UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Interjections and the Language Functions Debate

Elffers, E.

Publication date
2008

Published in
Bulletin - the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas

[Link to publication](#)

Interjections and the Language Functions Debate

Els Elffers

University of Amsterdam

Abstract

Five views of the function of interjections, developed in the first half of the 20th century by the psychologist-linguist Bühler, the linguists Gardiner, and Jakobson, and the psychologists Révész and Duijker, are discussed. All five scholars reject the earlier psychologism that reinforced the traditional emotion-expressive view of interjections; all of them argue for a listener-directed, communicative view of language in general, and all include a specific appeal-to-the-listener-function in their model of language functions. My original hypothesis was therefore that these scholars would reject the one-sided traditional view that interjections mainly express the speaker's emotions, acknowledging instead that the central function of most interjections is to make some appeal to the listener (a view supported by recent investigation of a corpus of spoken Dutch, which shows that only 7% fulfils a purely expressive function). As it turns out, however, all five scholars support the traditional view and attributed an expressive function to interjections. In this paper I try to explain this unexpected result.

1. Introduction

In the first half of the 20th century, quite a few linguists, philosophers and psychologists worked at theories of language functions. They distinguished three, four or even more central functions of language, and defended their own model against those of others. The 'language functions debate' mentioned in the title refers to this discussion.

In what follows I will focus on the models of five scholars: Bühler, Gardiner, Jakobson, Révész and Duijker. As a first introduction, I present some basic data:

a) Karl Bühler (1879-1963), Austrian psychologist-linguist
b) Alan Gardiner (1879-1963), British linguist
c) Roman Jakobson (1896-1982), Russian-American linguist
d) Géza Révész (1878-1955), Hungarian-Dutch psychologist
e) Bert Duijker (1912-1983), Dutch psychologist

More specifically, I will look at the position of interjections in the models of these five scholars. At first sight it seems plausible that the study of interjections benefited from the language function debate. Traditionally, interjections were described in a rather over-simplified manner: their only function would be the expression of the speaker's feelings, as in 'ow!' as an utterance of suffering. When one looks at interjections in

more detail, however, this characterization turns out to be true of only a relatively small number of the total class. In most cases interjections fulfil a variety of functions in which appeal to the listener is the central element. Think, for example, of 'hush!' as an admonition to silence, or 'hello!' which is meant to establish contact. 19th-century psychologistic views on language reinforced the simplistic view of interjections as pure emotion words.[1] What I had expected to find was that, from around 1900 onwards, in the context of criticism of this psychologism and of an increased attention to the whole range of language functions, a more realistic description of interjections would result. This article will show that this expectation proved incorrect.

The structure of the article is as follows. First, I present a characterization of the traditional view of interjections. Secondly, I discuss the general change, around 1900, from psychologism to a more functionalistic view of language, and its possible consequences for the description of interjections. Thirdly, I introduce the five scholars and their respective models of language functions. Fourthly, their views on interjections will be presented. Fifthly, and finally, I will try to interpret the results.

2. Inadequacy of the traditional view of interjections[2]

The traditional view of interjections, defended from Antiquity onwards, is that they express the speaker's feelings or emotions. It was incorporated in the earliest grammars of western European languages and continued in the grammars that followed.

As it turns out, however, this view adequately characterizes only a small subcategory of interjections. The main function of the majority of interjections is to make some appeal to the listener. There is certainly an emotional connotation in many interjections, but, put in modern terms, the main illocutionary force of most of them is not expressive, but directive. As empirical support, I mention one significant result: in Hofstede's analysis of a corpus of spoken Dutch, only 7.04 % of all interjections turned out to fulfil an expressive illocutionary function. Hofstede (1999) presents the following data:

Table1: Illocutionary functions of interjections in 17 fragments of spoken texts, 637 turns, 412 illocutionary analyses of interjections:

Representative (propositions, true or false)	6.80%
Expositive (directive in the conversation)	52.01%
Directive (to actions)	28.88%
Expressive (of the speaker's mental state)	7.04%
Commissive (to future actions)	4.37%

---

[1] Cf. Elffers (2005a, 2007) for a more detailed discussion of the 'emotion' view of interjections and of the factors, also briefly discussed below, that reinforced this view.

[2] Traditionally, and also in the discussions of interjections dealt with in this article, onomatopoeia is not included in the category of interjections.

Many examples of what traditionally are 'emotion expressing' words turn out to be actually directive appeal words. Both in earlier and in later grammars, the words themselves were not only observed, but in addition their specific functions were often correctly described; nevertheless, these grammars supported the overgeneralization that these functions are primarily emotional.

A 17th-century Dutch grammar presents a clear example of this type of analysis. Its author, Kók, defines interjections in terms of four features: they are indeclinable, they can function as a sentence by themselves, they are thrown in between other sentence elements, and their aim is to convey emotions. Kók subsequently distinguishes fifteen specific emotions and illustrates these with one or more interjections. When we look at the list of these alleged emotions (presented below in translation), we find that only four of them clearly refer to straightforward emotions (given in italics), while all the others concern other illocutionary functions, most of them directed at the listener:

> Outburst, Flattery, Request, *Surprise*, Threatening, *Sadness*, *Fear*, Derision, *Joy*, Call, Command to be silent, Reprimand, Blame, Crying, Laughing
> (Kók 1649: 48)

My speculation about the cause of this overgeneralization is that it may well have arisen in periods when grammar was focused on written language, and language was seen as an artificial system devised by man in order to communicate regular thought. This increased the distance between interjections and 'normal' words, whose form was considered purely conventional and whose meaning was assumed to be denotative. Interjections, on the other hand, lack this type of meaning. Some of them sound like spontaneous non-linguistic or pre-linguistic cries. Some of them exclusively belong to spoken, and even rough language. Together, these factors may have helped to create and continue the 'emotional' overgeneralization.

A further factor might be the general stubbornness of traditional grammatical categories. Writers of grammars have to cover grammar in its totality and have, throughout the centuries, been rather slow in making improvements in the semantic characterization of categories. This is especially the case in earlier periods, in which semantic adequacy was less important for a grammar than its function of instructing people on how to write correctly.[3]

During the 19th century, despite a growth in the empirical adequacy of grammars, the emotion-expressive view of interjections became even more prominent. This was thanks to two popular concerns.

First, there was the search for psychological counterparts of linguistic phenomena. The idea that language reflects a speaker's mental processes was much older, but now concepts borrowed from the new and rapidly developing discipline of psychology stimulated linguists to take the psychological basis of words and sentences much mores seriously. The meaning of words became generally identified with events in the mind of the speaker: concepts or representations. For interjections, there were no

---

[3] In Elffers (1991: ch.6), I discuss this characteristic of traditional grammar.

corresponding concepts or representations available. The most plausible alternative was to assume that the mental occurrences reflected by this word class were emotions.

Secondly, there was the increased involvement in theories on the origin of language. Language was frequently assumed to have developed from natural emotional cries, and interjections were regarded as remnants of those first embryonic words. This identification further reinforced the overgeneralization.

3. From psychologism to functionalism

From the end of the 19th century onwards, the two issues mentioned above gradually disappeared from the linguistic scene. The psychology of representations was replaced by various approaches in which the intentional act became the central psychological concept. For linguistics, this stimulated a turn towards an approach in terms of communicative functions rather than intra-psychological occurrences.[4] Secondly, the origin of language issue became less prominent. Recognition of its speculative character precluded any serious discussion about primitive man and the precise character of his first emotional cries.[5] At the same time empirical linguistic knowledge became more extensive and more detailed.

For the interjections section in grammars, all these developments resulted in a more differentiated approach. The monopoly of emotion expression disappeared. A large variety of subcategories were proposed, referring to speech acts such as calling, warning, command, and affirmation. Nevertheless, the overgeneralization did not disappear altogether. Even today, the emotion subcategory may include members whose main function is not the expression of some emotion but a communicative appeal to the listener. For example, in the authoritative and extensive Dutch grammar *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (Haseryn et al. 1997[2]: 579), the emotion subcategory contains interjections whose illocutionary force is to pity or to deride the listener.[6]

Now, it seems reasonable to expect these listener-directed functions to be given specific attention in the work of those scholars who developed a typology of language functions. Unlike the writers of grammars, who had to cover the whole conceptual framework of traditional grammar, they paid special attention to the specific issue of language functions. The five scholars whose views I will discuss all favoured a communicative approach to language. Today, the three linguists among them are all regarded as predecessors of pragmatics and speech act theory.[7] Révész and Duijker are

---

[4] Cf. Knobloch (1988) and Elffers (1999) for a more detailed analysis of this development.

[5] As early as 1866, the origin of language issue was banished from the arena of scientific debate by the French Academy of Sciences. Ideas about the origin of language did not disappear altogether, but they became more and more cautious and less substantial. Révész' book discussed here was meant as a new and more scientific contribution to the discussion (Révész 1946:11-15). Duijker's claim that the book 'immediately caused a renewed interest in the origin-of-language problem, which was previously considered unsolvable' (Duijker 1956: 5) seems highly exaggerated, however.

[6] Examples are *ocharme!* (*poor fellow*! pitying) and *pf! (pooh*! derision). Of course such interjections may also apply to a third party, rather than to the listener.

[7] Cf. Nerlich & Clarke (1996).

less well-known in linguistic circles, but whenever they are discussed, their pragmatic and listener-directed approach to language is stressed.[8]

4. Five models of language functions

4.1. Main sources

The works in which the authors exposed their models of language functions most prominently are the following:

a) K. Bühler. 'Kritische Musterung der neuern Theorien des Satzes'. Indogermanisches Jahrbuch 6. 1918: 1-20
------   Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Jena 1934 (p.24-33)
b) A. Gardiner. *The theory of speech and language*. Oxford 1932 (p.185-190 & 293-319)
c) R. Jakobson. 'Linguistics and poetics'. In: Th. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge, Mass. 1960: 350-377
d) G. Révész. *Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache*. Bern 1946 (p.119-150)
e) H.C.J. Duijker. *Taal en psychische werkelijkheid. Extralinguale elementen in de spraak*. Amsterdam 1946, chapters 1& 2

4.2. Relations?

How did the various models relate to each other? As to Bühler's three-function organon-model, this model was relatively original. To be sure, the issue was in the air and Bühler could build upon earlier theories by other scholars,[9] but his 1918 article on sentence theories with its first sentence 'Dreifach ist die Leistung der menschlichen Sprache: Kundgabe, Auslösung und Darstelling', was a milestone in the development of language function theories.

As for Gardiner, he developed very similar ideas independently,[10] but he knew and discussed Bühler's 1918 article on sentence theories.

Jakobson, Révész and Duijker all discuss Bühler's theory as it was presented in his *Sprachtheorie*, and they present their own views as alternatives to Bühler. Révész and Duijker also discuss and partially criticize Gardiner's model.

4.3. Context

What was the position of these models in the total oeuvre of the authors? In Bühler's oeuvre, the organon model was highly important. After its presentation in the 1918 article, it was further elaborated and it finally became one of Bühler's four axioms of

---

[8] Cf. Vonk (1996a and 1996b) and Foolen (2006).
[9] Cf. Vonk (1992: 4.2.1) and Knobloch (1988: 4.7).
[10] Cf. Bühler (1934: 25) and Nerlich & Clarke (1996: 341-343).

the study of language.[11] It runs like a continuous thread through his publications and it became one of his most well-known intellectual achievements.

In Gardiner's general linguistic work, the model is not the most prominent issue, compared to his central theme, the distinction between speech and language. But within the theory of speech, the subject is of considerable importance; it is extensively discussed twice, in two subsequent chapters of his book.[12]

Jakobson became famous for his achievements in almost every area of linguistics. His theory of language functions became very well-known, but the same is true of quite a few other new ideas he launched.[13]

Within the work of the psychologists Révész and Duijker, the discussion of language was restricted to only one episode in their careers. In Révész's case, however, the involvement in the problem of language origin was closely related to his general developmental approach in psychology, and also to his general endeavour to extend the area of psychology to the higher products of human culture. For example, he also published on the psychology of creative art, and in his book on the origin of language, parallels are drawn between language and music. So his linguistic work is not an accidental side-issue. Moreover, Révész considered his book on the origin of language to be his most successful work.[14]

Duijker was Révész' pupil and eventually became his successor as director of the Amsterdam Laboratory of Psychology. His book about extralingual elements in speech was his thesis. It appeared in the same year as Révész' *Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache*. Their simultaneous focus on language cannot be accidental, given their close professional relationship. On the other hand, the books are very dissimilar, and they hardly refer to each other. They share the broad perspective on language and its relation to other types of communication, but Révész' developmental approach is entirely lacking in Duijker's work. Their models of language functions also differ considerably. After his thesis, Duijker was mainly involved in general psychology. He developed a five-fold division of the discipline, which became very influential in the organization of departments of psychology. Duijker returned to linguistics only very late in his career, when he was inspired by new developments in psycholinguistics.

4.4. Content of the five models

Below, the content of the models of the five scholars is presented succinctly and schematically:

---

[11] Cf. Bühler (1934: ch.1), Vonk (1992: ch.4).

[12] Cf. Gardiner (1932: ch 4 'The sentence and its form' and ch. 5 'The sentence and its locutional context').

[13] For example, he developed a hierarchy of sounds, relevant to language history and typology, as well as to language acquisition and language pathology.

[14] Cf. Duijker (1956), a necrology of Révész.

Table 2: Schematic overview of five models of language functions

<u>CE: Central Element</u>

CE	speaker	listener		content	
B:	Kundgabe/Ausdruck	Auslösung/Appell		Darstellung	
G:	Exclamation	Question	Request	Statement	
J:	Emotive Poetic	Conative	Phatic	Referential	Metalingual
R:	---	Frage	Aufforderung	Mitteilung	
D:	Exclamatief	Interrogatief	Imperatief	Indicatief	

How to read this table? The 2nd to 6th lines of the leftmost column presents the first letter of the names of the five scholars. This is in each case followed by the language functions they distinguish, presented in their own terms.

All the terms presented in one column mean more or less the same. Each column is devoted to a different 'central element' (indicated by CE) of the speech situation (*speaker, listener* or *content*). For example, Bühler's *Kundgabe* or *Ausdruck*, Gardiner's and Duijker's *exclamative* function and Jakobson's *emotive* function all refer to the function of expressing the *speaker's* emotion. All five elements in the listener column refer to the function of making some appeal to the *listener*, and all five elements in the content column refer to the function of conveying some *content*. For Bühler, the model is now exhaustively described. Gardiner, however, wants to make a further distinction within the appeal function between demands for information, namely *questions*, and demands for action, or requests. He presents this as a subcategorization of Bühler's category of *Appell*-sentences. For this reason, Gardiner's questions and requests are put in the figure very near to each other. The same is true of Duijker's *interrogatief* and *imperatief*. Duijker does not appeal to Bühler in this context, but he groups the functions together because they share a common exhortative character. The *exclamatief* and the *indicatief* function, in turn, share the feature of 'communication in a narrower sense';[15] this similarity remains unexpressed in my figure.

Révész distinguishes three functions, all identical to functions assumed by others. *Auffordering* is identical to request and *imperatief*, but its position is less close to the question column, because Révész, unlike Gardiner and Duijker, does not regard them as closely related.

Jakobson distinguishes three functions (*emotive, conative* and *referential*) which he himself identifies with Bühler's three functions. Next to these, he assumes three additional functions: the *poetic* function, which focuses on the message for its own sake, the *phatic* function, which aims at creating and maintaining the contact between the interlocutors, and the *metalingual* function which focuses on the code itself. Their position in the figure is not entirely arbitrary; it is based upon tentative similarities between functions, but these were identified later by others,[16] not by Jakobson himself.

---

[15] Duijker explains this by saying that their only function is to convey something, not to elicit a reaction (Duijker 1946: 41).
[16] Cf. Nerlich & Clarke (1996: 285).

4.5 Differences and ambiguities

Of course, a separate article would be necessary to deal with all models exhaustively. I will therefore confine myself to two general remarks:

First, the three linguists Bühler, Gardiner and Jakobson stress the possibility of mixing functions. They actually assume that, somehow, all utterances exhibit all functions, albeit in very different ways, and in different degrees of prominence. The two psychologists, Révész and Duijker, assume one function for each utterance.

Secondly, the models of Bühler, Gardiner and Jakobson presuppose a very direct link between what they regard as essential elements in the speech situation and the language functions performed: their models are language function models as well as models representing their analysis of the speech situation in terms of its constitutive elements (CE). For Bühler and Gardiner these are the speaker, the listener and the things and situations talked about. Gardiner actually distinguishes the words of the utterance as the fourth constitutive element, but these are thought to be equally important for all functions, and therefore irrelevant for aims of distinction. In this, Gardiner differs from Jakobson, who distinguishes a separate metalingual function, which attaches much importance to the words that are used. In addition, Jakobson's poetic and phatic functions focus, respectively, upon the message and the contact channel as constitutive elements of the speech situation.

The two psychologists argue against this approach of linking essential elements of the speech situation to communicative functions. They regard such a link as a source of ambiguity in Bühler's model and propose a strict separation between the two issues.[17] Révész' model directly reflects this separation through the absence of an expressive function. Of course, Révész does regard the speaker as a central element of the speech situation, but this is irrelevant to his model of language functions. Given his extremely communicative view of language, he considers those utterances whose function is expressive and exclamative either as pre- or extra-linguistic, or as reducible to one of the other functions. Duijker also rejects the link between central elements and functions, but he does reintroduce the exclamative category. He argues against Révész' view, claiming that there exists a separate exclamative intention that essentially differs from the indicative and imperative intention (Duijker 1946: 40).

The two issues are clearly related. It is not a coincidence that those scholars who assume a direct relation between constitutive elements of the speech situation and language functions also stress the possibility of mixed functions. By definition, all element are present in all speech situations. So for these scholars, the idea that, in some way, all functions must be present in any utterance has a certain measure of a priori plausibility, which is lacking in theories that reject such a relation.

---

[17] The same and other ambiguities in Bühler's model have been discovered by contemporary linguists as well. Cf. Vonk (1992: 210f.) and Elffers (2005b).

5. Interjections and the five models

How did the five scholars deal with interjections? We observed that all models explicitly recognize one or more functions of appeal to the listener. So there is, in principle, a slot to be filled with interjections of this type. Given this possibility, the results of my investigation are somewhat surprising. Consider the following brief enumeration of the language function of interjections as conceived by the five scholars (again indicated by their initials), which is followed by some relevant quotations:

Functions of interjections:
                B: Kundgabe/ Ausdruck
                G: Exclamation
                J: Emotive
                R: Ausdruck (not in the model)
                D: Exclamatief

Relevant quotations:

B:

> […] der unreflektierte Imperativ und die Interjektion enthalten keine Aussage im strengen Sinne des Wortes, ihr Verhältnis zum Erlebnis des Sprechers ist und bleibt das Verhältnis der Kundgabe, auch wenn sie wissentlich und willentlich geäußert werden. (Bühler 1918: 8)

> Die Interjektionen und phonematisch geprägten Appellgebilde wie he! hallo! sind weder wie die Nennwörter feldfähig im Symbolfeld der Sprache noch ohne Vorbehalt den Zeigwörtern beizuzählen […] Es dürfte auch nicht falsch sein, wenn man sie zum Einklassensystem der tierischen und menschlichen Rufe rechnet und dadurch noch gründlicher von den eigentlichen Wörtern trennt. (Bühler 1934: 300)

G:

> The most primitive of all exclamations are stereotyped vocal performances like the sucking of the breath (fff!) at the sight or smell of a delicious dish. This is true speech, and the sound employed is a real word. [..] As words or stereotyped units of language such sounds are called **interjections**, and may be defined as words having reference to given types of psychic reaction and arousing an expectation of use in reference to a particular mood, attitude, or desire presently experienced by the speaker. (Gardiner 1932: 316)

J:

> The so-called EMOTIVE or 'expressive' function. focused in the ADDRESSER, aims at a direct expression of the speaker's attitude toward what he is speaking about […] The purely emotive stratum in language is presented by the interjections. (Jakobson 1960: 354)

R:

> Die Interjektionen stellen ursprünglich ebenso unwillkürliche Ausdrucksformen von affektiven Zuständen dar, wie die Ausdrucksbewegungen des Gesichts und der Glieder. […] Sie drücken auch weiterhin affective Zustände aus […]. (Révész 1946: 41-42)

> (against Gardiner) Der Ausruf […] gehört nicht zu den Hauptfunktionen der gegenseitigen sprachlichen Verständigung. Sie stellen sprachlich symbolisierte Ausdrucksbewegungen dar, sie stehen mithin mit den Interjektionen auf einer Stufe. (Révész 1946: 152)

D:

> Language is used in its exclamative function when it is the expression of the speaker's reaction to something that happened or was said. For example: 'hurrah!', 'great!', 'go to the devil', 'thalassa!', 'nonsense!'. This use of language expresses an emotional-affective response, a positive or negative evaluation. (Duijker 1946: 41, transl. E.E.)

The general finding is that all scholars regard interjections as expressive of the speaker's emotions. Bühler (1918) explicitly mentions the function of interjections: *Kundgabe*. In Bühler (1934), the words *He* and *Hallo* are dubbed *Appell*-words, but given his formulation 'Interjektionen und Appellgebilde', he excludes these words from the class of interjections. Given his emphasis on their similarity with animal cries, interjections are still regarded as *Kundgabegebilde*, although Bühler does not say this explicitly in his *Sprachtheorie*.[18] In his earlier article about sentence theories, however, he does say about interjections that their function is *Kundgabe*.

Gardiner explicitly states that interjections are the most stereotyped exclamation words, and defines them in terms of the expression of emotions.

Jakobson regards interjections as pure examples of emotive words.

Révész, who does not recognize an expressive language function, nevertheless attributes this function to interjections, thereby positioning them outside language. Duijker, finally, does not speak of interjections explicitly, but his examples of exclamations show that interjections belong to this class.

We must therefore conclude that nothing has really changed in relation to the traditional view. Interjections are still characterized as expressions of the speaker's emotions. All scholars exclusively relate them to the speaker-oriented, self-expressive function.

---

[18]   There is, however, a casual remark about one specific interjection, *aha*, which is called a *Kundgabe*-word (Bühler 1934: 311).

6. Looking for an explanation

How to interpret these results? Can they be explained? I will conclude by giving some tentative hints about factors that might be relevant.

A first point seems to be the simple fact that four of the five models assume a speaker-expressive language function and that the most plausible examples of words fulfilling this function are interjections. The need for their role as a slot-filler, in combination with an assumed lack of other plausible slot-fillers, may have reinforced a continuation of the well-known overgeneralization.

Note that Révész denies the existence of an expressive or exclamative function of language; his model, therefore, lacks the relevant slot. However, for him interjections are bound up with the so-called *interjections-theory*, which is one of many theories about the origin of language he rejects. The interjections-theory belongs to the category of *theories of expressive movements and sounds*.[19] According to Révész, these theories are all doomed to fail in their attempt to explain the origin of language, because they ignore the essential distinction between (pre-linguistic) *symptoms* (like interjections) and (fully-fledged linguistic) *symbols* (Révész 1946: 39-45). So despite his innovative model, Révész could not renew the traditional ideas about interjections. Because of their fixation in the interjections-theory, they could not fill any slot in his communicative model of language functions.

Apart from the issue of slot-filling, my guess is that part of the explanation of the lack of renewal might be found in a mechanism mentioned earlier: the stubbornness of traditional categories. I mentioned this in relation to traditional grammars, but we may extend this to all general linguistic works in which the empirical analysis of interjections is not a special focus of attention. All the works I have discussed have a general linguistic theme. Language functions play a central role, but within this area, the listener-directed appeal function, which could have evoked attention to interjections, is, for reasons that differ from author to author, either relatively unimportant, or is discussed in a way that discourages attention to interjections.

In the case of Bühler, for instance, the subtitle of his book already indicates that its main subject is the function of *Darstellung*. And as far as the *Appell* function is elaborated, this occurs in a very specific way. For Bühler, *deictic* elements such as pronouns are the main examples of the *Appell* function and only these examples are analysed thoroughly.[20] Apart from the quoted passage, interjections are mentioned several times in the *Sprachtheorie*, but never in order to analyse their semantic or pragmatic function. It is their syntactic character that fulfils an argumentative role in solving, for example, demarcation problems of the concepts *word* and *sentence*.[21]

---

[19] This category, in turn, belongs to the larger category of *biological theories*. Other larger categories are: *anthropological theories, philosophical and theological theories*. Révész' own theory is a *contact theory*.

[20] Cf. Elffers (2005b).

[21] Cf. Bühler (1934: 297, 359, 407); see also Ehlich (1986: 237-239), who concludes that Bühler hardly pays any attention to interjections, whereas his conceptual apparatus provides the means to analyze them adequately.

As for Jakobson, he presents his six-function model in the context of the theme 'linguistics and poetics'. His central aim is to describe the position of the poetic function among the other functions, and to elaborate only this function in detail.[22]

Duijker's book mainly deals with intonation, in relation to gesture and other extralingual means of expression. All these phenomena are regarded as natural rather than conventional, and as mainly fulfilling the expressive function. So this function receives most attention. Moreover, like Gardiner, Duijker conceives of the listener-appealing function in terms of the subcategories of questions and requests. These categories traditionally have sentence types as their formal counterparts. The effect might have been that interjections are dissociated from these functions.

The same is true for Révész' model; moreover, for Révész, the sentence types *imperative* and *indicative* play a prominent part in his own theory of the origin of language. This theory is entirely based upon contact between individuals by means of, primarily, imperative forms of the verb. Within this frame of thought, the listener-appealing function is prominent, but is assumed to be fulfilled by sentence types only. For Révész, interjections are positioned somewhere in pre-linguistic limbo.

This concludes my tentative explanation, which is different for each scholar, the only common element being a structural lack of focus on interjections in the work of all five scholars. For me, these results show, once again, how very true Karl Popper's metaphor of the searchlight is.[23] Popper emphasized that in scientific research, and even in life in general, observations are always preceded by expectations, points of view, questions or problems, which, like a searchlight, allow only a certain area to be observed. We can add: and, as a corollary, leave other areas in the dark to remain unobserved, for the time being.

References

Bühler, Karl. 1918. 'Kritische Musterung der neuern Theorien des Satzes.' *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch*. 6: 1-20.

Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. 1934 [1982]. Stuttgart etc.: Fischer.

Duijker, H.C.J. 1946. *Taal en psychische werkelijkheid. Extralinguale elementen in de spraak*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

Duijker, H.C.J. 1956. 'G Révész 1878-1955.' *Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie*, 48 (2): 3-6.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1986. *Interjektionen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Elffers, Els. 1991. *The historiography of grammatical concepts. 19th and 20th-century changes in the subject-predicate conception and the problem of their historical reconstruction*. Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi.

Elffers, Els. 1999. 'Psychological linguistics'. In: *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 4. Sprachtheorien der Neuzeit*. Ed. by Peter Schmitter. Tübingen: Narr, 301- 341.

Elffers, E. 2005a. 'Interjections in Dutch grammar.' *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 15 (1): 91-105.

---

[22] 20 of 28 pages of Jakobson's article are exclusively devoted to the poetic function.
[23] Popper (1972: 341-62).

Elffers, Els. 2005b. 'Reichling and De Groot: Two Dutch reactions to Bühler's Organon-modell.' *Historiographia Linguistica* 32: 87-116.

Elffers, Els. 2007. 'Interjections – On the margins of language.' In: *Linguistische und epistemologische Konzepte – diachron*. Ed. by Stephanos Matthaois & Peter Schmitter Münster: Nodus, 15-138.

Foolen. Ad. 2006. 'Show some emotion. De expressieve functie van taal.' In: *Amicitia in academia. Composities voor Els Elffers*. Ed. by Jan Noordegraaf, Frank Vonk & Marijke van der Wal. Amterdam/Münster: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU/ Nodus, 155-162.

Gardiner, Sir Alan. 1932 [1969]. *The theory of speech and language*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Haeseryn, W. et al. 1997. *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. 2 vols. 2nd revised edition. Groningen/Deurne: Nijhoff/Wolters Plantyn.

Hofstede, Gerard. 1999. 'De interjectie als illocutionaire handeling.' *Toegepaste taalwetenschap in artikelen* 61: 129-135.

Jakobson, Roman. 1960. 'Linguistics and poetics.' In: *Style in language*. Ed. by T.A. Sebeok. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 350-377.

Knobloch, Clemens. 1988. *Geschichte der psychologischen Sprachauffassung in Deutschland von 1850 bis 1920*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kók, A.L. 1649 [1981]. *Ont-werp der Neder-duitsche letter-konst*. Ed. by G.R.W Dibbets. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Nerlich, Brigitte & David D. Clarke. 1996. *Language, Action and Context. The early history of pragmatics in Europe and America, 1780-1930*. Amsterdam etc.: Benjamins.

Popper, Karl. 1972. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Révész, Géza. 1946. *Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache*. Bern: Francke.

Vonk, 1992. *Gestaltprinzip und abstraktive Relevanz. Eine wissenschaftshistorische Untersuchung zur Sprachaxiomatik Karl Bühlers*. Münster: Nodus.

Vonk, Frank 1996. 'Linguistik und Psychologie. Sprachursprung und Sprachfunktionen.' In: *Theorie und Rekonstruktion*. Ed. by Klaus D. Dutz & Hans J. Niederehe. Münster: Nodus, 181-205.

Vonk, Frank 1996'. 'Ausdruck als Mitteilung und Steuerung: Pragmatische Kritik an Wundts völkerpsychologischem Forschungsprogramm.' *Zeitschrift für Semiotik*. 18 (4): 441-460.

Contact details: Els Elffers
                        Mozartkade 11
                        1077 DJ Amsterdam
                        The Netherlands

                        els.elffers@uva.nl