



UDC 811.124+811.14

Verb Forms with Aspectual Semantics in Latin and Ancient Greek in the Text of the New Testament (Gospel of Mark)*

Evgeny G. Filimonov

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; evfilimonov@yandex.ru

Maksim L. Fedotov

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; tequila.lime@gmail.com

For citation: Filimonov E. G., Fedotov M. L. Verb Forms with Aspectual Semantics in Latin and Ancient Greek in the Text of the New Testament (Gospel of Mark). *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.103>

The results of a comparative study of verb forms with aspectual semantics in Ancient Greek (Koine) (which has an overt category of aspect) and Latin (where aspect is rather a covert category), based on the Gospel of Mark, have shown that the expected correspondence of verb forms appears to be standard in the material as well: it is found in the majority of cases (97,6% of the Ancient Greek Aorist translated by the Latin Perfect, and 89,4% of the Ancient Greek Imperfect/Present translated by the Latin Imperfect). Therefore, there must be a considerable semantic overlap between the Ancient Greek Aorist and the Latin Perfect forms and between the Ancient Greek Imperfect/Present forms and the Latin Imperfect forms. For each pair, there must be a common semantic core, corresponding in the first case to the perfective, and in the second case to the imperfective viewpoints. In the minority of cases, we find deviations from this standard correspondence. Some of them can be explained by the trivial fact that the context allows freedom in the choice of the aspectual viewpoint. However, in several cases, the discrepancies are not accidental and can be explained by the existence of specific differences between the grammatical systems of two languages. These include iterative contexts and contexts with speech verbs.

Keywords: Gospel of Mark, aspect, covert category, aspectual semantics, verb, Ancient Greek, Koine, Latin, Aorist, Perfect, Imperfect, perfective, imperfective.

* The study was supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant 22-28-00531 “Grammar of covert categories in Latin and Ancient Greek”. It is a continuation of an earlier study (Filimonov, Fedotov 2022) [Филимонов Е. Г., Федотов М. Л. Формы с аспектуальной семантикой в древнегреческом и современном русском языках (на материале текста Евангелия от Марка). *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* 2022, 26-2, 1166–1180], also based on the text of the Gospel of Mark, which compared the use of aspectual forms between Ancient Greek and Modern Russian.

1. Introduction

The paper presents the results of a comparative study of verb forms with aspectual semantics in Ancient Greek (Koine) (which has an overt separate category of aspect) and Latin (where aspect is rather a covert category), based on the Gospel of Mark. For the Ancient Greek original (ca 70 CE), the Nestle-Aland 26th/27th edition (Greek New Testament) was used; for the Latin translation, the Clementine Vulgate edition (ca 420 CE, Vulgata Clementina). Additionally, a contemporary English translation — the New International Version (Holy Bible NIV) — was used as an auxiliary translation. The study involved identifying and analyzing parallel verb forms (those that enter aspectual oppositions) in the Ancient Greek and Latin translations.

The paper is structured as follows. We will first discuss the cases of (trivial) correspondence of forms where perfective-like or imperfective-like forms are used in both translations (Section 1). After that, deviations from the standard correspondence will be covered. First, we will discuss trivial deviations, which can be explained by looseness of the context (Section 2). Second, in the remaining part of the paper, we will analyze non-trivial deviations, which should be explained by differences in the grammatical systems of the two languages (Section 3).

The aspectual system of Ancient Greek can be described as based on Aorist (semantically perfective) vs Imperfect/Present (semantically imperfective) stems/forms. In non-Indicative forms, including non-finite forms, the aspectual opposition is manifested in the Aorist vs Present(-stem) forms. Beyond the Indicative, these forms no longer manifest a temporal semantic opposition, only an aspectual one. In the Future tense, no aspectual opposition is found. Additionally, there is the Perfect, expressing perfect and resultative/stative semantics. See (Arkhangelsky, Panov 2012,¹ 136–139; Bary 2009, 5–6; van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019, 410–437).

In Latin, aspect is not a separate grammatical category, but is still present, manifested in the opposition of the so-called Perfect (perfective past) and Imperfect (imperfective past) Indicative finite tense-aspect forms. In addition, there are other forms derived from the same stems, which are contrasted to each other in less straightforward ways. See the description in (Panov 2011,² 29–48; Ernout, Thomas 1964, 216–219).³

We took into account all Perfect and Imperfect Indicative forms in Latin and those forms in Ancient Greek that corresponded to them in the text: mainly Aorist and Imper-

¹ Архангельский Т. А., Панов В. А. Аспект в греческом языке: проблемные зоны и типология. В сборнике: Плунгян В. А. (отв. ред.). *Исследования по теории грамматики. Выпуск 6: Типология аспектуальных систем и категорий*. Санкт-Петербург, Наука, 2012, 122–148.

² Панов В. А. *Аспектуальная функция латинских превербов: типология и диахрония*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата наук. Москва, ИЯз РАН, 2011.

³ It should be noted that not all linguists consider the opposition between Perfect and Imperfect in Latin to be aspectual. For example, H. Pinkster (2015, 382–384) suggests describing the Latin system as based on relative tense rather than aspect and to analyze Perfect as expressing anteriority to a speech time reference point (rather than perfective past) and Imperfect as expressing simultaneity with a past reference point (rather than imperfective past). See also an overview in: Aerts 2018. However, one can argue that it is in fact not the Latin being somehow divergent, but the perfective vs. imperfective aspect (West-European-style, not Slavic-style, cf. Spevak 2017) in general that is hard (or even unnecessary?) to distinguish from non-simultaneous vs. simultaneous relative tense. Such alternative analysis is essentially applicable not only to Latin, but also to other languages with an established perfective-imperfective contrast in the past (and to Ancient Greek as well, if we take the reference point to be non-fixed).

fect Indicative, but also Aorist/Present non-finite forms, Aorist/Present Optative forms, and Aorist/Present Subjunctive forms, as well as (Plu)Perfect forms (counted separately).⁴

2. Expected (trivial) correspondences

The expected correspondence of tense-aspect forms expressing the perfective aspectual viewpoint is AGr. Aorist — Lat. Perfect, as shown in the following examples (1) and (2):⁵

- (1) καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν (Aor.) σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν. (1:10)

Et statim ascendens de aqua, vidit (Perf.) caelos apertos, et Spiritum tamquam columbam descendentem, et manentem in ipso.

Just as Jesus was coming up out of the water, he **saw** heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on him like a dove.

- (2) ἀκούετε. ἰδοὺ ἐξῆλθεν (Aor.) ὁ σπείρων σπείραι... (4:3)

Audite: ecce exiit (Perf.) seminans ad seminandum...

Listen! A farmer **went out** to sow his seed...

The other expected correspondence of tense-aspect forms is AGr. Imperfect (Present)⁶ — Lat. Imperfect, expressing the imperfective viewpoint. See examples (3) and (4):

- (3) καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, ἐφοβοῦντο (Imperf.) γάρ. (16:8)

At illae exeuntes, fugerunt de monumento: invaserat enim eas tremor et pavor: et nemini quidquam dixerunt: timebant (Imperf.) enim.

Trembling and bewildered, the women went out and fled from the tomb. They said nothing to anyone, because they **were afraid**.

- (4) καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν (Imperf.), προσέπιπτον (Imperf.) αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραζον (Imperf.) λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. (3:11)

Et spiritus immundi, cum illum videbant (Imperf.), procidebant (Imperf.) ei: et clamabant (Imperf.), dicentes...

Whenever the impure spirits **saw** him, they **fell down** before him and **cried out**...

It should be added that the same two correspondences are also sometimes observed with non-finite forms in Ancient Greek (although we have only a few such examples in

⁴ I.e. all pairs of examples which contained any Indicative Present (proper) forms, any Imperative forms, or any Future forms in either language were left out, as well as all pairs which contained any Subjunctive or non-finite forms in Latin. This is motivated by the fact that these forms do not present a (straightforward) aspectual opposition.

⁵ Here and hereafter in the examples, those Latin and Ancient Greek verb forms that are relevant to the current discussion (as well as the verb forms corresponding to them in the English translation) are in bold and are accompanied by grammatical form abbreviations in parentheses. Sometimes, a literal translation is also added after it in square brackets. Other verb forms also appear in the examples, but these are provided for contextual completeness only and can be ignored.

⁶ The “(Present)” here denotes only the non-finite/Optative/Subjunctive Present-stem forms in Ancient Greek, which, together with the Imperfect, create an aspectual opposition with the Aorist-stem forms (see Introduction). In the actual data, among these forms only Present-stem participles happened to occur in a few cases as correspondences to Lat. Imperfect or (much more rarely) Perfect. An illustration can be found in (5).

our data). Consider the following examples with an AGr. Present Participle corresponding to a Lat. Imperfect (finite) form (5) and an AGr. Aorist Infinitive translated with a Lat. Perfect (finite) form (6):

- (5) καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν **αἰρόμενον** (Pres. Part.) ὑπὸ τεσσάρων. (2:3)

*Et venerunt ad eum ferentes paralyticum, qui a quatuor **portabatur** (Imperf.).*
Some men came, bringing to him a paralyzed man, **carried** by four of them.

- (6) μετὰ δὲ τὸ **παραδοθῆναι** (Aor. Inf.) [lit. ‘after **being handed over**’] τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (1:14)

*Postquam autem **traditus est** (Perf.) [lit. ‘**was handed over**’] Joannes, venit Jesus in Galilæam, prædicans Evangelium regni Dei.*

After John **was put in prison**, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God.

Now how frequent are the expected correspondences of tense-aspect forms in the analyzed data? The summarized data for all 16 chapters of the Gospel of Mark are presented in Table 1 (additionally including pairs with Ancient Greek Perfect, see below).

Let us begin with the numbers for the first four correspondences, summed up in a separate Table 2:

Table 1. Quantities of contexts in our data that manifest different types of correspondences between the forms in question in the two languages.

	By chapter																Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
AGr. Aor. — Lat. Perf.	36	20	16	23	32	59	18	31	39	33	16	51	8	57	33	20	492
AGr. Aor. — Lat. Imperf.	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	12
AGr. Imperf. (/Pres.) — Lat. Perf.	1	0	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	4	0	4	2	0	29
AGr. Imperf. (/Pres.) — Lat. Imperf.	21	14	15	17	24	36	10	9	14	14	14	10	1	21	21	3	244
AGr. (Plu)Perf. — Lat. Perf.	3	0	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	18
AGr. (Plu)Perf. — Lat. Imperf.	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3

Table 2. Quantities of contexts that manifest correspondences to AGr. Aorist and Imperfect forms (the difference is statistically significant, χ^2 , $P < 0.01$)

	Lat. Perf.	Lat. Imperf.	Total
AGr. Aor.	492	12	504
AGr. Imperf. (/Pres.)	29	244	273

As can be seen, both “consistent” correspondences are observed in the absolute majority of cases. AGr. Aorist corresponds to Lat. Perfect in 97,6% of all cases of Aorist in Ancient Greek and AGr. Imperfect (/Present) corresponds to Lat. Imperfect in 89,4% of all cases of Imperfect (/Present) in Ancient Greek.

This is in accord with the expectation that there must be a significant semantic overlap between the Aorist in Ancient Greek and the Perfect in Latin, on the one hand, and between the Imperfect/Present in Ancient Greek and the Imperfect in Latin. And that in each pair of forms we can speak of a single semantic core corresponding to the perfective viewpoint in the first case and the imperfective viewpoint in the second.

At the same time, in the remaining 2,4% of all cases of Aorist and 10,6% of all cases of Imperfect/Present in Ancient Greek we observe “inconsistent” forms in Latin: Imperfect and Perfect, respectively. These partial deviations from our preliminary expectations (that were based only on the core semantics of the forms in question) can be explained a) by the influence of the translator’s choice due to looseness of some contexts (see Section 2) and b) by several particularities of the Ancient Greek grammatical system that set it apart from the Latin system (see Section 3).

Before turning to these inconsistencies, let us also briefly discuss the correspondences with the AGr. (Plu)Perfect forms. As can be seen from Table 1, there are some cases, albeit rare, where it is the AGr. (Plu)Perfect that corresponds in the text to the Lat. Perfect; cf. an illustration in (7).

- (7) καὶ λέγων ὅτι **πεπλήρωται** (Perf.) [lit. ‘**has been fulfilled**’] ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν (Perf.) ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. (1:15)
et dicens: Quoniam impletum est (Perf.) [lit. ‘**has been fulfilled**’] *tempus, et appropinquavit* (Perf.) *regnum Dei: poenitemini, et credite Evangelio.*
 “The time **has come**,” he said. “The kingdom of God **has come near**. Repent and believe the good news!”

This is consistent with a view that the Latin aspectual system has one perfective form, the Perfect, while the Ancient Greek has two, the Aorist and the (Plu)Perfect. And while the latter two are, at least partly, contrasted according to whether the situation (viewed perfectly) remains currently relevant⁷ at reference time ((Plu)Perfect) or not (Aorist), the Latin Perfect is neutral with respect to current relevance and thus is used in both contexts.⁸ As for the even rarer cases of correspondence between AGr. (Plu)Perfect and the Lat. Imperfect, these represent the uses of the AGr. (Plu)Perfect where it expresses not perfect, but resultative/stative semantics, cf. (8).

- (8) λέγων, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; **οἶδά** (Perf.) [‘I **know**’ < *‘I **have seen**’] σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. (1:24)
dicens: Quid nobis et tibi, Jesu Nazarene? venisti perdere nos? scio (Imperf.) *qui sis, Sanctus Dei.*
 “What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I **know** who you are—the Holy One of God!”

⁷ For the “current relevance” analysis of perfect semantics, see (Dahl, Hedin 2000).

⁸ Even historically, the Latin Perfect was, according to reconstruction, a merger of the earlier Indo-European Perfect and Aorist forms, see (Pinkster 2015, 444) and references therein.

3. Trivial inconsistencies: Loose contexts

As already mentioned, in a minority of cases we see inconsistencies in the choice of tense-aspect forms between the two texts — where an imperfective-like form corresponds to a perfective-like form in the other translation and vice versa.

Some of these inconsistencies can be explained trivially by looseness of the context. In other words, such contexts allow a certain freedom of choice of the aspectual viewpoint, do not set it rigidly. As a result, sometimes a different viewpoint is chosen in the translation from the one used in the original.

Thus, in example (9), the two languages apparently use different viewpoints: the character entered a state of surprise ('became surprised', perfective) or was in that state ('was wondering', imperfective), respectively. Nevertheless, this difference is not critical for the perception and correct understanding of this fragment:

- (9) ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος **ἐθαύμασεν** (Aor.) εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν· (15:44)

*Pilatus autem **mirabatur** (Imperf.) si jam obiisset. Et accersito centurione, interrogavit eum si jam mortuus esset.*

Pilate **was surprised** to hear that he was already dead. Summoning the centurion, he asked him if Jesus had already died.

Consider also example (10). Here even the lexical meanings of the verbs are slightly different, resulting, again, in different aspectual viewpoints: perfective in Ancient Greek for an accomplished event of telling off and imperfective in Latin for an ongoing activity of threatening (which will later be interrupted):

- (10) καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδιά ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄψηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ **ἐπετίμησαν** (Aor.) [lit. '**rebuked**', '**told off**'] αὐτοῖς. (10:13)

*Et offerebant illi parvulos ut tangeret illos. Discipuli autem **comminabantur** (Imperf.) [lit. '**were threatening**'] offerentibus.*

People were bringing little children to Jesus for him to place his hands on them, but the disciples **rebuked** them. {When Jesus saw this, he was indignant. He said to them, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them..."}⁹

4. Non-trivial inconsistencies: systemic differences

In other cases, inconsistencies in the choice of aspectual forms should be explained in a non-trivial way: by (minor) differences in the grammatical systems of the two languages. In our data, we identified examples of two types of such differences: the use of the AGr. Aorist in iterative contexts (3.1) and of the AGr. Imperfect with verbs of speech (3.2).

4.1. Iterative contexts

A specific feature of Ancient Greek is the relatively frequent use of Aorist forms in contexts which can be seen as manifesting iterative semantics (in the past) (Schwyzer 1950, 278).⁹ In Latin, however, in these contexts, the (expected) Imperfect appears as a rule.

⁹ We are grateful to the anonymous reviewer for bringing to our attention that E. Schwyzer discusses Classical Greek examples without the iterative particle ἄν (unlike our example). However, we still believe that it concerns the same phenomenon of Aorist forms being used in iterative contexts.

Only a single robust example of such use has been encountered in our data:¹⁰

- (11) καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ εἰς πόλεις ἢ εἰς ἀγροὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθεισαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἄν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο (Aor.) αὐτοῦ ἐσώζοντο (Imperf.). (6:56)

Et quocumque introibat, in vicis, vel in villas aut civitates, in plateis ponebant infirmos, et deprecabantur eum, ut vel fimbriam vestimenti ejus tangerent, et quotquot tangebant (Imperf.) eum, salvi fiebant (Imperf.).

And wherever he went — into villages, towns or countryside—they placed the sick in the marketplaces. They begged him to let them touch even the edge of his cloak, and all who **touched** it were **healed**.

Here we encounter an Aorist form ἤψαντο ‘touched’ in a subordinate clause inside a main clause with an Imperfect form ἐσώζοντο ‘were healed/saved’. This former verb, despite being in the Aorist form, denotes an iterative situation linked to the one in the main clause (‘however many touched it were healed’). We also encounter the particle ἂν before the Aorist form, which itself has iterative semantics; the fact that this particle combines with Aorist forms in iterative contexts is mentioned in (van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019, 415).

It should be noted that the AGr. Imperfect, which is more expected in iterative contexts from a typological point of view as well as according to the general logic of the Ancient Greek system, is definitely also used in such contexts, just like in Latin. Consider example (4) above.

A possible explanation for the use of Aorist in iterative examples like (11) is that the Ancient Greek grammatical system reacts here not to iterativity (and imperfectivity), but to the attainment of its internal limit by each of the repeating (sub)events. While the Latin system (and the Ancient Greek system in cases like *ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον, and ἔκραζον* in (4)) reacts to the more abstract imperfectivity, accompanying the iterative semantics. This is the way such use of Aorist is explained by E. Schwyzer (1950, 278).

4.2. Verbs of speech

In Ancient Greek, it is possible to use the Imperfect with verbs of speech even when the corresponding speech situations seem to have a perfective viewpoint (i. e. are part of the narrative sequence). This especially concerns speech verbs that introduce reported speech. In Latin, in these contexts we more often encounter the (expected) Perfect forms.¹¹ This special behaviour of speech verbs in Ancient Greek was noticed long ago, cf. (Schwyzer 1950, 277–278). In the Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek such uses are considered to be a case of “stage-setting” function of the Imperfect (Van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019, 428–29).

We found at least 6 robust examples of such uses in our data (7:27, 8:5, 8:23, 10:10, 14:36, 15:4, and 15:12), two of them are presented below:

- (12) καὶ ἔλεγεν (Imperf.) [lit. ‘was saying’] αὐτῆ, ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν. (7:27)

¹⁰ We have discussed several other examples of AGr. Aorist forms in iterative contexts in (Filimonov, Fedotov 2022, 1173–1175).

¹¹ However, usage of Imperfect forms of speech verbs is prominent in the Latin text as well. For more on such uses in Latin, see (Rosén 2010).

Qui **dixit** (Perf.) illi: *Sine prius saturari filios: non est enim bonum sumere panem filiorum, et mittere canibus.*

“First let the children eat all they want,” he **told** her, “for it is not right to take the children’s bread and toss it to the dogs.”

- (13) καὶ ἠρώτα (Imperf.) [lit. ‘**was asking**’] αὐτοῦς, πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, ἑπτὰ. (8:5)
Et interrogavit (Perf.) *eos* : *Quot panes habetis ? Qui dixerunt* : *Septem.*
“How many loaves do you have?” Jesus **asked**. “Seven,” they replied.

Additionally, several similar cases can be found, with verbs that can be considered verbs of speech, but without the introduced reported speech:

- (14) ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνείτο (Imperf.) [lit. ‘**was denying**’]. καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ, ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ. (14:70)
At ille iterum negavit (Perf.). *Et post pusillum rursus qui astabant, dicebant Petro* : *Vere ex illis es : nam et Galilæus es.*
Again he **denied** it. After a little while, those standing near said to Peter, “Surely you are one of them, for you are a Galilean.”
- (15) ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, διδάσκαλε, εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, καὶ ἐκωλύομεν (Imperf.) [lit. ‘**were preventing**’] αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν. (9:38)
Respondit illi Joannes, dicens: Magister, vidimus quemdam in nomine tuo ejicientem dæmonia, qui non sequitur nos, et prohibuimus (Perf.) *eum.*
“Teacher,” said John, “we saw someone driving out demons in your name and we **told** him **to stop**, because he was not one of us.”

5. Conclusion

The expected correspondence of verb forms appears to be standard in the material as well: it is found in the majority of cases (97,6 % of the Ancient Greek Aorist translated by the Latin Perfect, and 89,4 % of the Ancient Greek Imperfect(/Present) translated by the Latin Imperfect).

Therefore, there must be a considerable semantic overlap between the Ancient Greek Aorist and the Latin Perfect forms and between the Ancient Greek Imperfect/Present forms and the Latin Imperfect forms. For each pair, there must be a common semantic core, corresponding in the first case to the perfective, and in the second case to the imperfective viewpoints.

There are some deviations from the standard correspondence. Some of them can be explained by the trivial fact that the context allows freedom in the choice of the aspectual viewpoint. However, in several cases, the discrepancies are not accidental and can be explained by the existence of specific differences between the grammatical systems of Ancient Greek and Latin. These are, in our data, iterative contexts and contexts with speech verbs, in which Ancient Greek demonstrates a certain degree of specificity, compared to Latin.

Sources

Greek New Testament: the Nestle-Aland 26th/27th Edition / The Internet Sacred Text Archive (ISTA). <https://sacred-texts.com/bib/gnt/index.htm> ((accessed: 12.09.2023).

Holy Bible, NIV (New International Version). Biblica, 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passages/?search=Mark&version=NIV> (accessed: 12.09.2023).
Vulgata Clementina: The Clementine Vulgate Project. <https://vulsearch.sourceforge.net/html/index.html> (accessed: 12.09.2023).

References

- Aerts S. Tense, Aspect and Aktionsart in Classical Latin: Towards a New Approach. *Symbolae Osloenses* 2018, 92:1, 107–149.
- Arkhangelsky T. A., Panov V. A. Aspect in Greek: Problematic Areas and Typology. In: V. A. Plungian (ed.). *Studies in the Theory of Grammar. Part 6: Typology of Aspectual Systems and Categories*. St Petersburg, Nauka Publ., 2012, 122–148 (in Russian).
- Bary C. L. A. *Aspect in Ancient Greek: A Semantic Analysis of the Aorist and Imperfective*. PhD thesis. Radboud University Nijmegen, 2009. <https://repository.uibn.ru.nl/handle/2066/74432> (25.05.2024).
- Dahl Ö., Hedin E. Current Relevance and Event Reference. In: Ö. Dahl (ed.). *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin — New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, 385–401.
- Ernout A., Thomas F. *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris, Klincksieck, 1964.
- Filimonov E. G., Fedotov M. L. Verb Forms with Aspectual Semantics in Ancient Greek and Modern Russian in the Text of the Gospel of Mark. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* 2022, 26-2, 1166–1180 (in Russian).
- Panov V. A. Aspectual Function of Latin Preverbs: Typology and Diachrony. Thesis for the degree of Candidate of Science. Moscow, Institute of Linguistics RAS Publ., 2011 (in Russian).
- Pinkster H. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. I: The Simple Clause*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Rosén H. Dum Loquimur, Fugerit Inuida Aetas: on Tense and Actionality of Latin Verba Dicendi. In: R. Page, A. Rubin (eds). *Studies in Classical Linguistics in Honor of Philip Baldi*. Leiden, Brill, 2010, 97–113.
- Schwyzler E. *Griechische Grammatik. Band 2: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. München, C. H. Beck, 1950.
- Spevak O. Some Remarks on Grammatical Aspect in Latin. *Philologia Classica* 2017, 11 (2), 282–288.
- van Emde Boas E., Rijksbaron A., Huitink L., De Bakker M. (eds) *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Плагольные формы с аспектуальной семантикой в латинском и древнегреческом языках в тексте Нового Завета (Евангелие от Марка)*

Евгений Геннадьевич Филимонов

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; evfilimonov@yandex.ru

Максим Леонидович Федотов

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; tequila.lime@gmail.com

Для цитирования: Filimonov E. G., Fedotov M. L. Verb Forms with Aspectual Semantics in Latin and Ancient Greek in the Text of the New Testament (Gospel of Mark). *Philologia Classica* 2024, 19 (1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2024.103>

* Статья подготовлена при поддержке гранта РФФ № 22-28-00531 «Грамматика скрытых категорий в латинском и древнегреческом языках» и является продолжением ранее опубликованного исследования: Филимонов Е. Г., Федотов М. Л. Формы с аспектуальной семантикой в древнегреческом и современном русском языках (на материале текста Евангелия от Марка). *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* 2022, 26 (2), 1166–1180, также основанного на тексте Евангелия от Марка, в котором проводится сравнение форм с аспектуальной семантикой в древнегреческом и современном русском языках.

В статье представлены результаты сопоставительного исследования глагольных форм с аспектуальной семантикой в древнегреческом (койне) (имеющем «открытую» категорию аспекта) и латинском (в котором аспект является скорее скрытой категорией) языках на материале Евангелия от Марка. Ожидаемое соответствие глагольных форм оказывается стандартным в исследованном материале: оно встречается в большинстве случаев (97,6% форм древнегреческого Аориста переводятся латинским Перфектом, и 89,4% древнегреческого Имперфекта/Презенса переводятся латинским Имперфектом). Таким образом, между древнегреческим Аористом и латинским Перфектом, а также между древнегреческим Имперфектом/Презенсом и латинским Имперфектом должно существовать значительное семантическое пересечение. Для каждой пары глагольных форм в двух языках можно постулировать общее семантическое ядро, соответствующее в первом случае перфективному, а во втором — имперфективному аспектуальному ракурсу. В небольшом числе случаев, однако, мы обнаруживаем отклонения от этого стандартного соответствия. Часть из этих случаев можно объяснить тем тривиальным фактом, что контекст допускает свободу в выборе аспектуального ракурса либо выбор лексики при переводе требует использования другого аспектуального ракурса. Также в ряде случаев расхождения неслучайны и могут быть объяснены наличием специфических различий между грамматическими системами древнегреческого и латинского. К последним случаям относятся итеративные контексты (в древнегреческом в них часто используется Аорист вместо типологически ожидаемого Имперфекта) и контексты с глаголами речи (в древнегреческом и — в меньшей степени — в латинском в таких контекстах часто используется Имперфект вместо ожидаемого Аориста).

Ключевые слова: Евангелие от Марка, аспект, скрытая категория, глагол, древнегреческий, койне, латинский, аорист, перфект, имперфект, перфектив, имперфектив.

Received: 11.09.2023

Accepted: 15.12.2023