characterisation*. Accessed 11 May 2020. <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/17/lutzky/#sect3>

Lutzky, Ursula. 2012. *Discourse markers in Early Modern English*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

McEnry, Tony. 2006. *Swearing in English: Bad language, purity and power from 1586 to the present*. London/New York. Routledge.

Moseley, Charles W. R. D. 2007. *English Renaissance drama: A very brief introduction to theatre and theatres of Shakespeare's time*. Tirril, Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks.co.uk.



Norrick, Neil R. 2011. "Interjections". In Andersen Gisle and Karin Aijmer (eds), *Pragmatics of society*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter: 243-291.

O'Connell, Daniel C. and Sabine Kowal. 2009. "Interjections in the performance of Jane Austen's *Pride and prejudice*". In *Journal of psycholinguistic research* 39(4): 285-304.

O'Brian, Nick. 2013. "Preface to the Bloomsbury revelations edition" in Hapgood, Elizabeth Reynolds (ed.), *Building a character. Constantin Stanislavski*. London: Bloomsbury Academic: vii – ix.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. Accessed 10 May 2020. <https://www.oed.com/>

Palfrey, Simon and Tiffany Stern. 2007. *Shakespeare in parts*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London/New York: Longman.

Salmon, Vivian. 1967. "Elizabethan colloquial English in the Falstaff plays". In *Leeds studies in English I*: 37-70. Reprinted in Salmon Vivian and Edwina Burness (eds) 1987. *A Reader in the language of Shakespearean drama*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing: 37-70.

Salmon, Vivian. 1965. "Sentence structures in colloquial Shakespearian English". In *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 105-140. Reprinted in Salmon Vivian and Edwina Burness (eds) 1987. *A Reader in the language of Shakespearean drama*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing: 265-300.

Shakespeare, William. 1623. "The life of Henry the fift." in *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies. Published according to the true originall copies*. Folger copy no 68. London: Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. Accessed 11 May 2020.

<https://www.folger.edu/the-shakespeare-first-folio-folger-copy-no-68#page/To+the+Reader/mode/2up>

Stern, Tiffany. 2004. *Making Shakespeare. From stage to page*. London/New York: Routledge.

Stern, Tiffany, 2016. "(Re:)Historicizing Spontaneity: Original Practices, Stanislavski, and Characterization". In Shurgot Michael W and Yu Jin Ko (eds), *Shakespeare's sense of character: On the page and from the stage*. London/New York: Routledge: 104-115.

Støle, Hildegunn. 2013. *Interjections in Late Middle English play texts: a multi-variable pragmatic approach*. PhD thesis, University of Stavanger. Accessed 11 May 2020.

<https://uis.brage.unit.no/uis-xmlui/handle/11250/185949>

Van Gelderen, Elly. 2014. *A history of the English language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

White, Martin. 1998. *Renaissance drama in action: An introduction to aspects of theatre practice and performance*. London/New York: Routledge.

Whyman, Rose. 2013. *Stanislavski. The basics*. London/New York: Routledge.

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

Wundt, Wilhelm. 1900. *Völkerpsychologie: Eine untersuchung der entwicklungsgesetze von sprache, mythos und sitte. Erstes Buch: Die Sprache*. Leipzig: Engelmann.

### **Web page articles:**

'About the Folger First Folios': The Folger Shakespeare Library. Accessed 10 May 2020.  
<https://www.folger.edu/shakespeare/first-folio/about-folger-folios>

'Shakespeare's First Folio': The British Library. Accessed 10 May 2020.  
<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/shakespeares-first-folio>

## Appendix

### Oxford numbers

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Primary int</b>	163 (18)	84 (15)	218 (17)	465 (24)
<b>Secondary int</b>	112 (22)	98 (14)	142 (16)	352 (31)
<b>Int phrases</b>	58 (33)	67 (34)	108 (51)	233 (91)
<b>Total</b>	<b>333 (73)</b>	<b>249 (63)</b>	<b>468 (84)</b>	<b>1051 (147)</b>

Table A. The individual occurrences of interjection and phrase tokens and distinctive (types).

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>		<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>
<b>Ah</b>	2	1	1	<b>Hum</b>	1		2
<b>Ah ha</b>	2	2		<b>La</b>	1		
<b>Alas</b>	14	12	22	<b>Lo</b>	3	1	2
<b>Ay</b>	1	1	2	<b>O</b>	34	41	35
<b>Diablo</b>			1	<b>Oh</b>	76	9	115
<b>Fie</b>	7	4	6	<b>Pardie</b>	1	1	
<b>Foh</b>	1		2	<b>Pish</b>			2
<b>Ha</b>	3	3	5	<b>Puh</b>	2		
<b>Ha, ha</b>	1	1	1	<b>Tilly-vally</b>		1	
<b>Ha, ha, ha</b>			3	<b>Tush</b>	2		1
<b>Ho</b>	11	5	17	<b>Tut</b>		1	
<b>Holla</b>	1		1	<b>Well-a-day</b>		1	

Table B. Distribution of primary interjections

	<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>		<b>Hamlet</b>	<b>Twelfth Night</b>	<b>Othello</b>
<b>Buzz</b>	2			<b>Plague</b>		1	
<b>Bloody</b>	1			<b>Pox</b>		1	
<b>Come</b>	11	6	4	<b>Say</b>	1		
<b>Come, come</b>	3	2	5	<b>So</b>			1
<b>Faith</b>	6	4	12	<b>Soft</b>	6	3	4
<b>Go, go</b>	1			<b>Sooth</b>		2	
<b>Help</b>	6		10	<b>Stand</b>	1		
<b>How</b>			4	<b>Thieves</b>			5
<b>Lord</b>	1			<b>Treachery</b>	1		
<b>Marry</b>	12	13	9	<b>Treason</b>	2		
<b>Mass</b>	1			<b>Troth</b>		1	
<b>Murder</b>			8	<b>Well</b>	8	11	15
<b>No</b>	1						

<b>Now, now</b>		1		<b>What</b>	10	9	19
<b>Out</b>	2		2	<b>Who</b>	1		1
<b>Peace</b>	3	16	2	<b>Why</b>	32	28	41

Table C. Distribution of secondary interjections

Hamlet			
As I do live	1	For shame	2
Before my God	1	For the love of God	1
By Cock	1	Fore God	1
By Gis	1	Go to	4
By heaven	8	God's bodykins	1
By my fay	1	Heaven and earth	1
By Saint Charity	1	In faith	6
By Saint Patrick	1	In good faith	2
By the Lord	1	In the name of God	1
By the mass	2	O God	4
By the rood	1	Sblood	2
By this hand	1	Soft you now	1
By yonder sun	1	Swounds	2
By'r lady	2	Upon my life	1
Come on	1	What ho	2
For God's love	1	Woe is me	1
For love of grace	1		

Table D. Distribution of interjectional phrases in *Hamlet*

Othello			
Alas the day	2	For this fair island	1
Alas the heavy day	1	Fore God	3
As I am a Christian	1	Forsooth	1
As I am a soldier	1	Go to	12
As I shall be saved	1	Goats and monkeys	1
Before me	1	God bless the mark	1
Beshrew me	1	God forbid	1
By heaven	10	God's troth	1
By Janus	1	God's will	2
By my faith	1	Good faith	2
By my life and soul	1	Heaven bless us	1
By my troth	2	Heaven forbid	1
By the mass	1	Heaven forgive us	1

By the world	1	Heavens forfend	2
By the worth of my eternal soul	1	In faith	8
By this hand	4	In good faith	1
By this heavenly light	2	O God	2
By yon marble heaven	1	O heaven	1
By'r Lady	1	O Lord	1
Come on	2	Sblood	1
Death and damnation	1	Swounds	9
Divinity of hell	1	Ud's death	1
Fire and brimstone	1	Ud's pity	1
For Christian shame	1	Upon my soul	1
For heaven sake	1	What ho	9
For shame	2		

Table E. Distribution of interjectional phrases in *Othello*