

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XL

2021

The appearance of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
<http://www.israel-classics.org>

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to one of these e-mail addresses:
scripta.classica.israelica@gmail.com or isaacb@tauex.tau.ac.il. For reviews, contact
yulia@bgu.ac.il. Please visit our website for submission guidelines. All submissions are refereed
by outside readers.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the following address: The Editors,
Scripta Classica Israelica, c/o Department of General History, Ben-Gurion University of the
Negev, P.O.B. 653 Beer Sheva 8410501, Israel.

Price \$50

© 2021 The Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies
All Rights Reserved

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief: BENJAMIN ISAAC

Editorial Board:
AVI AVIDOV
GABRIEL DANZIG
DANIELA DUECK

Editorial Assistant: Hila Brokman

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*

François de Callataÿ, Brussels and Paris
Hubert Cancik, Berlin
Averil Cameron, Oxford
Hannah M. Cotton, Jerusalem
Ephraim David, Haifa
Werner Eck, Köln
Denis Feeney, Princeton
Margalit Finkelberg, Tel Aviv
John Glucker, Tel Aviv
Erich Gruen, Berkeley
Benjamin Isaac, Tel Aviv

Ranon Katzoff, Ramat Gan
David Konstan, New York
Jaap Mansfeld, Utrecht
Doron Mendels, Jerusalem
Ra'anana Meridor, Jerusalem
Maren Niehoff, Jerusalem
John North, London
Hannah Rosén, Jerusalem
Brent Shaw, Princeton
Greg Woolf, London

THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

OFFICERS 2020-2021

| | |
|------------|----------------|
| President: | Jonathan Price |
| Secretary: | Lisa Maurice |
| Treasurer: | Shimon Epstein |

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Adi Erlich
Merav Haklai
Lisa Maurice
Andrea Rotstein
Iris Sulimani

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hannah Cotton
Ranon Katzoff
Ra'anana Meridor

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| JAMES M. REDFIELD, <i>Briseis: The Woman as a Speaking Sign</i> | 1 |
| CARLO DELEE DONNE, <i>Tackling Conventions: Plato's Barbarians between Language and Ontology</i> | 15 |
| JOHATHAN J. PRICE, <i>The Originality of Appian of Alexandria</i> | 31 |
| BENJAMIN ISAAC, <i>Caesarea: Before and After the Corpus of Inscription (CIIP)</i> | 49 |
| ALEXANDER ANDRASON AND MÓNICA DURÁN MAÑAS, <i>The Syntax of Interjections: Evidence from New Testament Greek</i> | 57 |
| CAROLINE PETIT, <i>Greek Particles in Galen's Oeuvre: Some Case Studies</i> | 95 |
| ROEE DROR, <i>Renderings of Idiomatic Topographical Terms in the Septuagint</i> | 125 |
| WERNER ECK AND YOTAM TEPPER, <i>A Stamp with Latin Inscription from Sobata/Shivta in the Negev</i> | 145 |
| RIVKA GERSHT AND PETER GENDELMAN, <i>Marble Cuboid Weight Carved with Eros from Khirbet Ibtin</i> | 151 |
| RONIT PALISTRANT SHAICK, <i>The "Marsyas of the Forum" image on Roman city coins of the Southern Levant</i> | 169 |
| JOSEPH GEIGER, <i>GLAJJ: Two More Addenda</i> | 203 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | |
| Rainer Friedrich, <i>Postoral Homer: orality and literacy in the Homeric Epic</i> (by Margalit Finkelberg) | 205 |
| Gabriel Danzig, David Johnson and Donald Morrison (eds.), <i>Plato and Xenophon. Comparative Studies</i> (by Livio Rossetti) | 207 |
| Peter Riedlberger, <i>Prolegomena zu den spätantiken Konstitutionen. Nebst einer Analyse der erbrechtlichen und verwandten Sanktionen gegen Heterodoxe</i> (by Robert M. Frakes) | 210 |
| Attilio Mastrocinque, Joseph E. Sanzo, and Marianna Scapini (eds.), <i>Ancient Magic: Then and Now</i> (by Ortal-Paz Saar) | 213 |
| Oren Margolis, <i>The Politics of Culture in Quattrocento Europe. René of Anjou in Italy</i> (by Tamara Lobato Beneyto) | 216 |
| OBITUARIES: GIDEON FOERSTER (by Orit Peleg-Barkat) | 219 |
| DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS | 225 |

The syntax of interjections: Evidence from New Testament Greek

Alexander Andrason and Mónica Durán Mañas

Abstract: The present article studies the syntax of interjections in New Testament Greek (NTG). By analyzing the compliance of NTG interjections with the six features associated with the interjective prototype in linguistic typology, the authors conclude the following: NTG interjections exhibit a semi-canonical and semi-extra-systematic profile. Interjections comply with three features (lack of integration in the clause grammar, incompatibility with syntactic operations, and a sentence-/clause-/phrase-peripheral (or external) position). The compliance with one feature (phonological separation) is partial. Two features tend to be violated (holophrasticity and lack of constructional combinatority). The syntactic profile of NTG interjections is highly similar to the profile exhibited by interjections in Classical Greek (5th-4th BCE), which demonstrates that the interjective syntax has remained fairly unaltered, at least, over five centuries.

Keywords: New Testament Greek, interjections, syntax, prototype, typology.

Introduction¹

The present article is dedicated to the syntax of interjections in New Testament Greek (NTG) – one of the most marginalized and unsystematic areas of research in NTG scholarship. To analyze the syntax of the interjective category in NTG in a comprehensive and systematic manner, we deploy the concept of a prototype of interjection (Ameka 1992; 2006; Nübling 2001; 2004; Ameka & Wilkins 2006; Stange & Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). Specifically, we examine whether NTG interjections comply with the features of the syntactic prototype of an interjection and its extra-systematicity as postulated in linguistic typology, and what the extent of this compliance – or violation – is. Furthermore, we contrast the results of our study with a similar analysis developed recently for the 5th-4th BCE Classical Greek (CG) by Nordgren (2015). The comparison of the syntactic profiles exhibited by CG and NTG – and their respective degrees of compliance with the cross-linguistic prototype and its extra-systematicity – aims to reveal the range of changes affecting the syntax of interjections or, on the contrary, its conservative character.²

¹ This paper was written during a research stay at the Institute of Languages and Cultures of the Mediterranean and Middle East, at the Spanish National research Council (ILC-CSIC) in Madrid in 2019.

² The present paper is limited to syntactic considerations. We are aware of the fact that, in language, syntax is related to semantics and pragmatics, and all language modules are interconnected. However, due to limitations in space, we cannot address all such non-syntactic issues in this article. Therefore, any meaning-oriented analysis will be kept to a necessary minimum. That said, we invite the reader who is interested in semantics and pragmatics to

To achieve its objective, the article will be structured as follows: in the next section (*Background*) we present the framework underlying our study and familiarize the reader with the previous research on interjections in Greek scholarship, first in CG – focusing on Nordgren’s (2015) comprehensive analysis – and next in NTG. Subsequently, we introduce the details of our empirical study (*Evidence*). After that, we interpret the results of this evidence within the adopted framework, additionally contrasting it with the syntactic profile of interjections in CG (*Results and discussion*). The final section (*Conclusion*) concludes our paper.

Background

The syntax of interjections – Our framework

The prototype of an interjection is an ideal representative of the interjective lexical class, constructed by linguistics given the regularity of certain features attested across languages and those features’ saliency.

In linguistic typology, interjections are primarily defined in semantic and pragmatic terms. First, a prototypical interjection expresses emotional states – i.e. emotions and sensations – and contains “an ‘I feel’ component” (Stange & Nübling 2014: 1983). Second, it is uttered semi-automatically in a reflex-like manner as a response to linguistic and extra-linguistic stimuli. Third, it is monologic and non-referential – it is not directed to interlocutors nor does it allow discourses about parties other than the speakers themselves (see Ameka 1992a, 2006; Ameka & Wilkins 2006; Nübling 2001, 2004; O’Connell & Kowal 2008; Velupillai 2012; Stange & Nübling 2014; Meinard 2015; Stange 2016).

It is not only meaning and function that distinguish interjections from other lexical classes. Interjections are also characterized by unique formal properties. Such formal properties associated with the prototype of an interjection are generally extra-systematic – interjections being marked phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically. Indeed, with regard to syntax – the field of our study – typologists agree that a prototypical interjection exhibits a high degree of extra-systematicity (Stange 2016: 47-48) as it has no syntactic representation at a phrase, clause, and sentence level. Drawing on research conducted by Ameka (1992; 2006), Nübling (2001; 2004), Ameka & Wilkins (2006), Norrick (2009), Velupillai (2012: 149-150), Stange & Nübling (2014), Meinard (2015), and Stange (2016), the interjective prototype may be attributed the following six, more specific extra-systematic features (F):

- F-1 Contrary to other lexical classes, interjections can function holophrastically. They may constitute complete, autonomous and, crucially, non-elliptical utterances that are equivalent to fully-fledged sentences.

consult our other paper dedicated specifically to the meaning of NTG interjections (Durán Mañas & Andrason 2021). The few semantic-pragmatic remarks included in the present article draw on the findings – all of them derived from a wide-range corpus study – of that other paper.

- F-2 In agreement with other lexical classes, interjections may also function as words, thus forming parts of larger syntactic units. Nevertheless, even in such instances, their behavior is extra-systematic. Interjections resist syntactic integration in clause grammar and do not constitute that clause's core elements that could be assigned syntactic functions. Specifically, interjections are not projected by the predicate; they are not governed by syntactic components of a clause, such as internal and external arguments and adjuncts; they do not modify the predicate, arguments, and adjuncts.
- F-3 Interjections do not enter into relationships – or do not form constructions – with other lexical classes and grammatical elements. The only regular exceptions are structures built of interjections themselves (e.g. reduplication and multiplication of a single interjection or sequences of different interjections) and vocatives.
- F-4 Contrary to genuine sentences, interjections are not susceptible of syntactic operations available in a language, e.g. negation, interrogation, and passivization. When occurring in negative, interrogative, or passive sentences, interjections entertain their own illocutionary force in an independent and potentially different manner from the force of the rest of the sentence.
- F-5 When used as words within a sentence, interjections occupy peripheral positions, usually appearing at the sentence's initial edge (the left margin) or, less commonly, at its final edge (the right margin).
- F-6 Interjections constitute an autonomous phonological or prosodic unit in a sentence, separated from its remaining parts by pause, intonation, or contouring.³

While the interjective prototype presented above embodies syntactic extra-systematicity to the highest extent, the extra-systematicity of its language-specific instantiations need not be so radical. That is, interjections attested in a particular language may comply with the prototype to a larger or lesser degree. Those that comply considerably are canonical instantiations – heavily extra-systematic from a syntactic perspective. Those that comply with some features associated with the prototype are semi-canonical and thus moderately extra-systematic. Those that comply with the prototype only minimally are non-canonical and, as a result, predominantly systematic.

Similarly, not all interjections attested cross-linguistically need to comply with the semantic and pragmatic – as well as phonological and morphological – properties associated with the prototype. As far as semantics and pragmatics are concerned, only

³ These prototypical syntactic features have largely been corroborated – although with some noticeable exceptions – in research conducted by one of the authors of the present paper on interjections in Semitic (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020; Andrason & Hutchison 2020), Khoisan (Andrason, Fehn & Phiri 2020), and Bantu languages (Andrason & Matutu 2019; Andrason & Dlali 2020).

emotive interjections express feelings and sensations. The remaining three types of interjections do not. Cognitive interjections indicate the speaker's cognitive states and their thought processes (Ameka 1992: 113). This ability to express some types of mental states is the reason cognitive interjections are grouped together with emotive interjections into the category of expressive interjections.⁴ Conative interjections express the speaker's wishes and draw attention (ibid.). Phatic interjections indicate the speaker's "attitude towards the on-going discourse" (ibid. 114; see also Ameka 2006; Ameka & Wilkins 2006; Stange & Nübling 2014; Stange 2016). Even more crucially, conative and phatic interjections fail to be semi-automatic and monologic. On the contrary, they are produced in a fully deliberate manner, typically in dialogues, often requiring the presence of an interlocutor or another participant (Ameka 1992; Wierzbicka 1992; Nübling, 2004; Stange 2016; Andrason & Hutchison 2020). Similarly, with regards to the formal aspects, only primary interjections (i.e. interjective lexemes that are used exclusively or predominantly as interjections, whether from their grammatical birth or due to the process of interjectionalization) comply with the features postulated for the prototype. In contrast, secondary interjections (i.e. originally non-interjective lexemes, e.g. nouns, verbs, and adverbs, or phrasal constructions that all have only been partially interjectionalized) and exclamations (i.e. non-interjective lexemes and constructions that are used as interjections rarely, spontaneously, and with no traces of entrenchment) tend to violate the formal features associated with the prototype (Ameka 1992; Nübling, 2001; 2004; Stange 2016; Andrason & Hutchison 2020).⁵

The analysis of constructional properties will be developed within the frame of construction grammar, with a construction being defined as a conventional form-function pairing with varying extents of complexity, abstraction, and tightness (Croft 2001; 2013; Goldberg 1995; 2003; 2006; 2013, Hoffmann & Trousdale 2013; Fried & Östman 2004; Bybee 2013). According to this definition, all syntactic patterns form constructions of a certain degree of schematicity and grammaticalization, ranging from tighter (more closely interconnected and/or more entrenched) to less tight.

The syntax of interjections – Classical Greek (CG) (Nordgren 2015)

In 2015, Lars Nordgren published a comprehensive study of interjections in the Classical Greek of the 5th-4th BCE. Similar to us, Nordgren tested CG interjective lexemes and constructions for their compliance with the typologically driven prototype

⁴ Importantly for our study, Nordgren (2015) groups emotive and cognitive interjections into a single class.

⁵ The different semantic and formal types of interjections can be arranged along two continua spanning from less canonical to more canonical: (a) the continuum of interjectionality: phatic > conative > cognitive > emotive; (b) the continuum of interjectionalization: exclamations > secondary interjections > primary interjections (Ameka 1992; Nübling 2001: 39; 2004: 14, 17-21; Stange & Nübling 2014: 1988; Meinard 2015; Stange 2016: 17; Andrason & Hutchison 2020).

of an interjection.⁶ Nordgren suggests the following regarding the six prototypical features presented in the *Framework* section above:

- F-1 CG interjections may be used holophrastically as free-standing utterances (Nordgren 2015: 72). However, this is attested only sporadically (ibid. 45, 48, 68, 71).

- F-2 CG interjections are predominantly used as words, forming parts of sentences whose core is usually a finite verb (Nordgren 2015: 45, 72). Given that no clear instances of syntactic integration in clause grammar are discussed or presented, we conclude that CG interjections do not constitute core structural components of a clause. Crucially, they are not projected by the (verbal) predicate; they are not governed by the core elements of a clause; they do not govern and modify the core elements of a clause.

- F-3 Although self-standing interjections are attested – whether used holophrastically or as parts of sentences – CG interjections typically form constructions (Nordgren 2015: 72, 247). First, interjections yield collocations, i.e. sequences of interjective lexemes that maintain their individual functions (ibid. 45). Second, interjections yield combinations, i.e. sequences of interjective lexemes exhibiting novel constructional functions that are different from those of their individual components (ibid.). Both types may involve the repetition (reduplication or multiplication) of a single lexeme or the grouping, asyndetic and syndetic, of different interjections (ibid. 46). Third, interjections yield constructions with noun phrases (NP) built around nouns, adjectives/participles, and pronouns (ibid.) inflected in a vocative, nominative, dative, and genitive case (ibid. 57-58, 247). Overall, the constructional character of CG interjections is common of the expressive type. It is less patent with the conative type. The phatic type exhibits the least constructional behavior (ibid. 51-63, 68, 71-72).

Given the pervasiveness of the constructions built around CG interjections and the regularity of those constructions' internal structure, they (i.e. interjective constructions) are regarded as “proper syntactic combinations” – Interjection Phrases (IPs) (Nordgren 2015: 72, 51, 247). IPs exhibit a structure composed of maximally six components (Nordgren 2015: 51-52). The head position – first in the phrase – is occupied by one interjection or a chain of consecutive interjections. The second position is filled by the dative 1st person pronoun *μοι* ‘to me’ (ibid. 51-52). For some interjections (e.g. *ὦμοι*), this relationship is so pervasive and entrenched that the two positions are interpreted as morphologically continuous, thus attesting to compounding (ibid. 53, 56). The third position is filled by a nominative NP coindexed with the speaker (ibid. 57) or a vocative NP – both built around a noun, adjective, participle, or pronoun (ibid. 51-52). The fourth position is filled by a genitive NP (ibid. 51-52, 58-59). The fifth position is filled by a

⁶ Since Nordgren (2015) draws on similar typological literature, his prototype of an interjection is highly similar to our prototype, which was presented above.

vocative (ibid. 51-52, 65). The sixth position is filled by a nominative – invariably co-referred with the speaker (ibid. 51-52, 65). The fifth and sixth positions are not as strongly/tightly connected to the interjective head, as can be noted by the presence of a comma separating them from the preceding elements (ibid. 65). Additionally, in a few exceptional cases, the IP contains an NP inflected in an accusative case (ibid. 57).

- F-4 The resistance to participate in syntactic operations (e.g. negation, interrogation, and passivization) is not explicitly discussed by Nordgren (2015). However, since interjections entertain their own illocutionary force – expressive for expressive interjection, imperative for conative interjections, and declarative for phatic interjections (ibid 185-186) – they may appear in negative, interrogative, and passive sentences without having a negative, interrogative, or passive value themselves.
- F-5 CG interjections occur in an initial, medial, and final position in a sentence (Nordgren 2015: 44). The most common position in all semantic types is the initial position (ibid). The medial position is much less common. The final position is “very rare” (ibid. 45).
- F-6 CG interjections are invariably separated from the adjacent sentence by a pause whose length may vary from short to long (Nordgren 2015: 45). A comma, semicolon, and full stop used within the same line are interpreted as exponents of a shorter pause (ibid.). The placement of an interjection in a separate line – i.e. properly *extra metrum* or “outside the metrical pattern of the text” (ibid.) – in addition to the use of a semicolon or full stop, is interpreted as a sign of longer pause (see footnote 10 below).⁷

⁷ Overall, studies on the syntax of interjections in Classical Greek are scarce. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the most significant, although very sketchy, contributions are standard grammars, in particular Sonnenschein (1894: 184, 212), Monro (1891: 298), Goodwin (1895: 222-223, 239), Gildersleeve (1900), Brugmann, Cohn & Thumb (1913: 644), Smyth (1920: 312-313, 482, 606-608), Chantraine (1953: 37, 66), and Schwyzer (1950). The interjection whose study was the most detailed is ὤ, analyzed thoroughly by Scott (1903; 1904; 1905). To our knowledge, most of modern research on interjections (Perrier 1996; López Eire 1996: 85-95; Perdicoyianni-Paléologue 2002: 49-88; Nordgren 2015) rely on dramatic texts where the dialogue invites their presence. The language of comedy was a bridge between the spoken and the literary language, allowing for the introduction of certain features of the former to the latter. Research on interjections, including their syntactic properties, improved in the second half of the 20th and especially in the 21st century. Brioso Sánchez (1971) and Lepre (1979; 2000; 2001) studied, among others, certain syntactic properties of interjections used in vocative constructions (in particular ὤ), including their integration in the sentence and their lexical productivity. Rodríguez Adrados (1992: 50, 169-170, 687-688, 700, 716) mentions that interjections do not enter in relationship with flexional lexical classes although they occur with vocative and nominative and govern dative and genitive; can be used holophrastically; and occupy an initial or medial position in a utterance, being separated by a pause from its remaining part. Other studies focused on the semantics, pragmatics (e.g. meaning, function, and etymology) and, less often, phonetics of interjections, mentioning syntactic characteristics rather

Syntax of interjections – New Testament Greek (NTG)

The interest in interjections in NTG scholarship has been more marginal than is the case of CG. Most mentions to NTG interjections are brief, accidental, and unsystematic, as illustrated by Blass, Debrunner & Funk (1961: 32, 54, 56, 81, 96, 113), Thrall (1962: 29), Moulton (1963a: 11, 71, 171-172; 1963b: 15; 1963c: 330), Duff (2005: 186), McLean (2011: 59), Delgado Jara (2013), as well as Robertson (1951: 299, 302, 328, 461, 544, 1193), albeit perhaps less superficially. Overall, scholars note the principal semantic role of interjections as the expressions of strong emotions, whether positive (e.g. affection) or negative (e.g. indignation) (Robertson 1951: 1193; Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961: 81; Moulton 1963a: 71; Delgado Jara, 2013: 34-35); the diachronic relationship of interjections with other lexical classes, e.g. nouns, verbs (imperatives), adverbs, and adjectives (Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961: 32, 54, 56; Robertson 1951: 299, 302, 328, 544, 1193; Moulton 1963a: 171-172, 240; 1963b: 330; McLean 2011: 59); the common lack of inflections or the morphological simplicity of interjections (Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961: 32; Moulton 1963a: 171); and their susceptibility to be influenced by foreign languages' usage, in particular Hebrew, Aramaic (Robertson 1951: 1193; Moulton 1963a: 11; 1963b: 15; 1963c: 296), and Latin (Lowe 1967: 34-34; Leclercq 1993: 262).

The discussion of the syntactic properties of NTG interjections is even more anecdotal. To begin with, interjections are sometimes considered not as grammatical words but rather as para-linguistic sounds (Winer 1869: 373), which leaves their study beyond the scope of syntax. They neither entertain a syntactic role in the sentence in which they occur, nor do they belong to the core grammar of the NTG language in general (Winer 1869: 373; Thrall 1962: 29). Very rarely is the syntactic peripherality of interjections questioned, and their contribution to (the sentence) syntax acknowledged (Robertson 1951: 1193). However, the only syntactic phenomenon consistently discussed with regard to interjections is their relationship to the case marking of adjacent nominal elements. That is, interjections often co-occur with nominal elements inflected in the vocative, dative, genitive, and even the accusative (Robertson 1951: 461, 1193; Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961: 81, 96, 113; Moulton 1963a: 71). Other syntactic issues are ignored.

accidentally (Martínez Hernández 1978; Labiano Ilundain 2000; Perdicoyianni-Paléologue 2002; Labiano 2017). The most systematic study of the interjective lexical class in Classical Greek before Nordgren (2015) was offered by Biraud (2004; 2010). Drawing on modern advances in semantics and pragmatics, Biraud provides not only the analysis of separate interjections but also establishes the proprieties of the interjective lexical class in its integrity. For comprehensive accounts of research on interjections in Classical Greek, consult Nordgren (2015: 23-36; see also see Biraud 2010). Interjections are also treated briefly in the new reference grammar of Greek authored by Emde Boas, Rijksbaron, Huitink, and Bakker (Emde Boas et al. 2019: 321, 489).

Evidence

The present section draws on a comprehensive empirical study during which the ten best candidates for interjections in NTG, previously selected on semantic-pragmatic grounds, were tested for their compliance with the syntactic prototype of interjection. These tested lexemes are (in order of their frequency): οὐαί (37), ναί (23), ὦ/ὦ̃ (17), δεῦτε (12), δεῦρο (8), ἄγε (2), εἶ (2), εὔγε (1), ἔα (1), οὐά (1).⁸ In total, 104 instances of interjective

⁸ The selection of these tokens was deliberate. It results from comprehensive research dedicated to the meaning of NTG interjections previously conducted (and concluded) by both authors (see Durán Mañas & Andrason 2021). That study enabled us to identify ten interjections that comply – at least, to a certain extent – with the semantic-pragmatic definition of interjections provided in section *The syntax of interjections – Our framework* above. All such interjections were divided into the four different semantic types, namely emotive, cognitive, conative, and phatic, and their meanings, which sometimes draw on more than one domain, were analyzed in detail. (By definition, we excluded any interjection that is nominalized in Greek, i.e. used as a noun, e.g. ὑμῶν τὸ ναί ‘your yes’ (James 5:12) and ἡ οὐαί ἡ τρίτη ‘the third woe’ (Rev 11:14).) This approach ensures the non-circularity of our argument in the present paper: we test the syntactic properties of lexemes that are interjections from a semantic-pragmatic perspective. It is also typical of typological studies devoted to interjections (see Nordgren 2015). It should be noted that, when elaborating our list of interjections, we decided to narrow it to primary interjections and those secondary interjections that are profoundly interjectionalized. Inversely, we excluded a number of less interjectionalized secondary interjections and all types of exclamations. This decision was motivated by two reasons. First, less interjectionalized secondary interjections and exclamations tend to distinguish themselves from primary interjections and highly interjectionalized secondary interjections by their generally systematic formal profile. They are also very often used in other functions than an interjective function, e.g. as adverbs, imperatives, pragmatic particles (discourse markers), and modal particles. Second, we intended our approach to be compatible with that of Nordgren (2015), who had also disregarded a number of less interjectionalized secondary interjections (divided into three classes: onomatopoeiae, particles, and routines/formulae). Our decision thus enhanced the commensurability of the data of CG and NTG. As a result, lexemes such as ἰδοῦ (see Nordgren 2015: 22-23), οὐ (cf. *ibid.* 21), and ἀμήν were excluded from our list. Nevertheless, contrary to Nordgren (2015: 58) who treats ὦ̃ as a particle (see also Lepre 1979), we included it in our set of interjections (there are 16 cases of ὦ̃ and 1 of ὦ). This is necessitated given the semantic-pragmatic approach we used to identify the members of the interjective category in NTG (see Durán Mañas & Andrason 2021). As demonstrated in that study, ὦ̃ is typically employed as an emotive (expressive) interjection communicating positive and negative feelings (Durán Mañas & Andrason 2021). Our analysis thus concurs with the views formulated by Blass, Debrunner & Funk (1961) and Delgado Jara (2013: 34-35) for whom ὦ̃ expresses a wide range of emotions from affection to indignation. The various emotive nuances of ὦ̃ are also acknowledged by Scott (1903; 1904; 1905) and Dickey (1996: 200, 204; see also Lepre 1996). With regard to ὦ̃, one should also note that the “futility” of the search for the meaning of this lexeme suggested by Dickey (1996: 205) concurs with the behavior of canonical interjections but is much less typical of (modal/pragmatic) particles. That is, canonical interjections are characterized by extreme polysemy and context dependency, and their meaning is “difficult to unravel and to transfer in sequential form” (Stange 2106: 38), being more of a procedural than denotating type

uses were carefully studied with regard to six prototypical features: holophrasticity, integration in clause grammar, constructional combinatority, participation in syntactic operations, position within the sentence, clause, and phrase, and phonological relationship to the other parts of the utterance.

F-1 Holophrasticity

Genuine holophrastic uses of NTG interjections are very poorly attested, featuring only three times ($\approx 3\%$) in the analyzed corpus (see example 1 below).⁹ According to our model, there may be two types of uncontroversial cases of holophrasticity. They emerge in examples in which an interjection either constitutes the only word of a turn (type a), or it constitutes the only word in a sentence within a turn composed of two or more sentences (type b). As far as the second type is concerned, we decided that the overt markers of sentence boundaries that would enable us to identify separate sentences are <.> and <.>. Two other punctuation signs (i.e. <.> and <.>) mark the separation of elements within a sentence.¹⁰ In the NTG corpus, all holophrastic interjections are of type a – they form both the entire sentence and the entire turn (see example 1 below). Their structural representation could therefore be #{}[I]}# where [] marks phrasal boundaries, {} marks sentence boundaries; and # marks the turn's edges. The only lexeme that is employed holophrastically is ναί (1). In such holophrastic uses, ναί invariably entertains a phatic function, expressing affirmation or agreement.

(1) Acts 22:27-28¹¹

²⁷ προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλίαρχος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Λέγε μοι, σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη,
Ναί

²⁸ ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ χιλίαρχος, ἐγώ...

²⁷ The tribune came and asked Paul: “Tell me, are you a Roman citizen?” And he said: “Yes.”

(Ameka 1992: 114; Stange & Nübling 2014: 1982, 1985; Meinard 2015: 156; Stange 2016: 12).

⁹ The other two cases are Mt 13:51 and 17:25.

¹⁰ This approach is not without problems. The main issue concerns the fact that NTG was written and transmitted without punctuation marks – although some signs were sporadically attested (Metzger 1981: 31-32). The principles of punctuation were only formulated in the 9-10th centuries. Overall, the punctuation used reflects a scribe and/or editor's choice and their interpretation of the text. This fact explains the wide fluctuation of punctuation marks in the editions until the Modern Age and some controversy, still present, in scholarship on how the NTG text should be punctuated (see Lattey & Burkitt 1928; Kilpatrick 1960; Metzger 1980; Wenham 1981; Aland & Aland 1987; Reed 1993; Poirier 1996; and more recently Thorsteinsson 2002; Hurtado 2014). Fully cognizant of these weaknesses, we chose the edition of Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger & Wikgren (1968) – which is accessible through the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) database – as basis for our analysis. In this regard, we adhere to Nordgren's approach who “ha[s] chosen to follow the punctuation of the editors, simply to be as “fair” as possible to the texts” (2015: 46; see footnote 55 below).

¹¹ In the examples, the relevant interjection(s) will be marked in bold.

²⁸ The tribune answered: “I...”

The above discussion means that NTG interjections are mostly used as parts of broader sentences or utterances, being thus accompanied by other lexical or grammatical elements, including other clauses. Three canonical examples are provided in (2.a-c). In (2.a), the interjection ὦ appears within a larger sentence frame composed of the vocative γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη ‘unbelieving and perverse generation’ (that together with the interjection yields an IP) and two fully-fledged verbal clauses. Each of the verbal clauses itself consists of a finite verb inflected in the future tense, i.e. ἔσομαι ‘I will be’ and ἀνέξομαι ‘I will bear’, that governs a complement, i.e. πρὸς ὑμᾶς ‘with you’ and ὑμῶν ‘you’ respectively – all of this is additionally headed by the temporal adjunct ἕως πότε ‘until when’ that profiles the clauses as interrogative. In (2.b), the interjection ὦ, accompanied by the vocative noun Θεόφιλε ‘Theophilus!’, is found within a complex sentence composed of two verbal clauses, i.e. the main clause: Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησάμην περὶ πάντων ‘I composed the first account (book) about all the things’; and a subordinate clause: ὃν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ‘that Jesus began to do and teach’. In (2.c), apart from the interjection itself (in this case, ναί), the sentence contains a clause built around the finite verb ἔρχομαι ‘I come/am coming’ that is inflected in the present tense, and an adverbial modifier ταχύ ‘quickly, soon’. The structural representation of (2.a-b) is {[IP] CP CP}; while that of (2.c) is {[IP] CP}.¹²

(2) a. Lk 9:41

ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;

‘Jesus answered: “O unbelieving and perverse generation, until when shall I be with you and bear with you?”’

b. Acts 1:1

Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, ὃν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν

‘I composed the first account (book) about all the things, o Theophilus, that Jesus began to do and teach (i.e. did and taught).’

c. Apoc 22:20

Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, Ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Ἀμήν, ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

‘The one who testifies to these things says: “Yes, I am coming soon.” Amen, Come, Lord Jesus!’

Instances in which the interjection is not accompanied by core clauses, but rather, together with its dependent – e.g. vocative or dative/accusative object (see section *F-3 Constructions* below) – forms the utterance, may be analyzed as approximating holophrasticity to a certain extent. In such cases, the utterance is nothing more than the interjective phrase: the head (i.e. the interjection) and the dependent(s) governed by the

¹² In modern approaches to syntax, (the unit of) a clause is defined as a complementizer phrase – hence the abbreviation CP.

interjective head (on government, see section *F-3 Constructions* below). The syntactic structure of such cases can therefore be represented as {[IP]} – a more elaborated variant of {[I]} discussed above. In other words, while cases of {[IP]} may not be analyzed as canonical holophrasticity (indeed the interjection linearly co-occurs with other elements), they could be analyzed as holophrastic from a hierarchical perspective. In both {[IP]} and {[I]}, the interjection constitutes the only head – with the dependent’s position realized or not, respectively. Examples (3.a-b) illustrate this phenomenon. In (3.a), the utterance is composed of the interjection *ναί* and a vocative noun *κύριε* ‘lord!’. The utterance in (3.b) is even more complex. It is formed by the interjection *οὐαὶ*, the particle *δέ*, and two complex NPs which are governed by the interjective head, i.e. *ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις* ‘those pregnant’ and *ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις* ‘the ones nursing infants in those days’, both linked by the conjunctive coordinator *καὶ* ‘and’. To conclude, although the interjection is accompanied by other elements in the two examples, these elements do not belong to a separate clause built around a predicate, but are rather governed by the interjection, jointly forming the IP. It is this phrase that functions as an autonomous utterance.

(3) a. Mt 9:28-29

²⁸ ἔλθόντι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοὶ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Πιστεῦετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, **Ναί**, κύριε.

²⁹ τότε ἤψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν λέγων,...

²⁸ When he entered the house, the blind men came to him; and Jesus said to them: “Do you believe that I can do this?” They said to him: “Yes, Lord.”

²⁹ Then he touched their eyes and said:...

b. Mk 13:17 (ibid. Mt 24:19)

οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

‘Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days!’ (NRSV)

F-2 Integration in clause grammar

Canonical holophrastic interjections {[I]} as well as interjections exhibiting a semi-holophrastic profile {[IP]} are by definition not integrated in any type of clausal structure. In contrast, genuine non-holophrastic interjections could – at least theoretically – be integrated into the grammar of an accompanying clause. As will be demonstrated in this section, instances of such integrations are extremely rare.

In general, non-holophrastic interjections are almost never integrated in the syntactic structure of an adjacent core clause (103x out of 104x ≈ 99%). They are neither projected by the predicate of that clause – whether verbal or non-verbal – nor are they governed by the predicate’s dependents, be they arguments or adjuncts. Similarly, interjections fail to govern the elements of the core clause or to modify them. This means that, when included within the brackets of the sentence, interjections are

syntactically external to – or disjointed from – the core clause. Examples (4.a-c) illustrate this point. In (4.a), the interjection $\tilde{\omega}$ and the vocative *πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥαδιουργίας* ‘full of all deceit and all fraud’ – as well as two other vocatives used in apposition (*υἱὲ διαβόλου* ‘son of devil’ and *ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης* ‘enemy of all righteousness’) – are disjointed from the core clause (*οὐ παύση διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας* ‘will you not cease perverting crooked the right paths of the Lord?’), having no structural place in its grammar. The interjection – like the other vocatives – does not fall under the scope of the complex predicate composed of the finite verb *παύση* ‘you will stop’ and the participle *διαστρέφων* ‘perverting’: it is not projected by it nor does it modify it. It also fails to be governed by the verb’s dependents (*τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας* ‘the right paths of the Lord’). Similarly, in (4.b), the interjection *ἔα* does not belong to the core clause. It does not fall under the scope of the non-verbal predicate and its dependents *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ;* ‘what do you want from us’ – either as modifier or projected/governed element. Rather, it appears as an extra-clausal structural element syntactically similar to the vocative *ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ* ‘Jesus of Nazareth’ used at the end of this sentence. In (4.c), it is the interjection *ναί* that is structurally external to the declarative core clause *καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν* ‘yet even the dogs eat the crumbs falling from their masters’ table’. That is, *ναί* has no syntactic bearings on the constituents of the core clause – neither the predicate (*ἐσθίει* ‘they eat’) nor the arguments (the subject *τὰ κυνάρια* ‘the dogs’ and the partitive object *ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων* ‘of the crumbs’) and adjuncts (e.g. *ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν* ‘from their masters’ table’); and through the mechanisms of neither projection, governance, or modification. As an extra-clausal structural element, *ναί* is seconded by the vocative noun *κύριε* ‘lord!’ – equally disjointed and/or externalized.

(4) a. Acts 13:10

εἶπεν, $\tilde{\omega}$ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥαδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης, οὐ παύση διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας;

‘and said: “O full of all deceit and all fraud, son of the devil, enemy of all righteousness, will you not cease perverting the right paths of the Lord?”

b. Luke 4:34¹³

Ἐα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

‘Ha, what do you want from us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are – the Holy One of God.

c. Matt 15:27

ἢ δὲ εἶπεν, *Ναί*, κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιγίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.

¹³ In agreement with the version of NTG underlying our study, we treat *ἔα* as an interjection in this example. However, ancient versions read this lexeme as the imperative of *ἐάω*.

‘She said: “Yes, Lord, yet even the dogs eat the crumbs falling from their masters’ table.”’

The only example where an interjection partakes in the core clause grammar is presented in (5). Following a traditional interpretation, the use of the interjection οὐαί ‘woe’ in (5) is fully comparable to the possessive dative, which is indeed employed in the second clause in this verse οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα lit. ‘I have no boast/glory’. The interjection would thus function as the subject of the verbal predicate ἔστιν ‘is’, which together with the dative object μοί ‘to me’ yields the clause ‘woe is to me’. However, this structure may also be interpreted differently – and in our view more accurately. Following Barðdal et al.’s (2013) analysis of the Indo-European reflexes of the interjection **wai* ‘woe’ in Indo-Iranian, Italic, Germanic, Slavonic, and Baltic, the Greek οὐαί may be understood as an attribute – part of the predicate ‘(there) is woe’ – while the dative pronoun may be analyzed as a subject(-like) argument: ‘to me, there is woe’ → ‘I have (experienced) woe’.¹⁴ Crucially, under both interpretations, οὐαί is an unquestionable component of the predicative clausal structure (cf. Barðdal et al. 2013). The clause containing οὐαί constitutes itself an apodosis in a conditional period, on par to the apodotic verbal clause found in a parallel conditional period earlier in the same verse: οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα ‘I cannot boast’ (lit. ‘there is no glory to me’).¹⁵

¹⁴ The relationship of οὐαί to IE **wai* is uncertain. This interjection is unattested in Homeric and Classical Greek and may therefore have been transferred to NTG as a case of borrowing, perhaps from Latin (Lowe 1967: 34-34; Leclercq 1993: 262) or Hebrew, although “remodeled on Latin vae” (Barðdal et al. 2013).

¹⁵ The other cases of οὐαί where this interjection occurs in verb-less constructions, governing a dative NP (see section *F-3 Constructions* below) are interpreted not as clauses but rather as phrases. Even though the verb εἶμί ‘be’ can be absent in Greek, thus yielding noun clauses, the examples with οὐαί – at least synchronically – do not involve the omission of εἶμί and have no clausal structure in terms of predicate, internal and/or external arguments, and adjuncts. Our analysis coincides with that of Barðdal et al. (2013) and Nordgren (2015). Barðdal et al. (2013) analyze such constructions as exclamative datives – a constructional pattern that is distinct from, albeit related to, the predicative one. Similarly, Nordgren (2015) fails to analyze comparable constructions built around other interjections and dative as clauses. Another significant fact is that in CG, these types of interjection + dative constructions could yield compound words (if the dative was pronominal), e.g. οἶμοι and ὄμοι (Nordgren 2015: 53). This renders a clausal interpretation highly problematic. The use of interjections (other than οὐαί and reflexes of **wai*) with exclamative dative is common in other languages. It is attested, for instance in Polish (*biada ci* ‘woe to you’) and Biblical Hebrew (Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020). In all such cases, the relevant constructions tend to be analyzed as phrases rather than clauses (ibid.).

Historically, the relationship between the clausal (predicative) and phrasal (dative exclamative) types is complex and still debated (see Barðdal et al. 2013). Barðdal et al. (2013) argue that the clausal (predicative) construction with **wai* is archaic, while the phrasal (dative exclamative) construction constitutes a focalized exclamatory variant developed subsequently. For Nordgren (2015) the evolution need not involve a clausal structure at all. Namely, a self-standing interjection was complemented by the dative, which when pronominal, merged into a single word (e.g. ὄμοι). Once reinterpreted as a word, a new evolutionary round began, that is, another dative, e.g. μοι, was added yielding ὄμοι μοι.

(5) 1 Cor 9:16

ἐὰν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστιν μοι καύχημα· ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἐπίκειται·
οὐαὶ γάρ μοι ἔστιν ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίσωμαι.

‘If I preach the gospel, I cannot boast, for I am compelled to preach; woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!’

F-3 Constructions

Even though self-standing interjections are attested – whether holophrastic (by definition) or non-holophrastic – genuine non-holophrastic interjections as well as those analyzed as semi-holophrastic often yield constructions. Two major types of such constructions are attested: horizontal (flat) structures and vertical (hierarchical) structures.

First, interjections enter into constructions with other interjections forming sequences of interjective lexemes – or collocations. In NTG, such collocations only involve repetitions of the same interjection. Reduplication, illustrated in (6.a), is attested three times,¹⁶ while triplication (6.b) is only attested once. Sequences composed of more than three interjections are unattested. The only interjection that is replicated is οὐαὶ. Following Corver’s (2015: 80) analysis of Dutch, we propose a horizontal (flat) structural representation of such cases, specifically in terms of (asyndetic) coordination.¹⁷ That is, each interjection is structurally parallel to the others, yielding the structure I+I (reduplication) or I+I+I (triplication) – all interjections being contained within a broader Conjunctive Phrase (ConjP).¹⁸

(6) a. Apoc 18:10

ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἑστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς, λέγοντες,
Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, Βαβυλὼν ἡ πόλις ἡ ἰσχυρά, ὅτι μιᾶ ὥρᾳ ἦλθεν ἡ
κρίσις σου.

When this round was completed, the third round took place, leading to the formation of ὅμοι μοί μοι (ibid. 56).

¹⁶ See also Apoc 18:10, 18:16, 18:19.

¹⁷ That is, horizontal with respect to other interjections. Of course, the structure of a ConjP itself is not flat but hierarchical (see Corver 2015). As is typical across languages, interjective conjuncts are not linked by a coordinating conjunction, e.g. καί. In other words, flat constructions built around concatenated interjections are asyndetic. This has no significant bearing on the status of interjections within our constructionist approach.

¹⁸ Combinations of different interjections that would yield a new constructional meaning and would suggest a more lexicalized reading (see that, in some languages, such collocations of two or three interjections may develop into semi-morphologized word-like structures) are unattested. That is, in all the cases where two or three interjective lexemes (as mentioned above, invariably οὐαὶ) co-occur in NTG, they are to be analyzed as coordinated. They thus express the same meaning merely repeated two or three times, most likely for emphatic purposes.

‘they will stand far off, in fear of her torment, and say: “Alas, alas, the great city, Babylon, the mighty city! For in one hour your judgment has come.”’ (NRSV)

b. Apoc 8:13

Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ πετομένου ἐν μεσουρανήματι λέγοντος φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, **Ὁὐαὶ οὐαὶ οὐαὶ** τοῖς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῶν λουπῶν φωνῶν τῆς σάλπιγγος τῶν τριῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν μελλόντων σαλπίζειν.

‘Then I looked, and I heard an eagle crying with a loud voice as it flew in midheaven: Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth, at (because of) the blasts of the other trumpets that the three angels are about to blow!’ (adapted from NRSV)

The other constructional class encompasses vertical (hierarchical) constructions. The verticality of this type stems from the higher structural position of the interjection, specifically its headedness – the interjection constituting the structural head of an IP (see Nordgren 2015). Two types of relationships may connect the components of such IPs: government (interjections governing dependents) or modification (interjections being modified by modifiers).

Governing structures emerge in cases in which interjections govern dependent (DEP) elements – the construction being represented as IP → I + DEP. The dependent elements are themselves noun phrases (NP) built of nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and participles inflected in a vocative, nominative, dative, or accusative case. In contrast, instances in which a dependent would be inflected in a genitive case are unattested. In this regard, we follow terminology used by Nordgren (2015), for whom the interjective head *governs* elements, which inversely *depend* on it. In further adherence to Nordgren’s terminology, this government and dependency may range from genuine (*tight*) to less canonical (less tight), i.e. with the interjection and the other elements being *combined* or *connected* more *closely* or less closely (ibid. 51-52, 57-58, 65).

The use of vocative NPs in combination with interjections is highly common. Such cases are attested 41 times, which constitutes approximately 39% of all the instances. Crucially, this use is fully productive, being attested with seven of the ten interjective lexemes analyzed in this study, whether expressive, phatic, or conative. However, the syntactic connection of such vocatives to their respective interjections – or the tightness of the whole construction – is uneven, ranging from tighter to less tight. The interjection that exhibits a particularly close relationship with vocatives is the expressive ὦ. Indeed, in all its uses (17x),¹⁹ ὦ is combined with a vocative. See, for instance, γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη ‘unbelieving and perverse generation’ in (2.a), Θεόφιλε ‘Theophilus’ in (2.b), and πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥαδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης ‘full of all deceit and all fraud, son of the devil, enemy of all righteousness’ in (4.a) discussed above. Significantly, ὦ/ὦ is never separated from its vocative: neither by other grammatical elements nor by orthographic separatrices (see section *F-6*

¹⁹ Rom 11:33; Mt 15:28, 17:17; Mk 9:19; Lk 9:41, 24:25; Acts 1:1, 13:10, 18:14, 27:21; Gal 3:1; 1 Tim 6:11, 6:20; Rom 2:1, 2:3, 9:20; Jas 2:20.

Phonological relationship below).²⁰ Another expressive interjection, i.e. οὐαί, is also commonly combined with vocatives – to be exact, in 11 cases out of the 37 attested. However, contrary to ὦ/ὦ̃, the vocative is regularly separated from the interjection – which is often additionally combined with a dependent dative – by a separatrix (see γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί ‘scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites’ in (7.a) below).²¹ The phatic interjection ναί co-occurs with a vocative in 7 cases²² out of 23 (see κύριε ‘Lord’ in (3.a) and (4.c) above). Similar to οὐαί, in all such cases, the vocative is separated from the interjection by an orthographic separatrix. Both in the case of οὐαί and ναί, this presence of orthographic separatrices and, if possible, further distance from the interjective head suggest a (much) lesser extent of constructional tightness. The two other expressive interjections εὖ (7.b) and εὖγε (7.c) are accompanied by a vocative in all their uses (two and one respectively): δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ ‘good and faithful slave’ (7.d) and ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε (7.e) ‘good slave’. Nevertheless, similar to οὐαί and ναί, such vocatives are separated from these interjections by orthographic separatrices, which may imply the lower tightness of this constructional pattern. In contrast, the conative interjections δεῦτε and δεῦρο are rarely employed with a vocative, to be exact, once each – out of 8 and 12 cases, respectively (see Λάζαρε ‘Lazarus’ in (7.b) and the pronoun ὑμεῖς, which we understand as vocative, in (7.c)). In two of those instances (one for δεῦτε and δεῦρο, respectively), no orthographic separatrix is present and the vocative occupies an immediate position after the interjection. Lastly, ἔα, οὐά, and ἄγε do not co-occur with vocatives, although this is most likely due to the scarcity of their uses (ἔα are οὐά are attested once; ἄγε is attested twice).²³ Overall, the syntactic tightness of I + VOC constructions ranges from higher (more similar to government) to lower (where the connection is looser to the extent that perhaps no *sensu stricto* government takes place). Constructional tightness is attested for expressive interjections and conative interjections (although its extent varies considerably). The absence of constructional tightness is typical of phatic interjections.²⁴

(7) a. Mt 23:15

Οὐαί ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν ποιῆσαι ἓνα προσήλυτον, καὶ ὅταν γένηται ποιεῖτε αὐτὸν υἱὸν γέννητος διπλοῦτερον ὑμῶν.

²⁰ As explained in footnote 10 above, the punctuation used in NTG reflects a scribe and/or editor’s choice and their interpretation of the text (see also footnote 55 and section *F-6 Phonological relationship* below).

²¹ Mt 11:21 (x2), 23:13, 23:15, 23:16, 23:23, 23:25, 23:27, 23:29; Lk 10:13 (x2).

²² Mt 9:28; 15:27; Jn 11:27, 21:15, 21:16; Philemon 1:20; Apoc 16:7.

²³ See, however, the use of οὐά and ἄγε with nominative NPs employed vocatively, discussed in the next paragraph below.

²⁴ Compare with a similar observation made by Nordgren for whom vocatives “are seldom tightly connected to the interjection” (2015: 58). We follow Nordgren’s analysis (*ibid.* 52, 57-58) who, despite reservations related to the lower constructionality or tightness of (some) vocatives, considers them as members of the IP, thus being governed by an interjective head.

‘Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you cross sea and land to make a single convert, and you make the new convert twice as much a child of hell as yourselves.’ (NRSV)

b. Mt 25:21²⁵

ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ, **Εὖ**, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου.

‘His master said to him: “Well done, good and faithful slave; you have been faithful in a few things, I will make you the ruler over many things; enter into the joy of your master.”’

c. Lk 19:17

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, **Εὖγε**, ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε, ὅτι ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστὸς ἐγένου, ἴσθι ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων.

‘and he said to him: “Well done, good slave! Because you have been faithful in a very small matter, take charge of ten cities.”’

d. Jn 11:43

καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασεν, Λάζαρε, **δεῦρο** ἔξω.

‘And having said these things, he called in a loud voice: Lazarus, here forth!’

e. Mk 6:31

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, **Δεῦτε** ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ’ ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον. ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν.

‘He said to them: “Come on, to a deserted place, all by yourselves and rest a while.” For many were coming and going, and they had no leisure even to eat.’ (adapted from NRSV)

The dependent NP may also be inflected in a nominative case. This occurs twelve times ($\approx 12\%$): five times with οὐαί,²⁶ three times with ναί,²⁷ twice with ἄγε,²⁸ once with δεῦτε,²⁹ and once with οὐά.³⁰ Contrary to vocative NPs, a nominative NP may use an article and, for some inflectional patterns – albeit not all of them – exhibits vocative-specific endings. Even then, however, the nominative does not entertain its typical function, i.e. the marker of an internal subject argument. Instead, it is used for dialogic purposes, that is, to address real or imaginary interlocutors in a manner similar to the vocative.³¹ Examples (8.a-b), illustrate the use of nominative NPs in a vocative function

²⁵ See also Mt 25:23.

²⁶ Lk 6:25 (x2); Apoc 18:10, 18:16, 18:19.

²⁷ Mt 11:26; Lk 10:21; Apoc 16:7.

²⁸ Jas 4:13; 5:1.

²⁹ Mt 25:34.

³⁰ Mk 15:29.

³¹ Indeed, the use of “articlar” nominative (Robertson & Davis 1933: 214) for the vocative is “very common” in NTG (ibid. 214-215). Such uses are “not unfrequently” attested in Homer

with *ναί*. In (8.a), *ναί* is accompanied by the nominative *πατήρ* formally distinct from the vocative *πάτερ*, additionally preceded by the definite article *ὁ*. This morpho-syntactic nominative structure is nevertheless employed vocatively. It refers to the addressee of the speech (God) identified overtly by the 2nd person pronouns σου ‘you’ and σοι ‘to you’, as well as paralleled by the explicit vocative form *πάτερ* used earlier in the same verse. The vocative role of a nominative is even more evident in (8.b). In this example, the NP accompanying the interjection *ναί*, i.e. *ὁ θεός* ‘the god’, is apparently inflected in the nominative. However, the nominative form of this word is generally employed as a vocative instead of the vocative proper in NTG, the morphological vocative generally failing to be used (Robertson & Davis 1933: 215).³² Moreover, *ὁ θεός* is found alongside another NP, inflected overtly in a vocative case, *κύριε* ‘lord!’ – both NPs pointing to the same referent, God, the addressee of the speaker’s words.³³ Examples (8.c-e) illustrate the vocative functions of nominative NPs used with other interjections: *δεῦτε* (see *οἱ εὐλογημένοι* ‘those who are blessed’ in (8.c)), *οὐά* (see *ὁ καταλύων* ‘you [who] destroy the temple’ in (8.d)), and *ἄγε* (see *οἱ πλούσιοι* ‘rich people’ in (8.e); for *οὐαί* see example (6) above and the nominative phrase *ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, Βαβυλῶν ἡ πόλις ἡ ἰσχυρά* ‘the great city, Babylon, the mighty city’). Overall, the syntactic tightness of I + NOM constructions is relatively low, nominative being connected to the interjective head rather loosely. Expressive and conative interjections exhibit somewhat greater constructional tightness with their respective nominatives than is the case of phatic interjections. Note, for instance, that although nominative is orthographically separated from *οὐαί* and *δεῦτε*, the separatrix is absent when the nominative is combined with *ἄγε* and *οὐά*. In contrast, the phatic *ναί* is invariably separated from its nominative by an orthographic separatrix.

(Monro 1891: 155-156; Chantraine 1953: 36) and are also “often” found in Attic Greek (Sonnenschein 1894: 237). The only examples in which the nominative accompanying an interjection could be interpreted non-vocatively are Apoc 18:16 and 18:19. Nevertheless, even in these instances, a vocative interpretation is possible. Indeed, given the context and the structure of the entire chapter (i.e. Apoc 18), the vocative reading is more plausible than the non-vocative one. Sometimes, the presence of a nominative seems to be conditioned by the fact that the addressee is the 2nd person subject of a verb that follows. In a few examples, the nominative may also be understood as being used in apposition to dative governed by an interjection.

³² This was the case already in CG (Smyth 1920: 54).

³³ The use of the nominative case instead of the vocative in vocative functions is also common cross-linguistically. It may be attested in Slavonic languages that have lost the vocative (e.g. Russian) as well as in those that have maintained it but allow for the nominative to be used as well (e.g. Polish: *Cześć Tomek!* (nominative) or *Cześć Tomku!* (vocative) ‘Hello Tomas!’).

(8) a. Lk 10:21

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· **ναί**, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

‘At that same hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit[b] and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will.” (NRSV)

b. Apoc 16:7

καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος, **Ναί**, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἀληθινὰ καὶ δίκαια αἱ κρίσεις σου.

‘And I heard the altar responding: “Yes, O Lord, God the Almighty, true and just are your judgments!”

c. Mt 25:34

τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, **Δεῦτε**, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου·

‘Then the king will say to those on his right: “Come, those who are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world.”

d. Mk 15:29

Καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες, **Οὐά** ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις,

‘Those who passed by insulted him, shaking their heads and saying: “Aha, you who destroy the temple and build it in three days,”

e. Jas 5:1

Ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίας ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομένας.

‘Come now, rich people, weep and cry over the miseries that are coming upon you.’

The tightest constructions and the closest syntactic connection appear in cases where the interjection is combined with dative and accusative elements. In such instances, dative and accusative elements are genuine dependents governed by the interjective head. This construction type is only attested with expressive interjections.

The use of an interjective head with a dependent dative element is fairly common, being attested 29 times ($\approx 28\%$).³⁴ However, only one interjection is able to project the dative case to its dependent. This interjection is the expressive οὐαί, which governs a dependent dative in 78% of its uses. The high syntactic tightness of the I + DAT construction hypothesized above concurs with the fact that οὐαί is never separated from its dependent (whether pronominal or nominal) by an orthographic separatrix, and the dependent occupies an immediate position after the interjective head, before any other element. The dependent marked by οὐαί for a dative case may be: a noun (with its modifiers), e.g. τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ ‘to that man’ in (9.a); a participle, e.g. ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις ‘those having in womb’ and ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ‘those nursing (infants)’ in (9.b); or a pronoun, typically 2nd person singular or plural, e.g. ὑμῖν ‘to you’ in (9.c).³⁵ Often, the interjection governs both the pronoun and the noun used in apposition, as illustrated by ὑμῖν ‘to you’ and τοῖς νομικοῖς ‘to the lawyers’ in (9.d). In all such cases, the dative indicates a person or collectives receiving and thus experiencing the threat.

(9) a. Mt 26:24

ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, **οὐαὶ** δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι’ οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδεται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.

‘The Son of Man goes as it is written about him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.’”

b. Mt 24:19

οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

‘Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days!’

c. Lk 11:44

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι [οἱ] περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἶδασιν.

‘Woe to you because you are like unmarked graves, and people walk over them without knowing it.’

d. Luke 11:52

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε.

³⁴ Mt 11:21 (x2), 18:7 (x2), 23:13, 23:15, 23:16, 23:23, 23:25, 23:27, 23:29, 24:19, 26:24, 13:17, 14:21; Lk 6:24, 6:25, 10:13 (x2), 11:42, 11:43, 11:44, 11:46, 11:47, 11:52, 21:23, 22:22; 1 Cor 9:16; Jude 1:11.

³⁵ See also αὐτοῖς in Jude 1:11.

‘Woe to you the lawyers, because you have taken away the key of knowledge. You yourselves have not entered, and you have hindered those who were entering.’

As mentioned above, an interjection may also govern a dependent inflected in an accusative case. As in Classical Greek (Nordgren 2015: 57), such uses are exceptional. They occur twice³⁶ and with only one interjection – the expressive οὐαί. The first of those cases (i.e. Apoc 8:13) has been introduced in (6.b) above. In that example, οὐαί governs the accusative participle τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ‘the dwelling ones’.³⁷ In (10) below, οὐαί governs the nouns τὴν γῆν ‘the earth’ and τὴν θάλασσαν ‘the sea’ connected by the conjunctive coordinator καὶ ‘and’. As with dative, the accusative used with οὐαί identifies the recipient/experiencer (human or personified) of a threat, the accusative dependent occupies an immediate position after the interjective head, and orthographic separatrixes are absent.

(10) Apoc 12:12

διὰ τοῦτο εὐφραίνεσθε, οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες· οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων θυμὸν μέγαν, εἰδὼς ὅτι ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει.

‘Therefore rejoice, you heavens and those who dwell in them! But woe to the earth and the sea, because the devil has come down to you with great wrath, because he knows that his time is short.’” (adapted from NRSV)

Apart from being combined with vocative, nominative, dative, and accusative elements, interjections may appear in combination with locative phrases. This type of construction only involves conative interjections – δεῦτε (4x) (11.a)³⁸ and δεῦρο (2x) (11.b).³⁹ To be more specific, δεῦτε and δεῦρο govern dependents expressing the idea of a goal: δεῦτε πρὸς με ‘...to me’ (Mt 11:28; 13.a), δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους ‘...to the wedding feast’ (Mt 22:4), δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν ‘... to the country’ (11.b; Acts 7:3), and ἔξω ‘forth, outside’ (Jn 11:43; see 7.e), as well as other directional nuances such as δεῦτε πίσω μου ‘...after me’ (Mt 4:19; Mk 1:17). It should be noted that the locative dependent appears immediately after the interjective head, from which it is never separated by an orthographic separatrix. All of this suggests that, like dative and accusative, as well as some instances of vocative, this construction is tight and may be analyzed in terms of government and dependency.

³⁶ Apoc 8:13, 12:12.

³⁷ The use of the accusative in (6.b) could be related to the presence of an infinitive.

³⁸ See also Mt 11:28, 22:4; Mk 1:17.

³⁹ See also Acts 7:3.

(11) a. Mt 11:28

Δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, καὶ γὰρ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς.

‘Here to me, you who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest.’

b. Acts 7:3

καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου, καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω.

‘and said to him: “Leave your country and your relatives and, come on, to the land that I will show you.”’

The other type of vertical (hierarchical) structures involving interjections emerges in cases in which interjections are accompanied by modifiers. In such instances, the modifier restricts the meaning of an interjection as well as the meaning of the phrase governed by the interjection, sometimes connecting it to the previous clause(s) or verse(s). This type of hierarchical structure could be represented as IP → I + MOD. Three types of modifiers are attested: particles, prepositional phrases, and subordinate clauses. As was the case of dependent elements, modifiers may be combined or connected with interjections more or less closely – with their modifier status being, respectively, more or less canonical. This stems from the fact that all such modifiers are of distinct morpho-syntactic and lexical types.

Three particles are attested as modifiers of the interjective phrase: *vñv* (3x),⁴⁰ *δὲ* (5x),⁴¹ and *γάρ* (1x).⁴² The uses of the particle *vñv* lit. ‘now’ are illustrated in (12.a) and (12.b). In (12.a), *vñv* occurs with *ἄγε*, in (12.b) with *δεῦρο*. In both cases, rather than conveying a temporal sense, *vñv* functions as a modal particle, expressing focality and emphasis (cf. Thrall 1962: 32-33). However, the constructional relationship of *vñv* with the interjection – and thus its modifier status – is uneven. The interjection and *vñv* form a much tighter construction in (12.a) than in (12.b), where *vñv* may also be interpreted as a particle modifying the predicate *ἀποστείλω*.⁴³ The adversative-contrastive particle *δέ* ‘but, and’ and the explanatory or affirmative particle *γάρ* ‘for, so, then; indeed, in fact’ also modify interjective phrases, which are invariably built around *οὐαί*. However, *δέ* and *γάρ* simultaneously connect the interjections or interjective phrases to the clauses

⁴⁰ With *ἄγε* (Jas 4:13; 5:1) and *δεῦρο* (Acts 7:34).

⁴¹ Always with *οὐαί*: Mt 23:13, 24:19, 26:24; Mk 13:17, 14:21.

⁴² 1 Cor 9:16 (see example 5).

⁴³ This expression *καὶ vñv* may constitute a case of pattern borrowing from Hebrew (cf. the discourse particle *וְעַתָּה* *v^e’attah* lit. ‘and now’).

used earlier in the respective verses (see examples 12.c for *δέ* and 5 for *γάρ*).⁴⁴ Therefore, their genuine constructionality with interjections may be lower. In most cases, the modifier co-occurs with a dependent element, e.g. a dative (see τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ ‘that man’ in 12.c) or a nominative used in a vocative function (see οἱ λέγοντες ‘you who say’ in 12.a).

(12) a. Jas 4:13

Ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες, Σήμερον ἢ αὔριον πορευσόμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν καὶ ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ ἐμπορευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν·

‘Come on now, you who say: “Today or tomorrow we will go to such or such town, spend a year there, do business and make money.”’

b. Acts 7:34

ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα, καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτούς· καὶ νῦν **δεῦρο** ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

‘I have surely seen the mistreatment of my people who are in Egypt and have heard their groaning, and I have come down to rescue them. Come now, I will send you to Egypt.’ (NRSV)

c. Mk 14:21

ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δι’ οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.

‘For the Son of Man goes just as it is written about him, but woe to that man who betrays the Son of Man! It would be better for him if he had not been born.’ (adapted form NRSV)

Interjections may also be modified by expressions of cause: either phrasal or clausal. As mentioned above, contrary to what one observes with vocative, nominative, dative, and accusative, interjections do not project a genitive case to a dependent NP. The only instances where NPs belonging to an IP are inflected in genitive involve prepositional phrases (PP) of cause. In such examples, the genitive case marking is not the property of the interjection itself but rather emerges due to the presence of a preposition – the head of a PP – specifically, *ἀπό* ‘because (of)’ and *ἐκ* ‘out of, from’. In (13) below, *ἀπό* constitutes the head in a prepositional phrase and projects the genitive case to the dependent NP τῶν σκανδάλων ‘the sins’. Holistically, the PP governed by *ἀπό* modifies the interjection οὐαὶ expressing the idea of cause. Similarly, in (6.b) discussed above, *ἐκ* projects the genitive case to the dependent and, as in (13), together with its own dependent expresses the idea of cause that triggers the threat (Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ οὐαὶ [...] ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν φωνῶν τῆς σάλπιγγος ‘Woe, woe, woe [...], at/because of the blasts of

⁴⁴ Regarding the complex and sometimes controversial functions of the particles *δέ* and *γάρ* see Robertson & Davis (1933: 203, 316-317), Winer (1882: 552-552, 566-567; and 558-560, 668-669), and Thrall (1962).

the other trumpets ...').⁴⁵ This construction type is relatively tight – the causal PP is connected closely to the interjection and the modifier status of the PP is high.

(13) Mt 18:7

οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται.

'Woe to the world because of stumbling blocks (i.e. offenses); such stumbling blocks (offenses) are necessary to come, but woe to the man by whom the stumbling block (offense) comes!'

While phrasal causal modifiers that are built around prepositions governing genitive are not particularly common, clausal causal modifiers, i.e. causal clauses introduced by a backward causal connector ὅτι 'for, because', are highly frequent. This is the most evident with οὐαὶ which is typically modified (23x out of 37x) by ὅτι clauses.⁴⁶ A canonical case of this is provided in (14). In the two verses quoted, the three interjective phrases composed of the interjection οὐαὶ and sometimes its dative dependent ὑμῖν 'you' are modified by three clauses of cause introduced by ὅτι. This type of use of ὅτι is also found with ναί (2x)⁴⁷ and εὐγε (1x).⁴⁸ As was the case of causal PPs, causal clauses are connected relatively closely to the interjective head, thus entertaining a relatively canonical modifier status.

(14) Lk 6:24-25

²⁴ Πλὴν **οὐαὶ** ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.

²⁵ **οὐαὶ** ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπλεησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε. **οὐαὶ**, οἱ γελοῦντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

²⁴ But woe to you who are rich, for you have received your consolation.

²⁵ Woe to you who are full now, for you will be hungry. Woe to you who are laughing now, for you will mourn and weep.' (NRSV)

The different NPs governed by the interjective head, as well as the different modifiers, are not necessarily exclusive. That is, vocative, nominative, dative and accusative NPs, locatives, particles, and causal expressions (phrasal or clausal) may coincide (see a similar conclusion in Nordgren 2015).⁴⁹ If present, dative and accusative

⁴⁵ The prepositional phrase built around ἐκ has both a temporal and a causal value.

⁴⁶ Mt 11:21 (2x), 11:21, 23:13, 23:15, 23:23, 23:25, 23:27, 23:29; Lk 6:24, 6:25 (2x), 10:13 (2x), 11:42, 11:43, 11:44, 11:46, 11:47, 11:52; Jude 11:1; Apoc 12:12, 18:10, 18:19.

⁴⁷ Mt 11:26; Lk 10:21.

⁴⁸ Lk 19:17.

⁴⁹ Similar to Nordgren (2015) our analysis of the hierarchy of IPs is limited to two layers: the higher-level element, i.e. the governing interjective head, and the lower-level elements, i.e. dependents – themselves of distinct degrees of dependency – and modifiers. The internal structure of the lower level of the IP is of course more complex, and the various dependents and modifiers may occupy different hierarchical positions. As such a detailed description

dependents, as well as locatives, precede vocative and nominative dependents (which always refer to the addressee of the speech). Vocative/nominative dependents may be more than one. Particle modifiers always precede dependents while causal modifiers (both a PP and a clause) follow them. This overall structure of the IP is captured by the following schema:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{IP} \rightarrow \text{I} + \text{MOD} + \text{DEP} \qquad \qquad \qquad + \text{MOD} \\ \text{PART} \quad \text{DAT/ACC or LOC} + \text{VOC/NOM} \quad + \text{CAUSE} \end{array}$$

Overall, in further similarity to Nordgren's results, the highest degree of constructional combinatority is exhibited by expressive interjections. It is lower for conative interjections – note that conatives do not govern the most canonical dependents, i.e. dative and accusative; they do however govern locatives, which is not the case of expressives. In contrast, phatic interjections exhibit the least prominent tendency to form constructions. In particular, the canonical phatic interjection *ναί* only combines with vocatives and vocatively used nominatives (albeit even this connection is much less tight than in the case of some expressive and conative interjections) as well as with expressions of cause (again, much less commonly than other interjections).

F-4 Syntactic operations

Interjections are not susceptible of syntactic operations available in NTG. First, non-conative interjections cannot be used imperatively. Second, no interjection can be negated, questioned, or passivized. When accompanied by imperative, interrogative, or negative clauses, interjections do not yield imperative, interrogative, and negative variants, but instead maintain their own illocutionary force that is always independent – and sometimes indeed distinct – from the force of the rest of the sentence. Examples (15-17) below illustrate this phenomenon.

The IP in (15), which is composed of the interjection $\tilde{\omega}$ and the vocative $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\epsilon$ 'man' (and its genitive $\theta\epsilon\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$ 'of God'), entertains an expressive-conative force – it communicates strong emotions of the speaker and draw attention of the interlocutor. This force is distinct from the illocution of the two clauses that follow the interjective phrase. Those clauses convey a directive value overtly communicated by the two imperatives: $\phi\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon$ 'flee' and $\delta\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon$ 'pursue'.

(15) 1 Tim 6:11

$\Sigma\tilde{\upsilon}$ δέ, $\tilde{\omega}$ $\tilde{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\epsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$, ταῦτα $\phi\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon$: $\delta\iota\omega\kappa\epsilon$ δέ δικαιοσύνην, εὐσέβειαν, πίστιν, ἀγάπην, ὑπομονήν, πραΰτητα.

'But as for you, o man of God, flee from these things; pursue righteousness, godliness, faith, love, endurance, gentleness.'

The disconnection between the illocutionary force of the interjection and its IP, on the one hand, and the illocutionary force of the rest of the sentence, on the other hand, is

lies beyond the scope of our study (and also failed to be addressed by Nordgren 2015), we leave it for further research.

even more visible in cases involving interrogative clauses. In (16), the interjective phrase that consists of ὦ and the vocative ἀνόητοι Γαλάται ‘foolish Galatians’ co-occurs with two interrogative clauses: τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν ‘who has bewitched you’ and οἷς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῦς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος; ‘before whose eyes was Jesus Christ publicly exhibited as crucified?’. The interjection itself – as well as the entire IP – has, however, no interrogative value but rather maintains its original illocutionary force, conative (drawing attention) and expressive (communicating feelings). Overall, examples of interjections being followed by interrogative clauses are common (see, e.g. 2.a, 4.b above).⁵⁰ This further demonstrates – and sanctions – the illocutionary independence of interjections.

(16) Gal 3:1

ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ’ ὀφθαλμοῦς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος;

‘O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you? You before whose eyes was Jesus Christ publicly exhibited as crucified?’

Similarly, in (17), the interpretation of the interjection ὦ is unaffected by the presence of negation in the main clause. Crucially, the polarity value of ὦ is not negative despite the use of the negative verb μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ‘you should not have sailed’. The incompatibility of the use of interjections with negators – and thus their resistance to participate in a syntactic operation of negation – is also patent in the absence of negative variants of the interjections δεῦρο and δεῦτε (which are compatible with locative dependents) as well as of ἄγε (which is derived from an imperative verb). None of those interjections is used with a negator to communicate a negative wish or prohibition. Overall, affirmative contexts are significantly more common than the negative ones, although the latter are not exceptional either.

(17) Acts 27:21

Πολλῆς τε ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπεν, Ἔδει μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες, πειθαρχήσαντάς μοι μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης κερδῆσαί τε τὴν ὕβριν ταύτην καὶ τὴν ζημίαν.

‘Since they had been without food for a long time, Paul then stood up among them and said, “Having listened to me, o men, you should not have sailed from Crete and gained this damage and loss.’ (Adapted from NRSV)

F-5 Position

The position of interjections can be analyzed with relation to three syntactic units: sentence, clause, and phrase.

⁵⁰ See also Mt 17:17, 9:19; Rom 9:20.

Within a sentence frame, interjections tend to occupy an initial position. This occurs 65 times, which equals 69% of all the possible 94 cases.⁵¹ An illustrative case is provided in (18.a). In that example, the interjection *ναί* appears at the beginning of a verse, subsequent to another verse (v. 19), the boundary of which is marked by a full stop. In its own sentence, *ναί* constitutes the first constituent, being followed by the vocative (*ἀδελφέ* ‘brother’) and two core clauses (*ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ* ‘let me have this benefit from you in the Lord’ and *ἀνάπαυσόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ* ‘Refresh my heart in Christ’). A sentence-medial position is also common, being attested 29 times ($\approx 31\%$).⁵² (18.b) illustrates this: *δεῦρο* appears inside a broader sentence; it follows four core clauses and the coordinator *καί*; and it precedes another clause, i.e. *ἀκολούθει μοι* ‘follow me’. No examples of interjections that would occupy a sentence-final position are attested.

(18) a. Philemon 1:20

ναί, ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ· ἀνάπαυσόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐν Χριστῷ.

‘Yes, brother, let me have this benefit from you in the Lord! Refresh my heart in Christ.’ (NRSV)

b. Mt 19:21

ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὑπάγε πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δός τοῖς πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι.

‘Jesus said to him, “If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your possessions, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me.”’ (NRSV)

As explained in section *F-2 Integration in clause grammar*, we have identified only one case ($\approx 1\%$) in which an interjection partakes in clause grammar and thus occupies a clause-internal position (see (5)). In that example, *οὐαί* appears clause-initially, i.e. before all the other elements of the clause (*οὐαὶ γάρ μοί ἐστιν ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίσωμαι* ‘woe to me if I do not preach the gospel!’). In the remaining cases (103x $\approx 99\%$), interjections are found outside a core clause.

The position of interjections within their own IPs is more diverse. That is, interjections may appear phrase-initially, medially, as well as finally. A phrase-initial position predominates, being attested 76 times ($\approx 96\%$ of all possible cases).⁵³ This is

⁵¹ See also Apoc 1:7, 14:13; Lk 6:25. In ten cases, the position of an interjection within a sentence frame cannot be estimated. This includes holophrastic interjections (see Mt 13:51, 17:25; Acts, 22:27) and semi-holophrastic whose utterances are the IP governed entirely by the interjection itself (see section *F-1 Holophrasticity*).

⁵² See also Mt 18:7; Lk 6:24, 11:42, 17:1; 18:22, 22:22; Mk 10:21; Acts 7:3, 7:34.

⁵³ See also Mt 11:21, 24:19 (=Lk 21:3); Mk 13:17; Lk 6, 25, 10:13, 11:43, 11:44, 11:47, 11:52; Jude 11:1.

illustrated in (19.a) where the interjection *ναί* occupies an initial position in its phrase – see *Ναί, κύριε* ‘Yes, Lord’ used at the beginning of the sentence. In contrast, phrase-medial and phrase-final positions are scarcely attested. We have identified two cases ($\approx 2\%$) in which an interjection occupies a phrase-medial position (see (7.d) discussed in section *F-3 Constructions*). In that example, *δεῦρο* appears after a vocative NP (*Λάζαρε* ‘Lazarus’) and before a locative (*ἐξῶ* ‘forth, out(side)’) – both dependent constituents in the IP governed by that interjection. In (19.b), the interjection *οὐαί* is used after the two dependents: the pronoun (*ὑμῖν* ‘to you’) and the definite noun (*τοῖς νομικοῖς* ‘the lawyers’) inflected in a dative case. It does, however, precede a modifier – a clause introduced by the backward causal connector *ὅτι*. The scarcity of phrase-final interjections is similar as this type of placement is attested only twice ($\approx 2\%$) (see example (12.a) above).⁵⁴ In (12.a), the interjection *δεῦρο* appears at the end of its phrase, after the modifier *νῦν* ‘now’.

(19) a. Jn 21:16

λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον, Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με; λέγει αὐτῷ, **Ναί**, κύριε, σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. λέγει αὐτῷ, Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

‘A second time he said to him, “Simon son of John, do you love me?” He said to him, “Yes, Lord; you know that I love you.” Jesus said to him, “Tend my sheep.”’ (NRSV)

b. Lk 11:46

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς **οὐαί**, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνὶ τῶν δακτύλων ὑμῶν οὐ προσμαύετε τοῖς φορτίοις.

‘And he said, “Woe also to you lawyers! For you load people with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not lift a finger to ease them.”’ (NRSV)

F-6 Phonological relationship

The phonological separation of interjections can only be assessed indirectly through the study of orthographic devices. Following Nordgren (2015), the presence of orthographic separatrices – i.e. the interpunctuation marks <·>, <·>, <·>, and <·> – is interpreted as evidence of separation, while their absence is interpreted as evidence of (at least relative) unity.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ See also Acts, 7:34.

⁵⁵ As explained in section *F-1 Holophrasticity* (see footnote 10), the punctuation marks used in the NTG text are not original but have been introduced by editors at much later times. Therefore, they need not be fully correlated with the actual or intended prosody of the text. We are fully cognizant of these problems. However, no other – especially more objective – method of determining (or rather estimating) the prosody of the NTG text is currently available. In that regard, we do not diverge from the method adopted by Nordgren (2015), who also derives his prosodic interpretation from orthographic devices (punctuation marks) present in edited works.

On their left edge, interjections tend to be orthographically separated from the adjacent (i.e. preceding) word. Separation is found in 93 cases ($\approx 89\%$), while its lack is found in 11 cases ($\approx 11\%$). All graphic separatrices can be used: <.>, <·>, <,>, and <,>. The individual frequency of the four punctuation marks is as follows: <,> is used in 46 instances;⁵⁶ <·> in 29x;⁵⁷ <·> in 13x;⁵⁸ and <,> in 5x.⁵⁹ For sentence non-initial interjections (29x),⁶⁰ separatrices (either <,> or <·>) appear 18 times.⁶¹ In 11 instances,⁶² separatrices are not used interjections occupy. When interjections occupy non-initial positions in their phrases (3x),⁶³ the presence of separatrices is even less evident, although this may be related to the scarcity of examples. Specifically, in the one case⁶⁴ of a phrase-medial position, <,> is used. In the two cases of a phrase-final position,⁶⁵ separatrices are absent.

As far as the right edge is concerned, the situation is inverse and the absence of separatrices prevails. To be exact, in 71 cases ($\approx 68\%$),⁶⁶ interjections are followed by other words without any orthographic separation. Separatrices appear in 33 instances ($\approx 32\%$).⁶⁷ Furthermore, only three separatrices are used, namely <,>, <·>, and <·>. Overall, <,> is by far the most common, appearing 29 times.⁶⁸ In contrast, <·> and <·> are seldom used: 3 times and once, respectively.⁶⁹ For interjections used within a sentence (94x) – which are all sentence non-final – the absence of separation is even more prominent. Interjections are not orthographically separated in 68 cases ($\approx 72\%$),⁷⁰ while separatrices are found 26 times ($\approx 28\%$).⁷¹ Similarly, when occupying a non-final position within an IP (76x), interjections tend not to be separated by orthographic signs on their right edge. This occurs 58 times ($\approx 76\%$).⁷² An overt orthographic separation appears only in 18 instances ($\approx 24\%$). The only separatrix used in such cases is <,>.

The absence of separatrices is particularly prevalent in two other, more specific situations. First, an interjection is never separated orthographically from its dative or

⁵⁶ See for instance Mt 25:21, 25:23, 25:34; Lk 4:34, 19:17; Acts 5:8; Apoc 17:1, 19:17, 21:9, 22:20.

⁵⁷ See for instance Mt 13:17, 23:29; Rom 11:33; Gal 3:1; Phil 4:3; 1 Tim 6:20; Philemon 1:20; Jas 5:1; Apoc 1:7, 14:13.

⁵⁸ See for instance Mt 11:21, 11:26, 21, 38, 22:4; Lk 10:13, 10:21, 11:51, 12:5; 1 Cor 9:16; Apoc 12:12.

⁵⁹ See Mt 11:9; Lk 7:26; Rom 3:29, 9:20; Jas 4:13.

⁶⁰ All such cases involve sentence-medial interjections since a final position is unattested.

⁶¹ See Mt 11:26, 18:7; Lk 10:21, 11:51, 12:5; Acts 27:21; Rom 2:1, 2:3; 1 Tim 6:11; Jas 2:20.

⁶² See Mt 19:21; Mk 10:21; Lk 6:24; 11:42, 17:1; 18:22, 22:22; Acts 7:3.

⁶³ See Lk 11:46; Jn 11:43; Acts 7:34.

⁶⁴ See Jn 11:43.

⁶⁵ See Lk 11:46; Acts 7:34.

⁶⁶ See Mt 11:21, 15:28, 18:7, 24:19, 26:24; Mk 13:17; Lk 9:41, 24:25; Rom 3:29, 11:33; Phil 4:3.

⁶⁷ See Mt 11:9; 13:51, 25:23, 25:34; Lk 4:34; 19:17; Jn 21:16; Apoc 17:1; 18:19, 21:9, 22:20.

⁶⁸ See Mt 11:9, 15:27, 25:21, 25:34; Lk 6, 25, 11:46, 19:17; Philemon 1:20; Apoc 17:1, 18:10.

⁶⁹ See Mt 13:51, 17:25, Acts 22:27, and Mt 21:16, respectively.

⁷⁰ See Mk, 10:21, 12:7, 19:21; Mt, 22:4, 28:6; Lk, 18:22; Acts, 7:3, 7:34; Jas, 4:3, 5:1; Jn, 11:43.

⁷¹ See Mt 15:27, 25:21, 25:34; Lk, 4:34, 19:17; Jn, 11:27, 21:16; Apoc, 17:1, 21:9, 22:20.

⁷² See Mt 11:21, 18:7, 24:19, 26:24; Mk 13:17, 14:21; Lk 6:24, 10:13, 11:42, 17:1.

accusative dependent. This is irrespective whether the dependent precedes (1x; 20.b) or follows (30x; 20.a) the interjection – a separatrix is found neither on the left edge nor on the right edge.⁷³ Second, the orthographic separation is always avoided in cases of reduplication and triplication. Rather than separating the consecutive interjections orthographically, a punctuation mark is placed before the first interjection of the series and/or after the last one.⁷⁴

(20) a. Mt 11:21

Οὐαί σοι, Χοραζίν· **οὐαί** σοι, Βηθσαϊδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γεγόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῶ μετενόησαν.

‘Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.’ (NRSV)

b. Lk 11:46

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς **οὐαί**, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐνὶ τῶν δακτύλων ὑμῶν οὐ προσπαύετε τοῖς φορτίοις.

‘And he said: “Woe also to you lawyers! For you load people with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not lift a finger to ease them.”’ (NRSV)

c. Apoc 18:19

καὶ ἔβαλον χοῦν ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκραζον κλαίοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες, λέγοντες, **Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ**, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, ἐν ἣ ἐπλούτησαν πάντες οἱ ἔχοντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ἐκ τῆς τιμιότητος αὐτῆς, ὅτι μιᾶ ὥρᾳ ἠρημώθη.

‘And they threw dust on their heads, as they wept and mourned, crying out, “Alas, alas, the great city, where all who had ships at sea grew rich by her wealth! For in one hour it (i.e. wealth) has been laid waste.”’ (adapted from NRSV)

⁷³ In contrast, following vocative and nominative dependents – if these appear immediately after the interjection with no dative/accusative NP or a modifier intervening in between – separation (invariably marked with <, >) is found 17 times (see examples (7.d-e) above), while its absence is attested 22 times (see examples (2.a), (4.a), and (7.c) above). The interjection ὦ (17x) is never separated from a vocative/nominative by an orthographic sign. In contrast, ναί (9x) and οὐαί (4x) are always separated from a vocative/nominative by <, >. The scarcity of the cases of vocatives/nominatives with other interjections does not allow to postulate any robust tendencies: δεῦτε is used with (Mt, 25:34) and without separatrices (Mk 6:31); εὗγε is used with a separatrix (Lk 19:17); οὐά (Mk 15:29) and εἶ are used without it (Mt 25:21, 23). In the only case where the vocative precedes the interjection (Jn 11:43), a comma is used (see example (7.b)).

⁷⁴ See also Apoc 8:13, 18:10, 18:16, 18:19. In Apoc 8:13, the punctuation mark is only used after the interjections.

Results and discussion

The evidence presented in the evidence section above enables us to propose the following generalizations that determine the extent of the compliance of NTG interjections with the interjective prototype:

- F-1 Genuine holophrastic uses of interjections, i.e. {[I]}, are scarce. Non-holophrastic uses – either as parts of fully-fledged sentences, i.e. {[I(P)] CP}, or as parts of interjective phrases, i.e. {[IP]}, prevail.

- F-2 Non-holophrastic interjections of the type {[I(P)] CP} are almost never integrated in clause grammar. (For holophrastic interjections and semi-holophrastic interjections, i.e. {[I]} and {[IP]}, such an integration is precluded by definition.) Only once an interjection is integrated in clausal syntax, functioning as the subject of the verbal predicate or as (part of) the predicate.

- F-3 Although self-standing interjections are attested, interjections tend to yield constructions: horizontal and vertical. Horizontal constructions involve collocations in which two or three identical interjections (always οὐαί) are coordinated, exhibiting the structure ConjP → I+I(+I). Vertical constructions emerge when interjections constitute structural heads of their own IPs and entertain a – more or less close – hierarchical relationship with the other elements of the IP in terms of government, i.e. IP → I + DEP and/or modification, i.e. IP → I + MOD. Interjections govern NPs (nouns, adjectives, pronouns, and participles) in vocative, nominative (used in a vocative sense), dative, and accusative case (the two last cases are only found with οὐαί). The tightest constructions – and the most canonical types of government – involve dative and accusative dependents, as well as expressive and conative interjective heads. The least tight constructions involve phatic interjections, as well as vocative and nominative dependents. Conative interjections may additionally govern locative phrases containing dependents that express the idea of a goal. Interjections are also qualified by modifiers: particles and expressions of cause, whether phrasal (i.e. a PP with NPs in genitive) or clausal (i.e. clauses headed by the backward causal connector ὅτι ‘for, because’). Various dependents and modifiers may coincide in a single IP – although their connection to or dependence on the interjective head is uneven. The maximal internal structure of an IP is captured by the formula: I + PART + DAT/ACC or LOC + VOC/NOM + CAUSE.

- F-4 Interjections are not susceptible of syntactic operations. When accompanied by imperative, interrogative, or negative clauses, interjections do not yield imperative, interrogative, and negative variants. Instead, they maintain their own illocutionary force, which is always independent – and sometimes different – from the force of the rest of the sentence.

- F-5 Interjections may appear sentence-initially and sentence-medially. The initial position is the most common, although the medial position is not infrequent either. Except for one case, interjections occupy an extra-clausal position. Within their own IPs, interjections tend to appear phrase-initially. Medial and final positions are also attested, although only in exceptional cases.
- F-6 The prosodic autonomy of NTG interjections is partial. On their left edge, interjections tend to be orthographically separated from the previous parts of the sentence or verse by <·>, <.>, <,>, or <:>. Nevertheless, such orthographic separation may also be absent. On their right edge, interjections predominantly lack any orthographic separation from the subsequent speech, even though the presence of separatrices is not precluded either (in such cases, typically making use of <,> and only exceptionally of <·> and <.>).⁷⁵

Overall, NTG interjections attest to a semi-canonical profile. They largely comply with three features: absence of syntactic integration in clause grammar (F-2); resistance to participate in syntactic operations (F-4); and, slightly less prominently, placement in a peripheral position in the sentence and phrase, and an external position with regard to the core clause (F-5). One feature is only instantiated partially: prosodic separation typically occurs on the left but is avoided on the right edge (F-6). Lastly, two features generally fail to be instantiated: interjections tend to occur non-holophrastically (F-1) and to form constructions, exhibiting a high extent of combinatority (F-3). As a result, the extra-systematicity of NTG interjections is moderate – certainly visible, although lesser than what is postulated for the cross-linguistic prototype.

The profile of the interjections in NTG largely overlaps with the profile of interjections in CG as described by Nordgren (2015). In both varieties the following can be observed: holophrasticity is rare (F-1); integration in clause grammar is generally absent (F-2); both horizontal and vertical structures are attested, and dependents exhibit significant lexical and morphological variations, surfacing as nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and participles, and being inflected in vocative, nominative, dative, and accusative; the dependent status of the inflected elements is uneven: it is more canonical for oblique cases (i.e. dative and accusative, as well as genitive in CG) than for nominative and vocative;⁷⁶ expressive interjections exhibit tighter constructional combinatority with their dependents than conative and especially phatic interjections (F-3); syntactic operations are not tolerated, with interjections entertaining their own illocutionary force (F-4); the position of interjections in a sentence is typically initial; a medial position is less prominent, while a final one is either exceptional (CG) or unattested (NTG) (F-5); orthographic separation is visible on the left edge (F-6). However, certain differences can also be noticed: contrary to CG, NTG does not attest to combinations of interjections or sequences of interjective lexemes that exhibit a novel

⁷⁵ The scarcity of right-edge separation is related to the constructional combinatority of interjections. It should be kept in mind that punctuation marks have been introduced by editors and not by the original authors. We have explained this fact in detail in footnotes 10 and 55 above.

⁷⁶ Note that both in NTG and CG, dative/accusative NPs precede vocative/nominative NPs.

constructional function different from that of their individual components, nor does it present cases where interjections would project a genitive case to their dependents (F-3); contrary to CG where orthographic separatrixes tend to be used on the right edge, NTG interjections are usually not separated from the following speech (F-6).

The comparison of the syntactic profiles exhibited by CG and NTG interjections demonstrates that, from the classical period to the time of the New Testament, the compliance of the interjective category with the cross-linguistic prototype and its extra-systematicity has only been minimally modified. The most significant differences concern the absence of the use of genitive dependents in interjective phrases – which most likely stems from the fact that none of the interjections that occur with the genitive in CG (Nordgren 2015: 60-63) are attested in NTG – and the weakening of phonological separation on the interjection's right edge. Apart from this, the essence of the syntax of interjections has remained unaltered.

Our study also provides further evidence for the use of the accusative with interjections – already known from residual cases found in CG. To be exact, CG rarely exhibits a construction referred to as 'accusative of exclamation' (Kühner 1898: 330), allowing for the use of accusative NPs with a few interjections. The interjections attested in CG are αἰαῖ (αἰαῖ Ἀδωνιν; Ar. Lys. 393), ὦ (see ὦ τὸν Ἀδωνιν; Sappho fr. 168), and ἄ (see ἄ Ζῆν, Ἰοῦς † ἰὸ μῆνις; A.Supp. 162) (Nordgren 2015: 57). Our data show that even though exceptional – like in other Greek varieties – such accusative IPs are attested in NTG as well. We identify οὐαῖ as an additional interjection in the set of interjective lexemes capable of projecting an accusative to their dependents.

Lastly, the results of our research enable us to recommend some enhancements to the general theory of interjections (Ameka 1992; 2006; Nübling 2001; 2004; Ameka & Wilkins 2006; Stange & Nübling 2014; Stange 2016) – all of them recently suggested by a few other scholars. First, similar to Nordgren (2015) and Andrason, Hornea & Joubert (2020), we propose that interjections yield interjective phrases in which they function as structural heads governing dependent constituents and projecting cases. Our study demonstrates that such interjective heads may also be modified. Second, similar to Corver (2015), we propose that collocations of interjections should be understood as coordinated constructions. Third, further expanding Nordgren's argument (2015: 39, 58-60, 93-94) and the data offered by Biblical Hebrew (Zobel 1978: 360; Andrason, Hornea & Joubert 2020), we propose that (some) interjections are closely related to causal phrases and clauses. Fourth, while not integrated in clause grammar, interjections are integrated in the grammar of a sentence (as disjointed IPs) as well as the grammar of its own phrase (as the head of the IP). This means that the non-integrational and non-constructional character of interjections – usually formulated in unconditional terms – is more nuanced and, therefore, needs to be revisited.

Conclusions

The present article studied the syntax of interjections in NTG. By examining the extent of the compliance of NTG interjections with the features associated with the syntactic prototype of an interjection, we conclude the following: NTG interjections exhibit a semi-canonical profile. Interjections generally comply with three features (lack of integration in clause grammar, resistance to participate in syntactic operations, and a

peripheral position in a phrase, clause, and sentence). The compliance with one feature (prosodic separation) is partial. Two features (holophrastically and lack of constructional combinatority) tend to be violated. All of this implies, in turn, that NTG interjections attest to a moderate extent of syntactic extra-systematicity. The profile of NTG interjections is highly similar to the profile exhibited in CG, which demonstrates that the syntax of interjections has essentially remained unaltered from the classical period to the time of the New Testament.

Stellenbosch University (Andrason)
Universidad de Granada (Durán Mañas)

References

- Aland, K., Aland, B. (1987). *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticisms*, Grand Rapids and Leiden: Brill Archive.
- Aland, K., Black, M., Martini, C., Metzger, B., Wikgren, A. (1968). *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Württemberg Bible Society.
- Ameka, F., Wilkins, D. (2006). "Interjections", in J-O. Östman, J. Verschueren (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1-19.
- Ameka, F. (1992). "Interjections: the universal yet neglected part of speech", *Journal of Pragmatics* 18/2-3: 101-118.
- Ameka, F. (2006). "Interjections", in K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 743-746.
- Andrason, A., Dlaki, M. (2020). "The (crucial yet neglected) category of interjections in Xhosa", *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 73/2. 159-217.
- Andrason, A., Hornea, I., Joubert, M. (2020). "The structure of interjections in Biblical Hebrew: Phonetics, morphology and syntax", *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 20/1: 1-43.
- Andrason, A., Fehn, A-M., Phiri, A. (2020). "Interjections in Tjwao", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 83/2. 293-319.
- Andrason, A., Hutchison, A. (2020). "Interjections in Biblical Aramaic – A radial model", *Aramaic Studies* 38/1: 1-45.
- Andrason, A., Matutu, N.H. (2019). "The syntax of interjections in isiXhosa – A corpus-driven study", *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics PLUS* 58: 1-16.
- Barðdal, J., Bjarnadóttir, V., Danesi, S., Dewey, T., Eythórsson, T., Fedriani, C., Smitherman, T. (2013). "The Story of 'Woe'", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 41/3-4: 321-377.
- Biraud, M. (2004). "Les valeurs illocutoires des interjections du grec classique dans les Oiseaux d'Aristophane", *L'Information Grammaticale* 101: 44-49.
- Biraud, M. (2010). *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique: Étude sémantique et pragmatique*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Blass, F., Debrunner, R., Funk, A. (1961): *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. (1971). "El vocativo y la interjección ω ", *Habis* 2: 35-48.
- Brugmann, K., Cohn, L., Thumb, A. (1913). *Griechische Grammatik: Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*, München: Beck.

- Bybee, J. (2013). "Usage-based theory and exemplar representations of constructions", in T. Hoffmann, G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 49-69.
- Chantraine, O. (1953). *Grammaire homérique. Tome II. Syntaxe*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Corver, N. (2015). "Interjections as Structured Root Expressions", in M. van Oostendorp, H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Representing Structure in Phonology and Syntax*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 41-83.
- Croft, W. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, W. (2013). "Radical Construction Grammar", in T. Hoffmann, G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 211-232.
- Delgado Jara, I. (2013). *Gramática griega del Nuevo Testamento. I Morfología*, Estella: Verbo Divino.
- Dickey, E. (1996). *Greek Forms of Address*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, J. (2005). *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durán Mañas, M., Andrason, A. (2021). "Semántica y traducción de las interjecciones en el griego del Nuevo Testamento", in López Salvá, M. (ed.), *En los albores del cristianismo*, Reus: Rhemata, pp. 169-184.
- Emde Boas, E. van, Rijksbaron A., Huitink L., Bakker M. de (2019). *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fried, M., Östman, J.-O. (2004). "Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch", in M. Fried, J.-O. Östman (eds.), *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 11-86.
- Gildersleeve, B.L. (1900). *Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes*, New York: American Book Company.
- Goldberg, A. (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2003). "Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language", *Trends in Cognitive Science* 7/5: 219-224.
- Goldberg, A. (2006). *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, A. (2013). "Constructionist approaches", in T. Hoffmann, G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 15-31.
- Goodwin, W. (1895). *A Greek Grammar*, London: Macmillan.
- Hoffmann, T., Trousdale, G. (2013). "Construction Grammar: Introduction", in T. Hoffmann, G. Trousdale (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-12.
- Hurtado, L.W. (2014). "Oral fixation and New Testament studies? 'Orality', 'performance' and reading texts in early Christianity", *New Testament Studies* 60: 321-340.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. (1960). "The punctuation of John VII 37-38", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 11: 340-342.
- Labiano, M. (2017). "Greek interjectional ἄ = "Stop doing that!" in Euripides", *Glotta* 93: 36-47.
- Labiano Ilundain, J.M. (2000). *Estudio de las interjecciones en las comedias de Aristófanes*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Lathey, C., Burkitt, F.C. (1928). "The punctuation of New Testament manuscripts", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 29: 396-398.

- Lepre, M.Z. (1979). *L'interiezione vocativa nei poemi omerici*, Roma: Istituto di Glottologia Università di Roma.
- Lepre, M.Z. (2000). "Le emozioni, la voce e i gesti – le interiezioni in greco antico: un capitolo dimenticato", *Linguistica e letteratura* 25/1-2: 9-45.
- Lepre, M.Z. (2001). "Dal gesto fonico alla parola: dalla parola al gesto fonico", *Linguistica e letteratura* 26/1-2: 9-28.
- Leclercq, H. (1993). "L'apport lexical du latin au grec du nouveau testament", in L. Isebaert (ed.), *Miscellanea linguistica Graeco-latina*, Namur: Société des Études Classiques, pp. 239-268.
- López Eire, A. (1996). *La lengua coloquial de la comedia aristofánica*, Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- Lowe, A.D. (1967). "The Origin of οὐαί", *Hermathena* 105: 34-39.
- Martínez Hernández, M. (1978). "Las interjecciones de dolor en Sófocles", *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica: Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 15: 73-136.
- McLean, B.H. (2011). *New Testament Greek. An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meinard, M. (2015). "Distinguishing onomatopoeias from interjections", *Journal of Pragmatics* 76: 150-168.
- Metzger, B.M. (1980). "The Punctuation of Rom. 9:5", in B.M. Metzger (ed.), *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*, Leiden: Brill, 57-74.
- Metzger, B.M. (1981). *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Palaeography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Monro, D.B. (1891). *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moulton, J.H. (1963a). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Prolegomena*, vol. 1, London and New York: T&T Clark International.
- Moulton, J.H. (1963b). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Accidence and Word-Formation*, vol. 2, London and New York: T&T Clark International.
- Moulton, J.H. (1963c). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Syntax*, vol. 3, London and New York: T&T Clark International.
- Nordgren, L. (2015). *Greek Interjections*, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Norrick, N. (2009). "Interjections as pragmatic markers", *Journal of Pragmatics* 41/5: 866-889.
- Nübling, D. (2001). "Von oh mein Jesus! zu oje! – Der Interjektionalisierungspfad von der sekundären zur primären Interjektion", *Deutsche Sprache* 29/1: 20-45.
- Nübling, D. (2004). "Die prototypische Interjektion: Ein Definitionsvorschlag", *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 26/1-2: 11-46.
- O'Connell, D.C., Kowal, S. (2008). *Communicating with One Another. Toward a Psychology of Spontaneous Spoken Discourse*, New York: Springer.
- Perdicoyianni-Paléologue, H. (2002). "The interjections in Greek tragedy", *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica. New Series* 70/1: 49-88.
- Perrier, N. (1996). *Les interjections grecques et latines chez Aristophane et Plaute*, M.A thesis, Université de Paris-Sorbone.
- Poirier, J. (1996). "'Day and night' and the Punctuation of John 9.3", *New Testament Studies* 42/2: 288-294.
- Reed, J.T. (1993). "Indicative and imperative in Rom 6, 21-22: the rhetoric of punctuation", *Biblica* 74/2: 244-257.
- Robertson, A.T. (1951). *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, New York: George H. Doran.
- Rodríguez Adrados, F. (1992), *Nueva sintaxis del griego antiguo*, Madrid: Gredos.

- Schwentner, E. (1924). *Die primären Interjektionen in den indogermanischen Sprachen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Griechischen, Lateinischen und Germanischen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Schwyzler, E. (1950). *Griechische Grammatik. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*, München: Beck.
- Scott, J.A. (1903). "The vocative in Homer and Hesiod", *American Journal of Philology* 24/2: 192-196.
- Scott, J.A. (1904). "The vocative in Aeschylus and Sophocles", *American Journal of Philology* 25/1: 81-84.
- Scott, J.A. (1905). "Additional notes on the vocative", *American Journal of Philology* 26/1: 32-43.
- Smyth, H.W. (1920). *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, New York: American Book Company.
- Sonnenschein E.A. (1894). *A Greek Grammar for Schools. Part II. Syntax*, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.
- Stange, U. (2016). *Emotive Interjections in British English. A Corpus-Based Study on Variation in Acquisition, Function and Usage*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stange, U., Nübling, D. (2014): "Interjections", in E.C. Müller, A.J. Cienki, E. Fricke, S.H. Ladewig, D. McNeill, S. Tessendorf (eds.), *Body – Language – Communication*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1982-1989.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Digital Library*. M.C. Pantelia (ed.). University of California: Irvine. Available online: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu>.
- Thorsteinsson, R.M. (2002). "Paul's missionary duty towards gentiles in Rome: A note on the punctuation and syntax of Rom 1.13-15", *New Testament Studies* 48: 531-547.
- Thrall, M.E. (1962). *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Velupillai, V. (2012). *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wenham, J.W. (1981). "When were the Saints raised? A Note on the punctuation of Matthew xxvii. 51-3", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 32: 150-152.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). "The semantics of interjections", *Journal of Pragmatics* 18/2-3: 159-192.
- Winer, G.B. (1869). *A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament*, Andover: Warren F. Draper.

Abbreviations of Bible translations:

NRSV – New Revised Standard Version