Multidimensionality in Livy's tense system: towards a functional systematicity of the Latin narrative tenses

In this paper, Livy's use of the Latin narrative tenses is examined from a functionalist point of view. Assuming that three levels of meaning (referential, textual and interpersonal) potentially underly paradigmatic choices in grammatical systems, "tense" and "aspect" are conceived of as three-dimensional categories related to the communicative intentions involved in the narrative tenses. Close-readings of episodes with that conception in mind reveal the significant role played by grammatical aspect in the Latin tense system. In addition, the interpersonal meaning of "perspective" (e.g. authorial vs. eyewitness report) is shown to be often involved in Livy's use of the tenses. Most importantly, the 3D-framework adopted in this study allows for a systematic categorization of all uses of the narrative tenses.

Keywords: tense and aspect; perspective; grammatical systems; narrative tenses; corpus linguistics

Author's information

Name: AERTS, Simon
Affiliation: Ghent University – Department of Linguistics (Latin section)
Address: Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Gent – Belgium
Email: simon.aerts@ugent.be

1.   Introduction[1]

1.1 Grammatical categories in 3D

Tense and (grammatical) aspect are "grammatical categories", i.e. "[sets] of syntactic features that express meanings from the same conceptual domain, occur in contrast to each other, [and] are typically expressed in the same fashion."[2] *Tense*, for example, expresses meanings related to the temporal location of a state of affairs (hence SoA) in time with respect to the moment of speech (S), and has a number of morphological realizations which express contrasting values in this domain (e.g. the simple past vs. the simple present in English) and which are both formed on the predicate.[3]

However, such a basic categorization of "meanings" or *signifiés* as expressed by a given morphological means or *signifiant* leaves several "uses" of those *signifiants* unexplained. For example, how can a *present* tense refer to events with *past* time reference in narratives? In recent decades, functional and cognitive linguists have explored how *signifiants* function in different types of discourse, in different contexts, and with different purposes. Apart from their most basic "meaning", several grammatical categories were found to have other levels of meaning. For instance, cognitive linguists found that, to the mind of a speaker and addressee with shared linguistic and cultural preconceptions, the present tense serves to create an illusion of presence at the scene of the narrated events – a meaning that cancels, in these given circumstances, the more basic meaning of the present tense as referring to the moment of speech.[4]

Regarding the grammatical category *aspect*, extant research on different languages and language families reveals a similar diversity of potential "meanings". Janda, for example, proposes a multidimensional model of Slavic aspect to grasp its full meaning potential. Starting from the cognitive, metaphorical similarity between matter (solid vs. fluid) and aspect (perfective vs. imperfective), she divides their characteristics into "inherent properties" (e.g. boundedness), interactions with other members of the category (e.g. sequencing vs. simultaneity) and interactions with humans (e.g. successful completion vs. frustration).[5]

In functional paradigms, which focus on the functions of lexico-grammatical means in communication, the theory known as Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is particularly well-suited for a multidimensional interpretation of grammatical categories. In SFL, an additional focus lies on the paradigmatic relations between the different *signifiants* of a grammatical category: in a system of choices between opposing alternatives, the positive choice for one option entails a negative choice for its

---

[1] For the methodology of the three-dimensional approach to tense and aspect, as first applied in AERTS 2014, I am greatly indebted to Professor Klaas Bentein at Ghent University (e.g. BENTEIN 2015, 2016).
[2] https://glossary.sil.org/term/grammatical-category (accessed 14/7/2020).
[3] COMRIE 1985, 9–18.
[4] LANGACKER 2011.
[5] JANDA 2004, 478–79.

alternative(s): in French, for example, to select the *imparfait* means *not* to select the *passé composé* – and that choice is motivated by the communicative aims of the speaker.

As such, several scholars working in an SFL-framework have proposed multidimensional interpretations of the semantic potential of lexico-grammatical categories. Thompson, for instance, proposed a 3D-model based on SFL's three "metafunctions" for the analysis of connectivity, in order to properly justify the distinctions in the theory.[6] Similarly, Fleischman and Kroon refer to meanings on three interdependent levels in their studies of, respectively, temporal distance and Latin discourse particles: a referential (or propositional) component, a textual (or discourse) component, and an interactional (or expressive) component.[7] Bache, then, proposed a 3D-meaning potential of English tense,[8] whereas Boogaart recognized three distinct, but related, dimensions of grammatical aspect, present or absent in the world's languages to various extents.[9] Studies of Ancient Greek narratives have illustrated the usefulness of a 3D-approach to aspect.[10] In this paper, I intend to show that a three-dimensional interpretation of the meaning potential of the grammatical categories *tense* and *aspect* serves to better, even fully, appreciate Livy's communicative intentions.

1.2   *Towards a multidimensional interpretation of Latin tense and aspect*

The disputed position of grammatical aspect in the Latin tense system can be at least partly explained by the fact that the functionality of this category has proven difficult to define.[11] As illustrated above, a multidimensional interpretation of the semantic potential of such grammatical categories can add to the understanding of the role they play in many languages. In that light, and following Coseriu and Boogaart, the "meaning" of Latin aspect in the current paper potentially concerns three dimensions, inspired by the three metafunctions posited by Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Ideational* aspect (hence AspectID) concerns the *representation* of the story-world reality and comprises mainly the concept of "termination", i.e. does a certain SoA terminate or cease to exist at story-time, or not?[12] *Textual* aspect (hence AspectTE) concerns the *presentation* of an SoA either as "one complete, indivisible whole"[13] ("global view"), or with focus only on that

---

[6] THOMPSON 2005. Elsewhere, Thompson explains that the various (functional) choices language users make when producing utterances, fall into three main sets of choices, referred to as metafunctions. Within those groups, the choices may interact with each other, but like most Systemic Functional linguists, Thompson does not consider much interaction to exist across the groups. Basically, the ideational metafunction concerns "using language to talk about the world", the textual metafunction is about "organizing language to fit in its context", and the interpersonal metafunction involves "using language to interact with other people." (THOMPSON 2014, 30).

[7] FLEISCHMAN 1989; KROON 1995.

[8] BACHE 2008, 109.

[9] BOOGAART 2004, 1173–74.

[10] BENTEIN 2015, 2016; AERTS 2014.

[11] See AERTS (2018, Ch. 2) for an overview of aspectual studies in the field of Latin linguistics. As Coseriu noted, a conceptualization of "grammatical aspect" based on one language (family) – usually Slavic languages – should not be projected onto other languages without careful consideration (COSERIU 1980, 13–14).

[12] COSERIU 1980, 21; BOOGAART 2004, 1173.

[13] DIK 1997, 221.

segment of the situation that overlaps with such a globally viewed event ("partial view"). *Interpersonal* aspect (hence AspectIN) contributes to the invitation of the hearer/reader to take a certain perspective on the story, either by viewing it from the experience of a story-internal consciousness ("viewpoint from within") or by narrating and commenting on the events from a distance, with a certain overview ("viewpoint from without").[14] The latter usually occurs with evaluations in the cotext on account of an external observer, as well as comparisons of the narrated story-line events to events taking place at a different time or place.[15] The former, then, can be expected to co-occur with evaluations only from a story-internal source (without overview), and with events that have a significant impact on the *psyche* of any observer.[16]

The existence of aspect as a grammatical category in Latin has often been challenged because the associated meanings were found to be restricted to strictly narrative discourse.[17] Moreover, the interpretation of the meaning potential of grammatical aspect was usually quite limited. In any case, in such theories the aspectual values connected to perfectivity (terminated, global view and viewpoint from without) are associated with the perfect indicative (hence "pf. ind.") by default (e.g. *dēlē-u-it*), while those of imperfectivity (unterminated, partial view and viewpoint from within) are linked to the imperfect indicative (hence "impf. ind.") by default (e.g. *dēlē-b-a-t*).[18] More specifically, grammatical aspect is said to reside on the stem morpheme, i.e. the *perfectum* stem (e.g. *dēlēu-*) and *infectum* stem (e.g. *dēlēu-)* as they were called originally by Varro in the first century BCE. As for the pluperfect tense (e.g. *dēlē-u-er-a-t)*, built on that same *perfectum* stem, scholars agree that the stem had developed towards expressing anteriority by the time of Classical Latin, as it had for the future perfect indicative (e.g. *dēlē-u-er-i-t*).[19] Any aspectual readings of SoAs in the pluperfect are expected to depend on the Aktionsart ("lexical aspect"); unlike the narrative perfect, for example, the aspectually neutral pluperfect cannot impose a global view on an atelic situation.[20] The same holds true for the present indicative ("pr. ind.", e.g. *dēle-t*): though built on the *infectum* stem, it does not signify aspectual meanings,[21] much like its Ancient Greek counterpart.[22] As for the subjunctive mood, the tenses in most subordinate clauses usually follow the

---

[14] BOOGAART 2004, 1174.
[15] STOCKWELL 2002, 54; AERTS 2019a, 219, 232–234. Cf. also VAN GILS – Kroon 2019, 355.
[16] STOCKWELL 2002, 44, 53; AERTS 2019a, 219, 232–234; ALLAN 2018, 142.
[17] PINKSTER 2015, 383; ADEMA 2019, 249.
[18] The labels "perfectivity" and "imperfectivity" are used in this paper only as hypernyms for the different dimensions of aspect hypothesized to be expressed by the Latin *perfectum* and *infectum* stems.
[19] OLDSJÖ 2001, 124; HAVERLING 2015, 194.
[20] Aktionsart refers to a set of lexical characteristics (dynamicity, durativity and telicity) of SoAs, resulting mainly in the so-called VENDLER categories (VENDLER 1967). *States* are non-dynamic, durative, and atelic: they are constant unless they are actively terminated and require no constant input of "energy" to continue to exist (e.g. *being hungry*). *Activities* are dynamic, durative, and atelic, i.e. they do not develop towards an inherent endpoint (e.g. *eating apples*). *Accomplishments* are dynamic, durative, and telic (e.g. *eating three apples*): when the endpoint is reached, the accomplishment is completed. *Achievements* are dynamic, momentaneous and telic, i.e. they are all culmination (e.g. *halving an apple*).
[21] HAVERLING 2010, 474.
[22] VAN EMDE BOAS et al. 2019, 414, 431; RIJKSBARON et al. 2000, 66.

consecutio temporum, i.e. a tense-based system relying on the anteriority, simultaneity or posteriority of the subordinate clause with respect to the main clause.[23]

According to relative tense theory,[24] however, *tense* is the only grammatical category expressed by the Latin verb stems: the pf. ind. (*dēlē-u-it* "he (has) destroyed") expresses the anterior relation ($<$) of an SoA (E) to the speech moment (S)[25] ("TenseID: $E < S$")[26] and functions as an absolute past tense ("simple past") in most of our corpus material. The impf. ind. (e.g. *dēlē-b-a-t* "he destroyed, he was destroying"), on the other hand, expresses the simultaneous relation ($=$) of an SoA (E) to a past reference point (R $< S$)[27] ("TenseID: $E = R < S$"), and is therefore to be regarded as an absolute-relative tense.[28] These basic temporal meanings can be thought of as *ideational* tense (hence TenseID), which concerns the anchoring of an SoA in time with the speech moment or "deictic center" as ultimate ground.[29]

However, just like aspect, Latin *tense* can be thought of as conveying meaning on three dimensions as well.[30] *Textual* tense (hence TenseTE), then, does not relate a narrative SoA to the deictic center in a direct way anymore: once established, pastness is inferable from the fact that we are dealing with a narrative about past events. In narratives, therefore, the verb tenses rather express the hierarchical relations between the SoAs.[31] Absolute tenses such as the narrative perfect and the historic present, where a reference point (R) is absent, involve a certain independence that results in the value of "sequence ($>$) of events" ("TenseTE: $E > E$"),[32] while SoAs expressed by absolute-relative tenses like the impf. ind. and the pluperfect are presented as dependent, secondary background to such sequenced events, i.e. either simultaneous ("TenseTE: $E = R$") or anterior

---

[23] OLDSJÖ 2001, 60; PINKSTER 2015, 481–482. Note that deviations from the *consecutio temporum* in the language of authors like Livy and Tacitus are also usually considered tense-based rather than aspect-based (e.g. the notion of "temporal displacement" below, cf. note 62).

[24] e.g. PINKSTER 2015.

[25] Anteriority is then expressed in the morphology by the *perfectum* stem (e.g. *dix-*), while the absence of a tense marker indicates that the speech moment is what the SoA is construed to be anterior to (cf. PINKSTER 2015, 442–445).

[26] For the origins of this notational method, as it is used throughout this paper, see REICHENBACH 1947. In short, "E" refers to an SoA, "S" refers to the speech moment or communicative setting, and "$<$", "$=$" and "$>$" refer to anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority, respectively. Sometimes, a reference point "R" serves as a pre-established temporal anchor: "$R < S$" is a past anchor, "$R = S$" is a present anchor. Despite its challenging mathematical appearance, the potential of all temporal relations to be broken down into such a formulaic notation reveals the structural similarity of those relations across the three levels of temporal meaning.

[27] Simultaneity is then expressed in the morphology by the *infectum* stem (e.g. *dic-*), while the pastness marker (*-(eb)a-*) indicates the relation to a past reference point (cf. PINKSTER 2015, 411–416), which could be, for instance, an adverbial or an absolute tense form and which should be "given" or "inferable" from the immediate co(n)text.

[28] See COMRIE 1985 for definitions of "absolute tense" and "absolute-relative tense". The latter does not include the imperfect tense for Comrie, but his focus is not on Latin. Nevertheless, PINKSTER's description of the temporal structure of the Latin impf. ind. does approximate Comrie's notion of absolute-relative tense quite closely.

[29] BACHE 2008, 70–71.

[30] Cf. BACHE 2008, 109.

[31] SMITH 2003, 94; BACHE 2008, 177.

[32] For the pr. ind. as used to refer to past events in narratives, the ideational temporal value of simultaneity to the speech moment ($E = S$) is always overruled by its textual value of "sequence of events" ($E > E$).

background ("TenseTE: E < R").[33] In the case of the narrative perfect, the events on the foreground occur in *iconic* sequence, i.e. the story-world timeline is reflected by the order in which the events are narrated in the text ("TenseTE: $E_y > E_x$").[34] Such a strict iconicity is not a prerequisite for the present tense with past time reference ("TenseTE: E > E").[35]

Interpersonal tense (hence TenseIN), on the other hand, concerns the vantage point taken on the events. First, when this dimension of the pf. ind. is emphasized, the author invites the audience to take a vantage point in the speech moment ("TenseIN: E < S"): they look back on the story, with hindsight and with the ability to manipulate the chronology of the events, i.e. to distort the iconicity of events required if the textual level of meaning would have been dominant.[36] This temporal interpersonal meaning combines with the aforementioned "AspectIN: viewpoint from without" to express an "external perspective".[37]

Second, the TenseIN meaning potential of the impf. ind. is twofold: either the audience is invited to identify with one or more story-internal characters (the past R) and to experience the events through their senses, emotions and thoughts ("TenseIN: E = R"), or the narrator is displaced to the story-world scene (the past R) as a virtual camera-eye, transmitting the events (E) he is observing at the scene to the audience in the speech moment (S), i.e. "TenseIN: E = R < S". The combination of these TenseIN values "AspectIN: viewpoint from within" results in two related perspectives: the "internal perspective" involves the identification with a character ("TenseIN: E = R"), while the "scenic camera-eye perspective" involves the experience through the neutral camera-eye ("TenseIN: E = R < S").[38]

Third, the pr. ind. has as its only interpersonal temporal value the expression of a "temporal illusion of proximity" ("TenseIN: E = S"), transporting narrator and audience to the story-world as virtual eyewitnesses.[39] Because of the aspectual neutrality of the pr. ind., this temporal meaning can combine with either a "viewpoint from within" or a "viewpoint from without" into an "immersive eyewitness perspective" or a "distanced eyewitness perspective", respectively. In the former, the audience feels fully immersed in the often shocking or at least lively action of the story-world: the events are *shown*, rather

---

[33] For descriptions of the foreground-background distinction, see, among many others, HOPPER 1979 and FLEISCHMAN 1990, Ch. 6.1. In our conception, foreground SoAs advance the plot, while background events/situations do not.

[34] MELLET – JOFFRE – SERBAT 1994, 83.

[35] The notation "TenseTE: E > E" was used with SoAs that occur sequentially but *not necessarily* in the order in which they are narrated. A relatively small portion of these SoAs probably *did* occur in such an iconic sequence ("TenseTE: $E_y > E_x$"), but we did not have enough evidence to make such a claim for these verbs with certainty. In other words, all events presented in *iconic* sequence are sequential events, but not all sequential events occur in an *iconic* sequence.

[36] Cf. Adema's and Smith's "report mode" for similar characteristics in a more narratological framework (ADEMA 2019, 28–30; SMITH 2003). See also CHAUSSERIE-LAPRÉE 1969, 371.

[37] See AERTS 2019a; 2019b for a more elaborate discussion of the perspectives referred to in this paper and the elements in the surrounding discourse that help us identify them ("cotextual cues"). See also Van Gils and Kroon's research parameters (VAN GILS – KROON 2019, 360).

[38] For the distinction between these two types of perspectives associated with the imperfect tense, see AERTS 2014, 4 [note 16], 12 [note 31], who refers to BENTEIN 2016, 26 [note 5]. For the term "scenic camera-eye perspective", see DE JONG – NÜNLIST 2004, 64–65.

[39] ALLAN – DE JONG – DE JONGE 2017.

than *told*, i.e. without mediation (e.g. evaluation, comparisons to other events or imposing a temporal structure using adverbials). In the latter, the audience and the narrator stay at a certain distance from where they are able to comment on the ongoing action, much like a sports commentator in the stands in a football stadium reports and comments on the ongoing action.

These perspectives were found to be very present in Livy's narrative, especially in so-called "graphic episodes" (e.g. battle scenes, sieges, heroic duels). The narration usually follows a pattern similar to a camera zooming in from the introduction of the events to the core of the action, only to back away again for the aftermath. Similarly, the narrative pace slows down, often to an almost "showing" of the action, after which the pace quickens again to "telling". The interpersonal meanings of aspect and tense leading to the five perspectives mentioned above are summarized in Table 1. In addition, some of the main cotextual cues leading to the annotation of these interpersonal meanings are provided in the table.

Table 1: Aspectual and temporal values behind the interpersonal meaning of "perspective" (AERTS 2018; 2019a; 2019b).

AspectIN / TenseIN		pf. ind.	impf. ind.		pr. ind.
		E < S - Hindsight - Distal deixis - Manipulation of chronology (adverbs)	**E = R** - Identification with 'given' character - Mental processes - Affected	**E = R < S** - Prox + dist deixis - Indirect discourse - Temporal displacement	**E = S** - Descriptive - Proximal deixis - Direct speech
pf. ind.	**Viewpoint from without** - evaluation/comparison - commentary/overview - external knowledge	external perspective			distanced eyewitness perspective
impf. ind.	**Viewpoint from within** - unmediated experience - psychology - descriptive		internal perspective	scenic camera-eye perspective	immersive eyewitness perspective

In Section 2, the data gathered during our close-readings of a randomly selected sample of episodes is presented for each of the main narrative tenses (i.e. the perfect, imperfect, and present tenses). In each of these subsections, the most common and familiar use of the tense is contrasted to more specific, less common uses – all of which fit a description in terms of the aspecto-temporal meanings described above. In doing so, we hope to add a certain formalisation, or systematisation, of characteristics to the existing categorisation of the narrative uses of the Latin tenses, as well as demonstrate the cotextual conditions and functional choices involved in deviations from the default tense choice. In particular, the author's considerations during that choice process seem to follow a more or less fixed

hierarchical structure.[40] In Section 3, we zoom in on specific uses of the tenses where grammatical aspect plays a significant role; as it turns out, it is vital for a proper interpretation of a nonnegligible percentage of data points. In Section 4, the focus lies on the considerable contribution of the communicative function of perspective, which relies on both interpersonal aspect and interpersonal tense. The resulting choice network reveals that the three dimensions of both aspect and tense which are posited in studies of general linguistics[41] do indeed play a role in the tense selection process in Latin narratives such as Livy's.

1.3 Some notes on the corpus

For the purposes of the current paper, a random sample of graphic episodes from Livy's *Ab urbe condita* was subjected to a close-reading process, during which the relevant finite predicates were annotated descriptively for a wide range of categorical variables. That sample consisted of "The rape of the Sabine virgins" (I,9–13)*,* "Horatius Cocles" (II,10)*,* "Defeat of the Hernici" (VII,7–8), "Torquatus" (VII,10); "Tiburtes (VII,11), "The Battle at the Caudine Forks: Part 1" (IX,1–2); "The Battle at Sentinum" (X,27–29), "The Battle at Luceria" (X,35–36), "The Battle at Cannae" (XXII,44–50), "Last actions of Marcellus in Sicily" (XXV,40–41), "Conquest of New Carthage" (XXVI,41–51), "Hostile camps in Northern Africa" (XXX,3–6), "Roman fleet at Utica" (XXX,9–10), and "The Battle of Side" (XXXVII,22–25), amounting to a total of 1,452 annotated data points on a total corpus size of about 13,850 words. From this sample, only those 1,214 data points were retained which are not (a) irrealis or potentialis, (b) morphologically ambiguous (e.g. *uenit, auertere*), (c) past participles that occur seemingly, in the consulted edition, in the position of a main clause verb, or (d) text-critically contestable in a relevant way.

At this point, it should be noted that no claims are made with any certainty for the Latin tense system beyond the episodes in Livy's narrative of the type selected for our sample. Nevertheless, the results of our research will no doubt contribute to the ongoing discussion of the difficult topic of tense and aspect in Latin: our research methodology and holistic approach to the meaning potential of the Latin tenses can easily be applied to other authors, genres and diachronic varieties of Latin, to the extent that they can help to improve our understanding of the Latin tense system.

2. Discussion of the corpus material

In the literature, many "uses" of the narrative tenses have been described and assigned "traditional labels" (e.g. *praesens historicum, imperfectum de conatu,* authorial perfect). These labels mainly concern the ideational and textual dimensions of both tense and aspect. Each subsection below will contrast the default aspecto-temporal values of the

---

[40] Note that in Systemic Functional Linguistics, a hierarchy between the metafunctions is not usually considered to exist (see also note 6). Nevertheless, as a functional paradigm, SFL offers mainly a number of general linguistic principles common to human communication in general, the implementation of which is thought to be highly language specific.

[41] E.g. COSERIU 1980, BOOGAART 2004, BACHE 2008.

narrative tenses to combinations of values where a particular marked meaning results in a specific use of that tense.[42] That dominant element, which could be an aspecto-temporal dimension, a perspective, a lexical characteristic (Aktionsart) or a combination of (some of) these, will be marked in the tables in **boldface**. A dash (–) indicates that a particular aspecto-temporal dimension is not marked by the "tense use" in question. In the final column of those tables, a number represents the absolute frequency of occurrence of that tense use in our sample. In the passages cited from this point onwards, predicates in **boldface** are of immediate relevance to the current discussion; <u>underlined</u> words are referred to in a more indirect way and marked merely for the reader's convenience.

2.1 The perfect tense

The most common narrative tense is the pf. ind. The combination of its default aspecto-temporal values results in the "narrative perfect" (*perfectum historicum*).[43]

Table 2: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the narrative perfect.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
$E < S$	$E_y > E_x$	Terminated	Global view	telic	124
Perspective: unmarked					

(1) Id uero indignum uisum ab tumultuario auxilio iam etiam castra Romana terreri, ut ea modo una causa ne extemplo transirent flumen derigerentque aciem tenuerit Romanos quod summa imperii eo die penes Paullum fuerit. Itaque <u>postero die</u> Varro, cui sors eius diei imperii <u>erat</u>, nihil consulto collega signum **proposuit** <u>instructasque copias</u> flumen **traduxit**, sequente Paullo quia magis non probare quam non adiuuare consilium <u>poterat</u>. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXII,45,4)[44]

In example (1), Varro gave the signal to leave camp (*proposuit*) at some point on a new day (*postero die*) and then, when the troops had formed up (*instructas copias*), he led them across the river (*traduxit*). The iconicity of the sequence is made explicit with these temporal adverbials ("TenseTE: $E_y > E_x$"), and the culmination of both telic events is not markedly prevented ("AspectID: terminated"). Moreover, they are viewed as indivisible wholes, without regard for any subphasing ("AspectTE: global view").

Sometimes, however, such a global view may occur unexpectedly, i.e. with atelic situations. As mentioned in the introduction, grammatical aspect may – in strictly narrative discourse impose a global view on an atelic situation, actively converting it into an event to equal the narrative perfect. In the literature, the label "complexive perfect" is

---

[42] Note that some labels in the literature – relevant as they may be – are not discussed in the current paper, simply because they did not occur in our current corpus. Note, in addition, as already mentioned, that the purpose of this paper is not to provide (new) labels for every single tense use, but rather to illustrate how existing labels correspond to varying combinations of the aspecto-temporal categories described above.

[43] KÜHNER – STEGMANN 1912, 126–30; PINKSTER 2015, 444; MENGE et al. 2000, 187.

[44] For our research, the relevant OCT-editions at https://www.oxfordscholarlyeditions.com were consulted; the texts cited in this paper were taken from these editions without adaptation.

sometimes used: "Als sog. komplexives (konstatierendes) Perfekt fasst das Perfekt einen länger dauernden oder einen sich wiederholenden Vorgang in einem Zeitpunkt zusammen."[45]

Table 3: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the complexive perfect.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	$E_y > E_x$	Terminated	**Global view**	**atelic**	23
Perspective: unmarked					

(2) Patefacta deinde porta eos quos in uia ferente ad castra hostium instruxerat emittit. Romani duce ipso praecipiente parumper **cessere**, ut propiores subsidiis in certamine ipso summittendis essent. Et <u>primo</u> haud impares **stetere** acies; subsidia <u>deinde</u> identidem summissa e castris non auerterunt solum in fugam hostes, sed adeo effusis **institerunt** ut nisi receptui cecinisset permixti fugientibus inrupturi fuisse in urbem uiderentur. (Livius, *Ab urbe condita,* XXVI,44,3–4)

In example (2), *drawing back, standing,* and *pressing on* clearly have no inherent endpoint in their (lexical) meaning beyond which they could not continue in the same way. Nevertheless, they are forced into a sequence by the complexive perfect (as indicated by the temporal adverbs *primo … deinde …*). One could argue that the temporal value is responsible for that imposition ("TenseTE: $E_y > E_x$), but as we will see, that TenseTE value also occurs with the imperfect tense, which suggests that the difference on the textual level is made in the domain of "view": it is the marked presentation with a "global view" that converts these atelic situations into foreground events.

Neither the narrative perfect nor the complexive perfect involve interpersonal meaning: they usually occur with a "neutral perspective", i.e. when the story is narrated in the most straightforward way, without overtly influencing the perception by the audience. Quite often, however, Livy does include an interpersonal meaning. As described by Aerts, the narrator can choose to adopt a vantage point in the present, looking back at the story-world with hindsight and overview ("AspectIN: viewpoint from without" + "TenseIN: E < S").[46] Within the uses of the perfect tense with that external perspective, a distinction is made on the textual dimension. First, with the *narratorial* perfect, the past events still occur on the story timeline in sequence, although the dominant TenseIN value has suspended the strict obligation of iconicity ("TenseTE: E > E").

---

[45] Menge et al. 2000, 187. Derived from the Latin *complector* 'to embrace, encompass, sum up', "complexive" is retained in this paper as a suitable term for the use of the perfect tense described in Table 3, where its decisive function is to markedly present an extended situation as one, summarized whole.
[46] Aerts 2018; 2019a; 2019b.

Table 4: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the narratorial perfect.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	E > E	Terminated	Global view	-	20
Perspective: external					

(3) Et trepidatio quidem quantam necesse erat in nocturno effuso tam late incendio orta est; ceterum fortuitum non hostilem ac bellicum ignem rati esse, sine armis ad restinguendum incendium effusi in armatos incidere hostes, maxime Numidas ab Masinissa notitia regiorum castrorum ad exitus itinerum idoneis locis dispositos. Multos in ipsis cubilibus semisomnos **hausit** flamma; multi [in] praecipiti fuga ruentes super alios alii in angustiis portarum **obtriti sunt**. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXX,5,8–10)

In example (3), the deaths of all these people by fire (*hausit*) and trampling *(obtriti sunt)* did not occur in a strictly iconic sequence, but they *are* presented as sequential events by the use of the perfect tense. Moreover, the summary of casualties in various individual bedrooms and alleys suggests an external perspective: if a more scenic simultaneity of ongoing situations would have been the desired *signifié*, the imperfect tense could and would have been used (see below for examples). Rather, it was Livy's aim to present these events in some sequence from an external vantage point, while still preserving the status of timeline event.

Second, with the *authorial* perfect, the past SoA ("TenseID: E < S") is related to the act of communication rather than to the story-world ("TenseTE: E < S").[47] Such SoAs are said to have the textual status of "discourse background" rather than "foreground" or "background", both of which are part of the story-world.

Table 5: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the authorial perfect.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	**E < S**	-	-	-	37
Perspective: external					

(4) Ex bello tam tristi laeta repente pax cariores Sabinas uiris ac parentibus et ante omnes Romulo ipsi **fecit**. Itaque cum populum in curias triginta diuideret, nomina earum curiis **imposuit**. Id non traditur, cum haud dubie aliquanto numerus maior hoc mulierum fuerit, aetate an dignitatibus suis uirorumue an sorte lectae sint, quae nomina curiis darent. Eodem tempore et centuriae tres equitum **conscriptae sunt**. Ramnenses ab Romulo, ab T. Tatio Titienses appellati: Lucerum nominis et originis causa incerta est. Inde non modo commune sed concors etiam regnum duobus regibus **fuit**. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* I,13,6–8)

---

[47] See PINKSTER 2015, 454 for the term. Cf. Kühner and Stegmann's "*urteilende* oder *konstatierende* Perfect" (KÜHNER – STEGMANN 1912, 130–32), also called *perfectum logicum*, which is similar to the *present perfect* in that it expresses events outside the actual narrative, from the vantage point of the speech moment.

In example (4), the narration has shifted from the story of the war with the Sabines (*ex bello tam tristi*) to the aftermath, i.e. its political implications. Between the authorial perfects we find timeless (or "general") present forms (*traditur*, *est*),[48] and perfect subjunctive forms (*fuerit, lectae sint*),[49] supporting the interpretation as "discourse background".

With those perfect subjunctive forms, and with *fuit*, we turn to the use of Latin perfect tense as a present perfect rather than a simple past. Occurring in nonnarrative discourse (e.g. discourse background, "TenseTE: E < S"), this *perfectum praesens*[50] is used with past actions that have relevance in the speech moment ("TenseID: E < R = S").

Table 6: *The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the perfect with current relevance.*

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.	# subj.
E < R = S	E < S	-	-	**Telic**	23	2
				Atelic	8	2

At this point, recall that aspectual meanings are not considered to be marked by the morphology of the perfect tense in nonnarrative discourse. In such cases, the structure of an SoA as a situation or an event depends solely on its (a)telicity. Within the traditional label of "perfect with current relevance", I further distinguish between "present anterior event" and "present anterior situation". With *fuit* in example (4), for instance, the situation that developed into the shared leadership of Rome between two consuls continued into Livy's day: the *perfectum praesens* does not impose termination on situations, which means they could be both continuing into or terminated at the moment of speech.[51]

Taking a step back, the pf. ind. also occurred with foreground events where the perspective should have resulted in either the impf. ind. (internal perspective or scenic camera-eye perspective) or the pr. ind. (immersive or distanced eyewitness perspective). These data points mainly involve telic SoAs where the ideational aspectual meaning of the pf. ind. is dominant, i.e. an emphasis on the successful termination ("perfect of success").[52]

Table 7: *The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the perfect of success.*

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	$E_y > E_x$	**Terminated**	Global view	Telic	39
Perspective: not neutral or external					

---

[48] PINKSTER 2015, 396; MENGE et al. 2000, 181.

[49] Cf. PINKSTER 2015, 557.

[50] KÜHNER – STEGMANN 1912, 124–25; PINKSTER 2015, 444; ADEMA 2019, 87.

[51] Examples of present anterior situations that could be argued to have terminated by the moment of speech are *fuit* (IX,1,3, *fuit* (IX,1,4), *potuimus* (IX,1,6); examples where a case could be made for present continuing situations are *fuit* (I,10,7), *fuit* (I,13,8), *fuistis* (XXVI,41,4), *obtinuistis* (XXVI,41,5), *uicerimus* (XXVI,41,9), *fuerit* (XXVI,49,1), *fuit* (XXVI,50,6) and *seruata est* (XXVI,50,6). In one case, it is difficult to decide either way (*fuit* in VII,10,13), but it is precisely that indeterminacy that characterizes the dominance of temporal values for this use of the perfect tense.

[52] That is not to say that narrative perfects cannot have a certain emphasis on termination. However, since it would not contribute decisively to the final selection of the verb tense, no distinction was made between emphatically terminated and other SoAs within the label of historic perfect.

(5) Sub equestris finem certaminis <u>coorta est</u> peditum pugna, primo et uiribus et animis par dum <u>constabant</u> ordines Gallis Hispanisque; tandem Romani, diu ac saepe conisi, aequa fronte acieque densa **impulere** hostium cuneum nimis tenuem eoque parum ualidum, a cetera prominentem acie. Impulsis deinde ac trepide referentibus pedem institere ac tenore uno per praeceps pauore fugientium agmen in mediam primum aciem inlati, postremo nullo resistente ad subsidia Afrorum **peruenerunt**, qui utrimque reductis alis constiterant media, qua Galli Hispanique steterant, aliquantum prominente acie. Qui cuneus ut pulsus <u>aequauit</u> frontem primum, deinde cedendo etiam sinum in medio <u>dedit</u>, Afri circa iam cornua fecerant inruentibusque incaute in medium Romanis **circumdedere** alas; mox cornua extendendo **clausere** et ab tergo hostes. Hinc Romani, defuncti nequiquam proelio uno, omissis Gallis Hispanisque, quorum terga ceciderant, aduersus Afros integram pugnam <u>ineunt</u>, non tantum eo iniquam quod inclusi aduersus circumfusos sed etiam quod fessi cum recentibus ac uegetis pugnabant. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXII,47,4–10).

Example (5) illustrates how a given piece of discourse can be annotated with a certain perspective despite a lower count of predicates in the verb tense associated with that perspective. The annotation was performed mainly on other grounds, in order to avoid circular reasoning: the association with the verb tense – *in casu,* the association between the (historic) present and the eyewitness perspectives – is exactly what required a statistical evaluation.[53] After a short introduction of this new part of the battle on the fields near Cannae in the first sentence, which features a narrative perfect as we would expect (*coorta est*), the audience is invited to observe the struggles (*diu ac saepe conisi*) of the advancing Romans as virtual eyewitnesses, as suggested by the visually descriptive language (*aequa fronte acieque densa, a cetera prominentem acie*). After their first failed attempts, the Romans start to have a series of successes, expressed – if the indicative is used – by the perfect of success (*impulere*, *peruenerunt*). Notice the progression from the less marked distanced eyewitness perspective, where the narrator is still in a position to offer evaluative commentary (*hostium cuneum nimis tenuem eoque parum ualidum*), to a more marked immersive eyewitness perspective, where the focus shifts towards more direct, unmediated emotional impressions on the observing audience (*impulsis deinde ac trepide referentibus*). With the *ut temporale* clause, where the perfect has the default values of the pluperfect tense (*perfectum pro plusquamperfecto*), the virtual eyewitnesses move to a more distanced position again, where the narrator describes how the famous pincer movement effectively managed to surprise and surround the Roman infantry, offering additional commentary from his viewpoint from without (*Afri <u>circa iam cornua fecerant</u> inruentibusque <u>incaute</u> in medium Romanis*). It is only the final foreground event where termination was not a dominant factor in the tense selection process, resulting in the tense associated with the distanced eyewitness perspective (*ineunt*).

---

[53] As shown by AERTS 2019a, a number of cotextual cues are highly associated with both the tenses and the perspectives linked to those tenses, confirming the association between them.

Finally, the perfect occurred several times in our corpus in strictly narrative discourse with the default values of the imperfect tense, i.e. simultaneous background (see below). In these cases, a marked external perspective overruled that textual meaning, resulting in the choice for the perfect tense.

Table 8: Instances of simultaneous background situations where an external perspective resulted in the perfect tense.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.	# subj.
E = R < S	E = R	Unterminated	Partial view	Atelic	34	4
Perspective: external						

(6) Hunc ordinem laboris quietisque quoad Carthagine **morati sunt seruarunt**. (…) His ita incohatis refectisque quae quassata erant muri dispositisque praesidiis ad custodiam urbis, Tarraconem est profectus. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXVI,51,5–9a)

In example (6), the external perspective is apparent in the first sentence from the dense summary of a longer period of alternating between *labor* and *quies*, the specifics of which are then illustrated in a longer text which we had to leave out here. After that illustration, the text goes on with *his ita incohatis*, indicating that still *morati sunt* and *seruarunt* had not terminated for most of the Roman troops when Scipio left for Tarraco.

2.2 The imperfect tense

As can be expected, the *imperfect* tense occurred much more frequently with such aspecto-temporal values, that is, when there is no marked interpersonal factor (e.g. an external perspective) to overrule the other dimensions. Its main function is to describe the simultaneous background against a given foreground. There are a number of types depending especially on the Aktionsart, as indicated in Table 9.

Table 9: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in simultaneous background situations.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.	# subj.
E = R < S	E = R	Unterminated	Partial view	State	68	25
E = R < S	E = R	Unterminated	Partial view	Activity	39	18
E = R < S	E = R	Unterminated	Partial view	Activity due to iteration	12	4
E = R < S	E = R	Unterminated	Partial view	State due to habitualization	32	8
Perspective: unmarked						

In example (1) above, the subordinate clauses containing the states *erat* and *poterat* provide an explanatory background to the actions of the consuls (*proposuit* and *traduxit*, respectively). These mainly descriptive situations are referred to as "continuous background situations". In example (5), the activities *constabant* and *pugnabant* are "durative background situations" (see also *suppeditabat* and *defendebant* in example (7) below), for which the imperfect tense is more often retained in the case of an external

perspective (e.g. with *constabant*): of the 38 perfect indicative forms which expressed simultaneous background situations in our corpus, only 5 were durative background situations where the external perspective was dominant enough to overrule nontermination in the tense selection process (e.g. *morati sunt* and *seruarunt* in example (6)), while 26 were continuous background situations involving mostly permanent, nontransitory states (e.g. *being tall* vs. *being sick*) where nontermination requires less emphasis.[54] Two other types of simultaneous background are "habitual background situations", which involve permanent characteristics of entities, including habituals, and "iterative background situations", which involve SoAs that are structurally equal to atelic activities due to the iteration of a telic event.[55]

> (7) Inter haec repleuerat iam Poenus armatis muros, et uis magna ex ingenti copia congesta telorum **suppeditabat**; sed neque uiri nec tela nec quicquam aliud aeque quam moenia ipsa sese **defendebant**. Rarae enim scalae altitudini aequari **poterant**, et quo quaeque altiores, eo infirmiores **erant**. Itaque cum summus quisque euadere non **posset**, **subirent** tamen alii, onere ipso **frangebantur**. Quidam stantibus scalis cum altitudo caliginem oculis offudisset, ad terram **delati sunt**. Et cum passim homines scalaeque **ruerent** et ipso successu audacia atque alacritas hostium **cresceret**, signum receptui <u>datum est</u>. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXVI,45,1–4)

In example (7), the storming of New Carthage is narrated from the perspective of a neutral observer floating among, and sympathetic with, the Romans: it is the displaced narrator who zooms in on the psychological impact on the Roman forces. That scenic camera-eye perspective, rather than the internal perspective of the Romans themselves, is apparent from the additional on-sight description of the defences and the weakness of the ladders. One remark is made, temporarily from an external perspective, about the dizziness that caused other soldiers to fall (*delati sunt*). Understandably, a neutral camera-eye would have missed that second reason. Concerning simultaneous background, the activities *suppeditabat* and *defendebant* are *durative* background situations, followed by the *habitual* background situations that convey the characteristics of the ladders (*poterant* and *erant*). This background explains the breaking of the ladders and the deaths of many Romans on the subsequent foreground (*Itaque … frangebantur … delati sunt.*), to which I will return shortly. This part of the story, however, ends with the sounding of the retreat *(datum est)*: a perfect of success emphasizes that the Romans were *finally* allowed to end their hopeless struggle. This foreground event is preceded by a *cum historicum* clause

---

[54] Of the 68 states in the impf. ind. annotated with "continuous background situation", 20 *did* involve an external perspective. However, these mainly concern transitory, nonpermanent states and/or forms of the lemma *sum,* i.e. *era(n)t*. At this point, it might be interesting to add that in the whole of Livy's *Ab urbe condita,* insofar as the text has come down to us, there are 2,177 occurrences of *erat* (and compounds) against 1,058 attestations of *fuit* (and compounds), i.e. a ratio of 2.1 to 1. In the plural, that ratio is 5.4 to 1, i.e. 1,151 attestations of *erant* against 214 perfects, 101 of which are *fuerunt* and 113 are the shortened form *fuere*. In our corpus, 213 out of 1,452 data points are forms of *sum* and its compounds, 207 of which were retained for the current analysis.

[55] CROFT 2012, 149.

situating the decision to retreat amidst the ongoing situation of (a) several men plummeting to their deaths (the iterative *ruerent*) and (b) the enemy troops gaining confidence (the durative *crescerent*).

Example (7) illustrates the association between the Latin impf. ind. and story-internal perspectives such as the scenic camera-eye perspective.[56] As Allan noted on the Ancient Greek imperfect, that interpersonal meaning (my term) often goes hand in hand with its textual meaning of simultaneous background.[57] However, we have also found several occurrences where the imperfect indicative is used for SoAs on the foreground. *Frangebantur* in example (7) is such a foreground SoA, but a foreground *situation* rather than *event*: as indicated by *quisque ... alii ...* and its plural subject, *frangebantur* is an iterative situation, but *itaque* indicates a progression on the story timeline, which we defined as a foreground SoA (see note 33).

Table 10: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in iterative foreground situations.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	E > E	**Unterminated**	Partial view	**Atelic**	16
Perspective: scenic camera-eye or eyewitness					

Neither of the traditional temporal values that best describe this use of the imperfect tense correspond to the values attributed to the imperfect indicative in relative tense theory: with these 16 "iterative foreground situations", no past reference point served as a past anchor for a simultaneous relation.[58] The main *signifié* that led to the choice of the imperfect tense, is situated on the interpersonal level and involves both a "viewpoint from within"[59] and a deictic shift involving a sense of simultaneity to a story-internal observer.[60]

Examples of foregrounded *events* in the imperfect tense are less common. For most of these, the imperfect tense primarily emphasizes nontermination, sometimes combined with an internal perspective or a scenic camera-eye perspective. This use could be called "progressive" and includes the even more specific label *imperfectum de conatu*.[61] The latter simply applies to those cases where the SoA involves an additional intentionality to reach the inherent endpoint, but for both, the role played by the imperfect tense is only an emphasis on nontermination.

Table 11: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in past progressives.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.	# subj.
E < S	E > E	**Unterminated**	Global view	**Telic**	9	3
Perspective: unmarked						

---

[56] AERTS 2019a, 230.
[57] ALLAN 2018, 141–142.
[58] Cf. Aerts' notion of "recurring cycle of foregrounded events", which also involve temporal progression (AERTS 2014, 5 [note 18]).
[59] See AERTS 2014, 3–4, who refers to BENTEIN 2016, 26.
[60] Cf. LYONS 1977, 579.
[61] PINKSTER 2015, 381, 420; KÜHNER – STEGMANN 1912, 121.

(8) Quae ubi consul accepit, sibimet ipsi circumeundos adloquendosque milites ratus, ut ad quosque uenerat, cunctantes arma capere <u>increpabat</u>: quid cessarent tergiuersarenturque? (…) Haec iurganti increpantique <u>respondebant</u> confectos se pugna hesterna esse; nec uiriùm quicquam nec sanguinis superesse; maiorem multitudinem hostium apparere quam pridie *fuerit*. Inter haec **appropinquabat** agmen; et iam breuiore interuallo certiora intuentes uallum secum portare Samnitem <u>adfirmant</u> nec dubium esse quin castra *circumuallaturi sint*. (Livius, *Ab urbe condita,* X,35,8–12)

Example (8) illustrates some of the characteristics used to identify the scenic camera-eye perspective. Besides the previously mentioned "iterative foreground situations" (*increpabat, respondebant*), notice the indirect, rather than direct, speech; in addition, the subjunctive forms display a deictic shift to the story-world ("temporal displacement"): anteriority and posteriority to past reference points are expressed by the *perfect* (rather than pluperfect) and *present* (rather than imperfect) subjunctive (*fuerit* and *circumuallaturi sint*, respectively), suggesting an (interpersonal) assimilation between the past of the story and the present of the communicative setting.[62] The past progressive in the example is *appropinquabat*: the Samnites approached the Roman camp against the background of the conversations between the consul and his terrified troops, but the subsequent text shows that they have not yet completed their approach.

There is one last use of the imperfect tense that deserves our attention. In some subordinate clauses (e.g. *cum historicum*), the imperfect subjunctive signifies not a simultaneous situation, but a simultaneous event:

Table 12: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in past simultaneous events.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.	# subj.
E = R < S	E = R	-	-	**Telic**	2	16
Perspective: unmarked						

(9) Ex bello tam tristi laeta repente pax cariores Sabinas uiris ac parentibus et ante omnes Romulo ipsi fecit. Itaque cum populum in curias triginta **diuideret**, nomina earum curiis imposuit. (Livius, *Ab urbe condita,* I,13,6)

These 16 "past simultaneous events" in the imperfect subjunctive, occurring in a wide range of perspectives (e.g. the external perspective in example (9)) do not undergo the aspectual signification that occurs only in the indicative. In the subjunctive, both the simultaneous situations mentioned earlier and the simultaneous events mentioned here rely on the (a)telicity of the SoAs for the implication of event vs. situation. Nevertheless, the indicative was found with simultaneous events twice, as with *increpabat* in example (10). In both cases, there is an additional internal perspective of a main character (*in casu*, Antiochus):

---

[62] Compare with Kühner and Stegmann's and Pinkster's *repraesentatio* account of deviations from the norm in the *consecutio temporum* (Kühner – Stegmann 1914, 194; Pinkster 2015, Ch. 7.113).

(10) Sed profectio Antiochi ab Sardibus, ⟨metusque⟩ ne opprimerentur maritimae urbes, abscedere custodia Ioniae atque Aeolidis prohibuerunt; Pamphilidam cum quattuor nauibus tectis ad eam classem quae circa Patara erat miserunt. <u>Antiochus</u> non ciuitatium modo quae circa se erant contrahebat praesidia, sed ad Prusiam Bithyniae regem Iegatos miserat litterasque, quibus transitum in Asiam Romanorum **increpabat**: uenire eos ad omnia regna tollenda, ut nullum usquam orbis terrarum nisi Romanum imperium esset. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXXVII,25,2b–5)

2.3 The present tense

The present tense is the only narrative tense that is, strictly speaking, not a past tense. Its basic, ideational meaning is simultaneity to the speech moment ("TenseID: E = S"), i.e. present. Nevertheless, as in many languages of the world, the Latin pr. ind. is used frequently in narratives about the past. As Pinkster notes, the preference of the so-called "historic present" (*praesens historicum* or *praesens repraesentivum*)[63] to be used with dynamic, often telic, SoAs results *de facto* in a stronger resemblance to the narrative perfect on the ideational and textual levels (our terms); however, in its less common use with atelic, mostly stative, SoAs, it replaces the imperfect tense.[64] At this point, it should be noted that the label "historic present" is reserved in this paper for that specific use of the "*praesens pro praeterito*"[65] where a marked interpersonal value contributes to the selection of the present tense (e.g. to suggest an eyewitness report).[66]

Table 13: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the historic present.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	E > E	-	-	**Dynamic**	91
E = R < S	E = R	-	-	**Stative**	29
Perspective: **eyewitness** (or scenic camera-eye if foreground)					

Recall that the present tense does not mark aspectual meanings: it leaves the interpretation of an SoA as, for instance, terminated or unterminated at story-time up to a combination of cotextual factors (e.g. Aktionsart or preceding/subsequent events). In our corpus, the historic present expressed a foreground event in the scenic camera-eye perspective (e.g. *adfirmant* in example (8)), immersive eyewitness perspective, or distanced eyewitness perspective (e.g. *ineunt* in example (5)) 91 times. Of these, 24 were annotated as "unterminated" (only activities and accomplishments, i.e. SoAs that are both durative and dynamic), while 67 were considered "terminated" (only accomplishments and achievements, i.e. SoAs that are dynamic as well as telic); all of them occurred in main clauses (or equivalents, e.g. *cum inversum*). With the value of simultaneous, ongoing background, the historic present was found 29 times (see example (11)): all of these

---

[63] See also MENGE et al. 2000, 181; KÜHNER – STEGMANN 1912, 115.
[64] PINKSTER 2015, 408.
[65] NIJK 2016, 218–20.
[66] Cf. PINKSTER 2015, 402.

involved either states or activities (in short: atelic situations), apart from three accomplishments in *dum*-clauses. Moreover, the scenic camera-eye perspective did not occur with this subtype of the historic present: in such cases, there would be no reason left to prefer the present tense over the imperfect tense.

> (11) Tunc inter primores duorum populorum **res geritur**; quidquid hinc aut illinc communis Mars belli **aufert**, multiplex quam pro numero damnum **est**. Volgus aliud armatorum, uelut delegata primoribus pugna, euentum suum in uirtute aliena **ponit**. Multi utrimque **cadunt**, plures **uolnera accipiunt**; … (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* VII,8,1)

However, as mentioned above, not all occurrences of the *praesens pro praeterito* come with such an interpersonal meaning. The "annalistic present", for example, prefers an unmarked neutral perspective, where the narrator's intention is simply to provide information and facts in a "dry" way.[67] While nontermination occurs with such annalistic presents (7 out of 23 times in our corpus), as it does with the historic present, the absence of a marked interpersonal value entails that only foregrounded SoAs can occur in such factual statements: for simultaneous background, the imperfect tense would be used.

Table 14: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the annalistic present.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	E > E	-	-	Telic	23
Perspective: neutral					

> (12) Lente agere his Tatius Sabinique uisi sunt: ipsi inter se tres populi communiter bellum **parant**. Ne Crustumini quidem atque Antemnates pro ardore iraque Caeninensium satis se impigre **mouent**; ita per se ipsum nomen Caeninum in agrum Romanum **impetum facit**. Sed effuse uastantibus **fit obuius** cum exercitu Romulus leuique certamine **docet** uanam sine uiribus iram esse. Exercitum **fundit fugatque**, fusum **persequitur**: regem in proelio **obtruncat** et **spoliat**: duce hostium occiso urbem primo impetu **capit**. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* I,10,2b–4)

The short sentences and the high narrative pace support the interpretation of these present tense forms as annalistic presents. An eyewitness experience is difficult because of the rapid shifting between different scenes. Some of the events (*parant* and *persequitur*) do not seem to terminate at story-time. *Mouent* is not even a foreground event, but a situation; its status of foreground relies solely on the temporal progression ("TenseTE: E > E") indicated by the present tense. These rare "foreground situations" occur 5 times in our corpus, always in the present indicative.[68] Notice the difference with complexive perfects (see above), where the marked contribution of the pf. ind. ("AspectTE: global

---

[67] For this label, see PINKSTER 2015, 409; HOFMANN – SZANTYR 1972, 306. The latter also mention "*praesens tabulare"* and "registering present" as labels for this use of the pr. ind.

[68] Other attestations of "foreground situations" in the present tense are *inclinant* (XXX,9,7), *cupiunt* (X,35,4), *tenet* (IX,2,10) and *silent* (IX,2,11).

view") would have converted such atelic situations into events. Finally, note that sequencing in the *praesens pro praeterito* is not necessarily iconic: surely the enemy king was beheaded and robbed of the *spolia* on the battlefield before the Romans chased his fleeing army over some distance?[69]

A second use of the ind. pr. with past time reference, but without a marked interpersonal meaning, is the one that often occurs with verbs of "sending" or "commanding" somebody to do something. In particular, *mitto* and *iubeo* often occurred in our corpus, in any kind of perspective, with a stressed textual meaning involving the successful follow-up of the "sending" or the "commanding". Table 15 provides an overview of the 48 occurrences of such verbs in our corpus in the present or perfect indicative tense.

Table 15: Anticipation with verbs of "commanding" and "sending" in the present and perfect indicative.

Verb tense	Anticipation	Follow-up	Perspective	# ind.
Present	**Yes**	**Successful**	External/neutral	**11**
			Eyewitness Scenic camera-eye	17
	No	-	**Eyewitness**	6
Perfect	Yes	Unsuccessful	External/neutral	3
	No	-	**External/neutral**	10

Out of 34 occurrences of verbs of "commanding" or "sending" in the pr. ind., 28 were annotated as anticipating on a successful follow-up: in the subsequent discourse, we can read that the order or mission was executed properly. In 11 of those instances, it was this particular textual meaning of "anticipation"[70] that resulted in the choice of the pr. ind. (e.g. *iubet* and *concelebrant* in example (13), narrated from a neutral perspective); in 17 additional instances, interpersonal meanings are involved as well.

(13) Indici deinde finitimis spectaculum **iubet**; quantoque apparatu tum sciebant aut poterant, **concelebrant** ut rem claram exspectatamque facerent. Multi mortales <u>conuenere</u>, … (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* I,9,7b–8a)

In example (13), Romulus' order to spread the news about the games to lure their neighbours to the newly built city, is followed by a successful execution in the verb *concelebrant*. The latter, in itself, is also a request with a successful follow-up: the invitations carried to the neighbouring people were widely accepted, as narrated by the perfect of success *conuenere* "showed up".

The pf. ind., on the other hand, occurs much less often with verbs like *iubere* and *mittere*. If there is an anticipation, it is a negative one, in the sense that there is a subsequent mention of a failed or poorly executed mission or task. In any case, all

---

[69] Cf. PINKSTER 2015, 409: "not all the events [in the annalistic present] are necessarily successive."
[70] Cf. BENTEIN 2015.

instances of verbs of "commanding" and "sending" in the pf. ind. in our corpus also occurred in a neutral or an external perspective.

3. Evidence for aspect in Livy's tense system

Grammatical aspect was introduced in this paper as a debated category in the Latin verbal system. However, as we have seen throughout Section 2, there are some uses of the tenses that can be most straightforwardly accounted for with aspect, while others even require it. In any case, our data strongly supports the general conclusion that aspectual meanings, be they primary or secondary (i.e. an interpretation of temporal meanings in certain contexts), can only be found with the pf. ind. and impf. ind. in strictly narrative discourse.[71] Recall, for example, that for present anterior events and situations the pf. ind. was used because of its temporal value of current relevance, rather than aspectual distinctions. As for the present tense, our data indicated that the annalistic and historic present do not mark (non)termination, while the latter did not even modify situations into events in some cases.

Within strictly narrative discourse, then, the discussion of our data revealed that aspect contributed significantly to the choice of verb tense in the case of several tense uses. We have seen that the complexive perfect, a specific subtype of the narrative perfect, relies on the marked textual aspectual meaning of "global view" to present an atelic situation as an event, while for the perfect of success, a marked ideational meaning of "termination" overruled a perspective that would have resulted in the choice for the imperfect or present tense. With the imperfect tense, on the other hand, foreground SoAs were marked as unterminated, either as progressive events or as iterative foreground situations. Recall that "progressivity" is the result of the nonculmination of a telic SoA, while "iterativity" is the result of the iteration of an event, e.g. by multiple subjects. Nevertheless, the temporal values for these uses are those of an absolute, nonsimultaneous past tense and cannot, therefore, account for the choice for the imperfect tense.

Additional evidence for the existence of aspect can be found in the use of the so-called "suspensive imperfect".[72] In Ancient Greek, the imperfect's aspectual potential includes a signal that a narrative will be returned to after a digression. With this "discourse function of the imperfect", a foreground SoA opens a frame that serves as background – on a macro-textual level – for an impending return to the same scene.[73]

Table 16: The ideational and textual aspecto-temporal values involved in the suspensive imperfect.

TenseID	TenseTE	AspectID	AspectTE	Aktionsart	# ind.
E < S	E > E	-	**Open view**	-	6
Perspective: unmarked					

[71] PINKSTER 2015, 383; ADEMA 2019, 249.
[72] MELLET 1988, 286. Chausserie-Laprée seems to refer to the same or a similar use of the impf. ind. as "situation qui se prolonge" (CHAUSSERIE-LAPRÉE 1969, 389 [note 1]).
[73] RIJKSBARON 1988.

(14) His raptim pro tempore instructis, mille ferme delecti propugnatores onerariis imponuntur; telorum maxime missilium ut quamuis longo certamine sufficerent uis ingens congeritur. Ita parati atque intenti hostium aduentum **opperiebantur**. Carthaginienses (…). Postero die sub ortum solis instruxere ab alto naves velut ad iustum proelium navale, et tamquam exituris contra Romanis. Cum diu stetissent, postquam nihil moveri ab hostibus viderunt, tum demum onerarias adgrediuntur. (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXX,10,7–11).

In example (14), *opperiebantur* is a successive, foreground event that leaves the narration open to return to after a short digression, i.e. after the narration has shifted to the approaching Carthaginian fleet. Once the enemy has joined the Romans at Utica the next day, the story there continues.

Finally, some of Livy's character speeches include narratives of their own. In example (15), Scipio has just reminded his troops of the troubles they knew in the past, which now plague the enemy instead.

(15) "Eadem in illos ingruit fortuna quae <u>nuper</u> nos **adflixit**; nam et deseruntur ab sociis, ut prius ab Celtiberis nos, et diduxere exercitus quae <u>patri patruoque meo</u> causa exitii **fuit**." (LIVIUS, *Ab urbe condita,* XXVI,41,21)

Rather than anterior to their respective main clauses, the pf. ind. forms *adflixit* and *fuit* are simultaneous to *nuper* and to the time when Scipio's ancestors led the army, respectively (cf. note 27). Such temporal values would have resulted in the imperfect tense, but Scipio wants to stress that these situations do not continue into the present moment. Such an emphasis on termination, together with other marked aspectual meanings, were found to be decisive for at least 20% of all relevant data points.

4. The relative relevance of the three dimensions for verb tense selection

The close readings of the corpus that was used for the current paper resulted in the data gathered in Table 17. In the column entirely under one header (e.g. "Textual"), the numbers reflect the data points for each tense where that one dimension alone was responsible for the tense choice. In columns under two headers, the responsibility is shared between two dimensions. In particular, the numbers in bold involve the interpersonal metafunction, as a decisive factor, in some way. An overview of the morphological grounds for the hypothesized associations between the perspectives and the narrative tenses has been provided in Table 1. For that pairing between morphology and (interpersonal) meaning, we started out from a holistic approach where it is assumed that the Classical Latin *perfectum* and *infectum* stems potentially convey both relative tense and – at least residually – grammatical aspect. The relevance of each dimension for the selection of the verb tense is summarized in the final row.

Table 17: The contribution of the textual, interpersonal, and ideational dimensions to the choice for the perfect, imperfect, and present indicative tenses.

Tense	Textual	Interpersonal		Ideational	Textual	X	Total
Perfect	83	**61**	**106**	89	2	2	343
Imperfect	114	**61**	**1** | 18	7	6	–	207
Present	23	**19**	**93**	–	32	2	169
Total	220	**141**	**200** | 18	96	40	4	719

As the numbers in bold in Table 17 show, the perspective alone dominated the tense choice for 200 out of 719 data points (i.e. 28%). An additional 141 SoAs in our corpus saw both their textual and interpersonal *signifiés* represented by the associated verb tense (e.g. iconic foreground sequence and external perspective by the pf. ind.), while a combination of interpersonal and ideational meaning (i.e. scenic camera-eye perspective and nontermination with the impf. ind.) accounts for 18 more data points. In total, the perspective is therefore involved in the tense choice for 50% of all occurrences of the pf. ind., impf. ind. and *praesens pro praeterito* in our corpus. On the other hand, 220 data points (31%) did not involve a particular perspective and relied solely on the textual dimension for the selection of their verb tense, while in 96 cases (13%) the ideational dimension was dominant (e.g. current relevance or (non)termination). Finally, in about 5% of our corpus, a special textual meaning (i.e. anticipation vs. conclusion, or the suspensive imperfect) modified the tense choice in the last instance.[74]

We are left, then, with four data points that appear to deny categorisation within the meaning potential of the verb tenses as described above. We cannot discuss all of these at length here; one example will have to serve as an illustration.

(16) Vbi constitere inter duas acies tot circa mortalium animis spe metuque pendentibus, Gallus uelut moles superne imminens proiecto laeua scuto in aduenientis arma hostis uanum caesim cum ingenti sonitu ensem **deiecit**; Romanus mucrone subrecto, cum scuto scutum imum perculisset totoque corpore interior periculo uolneris factus insinuasset se inter corpus armaque, uno alteroque subinde ictu uentrem atque inguina <u>hausit</u> et in spatium ingens ruentem <u>porrexit</u> hostem. (VII,10,9–10)

The many descriptive phrases and the high impact on human psychology, together with the very slow narrative pace and the complete lack of mediation, strongly suggest an intensification of the distanced eyewitness perspective of a few lines earlier (VII,10,2–6) into an immersive eyewitness perspective here, where the audience feels present at the scene of the battle between the mighty Gaul and Torquatus. However, none of the main clause predicates are in the associated pr. ind. For the final two SoAs, *hausit* and *porrexit*, we can understand that the perfect of success definitively concludes the fight, but along

---

[74] The pf. ind. was often used in our corpus for an SoA that conveyed the successful follow-up anticipated by a verb of "commanding" or "sending". Only in two instances, however, this was the only apparent reason to choose the pf. ind. (*euecti sunt*, concluding *mittit* in XXII,45,2–3 and *approbauere*, concluding the consul's admonishments, in X,35,13–16). More data on this "perfect of conclusion" is required, however.

the same line of reasoning, this cannot be said of *deiecit*, which fails to conclude the battle in the Gaul's favour. If we follow our own methodology for close-readings, there does not seem to be an explanation for *deiecit* within our framework. Given the low overall frequency of such cases, they might just confirm that no system – and surely no linguistic system, used by individuals – is completely perfect.

5. Concluding remarks

The aim of this paper was to support the three-dimensional framework for the analysis of the Latin narrative tenses, posited in earlier papers, with data from Livy's narrative.[75] Apart from a handful of data points, all the data gathered during our close-readings could be accounted for. In the indicative mood, the choice for the perfect, imperfect or present tense depends on a metafunctional hierarchy where first textual (e.g. narrative perfect, simultaneous background, annalistic present), then interpersonal (e.g. narratorial/authorial perfect, historic present) and finally ideational meanings (e.g. perfect of success, progressive imperfect, present perfect) contribute to the choice process. In a limited number of contexts, a marked textual meaning can have the final say (anticipatory present, suspensive imperfect). As for the subjunctive, most of our narrative SoAs (excluding e.g. potentialis/irrealis) followed the *consecutio temporum* rigorously: the pluperfect subjunctive signifies anteriority to the main clause, while the imperfect subjunctive expresses simultaneity or posteriority, without any aspectual distinction. However, a deictic shift (perfect instead of pluperfect, present instead of imperfect) consistently occurred in a character's indirect discourse if the reporting predicate occurred in a scenic camera-eye perspective. The perfect subjunctive also occurred to link past events directly to the speech moment on the interpersonal level (i.e. external perspective). Among these findings, the importance of aspect should not be downplayed. Its role in nondefault uses like the complexive perfect, the perfect of success, the progressive imperfect and the suspensive imperfect cannot be said to be a secondary effect of temporal meanings. However, our data strongly confirms that aspect is marked only by the perfect and imperfect indicative tenses, and only in strictly narrative discourse. In other cases, the status of situation vs. event is left to the (a)telicity of SoAs (e.g. iterative foreground situation, historic present).

Finally, the relevance of the perspectives introduced elsewhere was confirmed by our data.[76] These perspectives were shown to rely on the interpersonal dimensions of both tense and aspect, which can be recognized by several cotextual indications, as illustrated in the examples we discussed. Together, they offer Livy the tools to sweep his audience – sometimes gently, sometimes abruptly – from the more annalistic introduction of an episode, all the way to its graphic and dramatic core, and back to the annalistic aftermath.

---

[75] AERTS 2018, 2019a, 2019b.
[76] AERTS 2019a, 2019b.

References

ADEMA, SUZANNE 2019: *Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid. Narrative Style and Structure*, Leiden.

AERTS, SIMON 2014: *A Systemic Functional 'Three-Dimensional' Approach to Aspect in Thucydides' Histories III,* in: *Symbolae Osloenses* 88, pp. 2–41.

AERTS, SIMON 2018: *Tense, Aspect and Aktionsart in Classical Latin: Towards a New Approach*, in: *Symbolae Osloenses* 92, pp. 107–149.

AERTS, SIMON 2019a: *Cotextual Cues for the Annotation of Perspective in Livy's* Ab urbe condita, in: *Philologia Classica* 14 (2), pp. 216–238.

AERTS, SIMON 2019b.: *A Three-Dimensional, Systemic Functional Analysis of Tense Usage in Gregory of Tours'* Decem libri Historiarum, in: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica* 59, pp. 327–339.

ALLAN, RUTGER 2018: *Herodotus and Thucydides: Distance and Immersion*, in: LIDEWIJ VAN GILS – IRENE DE JONG – CAROLINE KROON (eds.), *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative: Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*, Leiden, pp. 131–154.

ALLAN, RUTGER – IRENE DE JONG – CASPER DE JONGE 2017: *From Enargeia to Immersion: The Ancient Roots of a Modern Concept,* in: *Style* 51 (1): 34–51.

BACHE, CARL. 2008: *English Tense and Aspect in Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar: A Critical Appraisal and an Alternative*, London.

BENTEIN, KLAAS 2015: *Aspectual Choice with Verba Dicendi in Herodotus'* Histories, in: *Emerita* 83 (2), pp. 221–245.

BENTEIN, KLAAS 2016: *Aspectual Choice and the Presentation of Narrative: An Application to Herodotus'* Histories, in: *Glotta* 92 (1), pp. 24–55.

BOOGAART, RONNY 2004: *Aspect and Aktionsart,* in: GEERT BOOIJ et al (eds.), *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation*, Berlin, pp. 1165–1180.

CHAUSSERIE-LAPREE, JEAN-PIERRE 1969: *L'expression narrative chez les historiens latins: Histoire d'un style,* Paris.

COMRIE, BERNARD 1985: *Tense*, Cambridge.

COSERIU, EUGENIO 1980: *Aspect verbal ou aspects verbaux? Quelques questions de théorie et de méthode,* in ROBERT B. MARTIN – JEAN DAVID (édd.), *La notion d'aspect*, Paris, pp. 13–23.

DE JONG, IRENE – RENÉ NÜNLIST 2004: *From Bird's Eye View to Close-up: The Standpoint of the Narrator in the Homeric Epics,* in: ANTON BIERL – ARBOGAST SCHMITT – ANDREAS WILLI (Hrsg.), *Antike Literatur in Neuer Deutung*, Leipzig, pp. 63–83.

FLEISCHMAN, SUZANNE 1989: *Temporal Distance: A Basic Linguistic Metaphor*, in: *Studies in Language* 13 (1), pp. 1–50.

FLEISCHMAN, SUZANNE 1990: *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*, London.

HAVERLING, GERD 2010: *Actionality, Tense, and Viewpoint*, in: PHILIP BALDI – PIERLUIGI CUZZOLIN (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Vol. 2:*

Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense, Berlin, pp. 277–523.

HAVERLING, GERD 2015: *The Temporal and Modal Functions of the Pluperfect*, in: GERD HAVERLING (ed.), *Latin Linguistics in the Early 21st Century: Acts of the 16th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Uppsala, June 6th–11th, 2011*, Uppsala, pp. 193–207.

HOPPER, PAUL 1979: *Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse*, in: TALMY GIVÓN (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax*, New York, pp. 213–241.

JANDA, LAURA 2004: *A Metaphor in Search of a Source Domain: The Categories of Slavic Aspect*, in: *Cognitive Linguistics* 15 (4), pp. 471–527.

KROON, CAROLINE 1995: *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of Nam, Enim, Autem, Vero, and At*, Amsterdam.

KÜHNER, RAPHAEL – CARL STEGMANN 1912–1914: *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache, II: Satzlehre,* 2nd edition; Hannover.

LANGACKER, RONALD 2011: *The English Present. Temporal Coincidence vs. Epistemic Immediacy*, in: ADELINE PATARD – FRANK BRISARD (eds.), *Cognitive Approaches to Tense, Aspect, and Epistemic Modality*, Amsterdam, pp. 45–86.

LYONS, JOHN. 1977: *Semantics*, Cambridge – New York.

MELLET, SYLVIE 1988: *L'imparfait de l'indicatif en latin classique. Temps, aspect, modalité: étude synchronique dans une perspective énonciative*, Paris.

MELLET, SYLVIE – MARIE-DOMINIQUE JOFFRE – GUY SERBAT 1994: *Grammaire fondamentale du latin: le signifié du verbe*, Louvain-la-Neuve.

MENGE, HERMANN et al. 2000: *Lehrbuch Der Lateinischen Syntax Und Semantik*, Darmstadt.

NIJK, ARJAN 2016: *Re-Experiencing the Past: The* Praesens pro Praeterito *in Non-Narrative Discourse in Classical Greek Tragedy*, in: *Philologus* 160 (2), pp. 216–250.

OLDSJÖ, FREDRIK 2001: *Tense and Aspect in Caesar's Narrative*, Uppsala.

PINKSTER, HARM 2015: *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. 1: The Simple Clause*, Oxford.

REICHENBACH, HANS 1947: *Elements of Symbolic Logic*, New York.

RIJKSBARON, ALBERT 1988: *The Discourse Function of the Imperfect*, in: ALBERT RIJKSBARON – HOTZE MULDER – GERRY WAKKER (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Raphael KÜHNER*, Amsterdam, pp. 237–254.

RIJKSBARON et al. 2000: *Beknopte syntaxis van het klassiek Grieks*, Lunteren.

THOMPSON, GEOFF 2005: *But Me Some Buts: A Multidimensional View of Conjunction*, in: *Text* 25 (6), pp. 763–791.

THOMPSON, GEOFF 2014: *Introducing Functional Grammar*, 3rd edition; London.

VAN EMDE BOAS, EVERT et al. 2019: *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge.

VAN GILS, LIDEWIJ – CAROLINE KROON 2019. *Engaging the Audience: An Intersubjectivity Approach to the Historic Present Tense in Latin,* in: LIDEWIJ VAN GILS – CAROLINE KROON – RODIE RISSELADA (eds.), *Lemmata Linguistica Latina, Vol. II: Clause and Discourse*, Berlin, pp. 351–373.

VENDLER, ZENO 1967: *Verbs and Times*, in: Zeno VENDLER (ed.), *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca (N.Y.), pp. 97–121.